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The purpose of this qualitative study was to describe the operation and impact of teacher study groups at one school site throughout a school year. The study was exploratory in nature. The research questions focused on the major factors in the school's external and internal context that impacted the study groups, the typical behaviors and interactions of the study group participants, and the impact of the study groups on the participants, the curriculum, and instruction.

Forty-nine staff members at one elementary school site participated in eight teacher study groups. Complete participant observation, interviews, a survey, a team building exercise, and document collection were used to collect data throughout the school year. Data analysis was ongoing and followed a constant comparative model.

Nine themes based on recurring behavior patterns were found. Seven reflected the internal context of the school and two the external context. The findings suggest that teachers and administrators do not have the knowledge base necessary to work together successfully as teams. Both a
strong knowledge base on teaming and ongoing support and participation by the administrator should be in place before there can be reasonable expectations for productive work as teams. Administrators should also convey consequences of nonparticipation and recognize the contributions of teams. The findings also indicated that the disruption of the rhythm of the school should be taken into consideration when implementing change. In addition, staff members need an opportunity to acknowledge their fundamental belief systems instead of denying racially related feelings. Teachers' feelings should be acknowledged and validated in the context in which they occur. Also, findings support the strength of heterogeneous grouping which provides the felt need to participate and a greater exchange of ideas. Implications from these findings can be extended to site-based management teams. Further research topics in the areas of team development, preservice and administrative programs, racial issues, and shared decision making were suggested.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study of school-based teacher study groups as a staff development model was designed to add to the research on staff development and change. This study was exploratory in nature. As a participant observer I studied the impact of teacher study groups as they related to the school culture and to societal and local concerns. In addition, the study focused on staff development, professional growth, program changes, and the effects of participation in the teacher study groups on the staff and the school culture.

John Goodlad (1983b) wrote that the energy required for successful school reform must come from within the school, from the teachers themselves. Yet the first wave of reform following the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation at Risk, focused on top-down, centralized mandates (Judge, 1988; Kirst, 1989; Passow, 1989; Raywid, 1990). These reforms can be described as prescriptive solutions to improving education rather than teacher centered, growth oriented solutions.

Beginning with the 1986-1987 Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) report, numerous reports were
written recommending a change in the focus of reform efforts (Passow, 1989; Regional Resource and Federal Centers Program, 1991). Recognizing the need for a change in focus, the second wave of restructuring acknowledged the importance of building a professional culture within the context of individual schools, as well as the critical role of teachers in managing and delivering curriculum and instruction (Simpson, 1990). Crucial to building this professional culture is the restructuring of relationships among teachers (Lewis, 1989).

In order to build a professional culture, school improvement strategies should take into account both the isolation in which teachers work and the context of the organization in which they work (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Research has shown that teachers learn their roles and develop their teaching styles and philosophies through experience within the school organization (Berliner, 1986; Leinhardt, 1990; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). In elementary schools, limited interaction with other teachers makes this experience an isolated activity.

Isolation severely limits the possibility of peer group discussion and shared analysis, and therefore limits professional growth and improvement. In addition, isolation exacerbates teachers' feelings of lack of confidence, vulnerability, and frustration (Joyce & Showers, 1987). The
resulting lack of collegiality often thwarts teachers' self-renewal efforts and involvement in school improvement efforts (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988). School-based continuing education in an improvement oriented culture is vital to successful school restructuring (Joyce & Murphy, 1990; Schlechty, 1990). Individual schools must create conditions in which educators can grow professionally and school improvement is the focus of collegial relationships (Joyce & Murphy, 1990).

Research during the last twenty years strongly suggests that the needs of adult learners must be met in order for staff development to be successful (Arin-Krupp, 1989; Field, 1979; Loucks & Lieberman, 1983; Wood, 1989). Adult learners need both a positive, growth-oriented change environment and information relevant to their personal concerns. A growth model is much more effective for adult learners than the traditional deficit model of inservice training (Arin-Krupp, 1989; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

Leaders of staff development processes also should acknowledge the social context of adult learners. Both societal and local concerns make up the social context. An understanding of these environmental pressures and their impact on schools is a critical component in school improvement efforts (Huberman, 1983; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Miles, 1983). Current improvement efforts should be focused on the needs of individual schools within their
social context (Miller, 1988; Sparks, 1990). After the problems and issues within the social context of school have been conceptualized, an awareness of those problems and issues must be developed before a solution can be proposed and action taken (Schlechty, 1988).

As teachers actively participate in ongoing, school-based staff development, a professional culture may emerge. A professional culture reduces isolation and therefore meets teachers' needs for collegiality, ongoing professional growth, and an opportunity to share their experience and expertise (Joyce, 1986). A school culture that acknowledges teachers as professionals by meeting their needs has been identified as a significant aspect of self-renewal within schools (Joyce, 1986). Successful change cannot occur in schools unless the change process involves teachers in a significantly meaningful way (Goodlad, 1983a; Devaney & Sykes, 1988; Lieberman, 1988; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Schlechty, 1990; Sparks, 1990; Sykes, 1987).

The greatest barrier to change is the absence of the knowledge and skills necessary to make that change. Opportunities to acquire new knowledge and reflect on present practices should be readily available to school personnel (Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Faculties require school-based developmental learning opportunities that are suited to their particular needs and available to the entire faculty (David, 1991a). With these opportunities teachers
perceive themselves as learners, and the culture of the school becomes one in which adult learning is energized and sustained (Murphy, 1991a). The resulting professional interaction contributes to higher levels of teacher competence, confidence, influence, and satisfaction; which in turn fosters teaching norms for continued improvement of curricular and instructional practices (Poole & Okeafor, 1989). One vehicle for restructuring relationships and promoting teacher learning is the teacher study group model. Teachers meet weekly in small groups to discuss current professional literature related to the identified needs of the school site.

Statement of the Problem

The problem for this study was to describe the operation and impact of teacher study groups at one school site.

Research Questions

The problem for this study focused on and was guided by the following research questions:

1. What major factors in the internal and external social context of the school had an impact on the study groups?

2. What typical behaviors of participation, leadership, decision making, information processing, problem
solving, interpersonal relationships, risk taking, and conflict resolution emerged from the teacher study groups?

3. What was the impact of the study groups on curriculum and instruction in the school?

4. What was the impact of participation in the study groups on individual participants and on their school?

Definition of Terms

1. A teacher study group consists of five to seven cross-grade level staff members who meet weekly for one hour during the school day to discuss two or three research-based articles that they have read prior to the meeting. The research articles are related to the site-based management goals of the school. Staff members choose their study group based on their participation in site-based management action teams.

2. A key informant is a person who is more willing to talk than others and may have greater experience in the setting than others. This person provides the researcher with an emic or insider's perspective. More time is spent talking with key informants than with ancillary informants (Dobbert, 1982).

3. An ancillary informant is a person the researcher is not necessarily as comfortable with as the key informant, but who can supply complementary or opposing data which help distinguish informants' personality patterns from cultural
patterns, provide reliability checks, and balance the choice of key informants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

4. **Grounded theory** evolves as raw data are gathered and patterns are analyzed. The researcher's questions are refocused and developed during the research process. The data are not gathered to prove or disprove a previously stated hypothesis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

5. A **participant observer** is a researcher who enters the culture to be studied, develops rapport with other participants, and systematically gathers information. Participant observation can vary from passive to complete participation (Spradley, 1980).

**Background and Significance**

The school in this study, Georgetown Elementary, was opened in 1955 to serve all ages of students who lived in a newly built African-American neighborhood. Grades one through twelve shared the new building and its full-sized gym, auditorium, and track. The school functioned in this form until 1969. Beginning in 1969, the Federal Court ordered that Georgetown's high school students be bused to the predominantly white high schools within this large metropolitan school district. In 1970, the court ordered the busing of Georgetown's junior high students, but allowed the elementary students to continue to attend their all African-American neighborhood school.
In mid-1975, the United States Court of Appeals reversed the District Court's 1970 decision and ordered the school district to submit a plan for removing the one race identity of the neighborhood elementary school. A magnet school plan was selected from among ten different plans presented to the court. The Georgetown Elementary magnet school court order required that: (a) a 50% white/black ratio be maintained in each classroom, (b) a superior and unique instructional program be designed to attract white students from throughout the school district, and (c) more than 80% of the certified staff have master's degrees and at least three years of teaching experience. The two-fold goal of the district was to make Georgetown Elementary attractive enough to draw white volunteer students, in addition to serving as a model school for the district. The magnet school plan, in operation since the fall of 1975, continues to function under court order.

In order to make this magnet school unique, the school district has provided extra funding, staffing, and educational programming not available to other schools within the district. Georgetown has maintained an approximate nine-to-one teacher to pupil ratio. Because of the unique educational opportunity offered to students, the school has had a consistent and extensive list of white volunteer students waiting for openings.
Since the program's inception the staff has been involved in a plethora of innovative programs. As the school district has grown, many of the instructional programs initially piloted at the magnet school have been implemented throughout the district. As other elementary schools have implemented the programs piloted by the magnet school, the programming throughout the district has become similar. In addition, the demographics of the school district have changed during the last ten years. Significantly larger numbers of minority students now attend many schools throughout the district.

In the fall of 1990, Georgetown Elementary began a restructuring process. The impetus for this process was a felt need by the central administration to once again make the school a unique setting, as well as a district-wide focus on the low achievement of minority students. Also, an organized and vocal group of African-American magnet school parents were expressing concern and displeasure with the school. The district responded to the parents' stated concerns, as well as a district commitment to maintaining the excellence of the magnet school program, by proposing that the magnet school begin a restructuring process in the fall of 1990.

During the 1990-1991 school year, the Georgetown staff took part in numerous restructuring activities facilitated by an outside consultant with expert knowledge of the
processes of change and restructuring. Sparks (1990) pointed out that it is important that the learners going through the change process as well as those facilitating the process understand change as a process in which effectiveness grows with understanding and development. At the suggestion of the school's site-based management outside facilitator, teacher study groups were formed.

The goal of the teacher study groups was to further the staff's understanding of research related to identified areas of need and to provide a school-based opportunity for professional and personal development. I was given the responsibility for developing, organizing, and facilitating the teacher study groups. Study group participants met during the school day for ten weeks to discuss the latest research-based professional literature. The study group participants were instructed to read their assigned articles prior to each weekly meeting. The content of the assigned articles pertained to the areas of need identified through a staff visioning activity: (a) school restructuring, (b) school climate, (c) teacher empowerment, (d) teaching thinking skills, (e) family and community involvement, (f) curriculum reorganization, (g) multicultural education, and (i) technology. Site-based management goals and objectives were written for each of the identified areas and action plans were generated for addressing these areas.
Review of Related Literature

During the last ten years, the base of research on implementing change has grown. The following review of related literature provides a discussion of content related literature on teacher study groups. In addition, the research method chosen for this study will be briefly described and justified.

Research on teacher study groups is very limited. In 1987, Murphy (1991b), working with Joyce and Showers, began the Models of Training Program in Richmond County, Georgia. The program, which addresses four models of student learning, combines teacher study groups with three other models of staff development: (a) a learning council which selects areas for improvement, (b) more than one hundred hours of faculty training on four learning models, and (c) a cadre of specially trained teachers to provide follow up and support to the study groups. Murphy reported that the Models of Training Program has been quite effective, but there is still much to learn about the process.

Little (1989) wrote that joint work is the strongest type of collaborative relationship. Shared responsibility for achieving the goals for school improvement was inherent in Georgetown's study group model. As Schlechty (1990) emphasized, teachers must become intellectual and thoughtful leaders if schools for the 21st century are going to
successfully meet the needs of a changing school population. Because individual schools are the primary unit of change, continuing attention to instruction and curriculum should be built into each school (Goodlad, 1983a; Wood, 1989). While creating and maintaining a culture for change, teachers can make more effective instructional decisions when they are equipped with shared knowledge and a shared focus. Shared knowledge also enables teachers to better cope with ongoing environmental turbulence that can impact the change process (Huberman, 1983; Miles, 1983).

The goal of the magnet school teacher study groups for the 1991-1992 school year was to review and discuss professional literature relevant to teacher expectations, student achievement, school climate, and community and school relationships. Joyce and Murphy (1990) found that a prevailing belief among many teachers and administrators was that curriculum and models of teaching could not overcome home background and inherited ability. Yet, in Japan effort on the part of the teacher and the student is believed to be the key to student achievement (Halloway, 1988; Stevenson, Lee & Stigler, 1986). School improvement efforts can not be successful as long as the belief system of the school is such that factors outside the school have a greater impact on achievement than curriculum, instruction, and the social climate of the school (Joyce & Murphy, 1990). Teachers need the knowledge base necessary to work their way through the
self-discovery and change necessary to provide an equitable education to all.

When increased student achievement is a goal, individual schools and their personnel are the primary units of change (Goodlad, 1983b; Wood, 1989). This study provides significant insight into: (a) a school-based teacher's model, (b) how teachers react to and assume this new role, and (c) how participation in study groups impacts teacher commitment to change. Research has shown that few desired outcomes occur without teacher commitment (Cuban, 1990a). This study also provides information relating to the impact of environmental turbulence on the school, the teachers, and the change process (Huberman, 1983).

I conducted this study in an elementary school setting using a qualitative design. I gathered and organized data from an emic, or insider's, point of view in order to describe the behavior patterns and associated meanings evolving from the teacher study groups and the impact of those behaviors on curriculum, instruction, and the school culture. Employing a qualitative rather than a quantitative point of view permitted me to gain an understanding of the participants' social behaviors in a naturally occurring cycle of events from the participants' frames of reference (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Kamil, 1985). "Schools are complex, often nested conglomerates of interdependent variables, events, perceptions, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors,
and thus their study cannot be approached in the same way that the study of single events and single variables can" (Salomon, 1991, p. 11).

A qualitative approach allowed me to examine teacher study group behaviors in their natural setting, so that the information gathered was not separated from the context. I gathered and analyzed the raw data. Through thick description, collecting information from a variety of sources in written rather than numerical form, I was able to gather and analyze descriptive information related to how the experiences of individuals and the staff were influenced by the study group process, the school context, and the community context; and in turn, how that context was then influenced by the individuals and the staff. My thick description contained immediate and local meanings of actions. I used these quotations in reporting my findings (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Dobbert, 1982; Erickson, 1986; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Qualitative research is concerned with the emic, the participant's perspective. Obtaining the teacher's point of view was vital since teachers have been recognized as having a critical role in managing and delivering instruction (Passow, 1989; Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). The restructuring of schools requires that teachers take an active role in the continuous study of teaching and learning. By doing so, teachers develop a sense of their own worth and begin to
focus not only on the needs of their students but also on their own development and professional health (Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Collegiality and an ongoing desire for professional growth opportunities are necessary conditions for restructuring. Both should be examined from the teacher's point of view because neither can be mandated from above (Goodlad, 1983a; Judge, 1988). Conditions for restructuring must be created by the teachers themselves within a supportive environment (Lieberman, 1988; McLaughlin & Yee, 1988). Through the use of a qualitative approach, this research study contributed to the theory relating to the capacity of a teacher study group model providing the necessary conditions to promote and sustain learning within the school, a key to schools improving themselves (Barth, 1986).

Qualitative researchers are more interested in recurrent interactions than in outcomes or products. This emphasis on process rather than on product is especially beneficial in educational research when the research questions address a diversity of influences from many sources (Dobbert, 1982; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). As the data are gathered and analyzed for recurring patterns of behavior, hypotheses emerge from the bottom up as grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Repeated regrounding by additional observations, rereading and searching through the data, or interviews with other members from the observation
site validates the findings and drives future observations and data gathering. In this study, regrounding was repeated numerous times until sufficient raw data had been gathered.

In qualitative research, theory is driven by the information gathered. A constant comparative method, the recursive combining of information collection and analysis, was used to develop theory in this research (Glaser, 1978). Through this iterative process, the repeated ongoing analysis of raw data, a model of the social processes and relationships from the participants' frames of reference emerged (Dobbert, 1982; Spradley, 1980).

Methodology

Nature of the Sample

Eight teacher study groups were formed. Staff members signed up for groups based on their participation in site-based management action teams and their interest. Each study group had from five to seven members from various grade levels. Having taught at Georgetown for eleven years, I was well acquainted with a number of the staff members. This enabled me to have a unique perspective of the study group participants.

Data Collection

My raw data collection began in August 1991, shortly after study group meetings began, and ended after the completion of study group meetings in June 1992. The
collection process was accomplished through a variety of procedures. I gathered information through the collection of participant observer field notes, informal conversational interviews (see Appendix A for an example), guided interviews (see Appendix B for an example), a team-building exercise (see Appendix C for an example), and an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix D). I collected both historical and current documents related to the study and kept a researcher's journal.

A participant observer in a familiar setting can overlook or misinterpret data because of the familiarity of the setting. Therefore, the participant observer must be aware of the dual perspectives experienced as both an insider and an outsider. It was imperative that I keep in mind the importance of increasing introspectiveness in order to use myself as a research instrument (Spradley, 1980). To facilitate this process, I recorded my perceptions of the research experience in a researcher's journal.

In order to check for researcher bias, I continually reexamined my researcher's journal for the following: (a) contradictions with field notes, (b) emotional reactions, (c) either formal or informal expectations about occurrences and reasons for them, and (d) judgmental rather than descriptive statements (Kamil, 1985). My increasing awareness and growing introspection were evident in my journal as the study progressed. Also, I conducted biweekly
member checks by discussing the accuracy of my interpretations of behaviors and interactions with both key and ancillary informants.

I chose ancillary informants to counteract whatever bias led to my selection of key informants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Spradley, 1980). Because I knew the majority of key and ancillary informants very well, the informants may have reported what they thought I wanted to hear or what they believed reflected best on themselves and the organization. To account for this halo effect, in the beginning and throughout the research, my participant observations were as unobtrusive as possible. Also, I assured participants anonymity as much as feasible. All participants were assigned numbers and no names were used in the data gathering process. Campus and school district organizational structures were disguised and fictitious names were used in all documents produced from this study.

One form of raw data collection was field notes. I observed three to five study group meetings a week and attended various other meetings related to my research. My field notes contained both descriptive and reflective material. The descriptive portion of my field notes contained depiction of: (a) physical and social patterns, (b) people, (c) events, and (d) behavior. My field notes also contained verbatim conversations and comments on my participant observer behaviors. Comments made to me by
friends participating in study groups were recorded along with all other statements. The reflective portion of my field notes included my informal analysis comments, such as emerging themes and patterns, speculation, impressions, and ideas, as well as comments on my participant observer's dilemma of conducting research in a familiar setting. Because I had friends participating in the study groups, this self-reflective process was valuable to me in monitoring any bias that might have entered the information collection process.

I actively participated in two study group sessions weekly and recorded field notes through memory ethnography, the experience as the participant observer remembers it. Field notes, documents, interview notes, and weekly analysis sheets were kept in chronological order in a large notebook. Weekly, or as appropriate, all field notes, documents collected, and interview notes taken were reviewed and coded. I then wrote a brief analysis.

Every three to four weeks, analysis sheets were coded and analyzed. This ongoing iterative analysis reduced the data collected and made it possible for me to ascertain emerging patterns of behavior and recurring events and discover meaning from the participants' perspectives. From this data, suggestions for future collection of clarifying information, observations, or interviews were generated. I discussed the accuracy of my interpretations of behaviors
and interactions with both key and ancillary informants to further guide the information collection process. These member checks occurred biweekly or as needed.

I chose key and ancillary informants from parents, community members, school district staff, and study group participants. I held ongoing informal conversational interviews with both key and ancillary informants. My focus during these interviews was determined by the raw data gathered as the study progressed. Each interview lasted from one to fifteen minutes. Examples of the types of questions I asked are located in Appendix A. Using memory ethnography and key phrases, I transcribed the interviews as nearly verbatim as possible. Because of its intrusiveness on the setting, I did not use a tape recorder.

I conducted guided interviews, the topics and issues given in advance, as recurring patterns of behavior and events emerged and the need for specific information arose. As key and ancillary informants were interviewed, I responded to their answers with probes and spontaneous questions (Appendix B). I gave each study group participant an open-ended questionnaire at the conclusion of study group meetings in May. The open-ended questions were based on information provided during informal and guided interviews, participant observations, a team-building activity, documents, and field notes (Appendix C). For example, I asked questions concerning study group participants'
feelings about their participation in teacher study groups, the topics addressed by study groups, and the interactions during study group meetings (Spradley, 1979).

I collected and chronologically stored in my field notebook all documents related to the study. For example, school site memos, study group schedules, informal notes, local newspaper articles, school district publications, and all written materials related to or generated by the study groups were collected. Both historical and current documents were collected. Additional questions and topics for both the interviews and the questionnaire were generated through document analysis.

In addition, I recorded in my researcher's journal the situational and emotional dilemma of being a participant observer. Because I was a research instrument in the study, my researcher's journal was an important source of information. This introspective record of my research experience made it possible for me to take into account and understand the influence of my personal biases and feelings on the research study. My journal contained a written record of my experiences, ideas, fears, mistakes, confusions, breakthroughs, reactions to informants, feelings sensed from others, and problems encountered during my research.
Data Analysis

True to the nature of qualitative design, my data analysis was ongoing and followed a constant comparative model. Using this iterative process, I drew and verified conclusions, reground theory, and developed hypotheses (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Kamil, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Spradley, 1980). My final data analysis, definite triangulation, was completed in August 1992.

The reduction and coding of raw data was ongoing. Miles and Huberman (1984) defined data reduction as "the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the raw data that appears in written-up field notes" (p. 21). During data reduction, I made analytic choices to refine, organize, and code all the raw data collected in such a way that conclusions could be drawn and verified. I developed categories of behavior which were combined into themes. The data were displayed in matrix and chart form in order to highlight areas that needed further research and finally, to verify conclusions.

After the collection of information was completed, I created a matrix based on the generalizations and recurrent behaviors and interactions that emerged from the ongoing constant comparative method of data analysis. Miles and Huberman (1984) recommended that matrix formats be generated near the end of the raw data collection procedures to ensure that they are "more contextually and empirically grounded."
(p. 89) and do not distort early raw data collection. Information from the matrix was used in the written analysis of my findings.

Triangulation, the ongoing iterative analysis process of comparing and verifying data from several different sources at different times throughout the data collection process, was used to address the validity and reliability of the research (Miles & Huberman, 1984). My data sources included participant observations, field notes, interviews, a questionnaire, historical and current documents, a team building activity, and my researcher's journal. In order to guide the study and verify the final conclusions, the data were coded and compared as they were gathered throughout the study. Member checks, which involved verifying with the participants my perceptions of what had been said and observed or how participants were feeling, also took place throughout the study.

Inter-rater reliability was addressed and conclusions were verified by discussing the information gathered with four unbiased individuals knowledgeable in staff development processes and familiar with the school setting and the study group process. Combined with the written analysis and tentative generalizations developed from the various data collection procedures, I further analyzed the data looking for similarities and differences until I could pose answers for my research questions.
I completed a written report of the research findings and presented it to the school district in December 1992. An overview of the major findings of the study were presented to the school staff during the fall semester of the 1992-1993 school year. Although my research findings were grounded in theory related to adult education, generalization to specific districts was not possible because each district and school setting has its own unique culture (Dobbert, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Spradley, 1980).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Schools throughout the nation are in the process of restructuring, "reconfiguring the basic functions, operations, and organization of schools" (National LEADership Network, 1991, p. 57). Significant changes in staff development have taken place in the last five years to support these restructuring efforts (Hirsh & Ponder, 1991; Diegmueller, 1992; Westbrook & Tipping, 1992). Site-based managed schools are implementing nontraditional approaches to staff development (Joyce, Murphy, Showers, & Murphy, 1989). Teacher study groups are one alternative form of staff development being used by schools to address the needs of their individual schools (Murphy, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c).

The problem of this study was to describe the operation and effects of teacher study groups at one school site. When studying this model, one must take into consideration not only the implementation of the model, but also the context in which study groups were implemented and the base of research upon which the use of the teacher study group model was built. This chapter begins with an overview of the changes in staff development brought about by school restructuring and the move to site-based management. It
continues with a discussion of effective staff development. A review of the change process and its inherent barriers and the needs of the adult learner are addressed. Finally, the importance of building a professional culture to support site-based staff development is presented.

Restructuring

One form of restructuring that has occurred in Texas is decentralization of decision making in the form of state mandated site-based management (Texas Education Agency, 1990). By September 1992, site-based management plans must be in place in all Texas school districts. Texas Education Code (TEC) Sections 21.930, 21.931, and 21.7532 are the primary Site-Based Decision-Making (SBDM) laws governing local site-based decision making (Kemerer & Hairston, 1991).

TEC Section 21.930 outlines the district-level decision making process, Section 21.931 the individual school site's decision making plans, and Section 21.7532 the campus performance objectives. The Texas SBDM laws "support a philosophy of educators, parents, and locally elected school boards and the community all working together to provide the best educational experience possible for children" (Association of Texas Professional Educators, p. 4).

Decentralized Decision Making

Site-based decision making is a process in which the staff of a school makes decisions and takes actions aimed at
achieving specified results at their school. The school's site-based management (SBM) committee could make decisions affecting personnel, curriculum, and the use of resources. Schools in which the SBM team makes complex changes beyond budget, staffing, and curriculum are usually characterized by a high level of staff collegiality and collaboration (David, 1989). The rationale for SBM is that the closer a decision is made to the students served by the decision, the greater the chance that the decision will indeed serve those students (Clune & White, 1988; Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990).

Teachers, parents, community members, and administrators should set the basic direction for the school and determine strategies as well as the organizational and instructional arrangements needed to achieve them (O'Neil, 1990). When teachers are involved in making important decisions that affect their students, the classrooms, and the school; this empowerment may result in teacher inspiration and revitalization (Rist, 1990). But, if this empowerment is limited by others' decisions and can be cancelled if it extends beyond defined boundaries, then frustration over authority can occur (Cooper, 1989; Prawat, 1991).

Authority and responsibility are two key dimensions that should be addressed in site-based management (Clune & White, 1988). This requires a commitment to communication at the school site and throughout the school district.
(American Association of School Administrators, 1988). In addition, site-based management assumes that school personnel have sufficient knowledge to make decisions that are in the best interest of the students (Conley & Bacharach, 1990; Raywood, 1990).

In order for educators to provide the best input into a decision making process, they should have a knowledge base of the most current professional research and literature relevant to their school site's identified needs (Showers, Joyce, & Bennet, 1987). This empowers teachers to make educational decisions in an information rich environment in which educators will work "harder and smarter" on behalf of their students and parents (Glickman, 1990a). Cooper (1989) defines this type of empowerment as less than power. Instead, Cooper sees empowerment as collegiality and collaboration in an evaluation-free context.

There are common issues that can create problems in schools implementing site-based management (Fullan, 1985; Glickman, 1991). The most commonly raised issue is lack of time. The traditional school structure does not provide sufficient time for ongoing teacher participation in decision making. Furthermore, teachers are not experienced in participatory decision making (Wildman & Niles, 1987; Little, 1990). They have neither the communication skills nor a shared professional vocabulary to sustain professional
interactions with other adults (David, 1990; Raywid, 1990; Prawat, 1991; Diegmueller, 1992).

