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Abstract
This study contributes to enquiries into the life space and the cultural agency of teachers. Using Harrè’s social construct of the teachers’ Umwelten, and Tonnies’ classical sociological distinction between the modern associational Gesellschaft modality and communal traditional modality of the Gemeinschaft, an account has been produced of the discursive repositioning of two teams of Year Seven school teachers in a Gesellschaft middle school dealing with the imposition of a Gemeinschaft senior school at Maroon Secondary.

Maroon Secondary began as a purpose designed alternative middle school based on the German Team Small Group model in 1992. Within five years of its opening it took on the provision of the academic examination oriented curriculum of the Victorian Certificate of Education. The threat to the local moral order and the teachers’ Umwelten forms a daily struggle that is constructed in the conversations of team members.

In recent years researchers have attempted to articulate the role of teacher agency in culture. Their point is, and this study demonstrates that, teachers are not passive recipients of a reified entity called culture or schooling. Rather teachers play an active role in making and remaking education and culture, and the manner in which their psychology is culturally organized. Agency is the intentional causal intervention in the world, subject to the possibility of a reflexive monitoring of that intervention.
Of course, the types of intervention as well as the sources of intentionality that inspire and constrain the intervention vary. An individualistic view of agency construes it as a negotiation of life styles in interpersonal dialogues or of "life spaces" individually, independent of even interpersonal linguistic interactions. In neither case are broader social constraints on these constructions acknowledged. The analysis of the teachers' discursive action in this study provides a critique of the individualistic model of agency and suggests a cultural model of agency which operates within and through a social structure in this case of their Team Small Group middle school.
CHAPTER 1 THE TSG/GESELLSCHAFT MIDDLE SCHOOL: COVER STORY

1.1 Stories of teachers and schools

In dividing teachers’ time between classroom interactions with a student focus and professional interactions in communal places within the school and wider community, the professional life of a teacher is influenced by interactions with students, other teachers and parents. Clandinin and Connelly (1996) describe these interactions as three types of stories. Briefly, the external accountability and policies which influence the working life of teachers are described as ‘sacred stories’, the classroom interactions of the teacher form ‘secret stories’ which are sometimes shared with other teachers, and the stories which teachers freely share with others outside the school are defined as ‘cover stories’. The effects and purposes of these stories are quite different. ‘Sacred stories’ are what typically bind teachers to their profession; they include the imposed standards and curriculum that direct their day-to-day practices whereby teachers are charged with the responsibility of interpreting and enacting these directives. ‘Secret stories’ are rarely disclosed even to other teachers and if shared are only told in secret places ie: staffrooms and offices, these stories show the realities of classroom teaching. The ‘cover story’ is the public face of the school, the story given to parents, members of the local community and new staff (see appendix A for copies of staff information). What follows in this chapter is a form of cover story, as it is put to parents and members of the education community who are not engaged in the daily interactions of the TSG (Team Small Group).
1.2 Maroon P-12 College

Maroon P-12 College is a government college in the western suburbs of Melbourne. The college opened nearly a decade ago, as a Year Seven to Ten middle school based on the German TSG model of teaching. As outlined by this model, year levels were split into teams, with two to four classes in each team. Each team had between three and six teachers, responsible for the education and welfare of their students. Maroon Secondary aimed to be a different kind of learning community, designed and built to accommodate teams of teachers in the one office and adjoining team based class rooms. Students were situated in learning and working groups called ‘Table Groups’ of four to six students, where each lesson required them to work together in some capacity. These Table Groups remain unchanged for at least a term, and the students remain in their Table Group across classes in all learning areas. Classrooms were set up (figure 1) to accommodate Table Groups and to facilitate whole team activities by having ‘concertina’ doors between classrooms. The flexibility of the environment and the timetable allowed teachers the freedom to try various negotiated and integrated curriculum ideas to challenge and extend themselves and their students.