Teachers traditionally have not been trained in conflict resolution or in leadership (Fullan, 1985). Both the principal and the teachers should be comfortable with the role of a teacher-leader. Additionally, school sites are not accustomed to providing their own staff development. Instead, individual schools have relied on the school district staff to provide these services (Bank & Williams, 1989; Raywid, 1990; Diegmueller, 1992).

In order for site-based management to be successful, a comprehensive improvement process that restructures and aligns (a) communication, (b) reporting and (c) student monitoring, and evaluation systems at the district level and the individual school sites must be implemented. Teachers and administrators must be provided with appropriate training and related technical assistance in order to successfully participate in effective decision making processes (Fullan, 1985; Bank & Williams, 1989; Raywid, 1990).

Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman (1992) report that the first three years of the five year New Futures Initiative project for restructuring urban schools have not resulted in restructuring. Instead, the findings "have stimulated a reconsideration of how to change schools to make them substantially more effective" (p. 51). One suggestion from
the findings was to provide a framework for changing the school structure from one which sustains the status quo to one which constructs new, shared educational meanings. The New Futures findings suggest that without these new shared meanings, implementation of educational reform will result in adaptation to present practices and existing assumptions of teachers (Wehlage, et al., 1992).

In contrast, reflective dialogue among educators is manifested in a critical analysis of existing curricula, instruction, school policies and practices, and assumptions about student abilities. Constructive dialogue leads to plans of action (p. 89).

The willingness of teachers and principals to question institutional assumptions is dependent on the support of central staff. The New Futures project recommends collegial activities scheduled during the school day in which teachers and principals are able to participate in ongoing dialogue and reflection; accompanied by "long-term training in group process, leadership, effective practices, and clinical observation" (Wehlage, et al., 1992, p. 89).

**Changes in Staff Development**

Teacher inservice is an old and familiar part of every educators' life. Historically, district level staff development has been utilized to implement new curriculum and instruction and to support professional growth of teachers. Traditionally, district based staff development
has relied on speakers and workshops, one time events, in order to initiate change (Deal, 1990). With the continued calls for school reform, the role of staff development has changed from one of training teachers to one of facilitating teachers in their own professional growth (Fullan, 1990). Staff development has moved from the district level to the building level during the last five to six years (Diegmueller, 1992). Site-based staff development could be used as a tool to build teacher capacity and to increase teacher empowerment (Maeroff, 1988).

At its best, teacher inservice can break down isolation and build networks, bolster confidence, increase knowledge of subject matter and of pedagogy, provide the kind of learning that fires enthusiasm, and involve teachers in the kinds of projects that provide access to decision making (p. 474).

The role of the school principal is changing as the governance structure of the school shifts from a centralized system to one of site-based decision making. Rather than relying on the central office to provide district-wide staff development, the principal is now responsible for creating a school culture in which improvement is the focus (Diegmueller, 1992).

The National LEADership Network Study Group on Restructuring (1991) agreed that one of the essential elements of restructuring was "a need to recreate schools as
learning communities where all members—teachers and administrators, as well as students—grow in and through their work" (p. 60). Both teachers and administrators need new knowledge and skills, along with the will to restructure (Barth, 1991). David (1991b) believes that this means infusing access to new knowledge and training into the school setting. The goal of staff development should be to create a school and school district culture that values ongoing learning for both students and adults to keep up with today's ever expanding knowledge base and rapid changes (Cuban, 1990b; Glickman, 1990b; National LEADership Network, 1991; Wehlage, et al., 1992).

Effective Staff Development

The present focus on restructuring is driven by current economic and social conditions. These driving forces will continue to exist in the years ahead. Therefore, change must be viewed as a constant rather than a happening. The goal of staff development should be to create school cultures that support this ongoing change process (Peterson, 1988; Sparks & Hirsh, 1990; Glickman, 1991).

Effective staff development: (a) models positive human interactions, (b) addresses the personal concerns of teachers in a direct and sensitive manner, (c) is designed to suit its purpose, and (d) maintains active participation
on the part of the participants (Hunter, 1986; Guskey, 1986; Bertani & Tafel, 1989). Fullan (1990) believes that effective staff development should involve working within the school itself. As an organization, schools are complex and powerfully resistant to change; therefore, staff developers working within the school must acknowledge both the personal and professional lives of individual teachers in order to foster and support life-long learning for all teachers (Fullan, 1990). Because teachers are often the primary focus of staff development and school improvement efforts, Wildeen and Andrews (1987) believe that effective staff development programs for teachers should enable (a) the knowledge base to increase, (b) the continuing need for self-renewal to be fulfilled, and (c) the exploration of new social complexities.

The research literature for staff development and the mission and belief statements of the National Staff Development Council are clustered around the following basic themes:

(a) staff development involves and benefits everyone who influences students' learning, (b) both individuals and organizations have the inherent responsibility to define and achieve their own excellence, (c) school improvement results from staff development, (d) effective staff development is based in research and theory and proved in practice, and (e) the value of
Staff development should be measured by its impact on staff and the students they serve (Caldwell, 1989, pp. 9-10).

Staff development can serve individuals, individual campuses, and the district as a whole (Huberman & Miles, 1986). With the move to site-based management, fewer schools are using teacher training as the only model for professional development (Fullan, 1990). As schools set their own agendas for staff development, alternative programs are now being offered, such as Teacher Study Groups. The staff developer's role is changing from one of trainer to one of facilitator (Diegmueller, 1992).

Sousa (1992) discussed ten areas that can be assessed to determine whether a district's staff development program "reflects current exemplary practices and is prepared for the future" (p. 34). Using a rating scale from zero, not present, to four, a high presence; Sousa recommends rating the following areas:

(a) strategic planning for the future, (b) emphasis on organizational development, (c) emphasis on building school culture, (d) research-based decisions, (e) encourage action research, (f) support for first-, second-, and third-year teachers, (g) more site-based building focus, (h) follow-up activities, (i) growth opportunities for staff developers, and (j) growth opportunities for other school personnel (p. 36).
The staff development role of the individual school is expanding (Fullan, 1985; Caldwell, 1989; Joyce & Murphy, 1990). This move to site-based staff development is supported by the extensive research on effective schools and exemplary staff development practices (Caldwell, 1989; Griffin, 1983; Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). Individual campuses can create their own staff development models and activities that are both compatible with the district's goals and objectives and support the individual school's initiatives. Sparks (1991a) believes that the role of staff development in the 1990s will be to help others find their own solutions rather than to be good trainers.

The Change Process

Change agents must acknowledge two unavoidable realities when dealing with change. The first reality is that classrooms are under the control of teachers. The second reality is that teachers and administrators have feelings about what they are presently doing and what they have been asked to do. Therefore, as Fullan stated: "change must be systemic, it must simultaneously address various aspects of the school system." (Sparks, 1991/1992, p. 9).

Change efforts only thrive in positive, growth-oriented cultures (Sparks, 1983; Wood, 1989). As a result, staff developers are having to become organizational specialists
because there is a need to address organizational development at both the district and the individual school level (Sparks, 1991c). Because teachers and administrators react individually to change, the obstacles to change are often personal. School improvement efforts can be blocked by the natural resistance of staff members to change coupled with their complacency with the status quo (Showers et al., 1987; Crandall, 1989). In addition, a positive school climate in which the staff and administration share a belief system which is "...positive, child oriented, and growth producing" rather than "...negative, teacher oriented, and stultifying" can affect the degree of professional development in the school (Peterson, 1988, p. 252).

**Personal Transformation**

Weissglass (1991) identified four obstacles to educational change as well as a model for educational change. His model is based on the assumption that "education requires personal transformation and improved collegial relationships" (p. 29). The four obstacles to change identified by Weissglass are (a) current school cultures because they are based on the original common school values, (b) personal resistance to change because of its demands, (c) lack of awareness of the need for change, and (d) isolated working conditions of teachers that prevent teachers from engaging in reflective conversations about
issues such as achievement, expectations, curriculum, and instruction.

Weissglass' (1991) model for change has four essential components of equal importance. The first component calls for teachers to continue obtaining information. In addition, teachers should learn from their interactions with parents and students, those which have been successful in the system and those which have not been successful. Teachers should read articles, engage in discussions, and gain knowledge of the change process in this component.

The second component is reflecting and planning. Teachers need time to reflect on the correspondence between their current practices and their beliefs. The third component addresses educators dealing with their own negative feelings. The goal of this component is to help educators learn how to be better listeners and develop emotionally supportive relationships. As a result, teachers can work their way through the negative feelings that are blocking learning and change.

The results of the first three components lead to the fourth, taking action on a broad basis. All of the components interact. Using this model, Weissglass (1991) believes that issues such as racial and gender bias can be addressed.

The area of emotional support is the most neglected of the four components. Weissglass (1991) writes that "anyone
trying to make professional improvements, particularly people who have a responsibility for nurturing children, can benefit from talking about their feelings in a supportive environment" (p. 30). Weissglass made the following recommendations to overcome obstacles to change:

(a) incorporate activities that break down educators' isolation, (b) provide opportunities for educators to improve their listening skills, (c) provide opportunities for educators to express their feelings about changes being proposed, about issues in education, and about their own past experiences as learners, (d) address controversial issues on a personal as well as an intellectual level, (e) provide the opportunity whenever you present information for each person to reflect on its meaning and to plan on how to use that information, (f) use staff development as an opportunity to establish and sustain mutual support networks, and (g) clarify for educators the difference between discussion groups, support groups, and action groups (p. 33).

Changing Attitudes

Hirsh and Ponder (1991) discussed how traditional attitudes about staff development must change in order for school restructuring to occur. Successful change will require substantive plans which teachers believe in and intend to implement. This will require staff development
that supports the change process and gives both the teachers and the administrators the skills necessary for participatory management and leadership. Hirsh and Ponder add that this change will not be easy. Collaborative follow-up strategies in the form of peer coaching, mentoring, and study groups can provide the support needed to implement long-lasting change.

**Concerns-Based Adoption Model**

Schlechty states that "change and professional growth have to be approached in an honestly collegial way, in which people learn from each other and by reflecting on their own experiences" (Sparks, 1991c, p. 5). When people go through significant change they feel uncomfortable. It is important for staff developers or others implementing change to be aware of how people experience change. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) hypothesized that individuals move through stages of concern when change occurs (Hord et al., 1987; Loucks-Horsley, 1989). CBAM identifies three general levels of concerns that people experience. The first level consists of self-concerns. These concerns deal with how the change will affect one personally. When teachers have resolved these concerns, the second level of concerns will emerge.

At the second level concerns are task-oriented. These concerns are about how to get the job done smoothly. When teachers are in the early stages of implementing something
new, task-oriented concerns are evident. As one is resolving these concerns, the third level of concerns will emerge.

The third and last concerns to emerge are impact-oriented concerns. At this level, teachers are considering how the change is impacting student learning and how they could work with other teachers to improve the process (Hord, et al., 1987; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Sparks, 1990). It is important that not only the change facilitator, but also the people going through the change, understand the change process. Virtually all administrators and teachers will go through these stages of concern when faced with a change. CBAM acknowledges that change is a process and that effectiveness grows with understanding and development. With this knowledge, people can acknowledge the natural progression of concerns they are experiencing (Hord et al., 1987; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Sparks, 1990). Anxiety, difficulties, and uncertainty are intrinsic to all successful change because change is a learning process. We can all learn from the problems that develop during this change/learning process (Fullan & Miles, 1992).

**Essential Practices**

There are additional issues that change agents must address in order for teachers and administrators to move successfully through the change process. Wood (1989) suggests five sequential stages that should be used in
designing and implementing a school-based staff development program. These five stages will correspond to school improvement goals and are based on research and effective practice:

Readiness. Faculty members study, select, and make a commitment to new behaviors and programs that focus on improving professional practice and student achievement.

Planning. Faculty members develop long-range plans to achieve the changes identified in the first stage.

Training. Inservice training sessions are conducted based upon what is known about adult learners.

Implementation. Participants integrate new professional behaviors and knowledge into daily work activities with follow-up assistance.

Maintenance. Changes in practice are monitored to ensure continued high levels of performance (p. 28).

Wood's (1989) model is made up of thirty-eight critical practices. During the Readiness stage, the following critical practices are essential: (a) a positive school climate, (b) a written list of goals which the staff supports, (c) an examination of current school practices, and (d) plans to achieve the school's goals that have been collaboratively developed.

The essential practices of Wood's (1989) second stage, Planning, are: (a) staff development needs of the staff are
identified by comparing desired and actual practices in the school, and (b) staff development is planned by teachers and administrators with information from the staff and includes specific outcomes. During the third stage, Training, it is essential that school principals participate in staff development activities with their staff (Wood, 1989). Fullan (Sparks, 1991/1992) also believes it is essential that the people who are going to be implementing the innovation develop a shared meaning so the innovation is used with some degree of consistency.

Wood's (1989) fourth stage, Implementation, has the following essential elements: (a) participants have support services to help them with implementation of their new learning and (b) staff members who are implementing their new learning are recognized for their efforts. Numerous changes fail because there is not sufficient interaction during this stage. Fullan stated that people need support and interaction with others during the implementation stage in order to successfully create change (Sparks, 1991/1992).

The last stage, stage five, is Maintenance. Once Implementation has been accomplished, it is essential that (a) staff members systematically monitor their new behavior, (b) student feedback is part of the monitoring process, and (c) the change facilitator shares the responsibility for the maintenance of the new behavior with staff members so that if the facilitator moves on, the change will have ongoing
support (Wood, 1989). Wood believes that "a crucial decision as districts move into school-based change is selecting a systematic, research-based process for planning and implementing school-based staff development" (p. 40). Fullan (1992) recommends that both teacher preparation and workplace conditions be improved so that change becomes the norm in collaborative organizations that stimulate continued improvement.

As Fullan (1982) noted, the most successful changes are simultaneously top down and bottom up. A number of studies have found that mandates can be successful if there is a great deal of support to fulfill the mandate. Changes in attitude do not always have to occur before behaviors can change, providing teachers are given the support to implement the mandated change (Guskey, 1986; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Sparks, 1990).

The Adult Learner

Change agents should address the needs of adult learners (Bertani & Tafel, 1989; Arin-Krupp, 1989; Wood, 1989; Leithwood, 1990). Adult learners need substantial freedom to direct their own growth in order to foster individual motivation and self-confidence (Arin-Krupp, 1989; Bertani & Tafel, 1989). Time for teacher learning is one of the most important investments a school system can make (Wildman & Niles, 1987). Because adult development is a
continuing growth process, effective staff development incorporates the principles of adult learning theory in planning and implementing staff development in order to accommodate developmental differences (Bertani & Tafel, 1989; Field, 1979).

Bertani and Tafel (1989) noted that theories on adult development can be divided into two basic groups, age and stage theories. Arin-Krupp represents the age theorists who address the various concerns and problems most people encounter at various ages in their lives. Stage theorists, such as Piaget and Kohlberg, focus on qualitative differences in a person's thinking at various times in their development.

Bertani and Tafel (1989) presented the following principles as the foundation of theory on adult learning: (a) adults are motivated to learn when they experience the need and interest, so those needs and interests are a good starting point, (b) adult orientation to learning is life-centered, so learning should be around life situations, (c) adult learning is based on experience, so adult education should analyze experiences, (d) adults have a need for self-direction; therefore, learning should be a process of mutual inquiry, and (e) adult education should provide for differences in style, time, place, and pace of learning because individual differences grow as people age.
Arin-Krupp (1989) wrote that "all learners need a positive, growth-oriented environment in which to try new ideas" (p. 45). In education, adult learners also want ideas that are both practical and compatible to their personal concerns (Showers et al., 1987). Arin-Krupp noted that adult learners share several common needs. Adult learners want staff development that focuses on their growth by: (a) serving as a growth model, (b) rewarding growth, and (c) expecting and accepting failures.

Adult learners want their learning to be relevant and practical at the same time that it focuses on their individual interests and needs (Showers et al., 1987). Therefore, relevant staff development should focus on the concerns of the adult learners. Because there are various learner needs, sources other than traditional staff development should be provided, such as mentoring or linking the learner to a study group (Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Murphy, 1991a, 1991b). Educators vary in the amount of structure and direction they need. Some educators are able to participate successfully in self-directed study; others will require a more structured other-directed approach (Arin-Krupp, 1989; David, 1990; Fullan, 1990).

Arin-Krupp (1989) suggests that individual learning styles should be taken into consideration when planning staff development. Providing adult learners with choices about breaks and eating, as well as providing for auditory,
visual, and kinesthetic learning styles will make the learners more comfortable. In addition, acknowledging these differences can diffuse participants' anger and frustration if it exists.

**Age Theory**

As an age theorist, Arin-Krupp (1989) discusses the developmental aspects of the adult learner in relationship to age. She believes that adult learning will be more successful if the learners' past experiences and developmental stages are taken into consideration. Arin-Krupp presents the following general descriptions for the following ages of adult learners: (a) in their 20's learners may be unsure of themselves as they attempt to establish an identity, (b) in their 30's learners are trying to determine how they fit into the world and, if career oriented, how they can advance in their careers, (c) in their 40's women become more assertive and men more nurturing, (d) in their 50's adults can become either rigid or mellow; their experience should be used to its fullest. "Linking developmental tasks and staff development activities maximizes learning for adults in each age group" (p. 49).

**Stage Theory**

Leithwood (1990) identified three dimensions of teacher development that instructional leaders can influence: (a) the development of professional expertise dimension, (b) the
psychological development dimension, and (c) the career cycle development dimension. Staff development has the greatest impact on the development of professional expertise dimension. Leithwood described six stages in the development of professional expertise. The first four stages are related to the teachers' classroom responsibilities. Stages five and six are concerned with the mature teachers' roles outside of classroom responsibilities and the school setting. Each of the six stages builds on the experiences of the previous ones. Therefore, as teachers progress from one stage to the next they are acquiring more professional expertise.

Stage one teachers are developing classroom survival skills such as classroom management. They have limited use of different teaching models and assessment. Stage two teachers are becoming more competent in the basic skills of instruction. They have well developed classroom management skills and use several different teaching models. Stage three teachers are developing and expanding their instructional flexibility and their use and knowledge of assessment and teaching models.

Stage four teachers acquire and implement a wide variety of teaching models and assessment techniques with instructional expertise. Stage five teachers are beginning to contribute to the instructional expertise of colleagues and are reflective about their own competence. Stage six
teachers participate in a broad range of educational decisions at all levels. At this stage teachers are committed to the goal of school improvement, able to exercise leadership, and have a good understanding of the policies and relationships of various levels within the system. Stages five and six correspond to what educators know as a master teacher. Peer coaching, mentoring, and active involvement in site-based management are professional activities of stage five and stage six teachers.

The adult teacher's psychological dimension and career cycle development dimension are interdependent with the professional growth dimension. Leithwood's (1990) psychological dimension has four stages that correspond with the first four stages of his development of professional expertise dimension. Stage one teachers have highly teacher directed classrooms, view their environment very simplistically, and are not divergent thinkers. Stage two teachers are conformists, focus on the expectations of others, and do not value independence.

Teachers at stage three of the psychological dimension are much more flexible, more divergent, and are future and achievement oriented. Stage four teachers are inner directed and have a broader perspective. Their classrooms are creative and flexible with an emphasis on meaningful learning.
Leithwood's (1990) third dimension in teacher development, career cycle, interacts with the first five stages of the professional development dimension. The first several years of a teacher's career are spent in stage one of the career cycle dimension, launching the career. Some teachers perceive this stage as easy and some as difficult, depending on their relationships with students and staff members.

When teachers make a deliberate commitment to the teaching profession or are secure in their job, the second career cycle stage is reached, stabilizing. At this time, teachers may seek greater professional responsibilities, act more independently, and not be intimidated by their supervisors. Stabilized teachers are much more comfortable in the classroom.

Stage three of Leithwood's (1990) career cycle can take various paths. Some teachers seek administrative roles, some pursue higher education or other professional stimulation, while some funnel their energy into improving and diversifying their classroom practices. Teachers in stage three are usually 30 to 40 years of age.

The fourth stage, reaching a professional plateau, usually occurs between the ages of 40 to 55. Some teachers stagnate and become bitter, viewing teaching as a job not a career (Leithwood, 1990). Based on the work of Kanter (1983), these teachers report feeling "stuck" or "not
moving" (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988). Others choose to stop seeking promotion and instead just enjoy teaching (Field, 1979).

Milstein (1990) offers seven suggestions for working with teachers who have reached a plateau: (a) get them to recognize plateaus as normal and at times positive, (b) reduce the focus on promotion as the major indicator of success, (c) help teachers move through career transitions, (d) create teacher leadership positions and give meaningful rewards for effective performance, (e) provide wellness activities, (f) provide supportive supervision, and (g) expand teacher participation at the district level.

Teachers may respond to the fifth and final stage of Leithwood's (1990) career development dimension in one of three different ways. One group will specialize in what they do best and focus on student learning. Another group of teachers will focus on student learning, but with a more negative attitude about past experiences. The final group will be bitter and tired. This group will not respond well to change.

Leithwood (1990) recommends the following guidelines for instructional leaders based on assumptions about adult development: (a) treat the teacher as a whole person, (b) establish a school culture based on norms of technical collaboration and professional inquiry, (c) carefully diagnose the starting points for teacher development, and
(e) recast routine administrative activities into powerful teacher development strategies. Leithwood believes that by acknowledging the psychological, professional expertise, and career cycle stages teachers go through in their professional development, those responsible for professional growth can help create collaborative professionals.

Lasley (1992) discusses Berliner's (1986) and Fuller and Brown's (1975) stages of teacher development. He describes stage one as the survival stage. Most new teachers and some experienced teachers are at this stage. In the survival stage teachers are concerned about classroom management and control. They focus on surviving the moment rather than the long term.

Most experienced teachers are at stage two, task focus. Instead of being concerned about management, they focus on delivery of material. Task focus teachers do not adjust their style to meet the needs of the students. They have adjusted to meet the demands of the classroom.

Teachers at stage three, impact focus, are concerned with both the process and the outcome. They look for new ways to reach their students. Impact focus teachers view their classrooms from multiple perspectives. A few teachers in each building are at this level. Staff development needs to provide appropriate reflective experiences to move teachers from stage one to stage two, and on to stage three (Lasley, 1992). "To develop awareness and knowledge
acquisition, learners must manipulate information to create personal relevance and retention (Garmston, 1992, p. 51).

**Self-Directed Learning**

When interviewed by Sparks (1991b), Arin-Krupp discussed the importance of self-directed adult learning. She commented that "site-based decision making really feeds into the adults desire to be self-directed" (p. 2). She recommends that teachers be given the opportunity to choose the type of staff development they attend. In instances when staff development may be required, the reason for the requirement should be explained clearly to the teachers. Arin-Krupp recommends that teachers be held accountable for the knowledge they are to gain while participating in staff development activities because the teacher is accountable for the education of the child. Staff development should provide knowledge, socialization, and self awareness in order to create a culture of lifelong learners (Fullan, 1987). This can be done in various models of staff development (Sparks, 1991a).

**Developing A Professional Culture**

Lieberman (1988) believes that the way staff members and students learn can be changed by building a more collaborative culture in the schools. Cooper (1988) stresses that in order to understand the culture of a school one must look at it through the eyes of the people who are
living it. She believes that the values and customs of the people in the school culture should be the focus of any change efforts. Without examining these factors and keeping the student-teacher relationship at the center, successful change will not take place.

Schlechty (1988) recommends that change agents have an informant, a person within the culture of the school who can "give a clear and accurate image of how their work is affecting the lives of others and how it is perceived" (p. 202). This helps the change agent gain insight into the "tacit understandings" of the school culture or a specific group of teachers within the school.

**Teacher Leaders**

Little (1988) and Carter and Powell (1992) see the possibility of teacher leadership changing the prevailing culture of a school and eventually the teaching profession. Little found that the past studies of teacher leadership have mixed results, but there has not been extensive research in this area. As schools implement SBM and shared decision making teachers take on more leadership responsibilities (Hallinger & Richardson, 1988). Little believes there are five conditions that will either support or erode a teacher's desire to assume the role of a teacher leader in a school setting. First, the role is diminished if the responsibilities of the are viewed as inconsequential or trivial. The role is enhanced if the responsibilities
are viewed as important and difficult. Second, if the teacher leader role is to punish or fix peers, it will be seen negatively. The role will be viewed positively if the teacher leader's responsibilities result in a dignified and highly respected professional image.

Next, the relationship between the administrator and the teacher leader should be clearly defined from the onset so that the role of the teacher leader is not later undermined. Fourth, there should be incentives for teachers to take a leadership role and work with their peers. Finally, the teacher leadership role should be formalized at the district level so that the role can continue as principals change positions.

Teacher leaders may encounter initial hostility and resistance. It is difficult to be a colleague and at the same time an expert. In order for teacher leaders to function effectively, a collaborative environment should already be in place. Once it exists, teacher leaders can promote and sustain a collaborative environment. Teacher leaders will have to learn to listen to teachers rather than give advice, work with teachers on their terms, and negotiate from a position of leadership without threatening those in administrative positions. The teacher leader role is not easy to fill (Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 1988; Smylie & Denny, 1990).
Professional Culture

The Coalition of Essential Schools found that everyone involved in restructuring will require reeducation to assume their new roles in the network of interdependent people that make up the school (Houston, 1988). There must be a norm of continuous improvement in order for the organization to function at its highest level (Little, 1982).

Restructuring requires that schools be seen as learning communities. Teachers and administrators do not come to the job perfectly formed, nor does their development follow a straight line. Only in the school constituted as a learning community will their professional growth continue to match the needs of their organization (National LEADership Network, 1991, p. 61).

Two key elements of a professional culture are (a) a specified time and place for discussion of instructional issues and (b) teachers providing their own professional development and inservice activities; "they continually update their knowledge and skills" (Miller, 1988, p. 182). Barth (1988) recommends that school become "communities of learners" with teachers, principals, and students learning.

Stevenson (1991) recommends that teachers be given time for continual professional development during the normal work week, as is done in Japan. Students benefit academically when their teachers share ideas, cooperate in
activities, and assist one another's intellectual growth (Lortie, 1975; Little, 1982; Tye & Tye, 1984). Sarason (1990) views teacher growth as a necessity. It must be in place for student growth to occur. Sarason believes that the schools must make themselves an intellectually exciting places for students and adults. Quality time for collegial interaction in educational dialog, decision making, and problem solving also is a factor which contributes to high staff morale (Wentworth, 1990).

Teacher Study Groups

Hirsh (1992) recommends the use of teacher study groups to establish readiness (Wood, 1989). When study group participants review research based articles they begin to recognize the deficiencies in their own programs and organization. In addition, they create a shared vocabulary and knowledge base that can be used in the planning process. A school culture that contains informed and aware staff members will be more likely to accept change (Nevi, 1988).

Hirsh (1992) suggests six guidelines which should be followed when establishing study groups at the school or school district level. First, it is important to establish who will coordinate the study group process. At the district level this could be a staff developer; at the school level it could be a teacher leader. Second, guidelines for the study groups should be established prior to beginning the meetings. For example: (a) participation
is voluntary, (b) meet one hour a week, (c) everyone is welcome to participate, and (d) each study group is limited to six people.

Third, Hirsh (1992) recommends establishing files of current and relevant research based articles. Everyone involved should be encouraged to contribute articles. Fourth, a meeting format should be established to specify what happens prior to the meeting, during the meetings, and after the meetings. For example: (a) how are the topics selected, (b) how do participants share the information, and (d) what is done with the information after the meetings.

Next, schedule study group meetings so that all the participants have some options. Meetings can be held at various times throughout the day. Finally, the benefits of study groups should be explained to participants: ideas that can be applied immediately in the classroom, making new friends, staff development credit if possible, a knowledge base for planning change, and a visible commitment to lifelong learning (Hirsh, 1992).

Summary

The second wave of educational reform has brought with it the building of new forms of relationships between and among members of the school community. The leadership and administrative structures of schools are changing; and as a result, both teachers and administrators have new roles for
which they have not been prepared. In addition, decentralized decision making and the resulting site-based decision making model have created new and demanding roles for administrators and staff members.

One of the outcomes of restructuring and site-based decision making has been a change in staff development. The role of the staff developer is changing from one of trainer to one of facilitator. Principals are becoming more responsible for their staff's professional development. Schools are beginning to implement their own staff development programs based on what is already known about guiding principles of staff development, the change process, and adult development.

Using this knowledge base, schools embarking on a restructuring process can create a learning organization that continually renews itself. Teacher study groups are one form of site-based staff development offering both teachers and administrators the opportunity to build a collaborative and reflective culture as educators move from the "egg-crate organizational structure" (Elmore, 1992, p. 46) to a restructured professional culture.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Calls for restructuring education are coming from many directions, both inside and outside of education. Site-based staff development, a hallmark of restructuring, is tailored to the needs of a particular school. Teacher study groups, a site-based staff development tool, can be used to expose educators to the knowledge necessary to restructure the basic functions, operations, and organization of schools.

The problem for my study was to describe the operation and impact of teacher study groups at one school site. This study was exploratory in nature. My study focused on and was guided by research questions which asked the following: (a) what major factors in the school's external and internal social context would impact the study groups, (b) what typical behaviors and interactions of the study group participants would emerge, and (c) what impact would study groups have on curriculum and instruction and on the participants themselves? Goetz and LeCompte (1984) recommend that the primary criterion one should use in selecting a research design is whether the design allows the
researcher to effectively achieve the research objectives. In order to meet this criterion, I chose a qualitative design for this case study of teacher study groups.

Participant observation and informal conversational interviews were the primary methods I used to collect information on the operation and impact of teacher study groups at the school site. My goal as a participant observer was not only to observe behavior, but also to go beyond mere observation to determine the meaning of that behavior (Dobbert, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). I chose to use a qualitative design in an educational setting in order "to provide rich, descriptive data about the contexts, activities, and beliefs of the participants" (Goetz & LeCompte, p. 17).

Research Design

Site

I selected an elementary school in a large North Texas suburban school district as the site for this case study. At the time of the study, Georgetown Elementary had approximately 700 pre-kindergarten through sixth grade students and a staff of 90. Fifty-one Georgetown Elementary staff members participated in the teacher study groups. For the second year, I was responsible for facilitating the teacher study groups. The principal of Georgetown required the participation of all classroom, special education, fine
arts, Chapter I, physical education, and computer teachers; along with the nurse, counselors, and librarian; in either study groups or a peer coaching activity. Noncertified personnel and certified teachers not primarily responsible for students were not required to participate in either study groups or peer coaching. Three noncertified support personnel chose to participate in study groups, none in peer coaching.

**Study Groups**

I scheduled study groups to meet once a week for a total of fifteen meetings from November 1991 through May 1992. Participants were asked to sign up for the study group of their choice. Both the focus topic for each study group and the leadership of each group were based on the school's site-based management action plans. Six of the eight study groups were led by site-based management action team leaders.

The composition of the 1991-1992 study groups differed significantly from the first year I had facilitated study groups, 1990-1991. The first year, the principal and I assigned staff members to study groups to ensure that each group would have cross grade level representation, close friends would be separated, and group leaders would be committed to the process. For the most part, the self-selected membership of the 1991-1992 study groups created clusters of grade levels, friends, and primary and
intermediate staff. As a result, the self-selected grouping in the 1991-1992 study groups was significantly more homogeneous than the previous year's assigned groups.

When signing up for study groups, the 1991-1992 participants were able to chose between four site-based management topics: (a) Family Involvement, (b) Multicultural Education, (c) Higher Order Thinking Skills, and (c) High Expectations. Critical Issues in Education, the fifth topic, and an ongoing peer coaching activity were the other choices.

From my 1990-1991 experience, I knew that in order for a study group to function most effectively the size of the group should be no more than five to seven participants. The number of staff members signing up for the Multicultural and Family Involvement groups was so large and in such an unbalanced distribution of grade levels and special area teachers that I attempted to split the groups and redistribute the membership. When I asked teachers to change groups, a few agreed to move to another group, most did not. Because teachers had signed up to be with their friends, the majority of the membership in each of the eight teacher study groups remained homogeneous.

Subjects

I followed Spradley and McCurdy's (1988) recommendation that unless a researcher has unlimited time to gather data,
the appropriate research model is to combine observation, participation, and informal interviewing. As a qualitative researcher, I used informants as a source of information. By asking questions, interviewing, taking field notes, and listening to casual conversations I was able to gather data which I then analyzed to produce a cultural description (Patten, 1980; Spradley, 1979). I depended on my informants to help create understanding. Therefore it was important for me to establish a rapport with the informants. At all times I was careful to safeguard their rights, interests, and sensitivities. Through questioning an informant in a friendly conversational manner, I was able to discover what the informants were experiencing, how they interpreted their experiences, and how they structured their social worlds (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

**Key informants.** My key informants included the school staff, school district personnel outside of the school setting, and nondistrict educators. I chose key informants to represent different personalities and different aspects of the school. I chose informants who were both district and nondistrict participants familiar with the topic and the school site. By changing the school site and informants names and any identifying details, I was able to assure all participants anonymity. I explained to the participants both the purpose of my research and my researcher's role.
Since I had worked at this site for eleven years, the key informants I selected were both close and casual acquaintances. I relied on Goetz and LeCompt's (1984) definition of key informants as the criterion for choosing informants for this research. Therefore, I chose participants who: (a) had a long term knowledge of the culture being observed, (b) had special communication skills, or (c) had special status in the culture, and (d) were willing to share their knowledge with me. Throughout my research my key informants: (a) provided insight, (b) made otherwise inaccessible data available, (c) made me aware of value conflicts, and (d) sensitized me to the implications of specific findings.

Additional factors I took into account when I selected key informants were (a) length of time at Georgetown, (b) total years of teaching experience, (c) participation in different social groups, and (d) the informants' insightfulness and willingness to talk. My goal when selecting key informants was to create as representative a group as possible.

I selected key informants for this study to provide a representative cross section of classroom and specialized teachers, grade levels, and administrators. Subjects outside of Georgetown Elementary who were familiar with the school site, the study group process, and the school's site-based management process also were selected as key
informants. The remaining study group participants served as ancillary informants, counter balancing any bias that led to my selection of key informants.

The eight study group leaders--six assigned through site-based management and two selected from the study group participants signing up for Critical Issues--served as key informants. Originally, my 1991-1992 study group plans called for each study group to be led by a member of my Study Group Committee. The Study Group Committee met in September 1991. Based on their experiences the previous year and the staff feedback on the 1990-1991 study group survey, the committee reached consensus on the following format for the 1991-1992 study group process: (a) assigned cross grade level grouping, (b) a school wide focus on topics, (c) three to four articles per group rather than a different article for each group member, and (d) members of the Study Group Committee leading the groups.

The Study Group Committee's goal was to have heterogeneous groups with committed leaders. A site-based management meeting of action team leaders, a different committee, changed these plans without consulting the members of the Study Group Committee. As a result, during the 1991-1992 school year only two of the eight study group leaders were members of my Study Group Committee. One of the site-based management leaders was new to the school and had not participated in study groups the previous year.
The resulting 1991-1992 study group leaders represented both primary and intermediate grades, as well as specialized faculty members. One Caucasian male, one African American female, and six Caucasian females made up the group of leaders. The length of time the study group leaders had been teaching at Georgetown varied. Three teachers had been at Georgetown for one to two years, three for five to eight years, and two for fifteen to eighteen years.

Since each of the study group leaders had access to unique information and no single leader could provide universal information, I selected six additional key informants. Five female Caucasian informants and one female African-American informant were selected in order to adequately represent the social, instructional, and supervisory relationships within the school; as well as the ethnic make up of the staff: (a) two administrators with five to ten years of experience at Georgetown, (b) two teachers with three to eight years of experience, all at Georgetown, and (c) one teacher with fifteen to twenty years of experience, five to eight of it at Georgetown.

Although the final female Caucasian informant worked primarily outside the school setting, she was quite familiar with Georgetown's site-based management and study group processes. She had from fifteen to twenty years of experience in the field of education, three directly with
Georgetown. A total of fourteen key informants participated in the study.

Data Collection

I conducted this case study at Georgetown Elementary during the fall and spring semesters of the 1991-1992 school year. Study groups met for one hour a week for a total of fifteen weeks beginning in November and concluding during May. In my role as study group facilitator, I instructed each group to meet for one hour weekly at a regularly scheduled time. Each group chose their own meeting place and time. I was a member of and actively participated in two different study groups. One group focused on critical issues in education and the other studied multi-cultural issues.

My data collection procedures included observations recorded in field notes, informal conversational interviews, guided interviews, document collection, a team-building activity, and a study group participants' open-ended questionnaire. Participant observations, document collection, and informal conversational interviews took place throughout the study. Guided interviews, completion of the questionnaire by study group participants, and the team-building activity all occurred during the last six weeks of the study.
Throughout this case study, my observations took place from three to five times a week during regularly scheduled study groups and in other weekly meetings related to my research questions. These meetings included (a) faculty, (b) study group committee, (c) study group leader, (d) site-based management, and (e) administrative meetings.

Participant observation was my primary method of gaining access to data. Through participant observation I was able to determine if what the informants said and thought they were doing, their definition of reality and the constructs of their world, matched what was actually occurring (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Participant observations can vary on a continuum from being a complete observer and not participating in activities at the setting to over participation. Over participation can occur when an observer becomes so involved with the setting that they lose their focus on research objectives (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Spradley, 1980). I continually guarded against over participation by refocusing on the problem and questions of my study.

Complete Participant Observation

In this case study, my role as a researcher represented complete participant observation (Spradley, 1980). Spradley cautions that when gathering data through participant observation in one's own work place, complete participant observation, the researcher must continually check to be
sure that the focus of the research is being maintained. I maintained the focus of my study by: (a) utilizing a researcher's journal, (b) conferring with experienced researchers outside the research setting, and (c) keeping the purpose of the research in mind during observations, ongoing analysis, and indefinite triangulation. This ensured that the data I was collecting related to the problem and questions of the study.

Qualitative research looks at interactions and events in a culture as they occur. My goal as a researcher was to understand the meaning of these interactions and events at Georgetown Elementary (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Rogers, 1984). In order to directly observe the study group participants' activities and interactions in an ongoing, naturalistic setting, my participant observations began in August 1991 and continued through May 1992. Field notes were written for each observation.

My participant observations provided me with a means of observing the activities of the participants and the characteristics of the social situation, as well as experiencing what it felt like to be a part of the scene. Spradley and McCurdy (1988) define culture as "the knowledge people use to generate and interpret social behavior" (p. 8). At Georgetown, this social behavior included any behaviors that were shared and considered normal, the ways staff members adapted to their environment.
Six features that distinguished my participant observer's role from that of a study group participant were (a) serving a dual purpose as both a participant and an observer, (b) being explicitly aware of details ordinary participants took for granted, (c) maintaining a broad mental image, (d) experiencing the feeling of being both an insider and an outsider at the same time, (e) using introspection to understand the experience, and (f) keeping a record of what I saw and experienced (Spradley, 1980).

Various types of participant observations took place throughout the study. I began with broad descriptive observations in order to get an overview of the social situation. These descriptive observations continued throughout the study. Based on my initial data analysis, my observations became more focused. Finally, I conducted selective observations after the focus of the research had been narrowed even more.

As a participant observer in a scene with which I was very familiar, my work place, I constantly had to be aware of what I might be missing because the social situation was not foreign to me. As a participant observer in one's own work place, I functioned at the highest possible level of involvement in and familiarity with the social setting. (Spradley, 1979; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984).
As a teacher at Georgetown, I was totally immersed in the school culture. Furthermore, I was participating in two study groups and for the second year facilitating the school's study group process. Spradley (1980) points out that themes often emerge through immersion as the participant observer listens to informants throughout the day, participates in the cultural scene, and thinks like a member of the culture.

I was aware of Spradley's (1980) caution that the more familiar the situation, the more difficult it is to study because "the less familiar you are with a social situation, the more you are able to see the tacit cultural rules at work" (p. 62). When totally immersed in a situation, Spradley and McCurdy (1988) recommend that the researcher not take anything for granted and continually search for meaning to discover what one already knows about the culture but do not realize they know. I followed Spradley and McCurdy's recommendation to utilize fellow workers to serve as informants for cultural scenes in which I was not participating.

I was able to easily gain entree and already had an intuitive knowledge of the social systems and culture of the school because I had taught at Georgetown Elementary for the past eleven years. Having previously established my credibility at this site subjects were agreeable to take part in the study. I assured them that fictitious names
would be used throughout my research and when I reported my findings. In addition, the name of the school and the school district would be changed.

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) stress the importance of the participant observer establishing rapport and becoming a natural part of the setting. I explained to the staff that neither their names nor the name of the school would be used in the study and that my research would not disrupt any regular routines. For the most part, subjects were not threatened by my role as a participant observer after the purpose of the study and their anonymity in were explained.

Observations occurred weekly in the two study groups in which I actively participated. Other study groups were observed on a random unscheduled basis one to three times a week. During those observations, I sometimes joined the group discussion and other times I merely listened. Over time, the group interactions became more natural and consistent whether I was actively participating or just observing.

Field Notes

The goal of my field notes was to include data relevant to the research focus; therefore, not everything was recorded. The forms of field notes collected were (a) a condensed account, (b) a recording of key phrases and major events written immediately after the observation, (c) an expanded account, and (d) memos. My expanded accounts were
an amplification of the condensed version giving as much specific detail as possible. My memos were interpretive comments based on my perceptions. They contained my: (a) initial insights, (b) interpretations, (c) generalizations, and (d) analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Since I had initiated and facilitated study groups at Georgetown the previous year, in my field notes I took great care to describe rather than to judge what was occurring and to record my feelings in a separate section of the notes as a source of reflection (Kamil, 1985). Member checks, my discussions of data with key informants, were conducted throughout the research to monitor the validity of my observations and to assist in maintaining my objectivity. Because of my familiarity with both the setting and several of the participants, I consistently had to be aware of tacit cultural rules that I might otherwise have overlooked. Multiple sources of data and triangulation became even more important.

I did not take complete field notes during study group meetings; instead, I recorded key phrases, important topics, and the sequence of events during or immediately following each study group observation. Later that day, I wrote complete field notes. I also recorded key phrases, topics, and events in the following additional situations: (a) faculty and site-based management meetings, (b) meetings
with administrators and group leaders, (c) Purpose, Outcome, and Process (POP) meetings, (d) telephone conversations, and (e) interviews. Once again, complete field notes were written from these observations and conversations.

**Interviews**

I conducted informal conversational interviews throughout the study. During these interviews, when questions emerged from the immediate context I asked them in an ongoing conversational manner. These interviews took place in various locations: (a) on the school site before, during, and after school, (b) at the administration building, (c) in informal social situations away from the school, and (d) over the telephone. My primary purpose in asking questions was to elicit meaning. Goetz and LeComte (1984) recommend "intensive, nonstandardized informant interviewing as the most efficient and efficacious format for obtaining data on institutionalized norms and statuses and as an adequate format for obtaining data on incidents and histories" (p. 125).

I followed Spradley (1979) and Patton's (1980) recommendations for interviewing informants. I used language the informants were comfortable with, avoided leading questions, asked only one question at a time, and avoided ambiguous "why" questions. To gain further
explanation and clarification, I asked numerous probing questions.

The questions took various forms. For example, I asked questions based on Spradley's Taxonomy of Ethnographic Questions (Spradley, 1979) which contains twenty-eight different types of questions divided into three categories: (a) descriptive, (b) structural, and (c) contrast. I encouraged elaboration by mixing and sequencing descriptive, structural, and contrast questions.

I followed Goetz and LeCompte's (1984) recommendation to begin interviews with less threatening descriptive questions. I then progressed to structural and contrast questions which were more complex and elicited emotion, values, and explanation. Descriptive questions were asked to discover the participants' views of some aspects of their culture. I asked structural questions to substantiate or generate constructs of the participants' culture. Contrast questions were asked to gain insight into meaning the participants attached to constructs they used and the relationships between those constructs. Once the interviews were under way, I again followed Spradley's (1979) recommendation to mix descriptive, structural, and contrast questions.

Informal conversational interviews. Qualitative interviews range in form from unstructured to quite structured (Patton, 1980). My informal conversational
interviews were characterized by questions that emerged from the immediate context and were asked naturally during the conversation. I listened to the informants and responded to what they were saying. The strengths of this type of interview were that it was naturalistic, the questions were relative, the interview was based on observation, and my questions could match the informant and the circumstances.

Informal conversational interviews took place three to five days a week throughout the study. These interviews were casual conversations which occurred when I sought out informants or when informants initiated conversations. The interviews occurred before, during, and after school wherever the informant or I happened to be at the time. Informal telephone interviews took place during and after school both at Georgetown and my own home.

Guided interviews. In an interview guide approach topics and issues are specified in advance but not the questions. In this study I used an interview guide approach when I interviewed four informants outside the school setting. I conducted guided interviews in May and early June. When I telephoned informants to set up a guided interview, I discussed the general focus of the interview with them. I did not send them questions prior to the interview. My interview topics were based on the emerging themes and patterns developing during my ongoing data analysis. In my interviews I included questions to verify
developing themes and to fill in missing information. My guided interviews took place in the informants' offices, in their homes, and in a conference room at Georgetown Elementary. During the interviews, I asked broad questions based on the problem of the study, research questions, and questions raised by ongoing data analysis. Probes keyed by the respondent's answers made the interviews more conversational and less limiting.

By providing informants with both the broad topic and focus of the interview ahead of time, I gave informants the opportunity to organize their thoughts. Even though this type of interview was more structured than my informal conversational interviews, it was still conversational. Therefore, I asked numerous probing questions (see Appendix B for an example).

I extended my study based on unanswered questions uncovered during indefinite triangulation (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). I collected further data specifically related to the questions of the study by conducting two guided interviews with a researcher from a nearby college. This researcher had interviewed each grade level as a group and other small clusters of job-alike faculty and staff during the last six weeks of school. His goal was to ascertain the overall concerns of the staff.

**Documents.** The documents I collected for this study included internal and external official documents, memos,
and other types of inner school communication as well as communication materials produced by the school for the public and parents. These documents provided not only the "official perspective", but also the communication patterns of the school. For example, I collected the following types of documents: (a) organizational, administrative, and participant generated material related to study groups, (b) intraschool memos, (c) faculty and site-based management meeting agendas and notes, (d) the school newsletter to parents, and (e) current and existing metropolitan newspaper articles. Likewise, data was gleaned from staff members' personal notes written to me as the study group facilitator.

During May 1992, a team-building exercise entitled Purpose, Outcome, and Process (POP), generated another set of documents for each study group which added to my collection of thick description. Each study group met twice during their regularly scheduled time and produced a set of POP documents which described each group's joint experiences and beliefs, much as a personal interview describes an individual's view of experiences (Spradley, 1979; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). On the first of their two days of POP meetings, individual groups discussed and generated their own lists of who they were as participants; for example teachers, parents, or friends; and what their purposes were as a group. In addition, each group compiled
a list of their group outcomes and the receivers of those outcomes.

On the second day of the POP exercise each group re-examined and recorded their present and future purposes, the process the group had used during meetings or desired to use in the future, and the present and future outcomes of the study group process. In order to share the results building wide, I collected all documents and posted them in the faculty lounge so they could be shared with the entire faculty. I then coded and analyzed all the completed forms.

In addition, I observed four different study groups participating in the POP process. Also, I observed a study group leaders' meeting in which the outcomes of the POP activity were discussed. A sample POP guide and worksheet are located in Appendix C.

The final document source for this study was an open-ended questionnaire I gave to all study group participants after the conclusion of study group meetings in May (see Appendix D). The questionnaire contained seventeen open-ended questions. Five questions gave the participants the choice of picking from an array of descriptive words or topics or supplying their own descriptive terms. The descriptive terms I provided were based on iterative analysis of the data gathered. The respondents completed the questionnaires anonymously. Before I distributed the questionnaires to all study group participants, I once again
reminded the participants of the purposes of the study and assured them that neither they nor the school site would be identified in either the final report to the school district or my dissertation.

To further ensure anonymity, I made arrangements for the questionnaires to be returned to a school secretary. Participants checked their own names off a master list as the questionnaires were returned. After several building wide reminders, plus the secretary's reminders, forty-five of forty-nine questionnaires were returned. All observations, field notes, interviews, questionnaires, and documents were similarly coded and analyzed. I have retained all documents and materials.

Data Analysis

I incorporated case study analysis, historical and current document analysis, and survey (questionnaire) analysis in this study in order to triangulate data and to address both the problem of the study and research questions. Miles and Huberman (1984) define a case or site as "a bounded context in which one is studying events, processes, and outcomes" (p. 28). I chose a participant observer case study design in order to achieve a detailed examination of teacher study groups in a bounded context.

By ensuring anonymity and choosing a variety of key informants, I addressed issues of qualitative validity and
reliability, as well as bias. Unlike quantitative researchers, "qualitative researchers tend to view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across different observations" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 44). I addressed the validity of the findings in this study by: (a) choosing representative informants, (b) generalizing from representative events, (c) drawing inferences from representative processes, and (d) using multiple methods and sources of information (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

My purpose in choosing multiple methods for data collection was to gather representative, unbiased information for analysis. In order to minimize bias I employed several methods of data collection in this study. My participant observations and informal conversational interviews took place throughout the study. I took extensive field notes and collected numerous documents related to the problem and questions of the study.

Throughout the study I developed grounded theory from inductive and iterative analysis of the empirical data of cultural description (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Rogers, 1984; Spradley, 1979). My ongoing analysis began shortly after the study began, continued throughout the study, and was completed in August 1992. Observations, field notes, interviews, a researcher's journal, an open-ended
questionnaire, a team-building exercise, and both existing and current documents were coded, analyzed, and retained.

**Summary Sheets**

As warranted, approximately every week to two weeks, I reviewed field notes, interviews, and documents. I then completed an analysis summary sheet which summarized:

(a) the events, (b) the people or situations involved, (c) the main issues or themes that stood out, (d) the information gained, and (e) suggestions for future contacts, target questions, or needed information. Through this process I was able to note initial patterns as they began to develop (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

**Indefinite Triangulation**

My indefinite triangulation of data throughout the collection stage was accomplished by extensive iterative review of all the data collected from multiple sources and analysis summary sheets. This review yielded emerging categories. Data analysis and coding to generate cultural patterns required my first organizing the data and then breaking it into manageable units. For example, Bogdan and Biklen (1982) suggest numerous categories for coding: (a) setting and context, (b) process, (c) event, (d) activity, (e) strategy, (f) method, (g) relationship and social structure, (h) subject's perspectives or ways of thinking about people and objects, or (i) a preassigned coding system.
I began by coding initial patterns of interactions and behaviors. Keeping the research questions as a focus, I synthesized the data by searching for consistent patterns and themes to generate meaning. Grounded theory began to develop as more data were collected, coded, and analyzed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). I noted more themes emerging as the research evolved and major findings were verified by participants. My ongoing indefinite triangulation confirmed whether or not the patterns and themes were representative and verified conclusions.

Coding

As data were gathered from multiple sources, I coded field notes, documents, interviews, and both the questionnaire responses and the Purpose, Outcomes, Process (POP) documents using the themes and categories developing from my iterative constant comparative model of data analysis. Coding was an ongoing process. As coding proceeded I dropped some categories when they were not supported by the data, added new categories in order to include data not covered by existing codes, and combined some categories as patterns developed. Furthermore, I conducted a search for negative cases. Appendix E contains an example of the layered coding employed in this study.

Quantification

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) state that "quantitative data can have conventional use in qualitative research" (p. 112).
These data were used in my iterative analysis process to:
(a) suggest trends, (b) provide descriptive information, (c) suggest areas for further exploration and questioning, (d) confirm data from other sources, and (e) check on ideas as they developed. I coded, collated, and in some instances quantified the responses from the study group questionnaire.

**Definite Triangulation**

After data collection was completed, I took a significant three week break from the research. This break provided me with the opportunity to distance myself from the research site and subjects before final analysis began. As a researcher, this helped me put into perspective my relationship to the research site and subjects.

As I collected data, they were compared and contrasted through indefinite triangulation. My findings emerged as the study progressed through inductive reasoning or from the bottom up. Grounded theory developed as more information was collected, coded, and analyzed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Themes emerged as the research evolved and I verified major findings with participants.

My final reduction and definite triangulation of data verified that the following themes occurred throughout different parts of the school culture and connected the different subsystems of the culture: (a) Interpersonal Conflict, (b) Feeling Stuck, (c) Emerging Awareness, (d) Impact on Curriculum and Instruction, (e) Selective Risk
Taking, (f) Racial Tensions, (g) Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power, (h) Study Group Process, and (i) Rhythm of the School Disrupted. I noted that the patterns that developed within these themes fell into two types, group related and individual.

Following Miles and Huberman's (1984) suggestion, after my final analysis, I had participants evaluate a general report of the major findings of the study in order to corroborate my findings. I took into consideration the following reasons why informants might not agree with my findings. The informants might not: (a) be familiar with the information, (b) understand the findings, (c) see the situation in the same way, (d) may be threatened by the findings, or (e) think the report was biased (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

Because I saw informant corroboratio as another occasion to learn more about the site, I discussed the tentative results with ten study group participants and three nonparticipants. The nonparticipants had backgrounds in staff development and were familiar with both the school setting and the study group process. Finally, I refined and extended my explanations and hypotheses and then posed answers for the research questions.

Limitations

As a qualitative researcher, I was aware of the limitations of this type of research. Qualitative studies
cannot be replicated and their findings are not generalizable because the research involves a unique cultural setting which cannot be duplicated. Because I was the primary research instrument, researcher bias could have distorted the study. This type of bias could not be totally eliminated because my values affected my ability to determine what data were important and what were not, thereby impacting the results.

I limited researcher bias by: (a) including reflections on my own subjectivity as a part of the research process, (b) having data verified throughout the research by informants and others outside the research, (c) using a variety of informants, some not directly involved in the research; (d) including informants with different points of view, (e) turning emotional and interpersonal thoughts into conceptual thoughts, (f) asking informants to gather data for me, (g) using several data sources to triangulate, (h) not telling what I knew in order to have it confirmed, and (i) continually refocusing on the research questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

In addition, I watched for observer effect throughout my research. Observer effect can occur when the behavior of the subject changes due to the presence of the researcher. I limited observer effect by: (a) being as unobtrusive as possible, (b) interacting in an informal manner, (c) staying
on the site as much as possible, (d) making sure the researcher's role was clear to all, (e) asking an informant to watch for researcher effects, (f) interviewing away from Georgetown in an informal setting, and (g) noting which behaviors appeared to be natural and which appeared to be in response to my presence (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

After gaining an indepth understanding of the context, I was able to derive an even deeper understanding of the culture from the unnatural behavior subjects displayed in front of me (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984). "People who are discreet, savvy in the environment under study, and conceptually ecumenical" can avoid both researcher bias and observer effect (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 234).