Within three years of Maroon Secondary opening, population growth in the area led to a demand for more VCE (Victorian Certificate of Education) and Primary schools in the region. Instead of building entire new campuses, the new campuses were attached to the existing college, with the primary campus site a short distance away. In 1997, Maroon Secondary began to offer VCE subjects. This sudden growth and shift to a traditional/academic structure became a new priority for the school and the TSG arrangement was terminated at Year Nine. No longer were students expected to meet the requirements of their TSG team in Year Ten but of teachers representing academic
departments who had to ensure that the students had a better understanding of the idea of VCE ‘work requirements’ in their subject discipline and be otherwise educated towards competitive examination success at Year Twelve.

**Figure 1**: Typical layout for a current Year Seven to Nine classroom at Maroon Secondary. Table groups of four to five students are used. The concertina door may be used to open up the room for team activities or alternative curriculum presentations.

A brief socio-historical account of Maroon Secondary School is necessary for the reader to develop a sense of place, in which this investigation of the teachers’ lived world within the changing school community took place. As a teacher with five years experience within the TSG *Gesellschaft* of Maroon Secondary and as a teacher educator, I am familiar with the unique features of the culture that exists at Maroon Secondary in the wider educational scene. In many ways, I feel that I am translating a very personal experience but one that is likely to be foreign to the educator experienced in the traditional model of liberal education that foregrounds cognitive development of students in academic areas that correspond to teaching departments.
through which the teacher's work is socially organised, and relies on motivational theory based on individual competition for success on external examinations.

The early 1990's were a time of progressive change in the education system in the state of Victoria. Perhaps the most obvious structural change in the state education system was the amalgamation of 'Technical' and 'High' School Divisions of the Ministry of Education and the closing or renaming of most schools as State 'Secondary Colleges'. This change was accompanied by the provision of a single senior general certificate of education, which had occurred in the English and German education systems years earlier.

The political reasons for the move from a Gemeinschaft to a Gesellschaft model of general education in Victoria were similar to those present four decades earlier in England and Germany. Increasing unemployment levels and the perceived need to better align secondary schools generally with rapidly changing employment opportunities and requirements were seen by the Blackburn report (1984) to predicate the social need to reform the traditional academic curriculum and examination system. From a political viewpoint the logic followed that: If students stayed within the secondary school system longer, unemployment statistics and dole payments would fall and there would be a greater chance that the general education provided would engender a wider range of knowledge useful in the workplace and in general citizenship.

At the same time as retention rates rose in the late eighties with de-emphasis on university controlled Sixth Form examinations, school populations were dropping
with birth rate declines. Inner urban schools were amalgamated or closed, while in the outer suburbs, where land prices were cheaper, the school age population continued to grow and in the study area a new state government school was built to cater for the middle school population. Consistent with structural reforms occurring in the education system in the early nineties an alternative middle school was designed based on the successful German TSG model. The culture of the community in which Maroon Secondary is set is also similar to that of the first German schools (Ratzki, 1988) of this type. It was to provide an education based not on either the technical model nor the academic high school model and outmoded pedagogies, but a new comprehensive approach which would deliver a curriculum through progressive pedagogies for the newly arrived middle class clientele in the area.

In 1993, Maroon Secondary opened its doors to students of an outer suburban housing estate in a formerly lower socio-economic area. Starting with Year Seven, it built up each year with an intake of about one hundred Year Seven students. The design of specific buildings defined Maroon Secondary as an alternative school setting. The buildings were designed (figure 2) to accommodate the TSG teams; large year level offices were built to accommodate all staff in a teaching team. There were to be no year level coordinators or homerooms and the foundation staff were committed to school-based, rather than text-book based, curriculum to foster the social and academic skills needed by their students in a changing world. As Maroon Secondary was intended to be a middle school, the focus was on education of the child as a whole and building a learning community supported by a range of assessment strategies and not tied to competitive individual grading primarily accountable to university entrance examinations at the end of Year Twelve. The top-down
development of the traditional subject discipline and exam culture from the sixth form to the middle years was not a concern for teachers at Maroon Secondary in these early years. The focus was on building up TSG teams; teachers and students working and

Figure 2: Map of Maroon Secondary. Note team areas and rooms.
learning together, developing an inclusive and responsive program that was immediately involving and engaging for adolescents. It adhered closely to the principles and practices of the TSG theorized by schools in Germany; embracing small group work, team skills and personal and social welfare.