Summary

As a complete participant observer, I conducted a case study of the operations and impact of teacher study groups at one school site. I obtained the data which created the thick description for this study through participant observations, informal conversational interviews, structured interviews, an open-ended questionnaire, a team building activity, and both historical and current document collection. My interviews with an outside researcher provided additional data related to the purpose and questions of the study. I triangulated data from all
sources to verify the representativeness and accuracy of the data. I retained all sources of data.

My data analysis was ongoing and followed a constant comparative model. Grounded theory was developed through triangulation of all data sources. I developed explanations and hypotheses for the research questions, as well as inferences for further study.
CHAPTER IV

NARRATIVE OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to describe the operation and impact of teacher study groups at one school site. My sources of data for this study were (a) participant observation, (b) field notes, (c) informal interviews, (d) documents, (e) structured interviews, (f) an open-ended questionnaire, and (g) a team building exercise. I clustered my key and ancillary informants into ten groups: (a) eight teacher study groups, (b) a group of administrators, and (c) a group of concerned nonsite participants. I analyzed the data from all sources to develop grounded theory (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). Through triangulation of all the data, I developed and verified nine themes.

This chapter is divided into five sections. In the first section, I describe the ten groups of participants and their roles in this case study. The second section defines the coding categories and nine themes I developed from the repeated regularities which occurred across the data. The themes are presented in terms of the external and internal context of the school. In the third section, I present the data in the nine themes as it appeared across the ten
groups. The fourth section presents the data in the nine themes which are representative of the ten groups combined. The final section contains a summary of the findings of this study. Throughout the five sections of this chapter, I have included various representative items from the data sources. The criteria I used for inclusion were (a) the frequency with which the example appeared in the data, (b) the significance of the item as an excellent example of a theme, and (c) the representativeness of the item of similar items. Fictitious names were used to protect the identity of the participants, the school site, and the school district.

Group Descriptions

Ten groups provided data for this case study. Eight teacher study groups were formed based on the staff's participation in site-based management (SBM) committees and their personal choice. The Georgetown administrators' group did not actively participate in the teacher study groups; however, they were involved in planning and monitoring the study groups. The concerned nonsite participants' group had knowledge of the school site and study group process, but were not directly involved in either the school site or the study groups.

Study Groups

Fifty-one Georgetown staff members signed up to participate in teacher study groups based on five areas of
interest: (1) Multi-cultural Education, (2) High Expectations, (3) Family Involvement, (4) Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), and (5) Critical Issues in Education. As study group facilitator I formed eight groups. Because of the large number of people who had signed up for Multi-cultural Education, Family Involvement, and Critical Issues, I formed two study groups for each of those areas. I attempted to redistribute personnel when the extra groups were formed in order to create more heterogeneous groups. Some participants agreed to change groups while others did not. As a result, some groups contained more of a mix of grade level and special area representation than others. All of the groups contained clusters of staff members on the same grade levels, close friends, and staff members with similar job descriptions. I participated in two study groups.

My role was to facilitate the entire study group process. At my request, each group developed a set of group norms. I scheduled weekly, one hour meetings for fifteen weeks. Meetings began in November and continued through the middle of May. Weekly, I provided each group with a set of articles relevant to their topic. Study group participants were told to read and then be prepared to share and discuss the information in the articles with their study group. Both the principal and I told study group participants that attendance was required for teachers directly responsible
for students. Although office staff, aides, and assistant
teachers were not required to participate in study groups,
some chose to join a group. Classroom coverage was provided
for all teachers when they were attending study group
meetings. The following sections describe each of the
groups that provided data for this case study.

Group A. This study group started the year with nine
participants. One dropped out when she found out that she
was not required to participate. The members of Group A
were a fourth grade, third grade, and sixth grade teacher
who were close friends; three specialists, and two
noncertified staff members who were not required to attend.
The group leader, Susie, chaired the SBM committee which was
writing action plans for this group's topic. Susie
recruited the membership of her committee. She told some
participants that if I requested that they change groups
they were not to change. She also asked me to move some
members of her group to another group. Susie chose to meet
before school and informed the other members of her group of
the meeting time. Group A's norms included "no names
attached when sharing outside the group" and "no judgements"
(document, 111/1). Their scheduled meeting time was from
7:45 am to 8:45 am. Consistently, I noted that their
meetings began around 7:55 am and were over by 8:20 am
(field notes, set 36/5). When I was attending one of their
meetings, Susie began the meeting by saying:
I have to leave early today. I have to be in my room by 8:25. I need to be with my kids; my kids come first. I have some special ones.

Another participant said:

We all do, so I think we all need to leave early today. I think we should dismiss at 8:20 (field notes, set 77/1).

As usual, the group dismissed at 8:20 am, twenty-five minutes early. In addition, this group spent only four of the fifteen scheduled meetings discussing the articles they had been assigned to read. Nine of the meetings they either worked on their SBM action plans or listened to educational tapes so they wouldn't have to read on their own time. Group A did not generate any ideas or suggestions for improving the school. Susie described her group as "task oriented" (field notes, set 44/1).

Group B. This group consisted of three fourth grade teachers and a fifth grade teacher and her close friend, a certified nonclassroom teacher. Since this group had no primary level teachers, I asked two teachers who worked with first grade to leave an all first grade group and join this group. They were somewhat reluctant to move because of the meeting time, after school, but did agree to join Group B. The leader of this group, Madge, was the chair of a SBM committee responsible for the group's topic. This group made a joint decision to meet after school. One group member missed ten meetings because of an after school conflict, but did not attempt to join another group or talk
to me about her conflict. The third time I talked to her about this situation she rearranged her schedule and began attending her group's meetings. Group norms included "what we discuss will be kept in the room" (document 111/3). When asked to describe the group, Madge stated:

My group is a pretty good group. We don't gripe too much. The articles have been good and we've had some good discussions. Some have gotten a little heated (field notes, set 62/1).

Group C. The members of this group were all primary level personnel. The three first grade, one kindergarten, and one third grade teacher chose to meet during the day and eat lunch as they met. A nonclassroom teacher I had asked to join this group did not attend any meetings due to an extended illness. Group C was led by the SBM committee chair for this topic, Sara. In May, when I requested that all attendance sheets be turned in to me for staff development credit, Sara reported that her group's attendance sheet was lost. When it was finally returned to me, after several requests, the sheet reported no absences and more meetings than I had scheduled (field notes, set 64/1; document, 11/20). Group C's norms included "be professional" and "no judgements made" (document 111/5). When I asked Sara to describe her group she said:

Oh don't worry about us. We just do our own thing. There is just too much to do around here. We are meeting, don't worry about it (informal interview, set 89/3).
Group D. Three sixth grade teachers, two special area teachers who worked with sixth grade, and two second grade teachers were in Group D. This group met during the day and ate their lunches together. The leader of this group, Teresa, was the chair of the SBM committee responsible for writing action plans for this topic. One member of this group had frequent absences due to a chronic illness. Norms for this group included "we will have a positive attitude", "attack the statement, not the person", and "we will rearrange meeting times as needed" (document, 111/7). This group's attendance sheet reported sixteen meetings, they were required to meet fifteen times. My informal conversational interviews with members of this group confirmed that the group had chosen to cancel three meetings which were not rescheduled (document, 111/19). One member of this group gave me an article she was excited about and wanted to share with all the study groups. Teresa described her group as:

We're a pretty good group. We're all friends, so we get along real well. It just doesn't seem like we have any real direction, so I don't feel like we get anything done, but we enjoy getting together (informal interview, set 48/1).

Group E. All the members of Group E were primary level teachers. Although the group leader, Katy, was new to the building, she was well known by both the administrators and the staff. She chaired the SBM committee for this topic. Among the norms this group chose were "everyone will state
their opinion without fear of judging" and "be supportive" (document 111/11). This group produced more written communication and generated more ideas than any other group, but they did not follow through on their ideas with actions. Describing her group, Katy said:

The group was complaining because they signed up for our topic and they don't want to talk about anything else. They were really negative and it turned into a bitch session. Don't give us anything but parent articles, we do alright with them (informal interview, set 39/2).

They are much happier again. Sorry only three showed up. It must have been a bad day. This really is a good group (field notes, set 48/1).

Group F. I participated in group F along with two reading teachers, a kindergarten teacher, a second grade teacher, and one member of the support staff. The group leader, Fran, was new to the school and not a member of a SBM committee. This group met during the school day. Group norms included "everyone responsible for their own food," "everyone participate," and "no judgements made" (document 111/13). At no time did I purposely interfere in the flow of conversation during study group meetings. At first the members of the group were guarded. I noted that they opened up and spoke more freely after a few meetings. Attendance was generally good. Participants may have felt some pressure to attend because of my role as study group facilitator. This group did not generate any ideas or plans for school improvement. Discussions generally stayed on the
topic. When describing the general interaction of the group, Fran stated:

It was a good time to get to know other people. I enjoyed learning about others (field notes, set 27/4).

I never really understood what was going on. I enjoyed it but most of the others didn't. They were not satisfied with just gaining knowledge. We didn't know what to do with the information; we discussed it and then we left (field notes, set 91/4).

Group G. All of the participants in Group G were close friends. One third grade, two special education, and three present and past fifth grade teachers participated in the group. I purposely had separated the members of this group. They changed groups on their own and ended up back together. When I asked two members of the group to move to another group they refused. Three members of the group did not attend six of the 13 meetings held. Others were significantly late or left early. The group leader, Ellen, was not involved in a SBM committee. I had asked her to lead the group because of her strong organizational skills. Among the norms of the group were "start and end on time" and "everyone participate" (document 111/14). One member of this group shared articles related to racial issues with the rest of the group and when I asked for them, with me. The group generated an idea on a racial issue related to instruction, but did not follow through with any action. All group members were Caucasian. When discussing the group, Ellen said:
We could really do some things, but people act like they are not responsible. I think we could really come up with some good ideas if people came and participated. We have the power to do a great job but people are just choosing not to do it (field notes, set 60/1).

Group H. The final study group, Group H, consisted of original members of Group A that the Group A leader had asked me to remove from her group plus original members of Group A who told me they did not want to stay with that group. I also participated in this group. Four members of the group were from primary, one a classroom teacher, and two were from intermediate, one a sixth grade teacher. The remaining members of the group were specialists. The leader of the group, Tom, was a member of a SBM committee focusing on our group topic. Attendance was fairly consistent, except for one member who missed six meetings because she was "busy" (document 111/15). At one meeting, I was the only one present, everyone else was "busy". The group met during the lunch hour, so we all ate our lunches as we discussed our study group articles. Two members of the group shared articles from their graduate classes with the group. The norms for this group included "no judgements made" and "everyone participate" (document 111/16). Tom, the group leader, described Group H as follows:

We have a really good group. People share their thoughts openly and appear to really listen to each other. I think our group (two African-Americans and four Caucasians) really made a difference in understanding each others feelings. I hope we can stay together next year. I'll be glad to be a leader again (field notes, set 97/1).
Administrators' Group. This group of informants was made up of the four Georgetown administrators. All were familiar with the study group format, purpose, and process. The administrators did not participate in study groups. Limited observation and monitoring of the study groups did occur. All administrators discussed the study group process with me in my role as facilitator, as well as with the study group participants.

Mary, the principal, had been at the school site for ten years. The assistant principals, Beth, Vicky, and Penny, had from three to seven years of experience at the school site. All the administrators supported the concept of study groups and my role as facilitator. I met regularly with the principal to discuss both the planning and the implementation stages of the teacher study groups. Mary said:

You set the groups up and let me look at it. What are you going to read? We need to get these started (field notes, set 5/1).

They can meet in the conference rooms and the library. I want to keep them centrally located for better control and observation (field notes, set 5/2).

I asked all the administrators to attend study groups on a regular basis. They said they would not be able to attend because they were too busy. Penny said:

I would have liked to have been able to be a true participant, but I was not comfortable with my role as a watch dog (field notes, set 107/2).
Vicky and Beth asked for all the information I had on study groups and copies of all the articles so they could have them for their files:

People may not appreciate what you do; they have no idea what a tremendous opportunity this is for professional growth (field notes, set 95/2).

**Concerned Nonsite Group.** The four nonsite professional educators were familiar with the study group process and the school setting. All followed the teacher study groups at Georgetown through both the 1990-1991 and 1991-1992 school years. In addition, all had backgrounds and training in staff development, Ann and Jenny for approximately ten years, Ken and Bonnie for five years. My conversational interviews with the four nonsite professional educators were ongoing. I conducted structured interviews with them toward the end of the study. Our discussions dealt with both my role as facilitator and the behaviors of the study group participants. A fifth member was added to this group when I extended my research to include a researcher from a nearby college. The following statements are representative of this group:

It isn't easy being a teacher leader. You are seen as one of them [the administrators] by the staff, but you are still a teacher to the administrators (field notes, set 106/2).

Hang in there. Try to spend your time with positive people. There are more positives out there, you just hear the complainers. That is pretty standard. The negative ones make the most noise (field notes, set 76/4).
Coding Categories and Themes

I developed categories of behavior from the repeated regularities in the data. I then summarized these categories as themes. Nine major themes emerged from my research. Seven dealt with the internal context of the school site and two with the external context (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Context</th>
<th>External Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td>Rhythm of the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Stuck</td>
<td>Disrupted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Risk Taking</td>
<td>Racial Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Group Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpersonal Conflict

My findings indicated that the staff members' typical behaviors when working together as a team were characterized by conflict and polarization around interpersonal issues within the work context. Typical staff behaviors were personalized and emotionally based. Participants displayed
their anxiety and increased tension by struggling for control, voicing concerns over excessive work, and retreating to the safety of isolation. The repeated patterns of behavior I found occurring consistently within the Interpersonal Conflict theme were (a) arguing about what should be done, (b) blaming statements, (c) complaining about the organization, its leaders, and no clear focus or purpose, and (d) choosing sides to create factions. Interpersonal Conflict behaviors appeared in both group and individual patterns of behavior. The following statements are examples of the Interpersonal Conflict theme.

During a Study Group Committee meeting, a committee member stated:

People are going to say that study groups are just one more thing to do (field notes, set 7/2).

When meetings were being scheduled, group leaders made the following remarks:

Well my group isn't going to meet during the day; my group is going to meet after school. I don't care what the rest of you do (field note, set 14/1).

How are we supposed to have time to work on [SBM] action plans? There is already too much going on around here (field notes, set 13/3).

An administrator described a meeting with the site-based management (SBM) team leaders, who became the study group leaders, as follows:

A general tone of frustration and anger over being asked to do anything extra. Complaints about the extra time study groups require and complaints about scheduling and meetings. So I had to give them
something to live with. I let them combine [SBM] committees with study groups so there are not extra meetings plus they get to choose their own [meeting] time. Otherwise, they are going to stir up trouble (field notes, set 13/3).

As study group facilitator, I was asked various questions when participants were signing up for study groups, such as:

Do you get the articles or do we have to do it (field notes, set 15/1)?

I just can't do one more thing, do we have to sign up for study groups (field notes, set 15/2)?

Later in the year I asked a participant why she had stopped going to her study group. She replied:

Well, I stopped because I'm part of the mentoring program so I don't have to go to study groups. I was just going because I believe in them and I'm on your committee. Anyway, it was way too negative, everyone just sat around and bitched about everything (field notes, set 59/1).

Feeling Stuck

A second behavioral theme that was repeated regularly throughout the internal context data was one that participants described as "feeling stuck". This lack of momentum toward a goal was expressed in both individual and group interactions. For example:

What have we ever accomplished by doing all these [SBM] things. Nothing ever changes (field notes, set 7/3).

Last night at the grade level party we talked about feeling stuck in this negative pattern. We agreed that it is time to move on (field notes, set 42/1).

If people have a problem they need to present it with a solution. Stop all the griping. That's hard to do. It is time to move on (field note, set 42/2).
Selective Risk Taking

The third theme that appeared repeatedly in the internal context was Selective Risk Taking. These behaviors included (a) retreating to the safe isolation of one's classroom, (b) cautious behavior such as not confronting one's peers and not speaking up in large groups, and (c) fear of peers "tattling" to the administration. The following examples are representative of Selective Risk Taking behavior.

When I discussed the study group process and goals with teachers new to Georgetown, only positive and supportive comments were made by teachers who had participated in study groups the previous year. Later, a key informant told me:

The complainers kept quiet until after the meeting. They weren't going to say anything in front of you (field notes, set 2/1).

When we met as a faculty and I presented the study group schedules and once again explained my research role I asked the group for both positive and negative feedback. No one asked any questions in the large group setting. After the meeting, I was bombarded with questions by individuals and small clusters of the staff (field notes, set 23/1).

A study group participant made the following comment:

Sara is a worthless leader. She doesn't do a good job leading the meetings. I'm fed up. Don't you tell her what I said (field notes, set 23/1).

While discussing some members of her group trying to cancel a study group meeting, another group leader stated:
Well I'll just go at 2:30 and see what happens. Don't you say you heard it [cancelling the meeting] from me or they will stop talking to me (field notes, set 26/1).

Study Group Process

I found that this internal context theme contained organizational and administrative behaviors, as well as participants' behaviors associated with the study group process. Organizational behaviors included (a) a self-selection process which created homogeneous groups made up of friends and familiar acquaintances and (b) statements and behaviors related to the actual mechanics of organizing the groups. The following examples are characteristic of organizational behavior within the Study Group Process theme.

All but one member of the 1990-1991 Study Group Committee responded positively when I asked them to take part in planning the 1991-1992 study groups. Typical responses were:

Great! I'm glad we're doing this again.
Sure. I think we need to keep going with the plans we talked about last year [new heterogeneous groups] (field notes, set 7/2).

From what I understand the mixed groups worked well (field notes, set 7/2).

In contrast, I was told that "people will sign up for what they want" in a planning meeting with administrators. Another administrator replied:

It will be just like Junior High. They [the staff] are going to sign up with their friends (field notes, set 13/1).
Another administrator commented:

I don't like cliquishness, it isn't healthy. They [study groups] will just end up bitch sessions. Nothing will be accomplished and there will be no growth (field notes, set 15/3).

After looking at the sign up sheets, the principal said to me:

This [pointing to a group] isn't going to work. They [people who had signed up] are all kindergarten and first grade in Family Involvement and all intermediate in High Expectations. We'll just have to tell first grade they have to split up. You ask these two to move to a different group (field notes, set 15/2).

The administrative behaviors in the study group process included (a) a lack of visible support and participation and (b) the administrative "watch dog" role. The following examples are characteristic of administrative behavior in the Study Group Process theme.

When I requested that the building administrators sign up for study groups along with the staff, the principal replied:

We are too busy. We will try to go to some [meetings] but we are not going to sign up. We are drowning right now, maybe second semester (field notes, set 15/7).

When I reported to the principal that study group participants were not attending meetings regularly and that some groups had become very negative, she called a meeting of all the administrators. Each of them was assigned two study groups to monitor and attend. I was told:

The administrators are going to start going to study group meetings to check up on what is going on. Maybe
that will get them [participants] to shape up (field notes, set 50/1).

The study group participants' behaviors within the Study Group Process theme were not consistent. Some groups generated more ideas than others. Unlike the 1990-1991 study groups, none of the 1991-1992 groups followed through and acted on their ideas. The study group participants displayed a general lack of accountability and initiative.

At the same time, when an administrator did attend meetings, the participants displayed appropriate study group behaviors. The groups and individual participants expressed both positive and negative feelings toward the study group process. These repeated patterns of behavior are represented by the following field notes.

Ellen came to me and said:

Only one person showed up for my study group. We may need to discuss a different time. People seem to have problems with this time. It is too bad. [There are] lots of good people in this group who could really come up with something good, but no one is taking the initiative (field notes, set 52/1).

Another study group leader, Katy, told me:

Everyone was coming up with excuses. I said, 'We will meet! We will come up with a time! If not, she [study group facilitator] will give us one.' We could do some things but people act like they are not responsible. I think we could really come up with some good ideas if people came and participated (field notes, set 60/1).

Madge, leader of Group B, told me:

I have a really good group. They usually come and we have some good discussions. Of course that doesn't include the one who dropped out. I told her to come
and talk to you about joining a different group (field notes, set 63/1).

In a meeting of study group leaders, Susie said:

Ideas came out of groups last year and communication. But not this year. There was more of a commitment last year (field notes, set 66/1).

**Emerging Awareness**

The theme of emerging awareness encompassed behavior patterns which demonstrated that the study group participants grew to realize that the homogeneous groups they formed through self-selection were neither as satisfying nor as productive as the heterogeneous groups they had been assigned to in 1990-1991. In addition, the participants acknowledged that they were tired of the negativeness that permeated interactions. The following statements are examples of the staff's Emerging Awareness behaviors.

Study group participants made the following statements to me, others standing nearby agreed:

I think there are more positive people than we know about. People need to tell the negative ones to mind their own business. I'm not putting up with it any more. I'm telling them I am sick and tired of this negative stuff (field notes, set 42/1).

Our group never really does much. We need cross grade level teams like last year (field notes, set 66/3).

The following statements reoccurred in the POP (Purpose, Outcome, Process) documents developed by each study group:
Membership of study groups should represent a cross section of the building (document 90/3).

[The] Outcomes of study groups should be a unified and empowered staff (document 90/7) and improved staff morale (document 90/8).

The purpose of the study groups should be to generate new ideas, apply what we have read, researched, and discussed to Georgetown, and generate ideas into action (document 90/11).

**Impact on Curriculum and Instruction**

The sixth theme I found in Georgetown's internal context was based on repeated statements which indicated that both the articles read by study group members and the subsequent discussions in study group meetings did have an impact on curriculum and instruction. The repeated behavior patterns I found indicated that the awareness level of the participants was increasing, although follow through and application were limited. Despite the negative interactions and statements, both the written outcomes of the POP activity and the open-ended questionnaire responses indicated that the staff's participation in study groups did raise their awareness level. The following examples are representative of the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme.

After members of a study group read an article on high teacher expectations, these statements were made during a study group meeting:

I read this article but I don't think it applies to us [Georgetown staff]. I know I always make sure I'm calling on my low kids.
But this article makes us think about it. I know with my resource kids, I let them off the hook sometimes. Now I can see that I shouldn't (field notes, set 28/1).

This is really interesting, I know I will be more aware [of who I call on] in the future (field notes, set 30/1).

The desired study group outcome and purpose sections of the POP documents contained statements such as:

[We need] A curriculum (particularly science) that provides the best possible education for our students (document, 90/3).

Intensively study accelerated learning for next year and incorporate this concept in our study groups (document 90/4).

Use the knowledge gained to revise and expand our curriculum (document 90/6).

Greater staff awareness in the areas of curriculum and instruction was supported by the study group participants' responses on the open-ended questionnaire:

I liked the small groups and the time to discuss important educational topics.

I felt that all of our discussions were useful. We learned a lot.

Study groups are a good way to share information and keep up with research. You get out of study group what you put into it (document 113/5).

**Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power**

The seventh and final theme I found in Georgetown's internal context was the ebb and flow of power being exchanged between the principal and the staff as the school changed from a strong top-down power structure to a teacher empowerment site-based management model. This exchange of power occurred when the loudest negative voices on the staff
caused the principal to retreat from a strongly stated position. The power then flowed into the hands of the teachers. However, when teachers did not follow through with the actions they had demanded, the principal reclaimed the power by taking another firm top-down stance. This caused the loud negative teachers to once again bring up the issue of teacher empowerment. As the negative voices grew, the principal retreated from her position and the power slowly flowed back toward the teachers as the cycle continued. The typical behaviors I found occurring within the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme were (a) teachers voicing the desire for empowerment but not displaying the actions that indicated an acceptance of responsibility, (b) the principal making top-down decisions, and (c) the administration presenting an official perspective to parents and the community. Examples of the ebb and flow of power are cited below.

Originally, the principal had empowered me to set up the study groups heterogeneously, separating negative influences. Led by Susie, the SBM committee leaders went to the principal and complained loudly about extra meetings. The principal came back to me and said:

I met with the [SBM] committee leaders and things have changed. They want to use the meeting time to write action plans; so now people will sign up for groups. I know that this is a problem; but I don't know, we have to do it. Susie wants to meet at 11:00 am. Well, she'll just have to take what she gets (field notes, set 12/1).
After empowering the staff to choose their own study groups based on SBM committees, the principal said to me:

Just get tough if first grade doesn't like it [being asked to move to another group]; they can't all be together in the same group. This is ridiculous (field notes, set 15/3).

The following description of teacher study groups was in the February school newsletter to parents:

Every staff member participates one hour weekly in a study group where the latest research is reviewed and decisions/recommendations are made for new programming at Georgetown (document 55/1).

In the POP documents, study groups wrote that they wanted the following for next year:

[To] aid in final decisions (document 90/6).

A feeling of empowerment (document 90/7).

We want a voice in recommending what's most important to us (document 90/8).

Responses on the open-ended questionnaire also indicated behavior patterns within the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme. I developed terms through ongoing data analysis that described what was being discussed during study group meetings besides the assigned articles. On the questionnaire, study group participants were asked to choose any or all of these terms and to add their own terms to describe what was being discussed in their study group meetings. Participants could pick as many of the terms as applied to their group. Questionnaires were returned by 45 of the 47 study group participants. School climate was
chosen by 38 participants, 20 chose administrative concerns, 15 instruction, 14 curriculum, and 8 grade level concerns. Other terms added by participants to describe what was being discussed besides the articles were (a) management procedures, (b) current events, (c) school health hazards, (d) personal lives, and (e) morale. Of the 47 respondents, 27 reported spending from 20% to 50% of each meeting's time discussing topics not related to the assigned articles (document 113/8).

Rhythm of the School Disrupted

The first external theme I found at Georgetown dealt with the staff's response to the disruption of the normal rhythm of the school. The first six months of the 1991-1992 school year were stressful for the staff because of the incomplete building renovation. The staff displayed their stress by voicing anxiety and feelings of being displaced. My findings indicated that staff members attempted to control their own individual environments by retreating to the isolation of their own classrooms and focusing on their individual needs. Anything that interrupted the patterns they established in their classrooms made them angry.

Georgetown was not ready for occupancy when inservice was held in August. Staff inservice was held in the auditorium of the central administration building. When I suggested to our principal that I discuss the study group
process with the staff during one of those inservice days, she replied:

No. Wait until later. I don't want to talk about that yet. People are too stressed out and upset already because we can't start school on time. I've got to keep them happy (field notes, set 2/2).

The statements that follow are examples of comments made by the staff during inservice training:

What in the world are we going to do about books? How can we teach without books?

When are we going to be able to get into our rooms? I feel so far behind (field notes, set 2/5).

By December, staff members were saying:

I can't believe he [a painter] walked in here right in the middle of my lesson. How in the world can I keep their attention when there is a guy on stilts painting the windows in my room. This happens all the time. I'm sick and tired of it (field note, set 73/2).