The role of the teaching team encompassed that of the year level coordinator, who in the conventional management model would take responsibility for student welfare, discipline and parental/community relations. This role was integral to the teaching and thus incumbent on all teachers in the team. Each student had only their team teachers for all of their subjects. In the TSG model, this is the basis for the relationship established between students and teachers. Teachers were often responsible for only around eighty pupils in the year, compared with an average one hundred and sixty in traditional department based teaching arrangements. They taught two or more subjects to the same students in the team. This arrangement facilitated extra contact with students in the team situation outside the classroom. As each teaching team moved up with the same group of students for at least three years the problems of curriculum continuity that often beset experience based learning were mitigated. The building and maintenance of working relationships with the students and their families was of paramount importance. Within the TSG model, the teaching team is responsible for monitoring the social and academic progress of the students and for their welfare and discipline. This approach provides consistency and stability for the students. Students were also given power to contribute to the formulation of rules, the development of special projects, seating arrangements and decision-making generally within the team. By working with students on more than an academic level, the teaching team becomes
the school experience for the student. They provide a stable, nurturing, democratic community for the student to learn and grow in.

The student population, while predominantly middle class, encompasses lower socio-economic and migrant groups. In the first few years of the college the less formal approach to curriculum and welfare appealed to parents of ‘difficult’ children, leading to a majority of boys. Teams worked to meet the challenges of these students through a range of curricular and extracurricular strategies. Subjects like “Enrichment” provided a double period a week for groups of students to pursue a variety of activities including, for instance, journalism, study skills, kite making, sports or craft, with various teachers. This program provided the opportunity for students to develop technical skills and new areas of interest, while interacting with each other and their teachers at another level.

When I began this research project in 2000, I hoped to access the TSG teachers’ world through the team planning for an integrated curriculum (IC) trial across Year Seven teams that year at Maroon Secondary. However as time progressed, the teams developed different focuses and only one of the teams developed IC units. The other team kept a subject model, which encompassed some sharing of curriculum and allowed time to plan for other team experiences. At this realisation, I broadened the focus from curricular to encompass all aspects of team planning and the conversations shared with the teachers gave much insight into the types of interactions needed to keep teams running in a school with a range of priorities. The changes and challenges experienced by the teachers in two Year Seven teaching teams at Maroon Secondary in the year 2000 are represented in conversational interviews with the author and the
ordinary language of the TSG teachers in a social-psychological enquiry into their lived world or *Umwelten.*
CHAPTER 2 THE PSYCHO-SOCIAL WORLD OF THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

2.1 The Umwelten of the TSG Teacher

This thesis researches the academic discourses and conversational realities that may be employed to represent the teachers’ world of social interaction. The term ‘world’ will be substituted with the German word ‘Umwelten’, used by Harrè (1993), to indicate the region of the psycho-social world which is available to the teachers by virtue of their capacity to make and notice differences as it allows affords and permits, in terms of the activities of middle schooling in the study school.

Harrè (1993) suggests that the ‘Umwelten’ is the “socially meaningful physical environment in which we live” (pp 151). It consists not only of a particular Euclidian time, but the architecture and rules that make up the physical space and influence the actions of humans within the situation. The life space defines the limits of what we experience and explore in this study, and is developed by teachers through their conversations. Generally the set up of the school, whether Government, Catholic or Independent, affects the rules, expectations, architecture and era of the school and changes the Umwelten for those participating within the school. The Umwelten is a combination of the social meanings and the physical context, which allows the teachers to ‘go on’ faced with new situations as changes occur over which they only have partial control.
2.2 Education systems as a sociological conception: the traditional vs the modern