**Racial Tension**

Although I felt racial tension was a significant undercurrent throughout the research, the second theme in Georgetown's external context appeared sporadically in my initial data. The importance of the role racial tension played at Georgetown did not appear until I extended my study by informally interviewing a researcher from a nearby college, Dr. Green. He had been asked by the principal to ascertain Georgetown's overall school climate by interviewing everyone on the staff. The behavior patterns characteristic of the Racial Tensions theme appeared in his
data collection, along with the other behaviors and themes that my research identified.

Historically, the Racial Tensions theme had played a major role at Georgetown. Last school year, 1990-1991, an African-American group of neighborhood parents accused the school staff of overt discrimination. The allegations were investigated by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA). There was extensive television and newspaper coverage throughout 1990-1991 and the beginning of the 1991-1992 school year (documents 115/1-115/16). Both agencies completed portions of their investigations and sent reports to the school district and the parent group. As a result, Georgetown Elementary and the school district have made significant changes in their special education programs. The OCR investigation was not completed during my research.

In response to the neighborhood parents' allegations, the district formed a Georgetown Elementary Task Force. The members of the Georgetown Task Force were (a) six Georgetown teachers, (b) six African-American parents, (c) six Caucasian parents, (d) a central office administrator, and (e) an African-American member of the school's Bi-Racial Committee. The Task Force met during the summer of 1991 and the first two months of the following school year. Their goal was to address the concerns of the African-American neighborhood parents. The staff reacted with a variety of
emotions to newspaper and television coverage and the investigations. The various emotions displayed by the staff were not addressed at the school site by the administration.

The following statements are representative of staff members' feelings as the 1991-1992 school year began. New staff members were asking:

I have lots of questions about the neighborhood group. Is it terrible? Have people been attacked? What can we expect? (field notes, set 2/4).

Staff members who had experienced the situation were saying:

You need to know how upset teachers are and support them. There are very strong feelings (field notes, set 2/4).

When I showed the principal my list of Study Group Committee Members, her first response had to do with racial balance on the committee:

It looks great. Good, you've got [and pointed to the two African-American names on the list] (field notes, set 6/2).

As my research progressed, study group participants' statements were representative of the Racial Tension theme:

My group got into a really deep conversation on Black culture. We're going to use the same article for next time (field notes 37/1).

It [poor behavior of African-American students] boils down to values. How do we teach values when the home values are so different? (field notes, 40/1).

The data I gathered by interviewing Dr. Green supported the presence of the Racial Tension theme at Georgetown:
Black teachers on the staff say there is racist behavior by white teachers or at least behaviors that can be construed as racist. White teachers are saying they feel like they are in a fish bowl, everyone is watching them so they are afraid to take actions because they may be seen as racist. So they are very frustrated and feel like they are in a damned if I do, and damned if I don't situation (field notes, set 96/3).

Themes Across Groups

I found that behaviors characteristic of each of the nine themes occurred in almost all of the ten groups. Representative patterns of behaviors within the themes appeared more often in some groups than others. Tables 2, 3, and 4, found at the end of this chapter, present the findings in matrix form. Examples of predominate behaviors within each theme across the eight teacher study groups, the administrators' group, and the concerned nonsite participants' group are presented in the following sections.

Interpersonal Conflict

I found behavior patterns characteristic of the Interpersonal Conflict theme in all the teacher study groups. Both the administrators' group and the concerned nonparticipants' group commented on the staff's Interpersonal Conflict behavior patterns. Once the study group process was underway, the majority of my conversations and observations were related to interpersonal conflict behaviors. The following excerpts illustrate these behaviors within each of the ten groups.
Group A. I found that the majority of the behavior patterns that appeared in the data for this group's participants and its leader, Susie, could be typified as: (a) complaints about the organization and its leadership, (b) a desire for control, (c) complaints about excessive work, (d) blaming, (e) desire for isolation, and (f) cliquishness. These behaviors were repeated with regularity in the data. For example, Susie hand-picked her group by rejecting those she did not want in her group. Also, Group A did not follow the guidelines for meeting times; they met for thirty minutes rather than an hour. In addition, this group used their shortened meeting time to listen to *Educational Leadership* tapes instead of reading articles on their own time as they had been instructed. Group A's Interpersonal Conflict theme behaviors are typified by the following illustrations.

When I delivered the third set of articles to Susie for her group (document 111/2) she said:

*We don't need articles this week. We will be listening to tapes. We have problems discussing; we run out of things to say. But with tapes I think it will work better. People just don't have time to read the articles because there is too much to do (field notes, set 56/1).*

Other comments by Susie and members of her group:

*We can't get excited about new ideas because we aren't happy with the way things are. People just want to seclude themselves and do their own thing (field notes, set 77/5).*
When Susie was asked by an administrator to stop a whispered conversation during a study group meeting, she replied:

Oh, we weren't talking about you; we were talking about somebody else (field notes, set 91/8).

Group B. Once again, I found that many of the behavior patterns of this group's members were typical of the Interpersonal Conflict theme, although my interactions with the group's leader, Madge, were not. Madge was positive about the study group concept and her involvement in it. At times she was frustrated with the negative behavior of her group. Blaming, desire for control, complaints about extra work, and isolation were behaviors that appeared with regularity within this group. The following excerpts illustrate the Interpersonal Conflict theme for Group B.

Madge commented to me:

It [study group] went well today. The group was glad to get back to reading articles. They didn't like writing the action plans. We had a pretty good discussion. Everyone was sharing. We all related to what we read. I hadn't thought of it from a special education point of view. I wish people would stop complaining so much. They sure griped because they had to help me write the action plans (field notes, set 36/1).

I need to tell you that Liz has stopped coming to meetings. She says she wants to stay in her room because she is tired of listening to other people being attacked by some of the group. What do I do? I told her to tell you (field notes, set 74/1).

Group C. The regularities I found in this group's behavior patterns also were characteristic of the Internal
Conflict theme. Blaming others, control issues, complaints about extra work, the organization, and its leader; and retreating to the safety of their rooms were behaviors that appeared in the data for this group. This group turned in an attendance sheet which showed everyone present for all meetings and meetings held during weeks when none were scheduled (document, 111/20). Originally, all of the first grade teachers had signed up for this group. They met as a group and chose their own meeting time and location. I was directed by the principal to ask two of the first grade teachers to move to another group. The examples which follow are typical for Group C.

In a meeting of study group leaders I held to discuss the ongoing problems with study groups, Sara said:

If we had been able to choose our own times it would have been better. I had to go with the time the group chose. And some people were bumped from their group and had to join other groups they didn't want to be in. It doesn't matter to me because it is in my room (field notes, set 66/2).

In a meeting of study group leaders held four weeks later, Sara said:

All those articles made it sound like things were working. We could write up study groups and make it sound that way. We all know that isn't true. People complain about it all the time. There's too much to do. Things around here are not working and the administrators won't do anything about it. There are people teaching here who shouldn't be (field notes, set 91/5).
Group D. The behavior patterns found in this group also reflected the theme of Interpersonal Conflict. Conflict, polarization, blaming, and complaints were typical within this group. Members of Group D voiced a very strong need for a cohesive staff and a clear focus, as illustrated by the following statements by group members:

We need cohesion. I know if everyone was studying parts of Accelerated School we would have all been involved and enthusiastic. What we need is a cohesive focus. Then we would feel more positive about what is going on (field notes, set 85/3).

If the purpose of study groups is sharing our opinions and feelings, then this year has been better. We have really vented in here. There are lots of angry people. We need to all do things, to accomplish things; and get rid of the goof offs (field notes, set 85/4).

Group E. Although Katy, the group leader, attempted to run a positive group, I noted that the group's consistent behavior patterns of arguing, complaining, polarization, and isolation fit the Interpersonal Conflict theme. The following examples are representative of this behavior.

A member of Group E told me:

You have got to talk to Katy. She really bugs us. She won't let us talk about anything but the articles and keeps telling us if we discuss anything else we will ruin your research (field notes, set 62/1).

Our group is hacked off at you because we thought you were just doing this [facilitating study groups] for your doctorate and so we were having to do this for your needs. I'm glad you straightened that out. I'll tell the others (field notes, set 63/1).

Group F. My participation in this group did not stop the Interpersonal Conflict behavior from happening when we
met. Complaints, polarization, blaming others, and a desire for the isolation of their classrooms were common behaviors with all members of the group except the support staff member, Alice. After reading an article on how higher level thinking skills could be used to teach children not to be prejudice Alice stated:

I really thought this was interesting. I want to use this information in the school newsletter. Do you think I can do that? (field notes, set 40/1).

When the group leader, Fran, was asked about her group she replied:

My group is negative. I think only Elizabeth [the researcher] and I enjoyed it. People wanted to be in their rooms. When Elizabeth wasn't there, they really complained and we cancelled some meetings (field notes, set 91/2).

We are all upset with Mary [the principal] for being so top down, for only telling a few people what is going on, for no planning, and for ignoring us so we don't feel like professionals. You only know what is going on if you are one of her special ones (field notes, set 91/6).

Group G. One of the Georgetown administrators commented to me that this was "a particularly unhealthy group". All but the group leader, Ellen, were close friends. Interpersonal Conflict behaviors, in addition to numerous absences, were prevalent. Complaints about the organization and about being too busy, as well as blaming and isolation were typical patterns of behavior for Group G. For example:

It [staff morale] won't change until we have a change in principal. Mary needs to leave. It is all her doing (field notes, set 69/1).
People are really negative, my group is, about study groups. They are mad because they have to do it. Most of our meetings end up as gripe sessions. Everyone is too busy (field notes, set 91/2; 95/1).

**Group H.** Again, even though I was a member of this group, I observed that there were behavior patterns that fit into the theme of Interpersonal Conflict. Complaints about excessive work and a lack of focus, a desire for control, and polarization did occur. In addition, some group members stated that they enjoyed the study group meetings. The following examples typify Group H's Interpersonal Conflict behavior patterns.

When I asked three members of Group A if they would join Group H, they said:

*Fine with me. I am not going to write action plans. She [Susie] is just too pushy. Who does she think she is anyway? I am sick and tired of her* (field notes, set 19/1).

Another comment typical of a Group H member was:

*This has been a good group. It is too bad that other groups have been ruined by negative people. There are some people who need to leave this building. They don't carry their weight and they ruin it for the rest of us. I'm sick and tired of their behavior. They are not professionals and they need to go* (field notes, set 80/3).

**Administrators' Group.** The following statements illustrate the administrators' comments on the Interpersonal Conflict behavior patterns of the staff, as well as the administrators' participation in blaming, arguing, and conflict:
Just ignore the complainers. They are always there. It is the same in every school. Teachers are terrible to each other. I get so sick of listening to them. It is time some people left this building. If they don't like it they should get out. Be sure to separate the negative ones as much as you can. Of course they always stick together and make it miserable for everyone (field notes, set 11/2).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. This group also commented on the Georgetown staff's Interpersonal Conflict behavior patterns. The statement which follows was made by the researcher from a nearby college, Dr. Green. It is representative of the comments made by members of this group:

What I have heard so far in talking with other members of the faculty is that there is lots of stress. The site-based management core team is a good idea but it has led to stress because people feel overworked. People are feeling bombarded so they are retreating into their work, their rooms, and isolated tasks that are safe. The sense of we has been lost. It is us against them and factions have been formed. [Everyone] has their backs up (field notes, set 96/3).

Another Nonsite Participant stated:

There are issues that some people will not let go of. The school culture is sick. The reactions to study groups were ridiculous. It is incredible that someone can ask, why bother to do it. The staff does not know how to work together (field notes, set 106/1).

Another Nonsite Group member said:

Teachers are usually not interested in changing themselves. Areas of concern will be money, participation in decision making, easier working conditions, and less evaluation. When it doesn't work out that way they get angry (field notes, set 109/2).

The behaviors that occurred with regularity in the theme of Interpersonal Conflict appeared in all ten groups. The degree to which they occurred varied from group to
group. These internal context behaviors did impact the study group process.

Feeling Stuck

I found instances of behavior patterns representative of the Feeling Stuck theme, an expressed feeling of lack of momentum towards a goal, in all ten groups. In the eight teacher study groups and the administrators' group, the participants voiced that they felt as though they were not making any progress and not feeling a sense of accomplishment. Participants used the term "spinning our wheels." Both the administrators and the concerned nonsite participants commented on the school-site participants' statements. The following excerpts are representative instances of the Feeling Stuck theme (see Table 2.0).

Group A. While discussing their future desired outcomes for study groups, members of Group A stated:

It is good to study it [multi-cultural education], but if it doesn't go beyond this room, as a building-wide goal, we are wasting our time.

We never put closure on anything around here. Nothing is ever completed or finished. We start well enough but we're constantly changing.

Our goal should be to find a building wide-vision. Nothing is building-wide now. We are spinning our wheels.

If Accelerated School is going to be our building focus then that is all we should be thinking about, and we should do it right this time (field notes, set 77/3).

In a meeting of study group leaders, this group's leader stated:
Why are we [study groups] meeting? We [study groups] have not accomplished anything this year (field notes, set 66/4).

**Group B.** This group also expressed a desire to feel a sense of achievement and momentum toward a goal in their POP meetings. I noted that Group B's members all agreed as members of their group stated:

Outcomes of [study group] could be a unified staff. I don't think it is this year, but it could be.

Also an empowered staff.

We could generate ideas for Project 2000 [the school's restructuring project].

And for long range goals.

We need a unified mission that everyone would understand. The mission or vision needs to be seen more clearly by all, as a team (field notes, set 78/3).

**Group C.** The leader of this group, Sara, explained her group's feelings of lack of forward momentum by saying:

We used to have some great discussions [during last year's series of study group meetings] in the teacher's lounge. Now we just seem to rehash the same complaints. [Others in the meeting agreed with her]. (field notes, set 66/2).

Things are not working around here. I mean globally. We do all this stuff but it isn't working. We don't get anywhere (field notes, set 91/6).

When I followed up on Sara's statement by asking other members of this group if that was how they felt, they all agreed (field notes, set 96/6).

**Group D.** I observed this group voicing their concerns about feeling no sense of momentum toward a goal in several
study group meetings. Group A's members all agreed with Teresa's statement:

We need a cohesive staff. We won't go anywhere until we are united. Right now we are just spinning our wheels stuck in a rut (field notes, set 85/4).

During the POP activity, Group D wrote:

The outcome of study groups should be a building wide goal of a cohesive staff, with study groups recommending courses of action for the staff to take (document, 133/21).

Group E. When I asked Katy, the leader of this group and new to the building this year, how the members of her group were reacting to the study group meetings, she expressed her feelings about her observations quite clearly:

It's just the same thing it always is. People bitch about being too busy but then they bitch about not getting stuff done. No wonder people don't feel like they are going anywhere. You have to work hard to do that. Around here it's complain instead of work. You guys ought to see what it is like at [another school]. Now that's work! I can't get anybody to work on the action plans (field notes, set 34/1).

Group F. Members of this group made statements that fit the theme of Feeling Stuck behavior patterns. Typical statements of members of this group were:

Communication is missing. Teachers don't feel like they have any ownership. What happened to teacher empowerment? We are supposed to be empowered but nothing happens. Nothing changes. We aren't moving forward. My group wants to see some changes. [There are] none yet. When? (field notes, set 66/4).

Group F wrote in their POP outcomes that they believed that one of the purposes of their study group was:

We want a voice in recommending what's most important to us (document 113/13).
One of the projected outcomes of their study group which they believed would benefit both the staff and the students was:

Improved staff morale (document 113/14).

Group G. This group proposed taking a faculty survey on accepting Black dialect in written work of students, an issue they discussed for several weeks. The group never followed through with the idea. The following statement is an example of the ongoing pattern of discussions within the Feeling Stuck theme that took place during Group G's study group meetings:

We [the school and staff] need to focus on one thing and incorporate it into all study groups to have everything fit in [together]. Incorporate this concept in our study groups so we can make it work. We [the staff] need results (field notes, set 77/4).

Group H. This group wrote in their POP document that one of the purposes of study groups was "to get us out of a rut" (document 90/5). Other comments made by members of this group that reflect the Feeling Stuck theme were:

I hope we can accomplish something. We really need to move beyond all the negative complaints. We have a good group so I think we can get a lot done. I sure hope so!

We keep hearing about changes. I'd like to see them. I think people try. Or at least some of us. It is really sad to see people go into their rooms and just do the same old thing. We keep hearing about so much that we can do to make a difference. I really would like to see that happen (field notes, set 22/1).

People just need to feel like all their efforts are worthwhile. I think it can happen. I'm looking
forward to study groups. Sharing ideas is a good beginning (field notes, set 25/1).

Administrator's Group. Toward the end of the school year, the administrators acknowledged the feelings staff members had been expressing. The administrators stated:

Lots of groups get stuck here. We need to work things out. Hopefully we will be able to do that on the retreat this summer. It needs to be well planned (field notes, set 91/1).

We [Beth and Penny] kept hearing rumbles of dissatisfaction. What people don't seem to realize is that they are the ones who have to make the changes. If they want change they are going to have to work at it. We sure can't do it for them. Beth and I [Penny] have talked about this before (field notes, set 91/11).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. Nonsite participants reported hearing a need to move on when talking to both staff members and administrators:

It sounds like this is a group [of people] that is saying they don't like the status quo and aren't sure how to move past it. I heard frustration voiced because changes they thought would take place haven't. Or at least that is their perspective (field notes, set 104/2).

The staff needs to understand each other, listen to each other. They need to move beyond this storming stage and address values. Talk and share feelings (field notes/set 108/1).

Control becomes an issue in entrenched organizations. Teachers are not teaming, they are isolated individuals (field notes, set 109/1 and 109/2; document 109/3).

One of the problems with study groups this year has been that the teachers have not seen results because they didn't create any. They need to see immediate impact on kids in order to buy into the concept. There was no immediate transferable result, so they didn't buy in (110/1).
Risk Taking

Behavior patterns teachers displayed such as not confronting peers, not speaking up in groups other than one which is perceived as safe, and retreating to the isolation of the classroom in order to avoid uncomfortable situations were either present or discussed in the eight teacher study groups. Both the Administrators' and the Concerned Nonsite Participants' groups discussed these reoccurring Risk Taking behaviors.

**Group A.** When I asked members of this group why they ran out of things to say, as reported by their leader Susie, they replied:

People don't speak up because Susie always pronounces what the correct opinion is, so we've learned to keep our mouths shut.

There are a few people who dominate the conversation. I just listen. It isn't worth my starting a fight.

It's ok. I don't really feel like I'm adding to the conversation (field notes, set 56/1).

**Group B.** Not confronting a peer, retreating to one's room for safety, and not speaking up in a large group were behavior patterns representative of the Risk Taking theme I found both exhibited and discussed by members of Group B. When asked if she would ask the principal a question about the disaggregated test scores for the building, a member of this group replied:

Not me! I'm not going to put myself out on a limb (field notes, set 37/2)
It isn't worth the hassle. We've talked about it [asking for the results]. No one seems to have an answer or really understand what is happening. No one wants to take the risk [to ask] (field notes, set 37/3).

Another member of the group stated:

I can tell this group how I feel because I feel safe, I feel supported. I'm not going to speak up in the [faculty meeting]; well, usually I don't, because I know how people talk about you afterwards (field notes, set 82/3).

Group C. I observed members of this group from the same department of the school retreating to their department's conference area, away from the flow of the rest of the building, in order to avoid situations that made them feel uncomfortable. For example, members of the group stated:

We [study group] meet in our own conference area. We hide away in there from the rest of you all.

It is just easier to do our own thing. I don't want to be in the lounge. It is not relaxing. Everyone is so stressed out that I just escape to my cubby hole [room].

I'd be perfectly happy never to go any farther than the primary wing. We get along so well down here. It just feels safer (field notes, set 94/2).

Group D. This group discussed the Risk Taking behavior of the fear of stating one's opinions or feelings in either a large group or a particular group. They agreed that:

People are not used to being around each other. Once one started with an idea the others caught on.

People need to be talking throughout the building. This [study groups] will give us a chance to communicate (field notes, set 45/1).
We [study group leaders] should get together more often to discuss what is going on with the groups. We don't ever have a chance to talk about what is going on throughout the building. People stay in their rooms (field notes, set 44/1).

**Group E.** I found that the Risk Taking behaviors of not confronting peers and retreating to classrooms were exhibited and discussed by members of this group. The excerpts which follow are an example of this behavior pattern:

We [the staff] have Goodie Day [morning treats] on Wednesday. It is the only time we can all get together as a building. I don't want to miss. I don't want to go to study group but I don't want to get into trouble with Katy [group leader]. I've already tried talking to her and it doesn't work. She won't change days. I'm afraid to say anything else. I'll get in trouble (field notes, set 76/1).

I can talk to you about this but I'll never tell Mary [the principal]. She is a friend and I just couldn't say it to her. So I keep my mouth shut and ignore. I don't feel very good about it (field notes, set 82/3).

**Group F.** Fear of confronting peers and isolation were patterns of staff behavior I noted being discussed by this group. Group members agreed with this statement made during a study group meeting:

If the purpose of study groups this year is voicing opinions and sharing, then this year is better. We've really vented in here. There are lots of angry people. I can say what I want in here. None of you will run to [the principal] Mary (field notes, set 85/3).

**Group G.** I observed that the behavior patterns which appeared with regularity in this group were fear of speaking in front of nonpeers and isolation. For example, the
following statements by group members are characteristic of their behaviors within the Risk Taking theme:

I know I won't say in front of a whole group what I would say with the people I trust in my group, because I feel safe with my group (field notes, set 43/3).

We don't ever get a chance to talk about what is going on throughout the building. People stay in their rooms (field notes, set 44/1).

**Group H.** Behavior patterns of members of this group also were typical of the Risk Taking theme. I observed that it took several weeks for members to feel they could openly express their reactions to articles and their feelings about the school climate. When asked to describe the earlier meetings a group member stated:

At first everyone was somewhat tentative and reticent to speak up. People are beginning to open up a little. We have a good mix of people who usually aren't around each other (field notes, set 28/1).

At the end of study group sessions, members of this group agreed that two purposes of study groups should be:

To get different perspectives from other people, a global view other than your own grade level or area; and to provide a means or opportunity to get to know others you usually are not in contact with in the building (field notes, set 80/4; document 90/5).

**Administrators' Group.** The administrators discussed the behaviors of the faculty that fit into the theme of Risk Taking, such as not confronting peers and retreating to the isolation of the classroom. The following statements illustrate the administrative view of Risk Taking:

I'd say that the school climate within individual classrooms is generally good. But is not good when the
teachers interact with administrators, teacher leaders, and each other because of the general low morale; too much to do, too many new things, because of expectations of doing so many new things. So the overall climate is down but the classroom climate, within the classrooms, is good. So teachers stay in their classrooms. It is too stressful otherwise (field notes, set 107/3).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. This group's discussions of Risk Taking behaviors, isolation and lack of trust which lead to limited communication, were summed up well by a staff development specialist who stated:

Open communication and trust are top priorities for teaming. It is natural for teachers to hide out in their classrooms. It's a place they control. Schools must focus on school culture and climate. [Georgetown] needs to work on it. I'll follow up on team building for the district (field notes, set 109/1).

Study Group Process

The repeated regularities in the Study Group Process theme were related to both the study group participants' and administrators' behaviors. These behaviors occurred in the organization and administration of study groups as well as in the participation of staff members in the study groups. I found that the participants' behaviors characteristic of the Study Group Process theme included (a) both positive and negative statements by the staff about study groups, (b) choosing groups based on peers, (c) no ideas generated to address Georgetown's needs, (d) no follow through on ideas that were generated in groups, (e) lack of accountability, and (f) acting as they knew they were expected to act when an observer was present at study group meetings, what I
called the good participant role. Examples of Study Group Process behaviors were evident in all eight study groups. Administrative behaviors included nonparticipation in study groups and the administrative watch dog role. Concerned nonsite participants discussed the Study Group Process behaviors of all involved.

**Group A.** Most of the members of this group were friends of the group leader. The majority of the comments about the study group process by the group leader, Susie, were not positive and the group did not follow the meeting format for either time or articles. The good participant behavior pattern was evident in this group whenever I observed. For example, I observed the following interchange between Susie and an administrator in a lengthy Study Group Leaders meeting in March:

Why are we meeting? [We've] not accomplished anything this year.

You meet to read professionally.

We didn't know that. People don't know that.

They [study groups] are a form of staff development.

Well, my group doesn't know that (field notes, set 66/4).

I found this interchange quite surprising since the purpose of study groups had been explained and stressed repeatedly. Susie opened her next study group meeting, at which I was present, with this statement to the group:
I think from our earlier meetings we know that there is teacher commitment in this group to study groups, and we don't mind engaging in professional dialogue and reading. We are going to be going through the POP process for the next two weeks.

A few minutes later she said:

The purpose of study groups is to study Georgetown and ways to make ourselves better by reading current professional articles (field notes, set 77/1).

**Group B.** Members of this group were close friends who worked together. This group's participants reported positive as well as negative reactions to their participation in study groups. The statements typically dealt with the articles they had read. After reading and discussing an article on prejudice, two members of Group B told me:

The article you gave us this week was excellent. Our group really got into a deep discussion. Everybody needs to read it. We all need this kind of information. Can you believe people said there wasn't prejudice in [a large North Texas metropolitan area].

We didn't all agree with what it said about handling prejudice but at least we were talking about it openly. I wish the whole group had been there. The ones who need it the most don't bother to read. It should be required reading. I know it helped our group (field notes, set 77/1).

**Group C.** When members of this group were asked to switch groups they complained about having to leave their peers and refused to join another group. The reoccurring Study Group Process behavior patterns I found in Group C were (a) acting as good participants when an administrator was present, (b) choosing a group based on peers, and (c) more negative than positive comments. For example, when
given information on the changing demographics in Texas, members of the group said:

Why do we have to read this? This doesn't have anything to do with us (field notes, set 46/3).

When I told them that an administrator might be attending their meeting the following day the group leader, Sara, and another member responded:

Don't give us another article. We haven't talked about the last two.

Gosh, we better let everyone know that we have to meet. Thanks for letting us know (field notes, set 51/1).

**Group D.** Membership in this group consisted of close friends and teachers on the same grade level. Group members were not reticent to discuss the differences between their usual study group behavior and their behavior when an administrator was present at the group meeting. The behavior patterns in this group also changed when I visited the group. Comments such as "now we have to behave" were made when I walked into Group D's study group meetings. The following comment was made to another group's leader by one of the members of Group D. This comment typifies the good participant's role played by members of this group when an administrator was present:

We had a good discussion. Everyone was there on time. Things went well. Not like they might have been usually (field notes, set 48/1).

**Group E.** Behaviors representative of the Study Group Process theme also were evident in this group. Group E gave
me three written sets of ideas generated on their topic; however, there was no follow through on any of the ideas (documents, 111/7, 111/8, 111/9). One document this group sent me shows that they were having a good time during one of their meetings. This was the only example of this type of behavior from any of the groups. After a faculty meeting in which the school's peer tutoring program was discussed I received the following written statement from Group E:

Our group has the following suggestions for the mentoring program at Georgetown. We feel it should be expanded and not confined to African-American boys. These are our suggestions for what we want to see in the program. For Katy - A sugar daddy. She also would like someone with fixing skills. For Doris - Tall and handsome. She needs help with dancing skills and meeting financial responsibilities. For Pat - Rich, flexible, a good sense of humor, and a friend to me first ... (document, 111/6).

**Group F.** This group contained four specialized teachers who worked together and two primary teachers. Once again, membership was based on peers rather than on the topic. I joined this group to give it a larger membership. Factions, polarization, and isolation within the school were discussed in this group. The Study Group Process behavior patterns changed when I was not present. When I asked the group leader how the meeting had gone when I was absent she replied:

We didn't meet last week. You were gone so we decided not to meet. Alexia wanted to meet but we didn't. So we have articles. I won't be there next week because I have a staffing. I think if anyone tells me I have to meet I will scream. There is too much to do (field notes, set 52/1).
Group G. This group was made up of peers I originally had separated. They regrouped when given the freedom to choose their own meeting time. Members of Group G openly discussed their lack of accountability behavior. For example, the following conversation between three members of Group G took place at a table at which I was sitting during an inservice meeting:

I've resigned from the [site-based management] core team and I'm just going to study group when I have time. I don't go when I have recess duty.

Well I stopped going [to study group] because I'm in [another staff development activity], so I don't have to go. Anyway, it was too negative.

Well we just have to do what we must. We've got to take care of ourselves (field notes, set 59/1).

The leader of Group G, Ellen, told me:

People are wanting me to put them down as present when they are only there for five minutes. Change where they were marked absent. I said I wouldn't [do it]. They needed to do it themselves, and they did! (field notes, set 97/1).

Ellen asked me when an administrator was going to visit her group:

I want to warn my group (field notes, set 48/1).

Later that day Ellen told me:

Vicky visited today. We were all there but one. It is the first time Hazel didn't complain about the meeting. She was very quiet (field notes, set 48/2).

Group H. Membership of this group was made up of friends, members of Group A rejected by Group A's leader, and me. I joined the group to increase its number and
balance its composition. Negative comments in this group related to the school as a whole and to the administration. Behaviors did change when an administrator was present, which occurred on one occasion. The conversation stayed positive and focused on the content of the articles. When I was absent the group did go ahead and meet. When the group leader was absent the group did not meet. The group did not generate any ideas for solving the school-wide and administrative concerns that were discussed during the regularly scheduled meetings. At the end of the school year the leader of the group commented to me:

We really have a great group. People share their thoughts openly and appear to really listen to each other. I think our group really made a difference in understanding each others' feelings. I hope we can stay together next year. I'll be glad to be leader again (field notes, set 97/1).

Administrators' Group. None of the administrators participated in study groups until it became evident that many participants were not attending study groups, were not following meeting guidelines, and many of the sessions were quite negative. At that time the principal assigned administrators to attend the study group meetings. One administrator did not attend any meetings, the others attended parts of one or two meetings. Penny told me:

I attended two meetings. Mary heard that some people were not going so she called an administrators' meeting and assigned us to groups to attend. I was the only one who attended so I stopped going. I did not like the role of watch dog and they knew that was what I was. When I walked in they said, 'What are you doing
here? The group leader came in late and said, 'Am I in trouble because I am late?' I enjoyed going once they got into discussing the article. They had a good discussion. I would have liked to have been able to be a true participant, but I was not comfortable with the watch dog role. It was evident that not everyone had read their article or even brought it with them. Everyone did participate in the discussion. It lasted about thirty minutes.

**Concerned Nonsite Participants Group.** This group of individuals discussed the Study Group Process behaviors of the participants and the administrators. The following statements represent the perspective of the nonsite participants:

Teachers are much happier in their rooms. It is hard for them to work together because it is so new. The most experienced teachers seem to be the most threatened by new ideas (field notes, set 104/6).

Groups need to be mixed and you need to separate friends to be sure some work gets done. People who work together a lot think alike and that doesn't lead to new ideas (field notes, 103/5).

They [teachers] need to know that when they go through change it is not going to be comfortable. They get along really well socially because they have taught together so long. This [restructuring] calls for different skills and will disrupt their patterns (field notes, set 103/7).

I told the district when we started site-based management that teachers had to have some training because they don't know how to work together as a team. They can party together but are not equipped to work together. They end up bickering and attacking each other (field notes, set 106/2).

**Emerging Awareness**

I found behavior patterns representative of the Emerging Awareness theme in seven of the eight study groups and the administrators' group. Emerging Awareness behaviors
were discussed by the concerned nonsite participants' group. As the year progressed, both study group participants and administrators stated that the previous year's format of assigned heterogeneous grouping and building-wide topics had been more successful than self-selected homogeneous groups discussing different topics. Study group participants and administrators acknowledged that the staff requested change in format was ineffective. The change in format had created even more opportunities for negative interactions and ended up being nongenerative. In addition, both study group participants and administrators voiced their frustration with the ongoing negative interactions among the staff. The following examples are representative of the Emerging Awareness theme in nine of the groups:

**Group A.** Susie, this group's leader, led the site-based management group who demanded the changes in the study group format. In March, I noted that Susie and members of her group were saying:

How do we recapture the enthusiasm? Last year ideas and communication came out of groups. Not this year. There was more of a commitment last year (field notes, set 66/1).

Last year at grade level meetings we'd talk about the articles and decide what our grade level view was and say to be sure to let them know in study group (field notes, set 66/2).

A member of this group with experience outside of Georgetown as a teacher leader made a comment to me which did not coincide with what I usually heard:
At first all year sounded very long. Breaks have helped. I like meeting. It makes me have intellectual discussions. I like telling my friends about the articles I've read. It's hard to work with teachers and teach teachers. I know. I've just [told them] that this is how we will do it. It worked out and they found out at the end that they learned. That's the way it is here. We need to read articles. We've had some good discussions (field notes, set 67/1).

**Group B.** Emerging Awareness behavior patterns also were present in this group. Group members expressed their desired changes in the study group format. They also discussed the need for more positive meetings. The following conversations are examples of the Emerging Awareness behavior patterns I found in Group B:

I wish we [study groups] were all talking about the same thing.

Last year we would come back and talk about it [the topic] and start thinking and talking about it before we read the articles.

All study groups should be discussing the same articles.

All study groups on the same focus, focusing on the same topics at the same time (field notes, set 78/1).

The outcome could be a unified staff. Don't think it is this year but it could be (field notes, set 78/3).

We are team members with a common goal. Not just for what one can do for one's self. A team effort. Part of the bigger team of the school and the staff (field notes, set 78/2).

**Group C.** Members of this group compared the study group format this year to last year stating:

It was better [last year] when we had the same articles. We used to have some great discussions in the teachers' lounge. Now we just seem to rehash the same complaints (field notes, set 66/2).
I hope this [POP process] works. I'm sick of listening to all the complaints. It is really getting divisive (field notes, set 66/5).

**Group D.** The members of this group discussed their desired study group format at length during their POP meetings. References were made to the climate of the meetings and the school as a whole. These Emerging Awareness behaviors are represented in the following Group D statements:

I'm really glad to know that! Study groups are there to enhance professional dialog. Now I've got it! We need to find a better way they can be a catalyst for change. They were last year (field notes, set 66/4).

I think we can turn this thing [negative experience] around (field notes, set 66/5).

There is a real difference between study groups and [site-based management] action teams. Shouldn't have combined study groups and action teams. Last year's [format] sounds better, everyone focused on the same thing. We don't see any outcome [this year]. What is it supposed to be? (field notes, set 85/2).

If the purpose this year is voicing opinions and sharing, then this year has been better. We've really vented in here. There are lots of angry people.

Last year went well because we all had a common ground. We need cohesion. Then we would feel more positive about what we are working on (field notes, set 85/3).

**Group E.** I found this group exhibiting the same Emerging Awareness behavior patterns as the other groups. The following comments, made to me by members of the group, are representative of Group E's behavior:

Well you need to talk with her [group leader]. We need new topics, like last year (field notes, set 62/1).
Last year was more interesting. I'm sick of reading about the same thing over and over. We just end up talking about what hacks people off (field notes, set 62/2).

**Group F.** I was not able to be present at this group's POP meetings. Therefore, the group agreed to tape record the meetings. I was told that only the official part of the meeting was recorded, not the informal discussion. During the POP meetings the following comments representative of the Emerging Awareness theme were made by members of Group F:

We need to study teacher stress. I'm afraid to say anything to anyone, they might bite my head off.

We want more of a say in what we study.

We don't have any outcomes since we haven't produced anything. All we have done is read and discuss. We have gained knowledge (field notes, set 81/3).

I'd like to see Georgetown stick with some critical issues at least a year or two and then fine tune what we've done. I'd like to see some cohesiveness. There used to be comradery. Everyone excited to be here, committed. Now we're all running around doing different things, staying in their rooms, don't even go to the lounge to eat. It sure is a critical issue (field notes set 81/5)

**Group G.** I did not find Emerging Awareness behaviors in the data for this group.

**Group H.** In a meeting with administrators to discuss why study groups were not working, a member of this group discussed the group's Emerging Awareness behaviors from a different perspective:

Our group became much closer to each other. We really learned a lot about each other. It was a good experience (field notes, set 91/5).
I found other Group H discussions which also fit into the Emerging Awareness behavior pattern, such as:

One of the outcomes [of study groups] has been realization.

It's been a place to share our concerns, our angers. We've felt free to discuss and cuss about what we see going on around here that we disagree with.

Our group worked because we are diverse. All groups should be. I'm glad Susie didn't want me in her group.

This has been a good group. It is too bad that other groups have been ruined by negative people. There are some people who need to leave this building. They don't carry their weight and they ruin it for the rest of us. I'm sick and tired of their behavior. They are not professionals and they need to go (field notes, set 80/3).

Administrators' Group. The administrators voiced some concern about changing the study group format when it was suggested. The decision was made to go with the self-selected homogeneous grouping in order to keep some vocal members of the staff happy. By spring, the administration was well aware of the impact of the changed format. In response to this concern, administrators were assigned to attend specific study groups and meetings were held with study group leaders to discuss the negative interactions within the groups and the evident lack of accountability. The following statement is a typical example:

We need cross-grade level groups. Your group [to a group leader] is all primary so there is no diversity to generate disruption and conversation. Topics stayed within the action teams and weren't discussed throughout the building. Negative people weren't separated so groups were not productive or positive.
We need to go back to the heterogeneous groups we had last year (field notes, set 66/3).

**Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group.** This group of individuals discussed the Emerging Awareness behavior of the study group participants. The following statements illustrate the Concerned Nonsite Participants' comments on the Emerging Awareness behaviors of the staff:

I see this [stress they are talking about] promoted by the lack of communication within the school, the fishbowl effect of teaching at Georgetown, the immediacy of the situation, and the lack of content about how to survive in this situation. We need to look at what comes before the frustration and anger. People are scared and afraid (field notes 104/1).

Georgetown really needs some work on team building. I've talked to numerous people. They say you are in the storming stage of team building. It will take some real work to move beyond it. This is the stage where people bog down and change fails (field notes, set 106/1).

It sounds like they realize that it didn't work this year. Do they realize that it will take more than a change in format to make it work? It is going to take some changes within people, their attitudes (field notes, set 106/2).

**Impact on Curriculum and Instruction**

The behavior patterns within the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme indicated that limited impact on Georgetown's curriculum and instruction occurred as a result of staff participation in study groups. Instead, comments of study group participants in six of eight groups, administrative comments, and concerned nonsite participants' comments indicated that the awareness level of study group participants appeared to be raised. The following comments...
illustrate the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme I found within the various groups.

**Group A.** Comments were made in this study group's meetings regarding the school's curriculum and instruction. For example:

This year's test results should give us information on what we need to work on.

We need to examine all of the curriculum, especially science, to see how we need to improve it. We can use those [test] scores (field notes, set 77/5).

**Group B.** Comments made to me by members of this group outside the study group meetings and during the meetings, indicated an increased awareness level. The following statements illustrate Group B's behavior patterns within the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme:

We had a good discussion. Everyone was sharing. We all related to what we read. I hadn't thought of it from a special education point of view (field notes, 36/1).

An outcome from study groups would be learning.

It could be professional growth.

It is all learning, the faculty and the students indirectly (field notes, set 78/2).

**Group C.** No comments were reported or made to me that were representative of the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme. This group did not address curriculum or instruction in their POP documents (documents 113/22 and 113/23).
Group D. Two members of this group asked me to make copies of articles dealing with instruction to share with the group. Curriculum also was addressed in their POP documents. The following statements are characteristic of the increased awareness level of Group D participants.

After telling me about an article on English as a second language (ESL) students she wanted to share with her group, Peg was so excited about the article that she followed me into the rest room where the following conversation took place:

I followed you here. I'm so excited about this article. I want them to read it.

I'll make copies for all the groups.

Great. It is a really great group. Please don't lose this [article].

I won't. I'll get copies for you today. I'll get them to Teresa [group leader] to pass out.

Wonderful. We are really missing out on our ESL kids.

I'll take care of it. This is wonderful. Just what I need, for you guys to come up with the articles (field notes, set 35/1).

Group E. I did not find that Group E's members made any comments that fit into the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction behavior patterns. Group E's POP documents did not mention curriculum or instruction. Instead, outcomes dealt with their narrow site-based management action team topic.
Group F. I did find behavior patterns within this group that were representative of the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme. It was evident from their discussions that their awareness was being raised. Issues related to curriculum and instruction were listed as outcomes of study groups in Group F's POP documents. The following statements are representative of Group F's behavior:

An outcome of study groups has been knowledge. We discussed articles and received knowledge from this (field notes, set 81/2).

All the things we read about we've heard about. Is there anything brand new out there? All the articles we read were instructional really. What about finding something new? (field notes, set 81/4).

Group G. Members of this group focused on instructional issues related to nonstandard use of English. Most of the articles on this topic were supplied by a group member. Notes from this group's meetings and comments made by members of the group, suggested that the impact of participation in study groups was at the awareness level. Notes from Group G contained the following statements:

We need direction and philosophical commitment concerning the teaching of formal language. The group feels we can respect the Black dialect but to function in the professional world mastery of standard dialect is needed (document 11/14c).

An activity for an interdisciplinary unit was shared with the group (document 11/14a).

This group wrote the following note to me but there was no follow through:
We will also compose an informal survey to present to the faculty concerning dialectal grammar (document 111/14d).

**Group H.** This group's consistent behavior pattern was to discuss the articles read in relationship to the school's current curriculum and instruction. As a member of this group, I took part in most of the conversations. Since we were a diverse group we were able to share information from various professional backgrounds: (a) early childhood, (b) speech, (c) special education, (d) physical education, and (e) both the primary and intermediate classroom teachers' perspectives. The statements from the POP process which follow are typical of Group H's behavior within the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme:

The purpose of study groups is to share professional concerns that impact the curriculum and instruction and the school climate (field notes, set 80/4).

We are a group focusing on multi-cultural issues related to education. We also studied other issues (field notes, set 113/5).

Another purpose of study groups is to make others' ideas our own. Customize [those ideas] to meet our own needs at Georgetown (field notes, set 113/6).

**Administrators' Group.** Members of this group reported to me that they could tell that participation in study groups had raised the awareness level of the participants. When an administrator met with grade levels to discuss curriculum and instruction, there were spontaneous conversations that referred to knowledge gained from the study group articles. The following statement by an
administrator exemplifies the participants' behavior within the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction theme:

I'd say there was an awareness. [Study groups] gave the staff new information that was current. They would not have gotten it otherwise. The vast majority of teachers do not do any professional reading and if they do it is in a very limited scope. When I met with 1st grade to talk about reading they brought up some information they had gained from a study group article, new information to them, and I was able to help them apply it. Hopefully, if teachers are aware of new information they will try it out or apply it in the classroom. This year, unlike last year, the results were at the awareness stage rather than making it their own (field notes, set 107/2).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. I noted that statements by members of this group supported the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction awareness stage on the part of the study group participants. Statements such as:

The goal is to transfer what is learned in study groups to improve curriculum and instruction. It was much more visible last year. There were significant changes made. Your uninterrupted time, collaboration, networking [computers] in the classroom, and Accelerated School pilot all came out of study groups. That is a goal everyone should be striving for (field notes, set 110/2).

Study groups are great for making sure that teachers who are really behind in professional growth can be exposed to the latest research. They need that information to generate ideas to solve their own problems (field notes, set 106/2).

Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power

Georgetown's staff and its principal were in the midst of changing from a strong top-down management style to site-based management and teacher empowerment. Both the principal and the staff were having to learn new and
sometimes uncomfortable roles. Management power flowed back and forth between the staff and the principal. The teachers demanded power and the principal gave it. The teachers didn't perform and the principal reacted by reclaiming the power. The teachers then reacted by voicing their displeasure and calling for teacher empowerment. The school was projecting an official site-based management image to the community while this exchange of power took place.

Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power behavior patterns appeared in seven of the eight study groups, the administrators' group, and were discussed by the concerned nonsite participants' group. The examples which follow are representative of the behavior patterns within the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme.

**Group A.** Members of this group voiced their desire for teacher empowerment and their resentment of top-down decisions. The statements which follow are characteristic of the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power behavior pattern of Group A:

Teachers don't feel like they have any ownership. What happened to teacher empowerment? We are supposed to be empowered but nothing happens. Nothing changes (field notes, set 66/4).

I may be totally wrong but I think one session during each month should be a problem solving day. Empower us to discuss issues and force the administration to ease our minds (field notes, set 77/5).

**Group B.** I found behavior patterns characteristic of the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power also were present in
this group. During a POP meeting the following interchange took place:

How do you say, if we are part of a group that helps make decisions, we don't want decisions made ahead and presented at the core team meetings. If [we are] really empowered then the core team needs input from teachers first.

That fits under purpose.

To ensure we have input into policy making decisions.

It doesn't mean we want to have [make] all the decisions (field notes, set 78/3).

The core team is where the power is right now. How do we get it to the faculty? (field notes, set 82/1)

All new ideas should flow through us before [the administration] makes decisions about them. All study groups should study the same issue before it is implemented (field notes, set 82/2).

Group C. Teacher empowerment was raised as an issue during Group C's POP meetings. The following interchange is representative of this group's conversations:

We need to identify critical issues ourselves or they will be told to us.

Do we have the authority to identify or recommend?

Can we recommend solutions and programs?

Can we do that?

Yes we can.

Last year the discipline plan came out of study groups.

We want to have a voice, a quorum to have that voice (field notes, set 81/1 and 81/2).

Group D. Teacher empowerment was an ongoing topic in this group. The following conversations are typical of the
Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power behavior pattern in this group:

Do we just take it [an idea] to the administration?

It has to have their support anyway.

Teachers need to take responsibility to communicate. To take the power they have been given and do something with it (field notes, set 43/1).

We need to empower ourselves. It just isn't happening.

What made it work last year is that they [a study group] were really excited about the concept [discipline plan] and they did something about it.

People in the group can take the initiative to do what is needed. That's what is wrong, people won't empower themselves (field notes, set 43/2, 43/3).

**Group E.** Members of this group discussed with me their frustration with site-based management and their belief that the principal would not give up her power.

Why bother to discuss it with her [principal]. She is going to do it her way anyway (field notes, set 82/4). Why do we bother, if they go running to Mary it will change anyway. She doesn't worry about us because we just go ahead and do it. We don't raise a stink like others do to get their way (field notes, set 85/3).

**Group F.** As a member of this group I was present during numerous discussions related to the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme. For example:

If a vocal minority is unhappy with things it will make a difference.

One or two people complain to the principal and things change (field notes, set 81/15).
Group G. Behaviors within the theme of Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power were present in Group G. The exchanges which follow are examples of these behaviors:

Is this [participation in study groups] required?

Yes. It was written in the Texas Education Agency proposal.

Well people aren't going to like it at all. The administration is always doing things without telling us (field notes, set 7/6).

We talk about wanting a building-wide focus and we are trying to find it. Mary [the principal] walks in the meeting and rattles it off. She has it already. What about us? Where is our input? (field notes, set 91/7).

Group H. The following conversation illustrates this group's behavior patterns within the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme:

My goal [as study group facilitator] is to have you all come up with ideas.

Ya, it took me a while to catch on to that. Now I understand. We aren't used to it. Now I'm beginning to understand that even though this is your thing you want us to do it, not you running it all. You just help us get it together (field notes, set 45/2).

Another conversation that took place when discussing an idea on which the faculty had reached consensus was:

We voted on it didn't we?

It was already decided. The vote was for paper purposes. We just put our hands up (field notes, set 77/4).

Administrators' Group. I found that it was difficult for the principal to move from her usual top-down style to one of shared decision making. The following data is
representative of the exchange of power that was taking place at Georgetown:

If teachers don't want to do it [teacher study groups] I'll tell them that they have to because it was part of our Texas Education Agency exemption (field notes, set 5/1).

It is just tough if first grade doesn't like it, they can't be together (field notes, set 15/3).

I know this is a problem. But we have to [change format of teacher study groups], some people are really upset about having to meet for site-based management and for study groups. I've got to keep them happy. I won't be like [another principal] and tell them what they have to do (field notes, set 13/2).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. Members of this group discussed both the administrator's and the staff's reactions. The following comments are representative of this group's reactions:

The few loudest negatives get lots of attention from the administration. They should be ignored. It creates a problem when the other administrators respond to them because then the principal respond to them too. It ends up in a knee-jerk reaction (field notes, set 110/1).

What I heard from the faculty was not what the principal was seeing. She sees herself empowering teachers and the teachers not accepting the responsibility. So then she has to come back in and be the bad guy. She is very frustrated (field notes, set 96/3).

Rhythm of the School Disrupted

I noted that study group participants and administrators reacted to the rhythm of the school year being disrupted in a variety of ways. Typical behaviors within this theme were statements which indicated (a)
anxiety, (b) a feeling of being displaced, and (c) a need for control over the environment. The following excerpts illustrate the Rhythm of the School Disrupted theme.

Group A. The following comments are representative of the statements made by members of this group in response to the disruption of the regular school rhythm:

It really bothers me not to be in my room. When are we going to get back into our rooms? I feel so far behind. The kids are going to be so out of routine because we didn't start when everyone else did (field notes, set 2/5).

Group B. I observed that behavior patterns typical of the Rhythm of School Disrupted theme also occurred in Group B. The following conversation is typical of this behavior:

They [administration] should have known that it wouldn't be ready. They should have started last fall. We wouldn't be in this mess now.

How are the fifth graders going to get ready for testing? They must be really frustrated. I sure am (field notes, set 2/6).

Group C. I did not find behaviors representative of the Rhythm of School Disrupted theme in the data for this group.

Group D. The statement which follows illustrates the Rhythm of School Disrupted behavior pattern I found in the data for this group:

I still haven't found all my stuff. Who knows where it ended up. All this [construction] has made for a rough year. I think it's been hard on the kids too. I'd love to know who walked off with my bulletin board materials. I did find some of my chairs in a 5th grade room and I took them back (field notes, set 91/11).
Group E. The following statement is characteristic of the reoccurring conversations I found within this group:

I keep telling you next year will be better. All this painting and moving and construction stuff made us all a little crazy. You'll see. Next year will start off on time and it will be much better. It can't be much worse! (field notes, set 91/12).

Group F. This comment was made during a study group meeting and is an example of the Rhythm of School Disrupted behavior that was evident in this group:

I don't know what is going on. With so much for us to do with the reconstruction we got off to a bad start (field notes, set 81/16).

Group G. The typical behaviors representing the Rhythm of School Disrupted theme can be illustrated by the following statement by a member of Group G:

People actually took my rolling chairs and my trash cans. And they even had my name on them. What a mess. I still have boxes I haven't unpacked and it is May. I may leave them in case we have to pack again. I sure hope next year gets off to a better start (field notes, set 91/11).

Group H. A member of this group made a statement that was typical of the types of statements being made by members of this group when discussing the disruption of the rhythm of the school:

Just you wait and see. If they don't get that carpeting done I bet the parents raise cain. And they should. Not having our rooms ready and all the constant mess in the kindergarten wing when they [builders] were so far behind. If I was a parent I would have put my kids somewhere else. I know I wish I'd been where there was some sense of normalcy (field notes, set 91/12).
Administrators' Group. My findings indicated behaviors representative of the Rhythm of School Disrupted theme also occurred in the Administrators' Group. The following statements are representative of this type of behavior:

Having school start with construction still going on was threatening and frustrating (field notes, set 110/1).

I think that a smoother beginning next year will create a calmer atmosphere. It was really tough for those teachers without rooms last fall. They never really felt comfortable all year. Always feeling behind (field notes, set 107/4).

When the renovations finally were completed in late January 1992, the school held a city wide open house to "show off its new look". Both the local and metropolitan newspapers and television covered the event (document 49/5).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. Members of this group discussed the staff's reactions to the disruption of the school year due to the construction. The following statement is typical of this group's reaction:

People told me about feeling like displaced refugees because they didn't have a room to start the year and they were having to share space. It has been very important to them to take a claim on their new space. This rebuilding has unsettled numerous people. Its shaken their security (field notes, set 108/1).

Racial Tensions

I found that the behaviors characteristic of the Racial Tension theme did not occur as frequently in my initial data as the other themes. The significance of the Racial Tension theme became apparent when I extended my study by interviewing an outside consultant working within the
school. Behaviors representative of this theme were (a) focusing on racial topics, (b) anger, (c) feeling threatened, and (d) sensitivity. My initial findings indicated that these behaviors occurred in eight of the ten study groups. The data which follows illustrate these behavior patterns.

Group A. This study group's topic addressed the multicultural composition of the school. During their POP meeting the following conversation took place between two members of this group:

Not everyone feels like a part of multi-cultural education. It can't happen if only six or seven people are discussing it. Other people are not knowledgeable, we [study group members] are.

A teacher said to me, 'I thought multi-cultural already was an emphasis for our building?'.

When I was here before [three years ago] I thought it was being done. Now I'm shocked to hear that it isn't (field notes, set 77/2).

Group B. Statements by members of this group were representative of the Racial Tension theme. For example:

There are teachers on the Task Force [white] who are having a very difficult time because they are being attacked in the Task Force meetings by the [Right Action Committee for Education] RACE people [African-American] (field notes, set 2/4).

I'm sick and tired of being attacked. I won't fight it any more. I just keep my mouth shut. It is really vicious (field notes, set 4/2).

Group C. The focus of this group also was related to improving the relationship between the school and the African-American neighborhood. The leader of this group
graduated from Georgetown when it was still a segregated high school. A member of the group made the following comment:

I'm sick of getting these articles about at risk students. These kids are not any different at all. People keep talking about their homes being so bad. It isn't true. My kids are not at risk because they are Black (field notes, set 36/1).

**Group D.** Behaviors representative of the Racial Tension theme did not appear in the data.

**Group E.** Behaviors representative of the Racial Tension theme did not appear in the data.

**Group F.** The following conversation is characteristic of the Racial Tension theme within this group:

It boils down to values. How do we teach values when the home values are so different.

I saw the scores for the district. There is a great disparity between whites' and blacks' scores. We are a black and white school. How do we get these [neighborhood] parents to share our values? (field notes, set 40/1).

The RACE group has attacked us [as teachers] so we defend ourselves the only way we know how, by retreating to our rooms (field notes, set 96/3).

**Group G.** This group selected a topic I did not assign which they spent four weeks discussing. After they moved on to a different topic they returned to racially related discussions regardless of the topic of the articles I provided. The following statement by the leader of Group G is typical of the behavior patterns within this group:

Our group really got into a deep conversation on Black culture. We're going to use the same article for next
time. There are people with very strong feelings. So we decided to keep the article and finish it next week. People have definite feelings about allowing Black dialect in schools. They do not think it should happen (field notes, set 37/1).

Group H. The focus of this group was on multi-cultural issues. The following statement illustrates the Racial Tension behavior patterns of this group:

One of the outcomes of this group has been a better knowledge of study group members' ethnic backgrounds and experiences. We need more communication for racial harmony. I was really nervous when we first started talking about it. I didn't really trust you all. Now I do (field notes, set 80/1).

No one has ever debriefed us after the high stress level, tension, and anger over being attacked by the RACE group last year. So all those feelings are buried or floating around somewhere. It is like people are being bombarded so they have retreated into their work, their rooms, and isolated tasks that are safe (field notes 96/2 and 96/3).

Administrators' Group. I found a very positive official position in all school-to-home communications dealing with racial matters (documents 4/2, 4/3, 55/1). The following statements are an example of this groups' behavior patterns within the Racial Tension theme:

I [principal] have to rewrite the Office of Civil Rights report. Everyone [central staff] wants something else in the answers. This is taking so much time we should be spending on kids. I'm so tired of this (field notes, set 16/4).

Maybe things will calm down some next year. We can't keep brushing racial problems under the rug. They need to be addressed up front (field notes, set 103/8).

Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. The principal asked an African American researcher from a nearby college, Dr. Green, to interview all staff members in an effort to
ascertain the concerns and feelings of the staff. The following statements were made by this researcher after interviewing the staff:

I recommend that the staff read Black and White Styles in Conflict by Kochman. It will help you to understand the communication and misunderstandings I keep hearing about (field notes, set 96/2).

When I asked if teachers discussed their feelings within the theme of Racial tension, the researcher replied:

Black teachers talked about how Black students were treated. The Black teachers were not pleased. The subject was not mentioned by white teachers. It is an issue of perspective (field notes, set 104/2).

**Combined Findings**

This section presents the combined data from all sources. I developed nine themes by combining data from each of the ten groups, the open-ended questionnaires, and the Purpose, Outcome, and Process (POP) study group team building activities. Data were gathered from the ten groups through participant observation, informal interviews, structured interviews, and document collection. Members of the eight study groups participated in the POP activities as groups and completed the anonymous questionnaire individually. Data representative of the nine themes across the ten groups are presented in this section.

**Interpersonal Conflict**

The repeated regularities I found in the data which were representative of the Interpersonal Conflict theme were
(a) arguing, (b) blaming, (c) complaining about being unfocused, (d) expressing anxiety, (e) control issues, and (f) isolation. The following citation from the data is characteristic of the Internal Conflict theme:

Working at two schools I really see a difference. People are much more negative here. I find it hard to deal with all the conflict so I just stay in my gym and do my thing. I'm not going to get involved in all the bickering. Being a part of this [study] group has helped me see that their are some of you addressing needs of kids. Not just your own personal needs. That's the way it should be for all of us (field notes, set 80/5).

A study group participant made the following suggestion for improving the study group process in response to a question on the study group questionnaire:

Facilitate participation and interaction by all. Don't let it become dominated by one or two people. Don't let it become a gripe session (document 113/10).

Feeling Stuck

Behavior patterns within the second internal context theme, Feeling Stuck, occurred throughout the data. Participants voiced concerns about feeling a lack of progress toward a goal and a lack of accomplishment. The statement which follows is representative of the Feeling Stuck theme across the data:

We've got to write action plans. Why bother. We just write them and don't do anything about them. We never get anything done around here. People complain about not getting anything done but they don't do the work (field notes, set 50/1).
Selective Risk Taking

The repeated regularities I found appearing across the data in the third internal context theme, Selective Risk Taking, were (a) retreating to the isolation of the classroom, (b) not confronting peers, (c) reticence to make statements in large groups, and (d) concern that peers would report to the principal what was said during discussions.

The statement which follows is representative of the Selective Risk Taking behaviors across the ten groups:

People are feeling bombarded so they have retreated into their work, their rooms. Isolated tasks are safe. Teachers are afraid of confronting each other and the administration. Communication is a problem mentioned by all (field notes, set 96/3).

Study Group Process

My findings indicated that organizational, administrative, and study group participants' Study Group Process behaviors occurred across the data sources. Organizational behaviors included (a) study group participants choosing group membership based on composition of the group rather than the topic to be studied, (b) both positive and negative statements in reference to study groups, and (c) behaviors related to organizing the groups such as switching groups after group membership was published and refusing to change groups when asked. Administrative behaviors within the Study Group Process theme were (a) no visible show of support for the study group process, (b) nonparticipation in study groups, and (c)
attending study groups only in an enforcement role. Study group participants' behaviors included (a) lack of accountability, (b) responding with appropriate behavior and statements when administrators were present, and (c) no follow through on ideas generated by the groups. The following example is characteristic of the Study Group Process theme which appeared throughout the data.

In a meeting called by the administration because of concerns over the negativeness of the groups, the lack of attendance, and cancelled and shortened meetings the following exchange between study group leaders and an administrator took place:

Are you meeting for the full hour?

Yes [all agreed].

Are you discussing the articles, or since you all know each other so well, not staying on topic?

Yes, we are discussing [all agreed].

What are you going to do with the ideas?

We are keeping notes. Then we will see what needs to be done [all agreed] (field notes, set 46/2).

A Georgetown administrator responsible for staff development at the school site made the following comment at the end of the school year:

It is important that study groups continue and be used throughout the district. They are an effective and powerful form of staff development. You can't let the bad experience this year cast a shadow because they do work well where the school climate is better. It is important that this come out in your report to the district (field notes, set 107/4).
Emerging Awareness

I noted that Emerging Awareness, the fourth internal context theme, began to appear in the data as the school year progressed. Study group participants and administrators stated that the heterogeneously assigned groups of the previous year had been more productive and a much more positive experience for the staff. Study group participants began to state that they were tired of the negative interactions. The following responses on the study group questionnaire are representative of the Emerging Awareness behavior pattern which occurred across all groups:

The variety of articles was good. We need to be informed about general education issues. We would never take time to read this if not for study groups. Would like all groups to read the same articles like we did last year (document 113/2).

Think we should have either reps K123456 or very focused topic groups.

Continue groups which include people from different areas and continue allowing groups to stay together for the year. It takes time to build a comfortable atmosphere (document 113/6).

Make groups more diverse like the first year we did study groups. This provided a broader range from which to get input on issues.

The first year we did study groups (articles) I felt it was much better (document 113/9).

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

In reviewing my data, I found that the predominate behaviors characteristic of the fifth internal context theme, Impact on Curriculum and Instruction, were evident in
both group and document data. The data indicated that the awareness level of staff members was raised both by reading study group articles and by discussing the information gained from the articles during study group meetings. Discussions of the content of the articles outside of study group meetings also helped raise the awareness level of the study group participants. The examples which follow are characteristic of the Impact of Curriculum and Instruction theme across the data:

I really thought this [article] was interesting. Ties right into all the higher level skills (field notes, set 40/1).

Fifteen of the 45 questionnaire respondents stated that a topic discussed other than the articles was instruction. Fourteen stated that curriculum was discussed (document 112/2).

**Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power**

The seventh internal context theme, the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power, was not apparent to me in the data until later in the analysis process. At that time, the ongoing pattern of staff and principal exchanging power within the framework of site-based management emerged. I noted that this cyclical chain of events began when the principal either took a firm stand on a position or gave the staff responsibility. Either action was followed by negative reactions from Georgetown staff members. The principal then retreated from her stated position and the staff was given
responsibility for following through on their stated position. When staff members did not follow through with actions, the principal then took a strong top-down position. This, in turn, angered staff members who continually were calling for teacher empowerment. This cycle was ongoing and fluctuated with the degree of emotional response to issues.

The members of the study groups saw teacher empowerment as an outcome of study groups. All of the POP documents contained references to teacher empowerment. The statements which follow represent the overall Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme I found in the data:

Empower teachers to make decisions about curriculum and building concerns (document 90/3).

Aid in final decisions (document 90/6).

To help make decisions regarding direction of our school. To allow an avenue whereby each voice can be heard, to ensure teachers have a part in the decision-making process. [Outcomes] an empowered staff, a feeling of empowerment (document 90/7).

When the principal walked into a meeting of study group leaders meeting in May, study group leaders were voicing their frustration over feeling as though they had no focus. The principal's first statement was:

Well our vision for next year will be Accelerated School, multi-cultural, and parent involvement (field notes, set 91/2).

After the principal left the meeting, members of the group voiced their frustration and anger over being told what the school's vision would be for the following year.
Angry members of this group went to the principal and complained. The principal then backed down and told the angry staff members that the focus would be a school-wide decision. Later, she said to me:

I'll let them come up with a vision. They better understand that sitting around and talking about it isn't going to work. If they don't do something about it in the next week, I will tell them. No one wants to be responsible, just to complain. I'm tired of it. There is too much to do. And they will do it. Action plans never got done this year (field notes, set 91/12).

Rhythm of the School Disrupted

The behavior patterns I noted within this external context theme were in response to a major remodeling and building project at Georgetown which disrupted the normal rhythm of the school. Behaviors characteristic of the ninth and final research theme were (a) voicing anxiety and feelings of being displaced, (b) anger over having regular school routines, especially the beginning of the school year, disrupted, (c) retreating to the isolation of classrooms, and (d) focusing only on individual needs. The predominate overall Rhythm of the School Disrupted behaviors are represented by the following statement by a study group participant:

There is pressure and stress, negative statements and attitudes. Teachers used to being in control of their rooms are feeling out of control and it bothers them. The builders are in control. Teachers want to set up their rooms because it gives them a sense of security. There is no security here. Not even an accurate move-in date. It keeps changing (field notes, set 2/2).
Racial Tension

I was aware that tension over racial issues had been a consistent topic of discussion at Georgetown from late summer 1990 through the fall of 1991. In reviewing my data I found that behaviors related to the tension over racial issues varied from group to group. By extending my research to include interviewing a researcher from a nearby college who had interviewed the Georgetown staff, the significant behavior patterns in the external context Racial Tension theme emerged. The data which follows is from my interview with the college researcher. It represents the overall theme of Racial Tension at Georgetown:

There are racial problems and tension at Georgetown. Only Blacks appear to be acknowledging it. You need to be a facilitator of understanding. The faculty does not know how to work together. They do need help in this area. I will be presenting a workshop to the faculty to address this issue [differences between Black and white communication styles and experiences] at the retreat. We need to understand each other, listen to each other. We need to move beyond this storming stage and address our values. Talk and share our feelings (field notes, set 108/1).

Summary

The findings of this participant observer case study were presented in this chapter. Data for this study were gathered from ten groups: (a) eight Teacher Study Groups, (b) an Administrators' Group, and (c) a Concerned Nonsite Participants' Group. I developed nine themes representative of the ten groups through iterative data analysis. The
seven internal context themes I found were (a) Interpersonal Conflict, (b) Feeling Stuck, (c) Selective Risk Taking, (d) Study Group Process, (e) Emerging Awareness, (f) Impact on Curriculum and Instruction, and (f) Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power. The two external context themes were Rhythm of the School Disrupted and Racial Tension. I have cited examples from the data to illustrate the behavior patterns characteristic of each theme.
### Table 2

**Themes Across Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Interpersonal Conflict</th>
<th>Feeling Stuck</th>
<th>Selective Risk Taking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>blaming, control, isolation, complaints</td>
<td>no closure, wasting time, spinning wheels, feeling stuck</td>
<td>not confronting peers, safety in rooms, not talking in large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>blaming, control, isolation, complaints</td>
<td>no unity of purpose, no closure, no momentum</td>
<td>not confronting peers, safety in rooms, not talking in large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>blaming, control, isolation, complaints</td>
<td>rehash complaints, no cohesiveness, no progress</td>
<td>safety in rooms, lack of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>conflict, polarization, blaming, complaints</td>
<td>no momentum, spinning our wheels</td>
<td>retreat to safety, not confronting peers, not talking in large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>arguing, isolation, complaining, polarization</td>
<td>not going anywhere, no unity of purpose</td>
<td>not confronting peers, retreat to safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>complaints, isolation, polarization, blaming</td>
<td>no ownership, nothing changes</td>
<td>not confronting peers, retreat to safety, not communicating with principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>complaints, blaming, isolation</td>
<td>no follow through by staff, need a focus</td>
<td>fear of speaking up in large groups, lack of trust, retreat to safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>complaints, control, polarization</td>
<td>in a rut, doing same old thing, need accomplishments</td>
<td>not confronting peers, lack of trust, fear of speaking up in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>blaming, arguing, conflict</td>
<td>stuck, we can't do for them</td>
<td>not confronting, retreat to safety of classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsite</td>
<td>stress, overworked, isolation, polarization, anger</td>
<td>staff doesn't know how to move forward, stuck, control issues, staff doesn't see own changes</td>
<td>lack of trust, retreat to safety of rooms, limited communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Themes Across Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power</th>
<th>Racial Tensions</th>
<th>Rhythm of School Disrupted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down</td>
<td>focus on racial issues, sensitivity</td>
<td>anxiety, feeling displaced, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down</td>
<td>sensitivity, anger</td>
<td>anxiety, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down</td>
<td>sensitivity, anger</td>
<td>not in the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down</td>
<td>not in the initial data</td>
<td>anxiety, control, feeling displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down</td>
<td>not in the initial data</td>
<td>anxiety, feeling displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>want teacher empowerment, resent top-down, a vocal minority causes principal to back off</td>
<td>focus on racial issues, anger, sensitivity</td>
<td>anxiety, feeling displaced, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>resent top-down, want teacher empowerment</td>
<td>focus on racial issues, anger, sensitivity</td>
<td>anxiety, feeling displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>resent top-down, want teacher empowerment</td>
<td>focus on racial issues, sensitivity, anger</td>
<td>anxiety, control, feeling displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>Lack of teacher accountability, top-down decisions, retreat from decisions when confronted</td>
<td>focus on racial issues, sensitivity, anger</td>
<td>anxiety, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-site Teachers</td>
<td>resent top-down, lack of teacher accountability, teachers want power, not responsibility</td>
<td>misunderstandings, anger, sensitivity, denial</td>
<td>control issues, rhythm of school upset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

**Themes Across Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Group Process Groups</th>
<th>Emerging Awareness</th>
<th>Impact on Curriculum and Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>negative comments, choice based on peers, good participant role, did not follow format, no ideas generated</td>
<td>want original format, gained knowledge, want heterogeneous groups *staff needs to read articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>positive and negative comments, no ideas generated</td>
<td>last year better, need heterogeneous groups, tired of negativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>lack of accountability, good participant role, choice based on peers, no ideas generated, more negative than positive</td>
<td>better last year, tired of negativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>lack of accountability, good participant role, choice based on peers, no ideas generated</td>
<td>want last year's format, tired of negativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>choice based on peers, no follow through on ideas, negative and positive comments, *had a good time</td>
<td>want last year's format, tired of negativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>no ideas generated, lack of accountability, choice based on peers, good participants role</td>
<td>want last year's format, tired of negativeness, gained knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>choice based on peers, lack of accountability, no follow through on ideas, good participants role, negative comments</td>
<td>not in data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>both negative and positive comments, good participant role, no ideas generated</td>
<td>gained knowledge from peers, want last year's format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 cont'd

**Themes Across Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Group Process Groups</th>
<th>Emerging Awareness</th>
<th>Impact on Curriculum and Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm. nonparticipation, watch dog role</td>
<td>new format didn't work, go back to last year's format</td>
<td>staff gained knowledge, raised awareness level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-site need: heterogeneous groups, understanding of change, teaming skills</td>
<td>need more than change in format, staff controls negativeness</td>
<td>staff needs knowledge, staff at awareness not application level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*anomoly in the data*
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The operation and impact of teacher study groups at one school site are described in this case study. I gathered data for this site-based staff development study through: (a) participant observation, (b) interviewing, (c) document collection, (d) a team building activity, and (e) an open-ended questionnaire. Eight teacher study groups, a group made up of administrators at the site, a group consisting of concerned nonsite participants, and a researcher from a nearby college served as data sources. This case study describes not only the outcome of the study group process, but also the impact of both the external and internal environments on the study group participants and the study group process. This study will add to the limited research related to teacher study groups as a form of school-based staff development (Murphy, 1991b).

Overview of Study

I utilized the following qualitative research techniques to collect data for this study: (a) complete participant observation, (b) field notes, (c) informal conversational and guided interviews, (d) an open-ended questionnaire, (e) historical and current document
collection, and (f) a researcher's journal. I used all data sources in both indefinite and definite triangulation of data. My participant observations began in August 1991 and continued through May 1992. My informal conversational interviews with study group participants, administrators, and non-site participants were ongoing. During the last six weeks of my research I conducted structured interviews with nonsite participants. Study group participants also took part in a team building exercise and completed an open-ended questionnaire. My field notes contained key phrases, observations, conversations, and behaviors. My interpretations and coding were written in the margins of the field notes. I collected both historical and current documents throughout the research.

All the data I gathered were coded and analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). Themes were developed through initial and repetitive coding of data. Data were grouped into initial themes by comparing and contrasting key words, categories of behaviors, and related terms in an iterative process. After a three week break from the analysis process, I began final reduction and triangulation of the data. Definite triangulation of data verified that eight themes reoccurred consistently throughout the data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). I extended my study when questions related to the Racial Tension theme remained unanswered. The ninth theme, Racial Tension, was
Themes

I developed and labeled nine themes through initial and repetitive coding and analysis of the data. Seven themes reflected Georgetown's internal context behavior patterns and two themes reflected the staffs' behaviors in response to the school's external context. The seven internal context themes I developed from the data were (a) Interpersonal Conflict, (b) Feeling Stuck, (c) Selective Risk Taking, (d) Study Group Process, (e) Emerging Awareness, (f) Impact on Curriculum and Instruction, and (g) Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power. The two external context themes I developed from the data were Rhythm of the School Disrupted and, after extending my study, Racial Tension.

Interpersonal Conflict. This theme consisted of behavior patterns representative of the conflict and polarization among the staff. I found that power struggles, concerns over excessive work, arguing, blaming, complaining, and desire for isolation occurred repeatedly in the data. These behaviors parallel the characteristics of a negative school culture discussed by Lieberman and Miller (1984), Barth (1988), Joyce and Murphy (1990), and Fullan (1990).

Feeling Stuck. The behavior patterns I identified within the Feeling Stuck theme consisted of the staff using
the term "feeling stuck" and stating that they felt no movement toward achieving a goal.

Selective Risk Taking. The behavior patterns I categorized together in the Selective Risk Taking theme consisted of: (a) retreating to one's classroom, (b) not confronting peers or administrators, (c) not making statements in large groups, and (d) a fear of peers conveying private conversations to the principal.

Study Group Process. The categories of behaviors I included in the Study Group Process theme consisted of administrative and participant behaviors related to the organization and administration of study groups. These behavior patterns included (a) administrative nonparticipation, (b) an administrative enforcement role, (c) participants' lack of feeling accountable, and (d) no participant follow through on ideas they generated.

Emerging Awareness. I found two behavior patterns characteristic of the Emerging Awareness theme. The first was a realization and acknowledgement that the 1990-1991 assigned heterogeneous study group format had been more successful than the 1991-1992 self-selected homogeneous format. The second was a stated dislike of the negativeness that permeated the school culture.

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction. Although the school's curriculum and instruction were not directly impacted by the study group process, I identified behavior
patterns within this theme that indicated that study group participation had raised the awareness level of the study group participants.

**Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power.** My final internal context theme was based on both administrative and participant behaviors. I found a cyclical behavior pattern which reappeared in the data. This ongoing pattern consisted of: (a) the principal taking a strong stand, (b) vocal staff members responding negatively and bring up teacher empowerment and site-based management (SBM) issues, (c) the principal retreating from her stand, (d) the staff not following through with the responsibilities they had demanded, and (e) the cycle beginning again when the principal responded by making a top down decision in order to enforce staff follow through. My data showed that various stages of this cycle were evident in both school-wide and grade level issues throughout the school. The power struggles that were evident in my data parallel Blase's (1990) and Lerner's (1985) descriptions of unconstructive power struggles in which anger, in the form of fighting, blaming, and then withdrawing, maintains the status quo of unhealthy interpersonal relationships.

**Rhythm of the School Disrupted.** I found that behaviors within the first external context theme, Rhythm of the School Disrupted, were in response to a major remodeling project at the school site which ran six months beyond the
scheduled completion date. When school started a week late and construction activities continued until January, my field notes revealed that staff members voiced anxiety and feelings of being displaced. Staff members attempted to regain control of their environment by: (a) retreating to their classrooms, (b) focusing on their individual needs, and (c) creating familiar patterns. When these patterns were disrupted I found that staff members generally responded angrily.

Racial Tension. The second of two external context themes, Racial Tension, was confirmed when I extended my research. As a participant observer, I was aware of the staff’s anger and stress in response to the previous two years of racial tension at Georgetown. I sensed those feelings still existed; yet behaviors related to racial issues appeared only sporadically in the research data. It was as though the intense feelings and discussions related to the racial issues raised at Georgetown by the environmental turbulence of the previous two years had been pushed beneath the surface.

At first, one study group’s focus on racial issues appeared to be an anomaly in the data. The staff’s continuing reactions to the accusations of racial discrimination finally appeared when I extended my study to include data gathered by a researcher from a nearby college.
Addressing Research Questions

My study focused on and was guided by four research questions: (a) what major factors in the internal and external social context of the school had an impact on the study groups, (b) what typical behaviors of participation, leadership, decision making, information processing, problem solving, interpersonal relationships, risk taking, and conflict resolution emerged from the teacher study groups; (c) what was the impact of the study groups on curriculum and instruction in the school, and (d) what was the impact of participation in the study groups on individual participants and on their school? Beginning with the first question, the following sections address the research questions.

Major Internal and External Context Factors

Internal Context. I found that factors within the internal context of Georgetown Elementary significantly impacted teacher study groups. Through analysis of data it became evident that the behavior patterns in the Interpersonal Conflict, Feeling Stuck, Selective Risk Taking, and Study Group Process themes had a significant impact on not only the study groups, but also on the school as a whole. After extensive reading, I learned that the categories of participants' behaviors within these internal context themes paralleled Tuckman's (1965) norming and storming stages of team development.
Tuckman's (1965) general stages of group development theory describes four sequential stages of group development: (a) forming, (b) storming, (c) norming, and (d) performing. During the forming stage group members are testing each other. As a result they are polite, impersonal, watchful, and guarded. In my analysis of data these behaviors were characteristic of the Selective Risk Taking theme in which study group members were watchful and guarded during study group leaders' meetings, faculty and SBM meetings, and in some study groups.

During the storming stage of group development participants engage in infighting. The storming behaviors I observed included: (a) conflicts over control, (b) confronting people, (c) opting out, (d) focusing on difficulties, and (e) feeling stuck. I found behaviors and feelings representative of the storming stage appearing repeatedly throughout the data. Study group participants reported feeling: (a) angry toward the leader, the goals and tasks of the team, and other members, (b) sad and discouraged, (c) incompetent, (d) frustrated, or (e) unproductive (Tuckman, 1965; Scholtes, 1988). These storming characteristics were evident in the Interpersonal Conflict, Feeling Stuck, and Study Group Process themes. Janis (1988) warns that cohesive teams are not necessarily high performing teams. They can get stuck in a "group think syndrome" which parallels the storming stage of Tuckman's
theory. The homogeneous study group structure may have created a group think syndrome.

In the norming stage group norms are finalized. The group establishes procedures, develops skills, gives feedback, and confronts issues. In the final stage of group development, performing, the participants display a mature closeness. Tuckman (1965) and Scholtes (1988) describe participants in the performing stage as resourceful, flexible, open, effective, close, and supportive. I did not find consistent behavior patterns representative of the norming and performing stages in the data collected for this case study.

It became evident to me that participants in this study were stuck in the storming stage of group development. Research shows that team members must work their way through every stage of group development in order to become a productive team (Tuckman, 1965; Scholtes, 1988). These stages may last from one meeting to many months. The most difficult stage to move out of is storming. Tuckman and Scholtes found that when groups get stuck in the storming stage they fluctuate back and forth between the forming and storming stages, dependent on the interactions of the group members. I observed this fluctuation occurring throughout the school.

The data collected in this study identified extensive examples of study group participants' behaviors in the
storming stage of group development. As a complete participant observer, I saw both storming and forming behavior patterns throughout the school culture. These behaviors appeared not only in relationship to study groups but also in all discussions and activities related to site-based management (SBM).

Although Georgetown was in its fourth year of SBM, I observed that the principal and the faculty appeared to be neither comfortable nor consistent in their roles and expectations. My findings were consistent with the findings of Weiss et al. (1992). They found that shared decision making does lead to teacher conflict. Other recent research has shown that the behavior patterns characteristic of my case study's Interpersonal Conflict, Feeling Stuck, Selective Risk Taking, and Study Group Process themes have been occurring in other schools in which site-based management has been implemented (Carson, 1992; Covey, 1988; Crandall, 1989; Malen et al., 1990).

The Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power behavior patterns made up the final internal context theme I found impacting teacher study groups. The behavior patterns I identified paralleled what Weiss et al. (1992) found in their research on site-based management. They found that in site-based managed schools teachers expressed confusion and engaged in power struggles over: (a) authority, (b) empowerment, and (c) responsibility.
I found that staff members' frustration and confusion over authority, empowerment, and responsibility appeared repeatedly in the data: (a) in informal conversations about study groups, (b) during study groups, (c) in the Purpose, Outcome, Process (POP) documents generated by the study groups, and (d) in study group participants' questionnaire responses when they were asked what topics were discussed other than the assigned articles. Research by Malen et al. (1990); Wehlage et al. (1992); Weiss et al. (1992), and Blase (1991) found corresponding behaviors in schools which have implemented shared decision making.

External Context. In addition to the impact of the internal context on study groups, my first research question also addressed the impact of the external context on teacher study groups. I identified three major external context factors impacting teacher study groups at Georgetown. Neighborhood parents' accusations of racial discrimination occurring at Georgetown and subsequent investigations by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) throughout the 1991-1992 school year were reflected in the Racial Tension theme. The impact of an extensive remodeling and building project at the school that was not completed as scheduled was evident in the Rhythm of the School Disrupted theme.

During my research, multi-cultural education was a staff development topic for the school as a whole as well as
two study groups. Other study group topics were aimed at highlighting the neighborhood students' educational needs. During indefinite triangulation, the impact of racial issues raised during the previous two years was not clear. With the exception of one group, I found that the study group participants made very few statements related to their feelings about racial issues. I noted the absence of these statements because it was in sharp contrast to the previous year and the first three weeks of my data collection.

Conversations related to racial issues did not appear with any regularity in my data. My analysis of the data uncovered the following anomalies: (a) a group with all Caucasian participants took a very strong stand on rejecting African-American dialect in all written work and decided on their own to spend five weeks on the subject, (b) an African-American member of one of the multi-cultural groups stated that her "comfort level was raised because she had a better understanding of the ethnic backgrounds and experiences" of Caucasian members of the group, and (c) isolated comments in two of the three all Caucasian groups indicated that some participants did not believe that discrimination existed at Georgetown or in the suburban area served by the school district.

In early May, I participated in a group interview at Georgetown. The interview was conducted by a researcher from a nearby college who was interviewing all staff members
in grade level or small job-alike groups. I was surprised when strong feelings about racial issues were raised repeatedly by members of my group. At that time, I decided to extend my study to see if this behavior occurred during the outside researcher's other interviews.

I met with the researcher after he had completed his staff interviews at Georgetown. His data indicated that both African-American and Caucasian staff members acknowledged they had strong feelings related to racial issues within the school. Staff members also reported they were not comfortable discussing their feelings. It became evident to me that this tension did have an impact on study groups because it created a situation in which participants, especially African-American teachers, did not feel they could risk voicing their true feelings. The participants' feelings and actions within the Racial Tension theme were a reflection of the behavior patterns prevalent in the metropolitan area surrounding Georgetown.

**Rhythm of School Disrupted.** Extensive remodeling and construction at Georgetown were not completed as scheduled and school started a week late. Therefore, teachers were not able to work in the school until the weekend before students arrived on Monday. In addition, construction crews did not leave the building until early January. Because of the ongoing construction, on several occasions I observed teacher's routines and classrooms being disrupted.
I noted that the Georgetown teachers placed great value on the boundaries which separate their classrooms from the rest of the school and from other interfering factors. Lortie (1975) discussed the importance teachers give to boundedness. Lortie found that teachers defined a good day as a day with no interruptions and predictable patterns. I heard similar statements being made repeatedly by study group participants. Lieberman and Miller (1984) found that the rhythm of the school year, the rhythm and patterns of the school day, and predictable routines created a sense of control and security for teachers.

At Georgetown, I observed teacher behavior patterns that indicated they had lost both a sense of security and of control as they were being impacted by the remodeling. As a result of the disruption of the school’s rhythm and patterns, Georgetown’s teachers were anxious, angry, and territorial. In addition, they focused on their personal needs, retreated to the safety of isolation, and felt displaced. I found that all of these behavior patterns impacted the school as a whole as well as the teacher study groups.

Typical Study Group Behaviors

My second research question addressed the typical behaviors of study group participants. I found that behavior patterns of study group participants were typically characteristic of the Interpersonal Conflict, Feeling Stuck,

**Participation.** My analysis of data confirmed that study group members' participation levels varied on an individual and group basis. My data indicated that absences were distributed evenly among staff members. The average group member missed three or four of the fifteen scheduled meetings. Five participants had excessive, more than eight, absences. It became evident to me that staff members' levels of commitment to the study group process related directly to their attendance.

Even though I had stressed that attendance be taken weekly, my findings indicated that study group participants did not feel there would be any significant consequences if they did not attend meetings or follow the meeting format. Without administrative commitment in the form of participation, administrative pressure, and visible support; the staff did not feel a commitment to the study group process. This parallels the findings of Miles and Huberman (1984), Hord et al. (1987), and Leithwood (1987, 1990) that without visible administrative support of and participation in the staff development activities in which teachers are involved, teachers will not feel a commitment to those activities. McKibbin and Joyce (1980) also found that the school climate has a significant impact on the use of innovations such as teacher study groups. The negative
school climate at Georgetown did not support the implementation of teacher study groups as a site-based staff development model. Research shows that a principal can facilitate effective staff development in a school by building a healthy school culture, encouraging the staff, and participating in all the activities in which the teachers are involved (Bertani & Tafel, 1989; Orlich, 1989).

Leadership. Fullan and Stigelbaur (1991), Joyce and Murphy (1990), and Miles and Huberman (1984) found that implementation does not occur without committed group leaders. Because my original study group design was not followed, study group leadership varied from group to group: (a) three leaders followed study group guidelines closely, (b) two leaders changed the format significantly without consulting me, and (c) three leaders were inconsistent.

When the study group leaders met as a group, I observed conversations and interactions which were typical of the Interpersonal Conflict theme. Only one of the eight group leaders stated that he would like to be a group leader again the following year. He had been a member of the Study Group Committee. All leaders reacted with concern when I told them administrators would start attending their meetings. The study group leaders' behavior patterns were representative of the type of behaviors that occur in the micropolitics of a school having difficulty implementing site-based management (Blase, 1991; Weiss et al., 1992).
Decision making. I did not observe a consistent pattern of decision making behaviors occurring in the data. My findings indicated that study group members appeared to lack the skills necessary to move forward on the issues they repeatedly raised.

Information processing. Hopkins (1990) and McCaslin and Good (1992) stressed the importance of a positive school climate as a favorable environment for staff development. The Georgetown staff's Interpersonal Conflict, Selective Risk Taking, and Study Group behaviors were indicative of a negative school climate. The school's negative culture affected the teacher as a learner study group model. I noticed that information processing behaviors appeared at times to be blocked by the emotionality which permeated most study group meetings, study group leaders' meetings, and general staff discussions.

I found that the focus of many study group participants was on the ongoing Interpersonal Conflict behavior patterns rather than on the content of the articles. I observed participants reporting on their study group articles with their own personal agendas as the focus rather than the needs of the school. I rarely observed teacher reflection occurring; therefore, few solution oriented ideas were generated.

Problem solving. Participants' problem solving behaviors were infrequent and at a self-concerns level. I
observed that complaints about numerous school related topics were ongoing. Two study groups generated global ideas to address problems they had discussed; but none of the groups generated a specific plan to solve an identified problem. Again, I believe this reflected the barrier to school improvement efforts created by Georgetown's negative school climate (Hopkins, 1990).

*Interpersonal relationships.* I observed that interpersonal relationships among the staff were congenial on the surface. However, a Georgetown administrator with a background in staff development described the dynamics of the Georgetown staff as "unhealthy" when they attempted to work together on school related rather than social tasks. I coded more data with Interpersonal Conflict categories than any other theme.

As I stated earlier, Lortie (1975) and Lieberman and Miller (1984) pointed out that teachers place great value on the boundaries and isolation that separates them from the rest of the school. As my research progressed, it became evident to me that because teacher study groups and SBM teams required teachers to leave the safe isolation of their classrooms and risk exposing themselves professionally to their peers as they worked together toward common educational goals, those models made teachers very uncomfortable. The interpersonal conflict I found at Georgetown is typical of what happens when teachers begin to
work together on a collegial level rather than the known and comfortable congenial level (Glickman, 1990a; Wood, Freeland, and Szabo, 1985).

**Risk taking.** It became evident to me that study group participants' risk taking behaviors paralleled Lieberman and Miller's (1984) description of elementary school teachers' privacy and practicality rules. The vast majority of the study group participants remained private. They were unwilling to risk exposure to, or censure by, their professional peers or administrators. Therefore, discussions stayed on a congenial level and most study group participants kept true feelings and opinions to themselves.

My continued observations led me to discover that study group participants' behavior patterns within the Interpersonal Conflict, Feeling Stuck, Selective Risk Taking, and Study Group Process themes showed they had learned Lieberman and Miller's (1984) lessons of a practicality rule well: (a) to draw on experience rather than on research, (b) to stay in their place in the pecking order within the school, (c) "to keep quiet when private principles are violated by public practices" (p. 8), and (d) "to be politic about what they say and to whom they say it" (p. 8).

**Conflict resolution.** Conflict resolution behaviors rarely appeared in the data I gathered for this case study.
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

My third research question dealt with the impact study groups had on Georgetown's curriculum and instruction. Unlike the 1990-1991 study groups, I found the effect of the 1991-1992 study groups on curriculum and instruction at Georgetown to be at the awareness level rather than at the implementation level. Participants reported that their awareness levels were raised because they had been exposed to current research-based articles that they probably would not have read. Limited discussions of curricular and instructional issues did take place during study group meetings. The majority of these discussions involved individuals stating their personal preferences for what they wanted to happen in their own classrooms. These findings parallel Newmann's (1991) research findings on restructured schools.

As the year progressed, I noted study group participants discussing a return to assigned heterogeneous grouping. Study group participants acknowledged that discussions with peers who either already shared their point of view or were not going to offer an opposing perspective was neither stimulating nor profitable. As a result, the participants requested heterogeneous grouping for the following year in order to facilitate more cross-grade level and building-wide communication.
Comments by study group participants and my observations confirmed that conversations related to study group articles rarely occurred outside of study group meetings. The content of the study group articles was not discussed in the teachers lounge, at grade level meetings, or at faculty meetings. When I asked study group participants for suggestions to improve the study group process, they requested returning to the original study group format in which: (a) all study groups read the same sets of articles on a common topic in order to facilitate school-wide discussions of the articles and (b) the members of each study group represent various primary and intermediate grade levels and specialties.

My findings indicated that staff members appeared to have gained an understanding of the importance of a common set of knowledge which can grow from the sharing of articles and information. Even with all the complaints, which at times appeared to drown out any positive comments, on several occasions I observed behaviors which indicated that participants were beginning to understand the importance of continual learning rather than relying on what has always been done. The behaviors I found at Georgetown were similar to the behavior patterns of teachers beginning to understand the importance of life-long learning (Joyce, 1986).
Impact on The School

My fourth and last research question concerned the impact of study groups on the school. At Georgetown, teacher study groups created a vehicle for raising both faculty and administrative awareness. My findings indicated that study groups provided a comfortable setting for the staff to freely voice their concerns. As Little (1989) warned can happen in group work, overall, this led to an escalation of the negative climate of the school because study group participants' negative comments were reinforced by their peers.

At the conclusion of the 1991-1992 study group meetings, an administrator and I met jointly with the study group leaders to discuss the study group process. During this meeting, I once again observed the study group leaders stating quite strongly, and at times loudly, their frustrations with: (a) their role in the site-based management process, (b) their lack of focus, (c) their lack of a sense of accomplishment, (d) the school climate, and (d) the principal. My data indicated that the feelings being expressed by the study group leaders corresponded to research findings on teachers' reactions to: (a) site-based management (Blase, 1991), (b) shared decision making (Malen et al., 1990), (c) team development (Scholtes, 1988), (d) team work (Carson, 1992), and (e) joint work, which Little (1989) defines as the highest form of collegiality.
I found that the impact of study groups on the school extended to the principal, even though she had not participated in the teacher study groups. I discussed the findings of my research with the principal and the Georgetown's outside site-based management facilitator. After consulting with the outside SBM facilitator and staff development specialists, as well as reconciling her personal feelings about the staff's behaviors and perceptions, the principal stated that she would take the following steps: (a) break the exchanging of power cycle, which I found in the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power Cycle, by not reacting in a "knee-jerk" manner to the comments and complaints of the loud negative staff members, (b) arrange for and actively participate in ongoing team-building staff development for everyone on the Georgetown staff during the following school year, (c) redefine the SBM format so that all staff members would have a specified channel of communication to voice their feelings and concerns if they chose to do so, (d) create and actively participate in heterogeneous cross-grade level and cross-discipline study groups for the following year, (e) have all study groups read the same articles to facilitate building-wide discussions with a common knowledge base, and (f) arrange for participation of all Georgetown staff members in ongoing staff development addressing racial issues raised by the staff.
Significance and Implications

Although the 1991-1992 study groups did not have the staff development impact I had envisioned, improving building-wide communication, reducing isolation, and generating actions to address identified problems, as my research unfolded I learned that the study groups did have a significant impact on the administration, the staff, and the school as a whole. As I analyzed the data collected for this case study several themes which impacted the implementation of teacher study groups as a site-based staff development model emerged.

After my research began, both my original purpose for study groups and the composition of study groups were changed to conform to the reality of Georgetown's ongoing site-based management teams. Therefore, the results of this study have significance and implications not only for study groups as a site-based development model, but also for the use of teams in the implementation of site-based management. The findings of my study suggest that the following implications and recommendations may support more successful implementation of teacher study groups as a site-based staff development model, as well as site-based management teams. My findings suggest implications and recommendations in the following areas: (a) shared decision making, (b) school culture, (c) leadership, (d) team development, (e) team
composition, (f) addressing racial tension, (g) disruption of school rhythms, and (h) a holistic view.

**Implications and Recommendations**

**Shared decision making.** In order for administrators and teachers to successfully participate in shared decision making, both need a strong knowledge base in the areas of interpersonal relationships and personal growth. With this knowledge base they should be able to understand and accept responsibility for their own actions and improve their professional interpersonal relationships.

The traditional hierarchical power structure and the isolated nature of schools do not foster trust and open communication which are prerequisites for successful shared decision making. The behavior patterns which occurred in the Ebb and Flow of Exchanging Power theme were typical of power struggles in interpersonal relationships. Shared decision making may not be successful as a management model unless both administrators and staff members have a greater understanding of their respective roles in the undercurrents of power struggles. In order for administrators and staff members to deal successfully with power struggles, staff development should address both relationship building and personal growth skills.

**School culture.** Teachers' feelings should be acknowledged and validated in the context in which they occur. Current research reconfirms that the school culture,
the relationships within the school between teachers and between teachers and administrators, should be healthy in order for teachers to work together beyond a purely social level. Team building training should be provided as schools move from the rules of privacy and practicality in a hierarchical structure to new rules for mutual decision making and shared control. Knowledge of team dynamics should be coupled with the social skills necessary to actualize team effectiveness. This knowledge coupled with new skills could have defused some of the anxiety, anger, and lack of forward momentum experienced at Georgetown as it moved from a top-down structure to one of teacher empowerment. By utilizing a process such as the Leadership Development Process (1989), staff members could achieve their full potential both as team members and individually.

I hypothesize that the major contributing factor to the lack of successful school restructuring and limited success of SBM at Georgetown is that to date the focus of change has been external to the school culture: fix the student, fix the parent, fix society; it has not been to change the school culture. In addition, any attempts to change the school culture have been largely ineffective because the active participants, teachers and administrators, do not have the knowledge base, social skills, or desire to leave their isolated work spaces and join together to work as a team. It is much safer to maintain the status quo of
isolation and the hierarchical model of school governance with its inherent rule, if there is always someone else in charge, then there is always someone else to blame.

Leadership. Building principals need to demonstrate commitment to staff development activities by: (a) actively participating in the activities, (b) clearly conveying to the participants the consequences of nonparticipation, and (c) recognizing the contributions of teams, be it study groups or SBM teams, and individuals. As the follow-up on the Rand Change Agent study has shown, participants' negative beliefs about an innovation can change after implementation (McLaughlin, 1990). With committed leadership, the implementation of teacher study groups and site-based management teams would be more successful. It also would be beneficial for principals to cultivate a group of committed teacher leaders who could then serve as leaders for teacher study groups or SBM teams.

Team development. Both a strong knowledge base on teaming and ongoing support for the teaming process should be in place before there can be reasonable expectations for productive work as teams. The traditionally isolated nature of teaching coupled with a top-down management style of administration does not foster a teaming approach. The participants do not know how to work together as a team. Three years ago Georgetown teachers were given a two hour overview of team building on a teacher retreat. Site-based
management teams were then formed. Without a strong teaming knowledge base and specific team building training and ongoing support, this faculty was "stuck" in the storming stage of team building. There was not a conscious, nurturing effort to provide the staff members with either the knowledge base or the skills necessary to work together as productive teams. Without this knowledge base, team members were not able to recognize dissatisfaction as a natural part of the team building process. Therefore, participants were unable to take stock, review goals, and move on. Instead they saw site-based management and shared decision making as too demanding, frustrating, and unsuccessful.

Team building may prove to be a difficult process. Both teachers and administrators have experienced success functioning in the traditionally isolated nature of education. These known patterns make them reluctant to change their behavior. Perhaps school districts could utilize the extensive research on teaming to provide the information base and ongoing support necessary for a school's staff to function productively as site-based staff development teams, teacher study groups, or site-based management teams.

Team composition. Staff members should be randomly assigned to study groups in order to create the discomfort that generates dialogue. The goal should be to create
purposeful groups organized around tasks rather than
satisfying the emotional safety needs of the participants.
In a school that had been actively participating in SBM for
four years, when given the opportunity to self-select study
groups, teachers placed more value on the composition of the
group, a familiar safe environment, than on the topics
chosen through SBM. Yet, once the meetings were underway,
and again at their conclusion, participants requested that
the group format be returned to the heterogeneous format of
the prior year.

I believe it is significant that throughout my
research, study group participants referred to the success
of the previous year's study groups. Study group
participants saw the 1990-1991 study groups as having
provided more: (a) communication throughout the building,
(b) sharing of new ideas, (c) different perspectives from
staff members they were not normally around, and (d) plans
to address identified problems.

The homogeneous nature of the 1991-1992 study groups
did not provide a situation in which participants had a felt
need to be responsible for reading and discussing articles
or for attending as many meetings as possible. Meaningful
dialogue was not created because divergent views were not
present. Since the group leaders were not committed to the
Study Group process and participants were friends, there was
no pressure from any direction other than top down to rectify the situation.

By sharing data on the strengths of heterogeneous grouping with both district and building level administrators and SBM teams, school districts could decrease the number of homogeneous groups at both the district and building levels. Recognizing and implementing this suggestion could result in more productive groups at both levels.

Addressing racial tensions. Staff members need an opportunity to acknowledge their fundamental belief systems instead of denying racially related feelings. The racial tension which appeared in this case study was a reflection of the events occurring in the surrounding environment. Educators do not leave their belief systems outside the school building doors. Due to the changing demographics of our nation's schools, educators should participate in extensive and ongoing staff development which addresses current racial issues.

Disruption of school rhythms. The impact of external disruptions and the staff's reactions to those disruptions should be acknowledged and taken into consideration when implementing change. In this study staff members felt threatened and angry when the traditional rhythms and patterns of the school were interrupted. Conceptually, both site-based management and site-based staff development
models challenge the traditional patterns at the building and district levels. A stable environment should be a consideration when implementing change. The knowledge base teachers and administrators will need in order to change their traditional patterns could be provided by staff developers and administrators. This information could be a focus for both preservice and administrative training.

Holistic view. Change agents should have a holistic view because the implementation of any type of team approach will reflect the culture of the organization. My case study provided a global view of the staff's behavior patterns. What I could see, but participants did not appear to recognize, was that they themselves could have changed the way the groups were functioning. The underlying reasons for the staff's behavior patterns may not have been recognized without my final report to the principal. The power of what Hanna (1992) calls the "fly on the wall" examination of current practices in order to change the culture of the organization should be a part of every school's restructuring activities.

Suggestions for Further Research

The limited number of research studies on the concept and process of teacher study groups as a site-based staff development tool suggests a need for additional research in this area. With the shift from district-wide to site-based
staff development, staff developers, building administrators, and teachers need research-based information on options to the traditional models of staff development. The results of this case study suggest several questions for further qualitative research studies.

**Shared Decision Making**

What forms of shared decision making and patterns of exchanging power have evolved in schools in which site-based management has been in place for four to six years? This information would be of value for both present administrators and Educational Administration programs.

**Team Development Skills**

What impact does site-based team building staff development have on a school's culture? One of the research questions guiding this study could focus on the staff's reactions to moving from an unwritten rule of privacy to a rule with expectations for collaboration and risk taking. A second research question could be to determine the impact site-based team building staff development had on staff and administrative perceptions of site-based management's success.

**Preservice**

How does preservice education addresses the concepts of site-based management and team development? Unless future teachers have a meaningful background in these areas, the traditional structure of isolated workers will continue.
Administrators

How do management styles change when administrators are given an extensive group development knowledge base? How does this information change their implementation of teacher study groups or shared decision making?

Racial Issues

How do Caucasian and minority views of the school's culture in multi-racial schools differ? What impact does this difference have on the implementation of multicultural curriculum, the staff, and the students? As our nation’s demographics and school populations change, the vast majority of teachers and administrators remain Caucasian. Therefore, a future researcher may wish to investigate beyond the implementation of multi-cultural curriculum to the underlying belief systems and feelings of school personnel.

Action Research

Finally, how is qualitative research addressed in preparing administrators and how is it currently being used by administrators? What is the role of qualitative research in site-based staff development and restructuring?

Conclusion

The findings of my study have implications and significance for staff developers, administrators, and teachers involved in site-based management and shared
decision making, as well as for schools considering implementation of teacher study groups. Examining the results of this study led me to further questions in the areas of site-based management, team development, racial issues within the school culture, shared decision making, and the role of qualitative research in school improvement efforts.

The operation and impact of teacher study groups as a site-based staff development model were affected by a number of factors at the school site. Both the internal and external context of the school significantly impacted the study group participants. Georgetown's teacher study groups served as much more than a staff development tool. The results of my research provided the principal with a holistic view of the culture of the school. With this view, it became evident to the principal that in order to support school improvement efforts, the ongoing developmental needs of the staff that were identified in this study needed to be addressed in order to move from a socially congenial to a professionally collaborative school culture.

Georgetown's school culture was a reflection of the negative school climate created by the power struggles over shared decision making and teacher empowerment. Not only was the staff stuck in the storming stage of group development, they also were angry over the discrepancy between what they hoped would happen when site-based
management was implemented and what became reality. The staff members were frustrated with what was expected of them, how much there was to do, and the time and commitment it required. As a result they were angry and lacked a shared vision. Georgetown's negative culture, coupled with unaddressed undercurrents of racial tension, loss of safety, and disrupted routines, had a significant impact on teacher study groups. It became apparent to me that the Georgetown faculty and administration, myself included, did not have the knowledge base, the skills, and in many cases the will necessary to work together satisfactorily in either study groups or site-based management teams.
INFORMAL CONVERSATIONAL INTERVIEW
(EXAMPLE)

1. Who attended your study group meeting today?
2. Would you describe your study group meeting today?
3. How was it alike or different from earlier meetings?
4. What were the other topics discussed besides the articles?
5. What were people's reactions to the articles?
6. How would you describe the general feeling tone?
7. Can you give me some examples of people's behavior?
8. How would your group define empowerment?
9. Do you feel safe in your study group?
10. How has your study group changed since October?
11. How does your participation in this year's group compare to last year's participation?
12. How has the construction impacted you?

I followed each question with probes when it was appropriate. The following probes are representative:

1. Can you tell me some more?
2. What does that mean to you?
3. Do you mean ...?
4. Can you give me an example?
5. Why or why not?
6. How did that make you feel?
7. What kind of impact do you think that will have on Georgetown?
APPENDIX B

GUIDED INTERVIEW
GUIDED INTERVIEW
(EXAMPLE)

I discussed the following focus topics with informants before I interviewed them: (a) site-based management, (b) school climate, (c) shared decision making, (d) teacher study groups, (e) teacher leaders, and (f) site-based staff development.

The following questions are examples of questions I asked during a guided interview:
1. What suggestions do you have for improving the study group process?
2. What suggestions do you have for me as a teacher leader?
3. How would you describe the Georgetown school climate?
4. What did you find in the area of racial tension when you talked with staff members?
5. How can racial tension be addressed at Georgetown?
6. What areas of concern did staff members list the most frequently?
7. What kind of an impact would you expect the school climate to have on teacher study groups?
8. How is the district addressing team building skills?
9. How are other schools in the district reacting to site-based management?
I followed each question with probes when it was appropriate. The following examples are representative of the probes I used:

1. Can you tell me some more?
2. What does that mean to the school?
3. Do you mean ...?
4. Can you give me an example?
5. Why or why not?
6. What do you recommend?
7. What kind of impact do you think this will have on Georgetown?
APPENDIX C

PURPOSE OUTCOME PROCESS ACTIVITY
Purpose: To review and establish the role of the Study Groups.

Outcomes: Study group handouts

Process: Discussion, brainstorming, consensus

Suggestion:

**Day 1:**

1. Discuss with group these two questions:
   
   a. Who are you? (as a study group) Keep this simple and to the point.
   
   b. What is your purpose? (as a study group)

   • Present both questions at the same time to facilitate placing answers in the proper place. Answers may be changed around if felt they strongly answer "you" or "purpose" more.

   • Do Question Sheet

2. Next, discuss:

   a. What are the outcomes (items to come from the study group) of the groups work.

   b. Who are the receivers of these outcomes

   • Do a T chart and list outcomes on one side and receivers on the other.

   Limit discussion time to 10 to 15 minutes and reach group consensus as completion.
QUESTIONS SHEET

WHO ARE YOU?

WHAT IS YOUR PURPOSE?

STUDY GROUP: ____________________
Study Group:__________________________
Day 2

Purpose: To clarify, reevaluate and renew the role of the study group for the future.

Outcomes: Handout of Study Group/Action Team Sheet

Process: Discussion, consensus

1. Discuss as a whole group Purpose of the Study Group.

   The Study Group/Action Team sheet will help with each select. Come to consensus of the Purpose of the group.

2. Be careful with Outcomes and Process.
   - Process may come out while talking about Outcomes.

   How you do it - is process. The form it will take (action plan, workshop, staff development training, handouts, etc.) are outcomes. In what way will these things be delivered.
Discussion sheet for
Study Group and Action Teams

Purpose:
• What or
• Why or
• Mission

Outcome
• Tangible items
• Combination of people or materials which can be given or received (ex: People to people, People to materials, materials to people, materials to materials)

Process:
• How to be done, achieved, accomplished
Purpose:

Outcomes:

Process:

Study Group:
APPENDIX D

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE
Thank you for taking time out of your busy day to complete this survey. Your perceptions and suggestions are vital for improving the Study Group / Action Team staff development process. Thank you for your input.

Please return this survey to Bobbi by Friday, May 22 and check your name off the list. You do not have to identify yourself on the survey. Your input will be confidential and compiled as a group report.

I was a member of an Action Research Study Group.

I was a member of a Critical Issues Study Group.

I attended ______ meetings.

I read my article ______ times before the meetings.

I found the articles: informative thought provoking applicable to HPP
not of value difficult to read other:

Recommendations:

The cooperative learning format worked: well o.k. did not work was not used
other:

Recommendations:

I participated actively during discussions: yes no at times

Why / Why not:

Recommendations:
Generally, what percentage of the time was spent discussing the content of the articles? ____

What other topics were discussed? (not directly related to the articles)

- school climate
- grade level concerns
- administrative concerns
- curriculum
- instruction
- other:

What percentage of each meeting time did this occur? ____

How often did this occur? every meeting, most of the time, some of the time, rarely, other:

Suggestions for improving the Study Group / Action Research process:

Suggestions for the individual group facilitators:

Suggestions for the Study Group / Action Research facilitator:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORTS !!!!!!
APPENDIX E

LAYERED CODING
Topic: 5G meeting
Who: LG Leader

5/31: Everyone here except B. Yes, I know how she is, but just stopped expecting her. I don't know why she thinks the rules don't apply to her!

5/31: It was not a very good meeting. We got into a huge discussion about mentoring, why just Black boys. Some people really resent the focus on Black. I stayed out of it. I don't want a fight on my hands. I'm already overwhelmed. I just felt like going to my room to recover.

5/31: Picking it up again. There is too much stress and here we don't need to make it any worse.

6/1: shared some information.

6/1: different questioning strategies. gains from activity.

6/1: so much interesting. We also talked about the 5G wave.

6/1: C said you guys didn't have any impact. What did the idea come from? Not this principal. Angry.

6/1: Still to you about it first?
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