Contrasting modal views of society are used widely in sociology and educational sociology. Markova (1996), Durkeim, Weber and Tonnies conceptualise social changes in terms of the contrast of the 'traditional' and the 'modern'. Their sociological conceptions of the traditional and the modern were defined in a way to allow overlap of meanings and thus assimilation of the terms with one another. The traditional and the modern society embody very different relationships, which influence sociological change. In the traditional view of society, relations are personal, communal, primary, with strong similarity of attitudes, and an orientation to the past. In the modern view of society, relations are impersonal, bureaucratic, differentiated, open and mobile, and future changes are anticipated by society.

Tonnies (1955) first used Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft which are two German words, loosely translated to mean 'community' and 'society', to contrast a social relationship of solidarity between individuals based on affection, kinship or membership of a community such as a family, religious order or group of friends (the traditional Gemeinschaft) with one based upon the division of labour and contractual relations between isolated individuals consulting only their own self-interest (the modern Gesellschaft). Both of these concepts are used as mental constructs, and while they do not correspond to any existing society, they have been used to investigate social relationships within educational systems. The Gemeinschaft presents a traditional 'community of scholarship' idea of curriculum, concerned with building enduring relationships among teachers and students within the school, which has its roots in monastic traditions and religious discipleship. The Gesellschaft embodies an association model of curriculum that is more club like, based on less formal association of teachers and students that are more independent, equitable and
voluntary. King(1976) and Reid & Filby (1982), applied this contrast to ideal types of school societies between the German and British models in the study of the ethos of the traditional English grammar school sixth form and the emergent sixth form colleges. Traditionally, English grammar and public schools used the sixth form as an induction of middle class students into the gentry (Reid and Filby, 1982, pp 17). In contrast the sixth form colleges, or comprehensive schools, were to provide a general education for the wider public through three differing sixth form programs encompassing differing leaving ages and outcomes which were not just vocationally focussed (Reid and Filby, 1982, p.67-68). Comprehensive schools moved away from the classics and from being a preparatory university course. These schools developed programs inclusive of general student interests and the provision of ‘non academic’ subjects aimed at improving girls participation (Reid and Filby, 1982, p.153-154). The changes in the English system have taken place over the last one hundred years and the demands on the system can be likened to those that have occurred in Victoria over the last two decades.

The ‘lived world’ or Umwelten of the secondary teacher can be characterised within the social functions of these two psycho-social visions of education which are constantly reshaping secondary curriculum in Victoria. As educators it is argued that they are challenged by changing social expectations to reposition themselves in the psycho-social space between community and association, and in the process of teachers’ repositioning their Umwelten is given ‘form and meaning’.

During the 1980’s and 1990’s major reviews of the Victorian education system took place. Two of these encompassed the compulsory years of schooling (Morrow, 1992)
and the post-compulsory years of schooling (Blackburn, 1984). Relying on attendance, participation, retention and subject selection data both reports gave insight into the changing social world, employment opportunities, patterns of work and the need to provide a general ‘universal’ education for students who, because of societal changes, are becoming required to complete a form of post-compulsory education (Blackburn, 1984). Blackburn (1984) also called for a review of the middle school, in order for students to feel satisfaction and success in their school life and possibly lead to retention in the post-compulsory years of schooling. The review of the middle years of schooling (Morrow, 1992) also had at it’s core issues of motivation and students attendance, calling for programs which reflected the needs and interests of adolescents and the development of a pastoral care focus for adolescents. Both of these reviews highlighted a need for change in Secondary education beyond vocational and university preparation.

In this reformist context, Maroon Secondary College was designed and built in 1992 specifically as an alternative model to the mainstream middle school in a suburb with a rapidly expanding population. Its architecture was based on a German comprehensive TSG model, which employed small teams of teachers with the same groups of students through their middle years (7-10) of schooling. However, by 1997, the social climate had changed and the school was expected to prepare students for the traditional academic examinations of the VCE. The TSG teachers were expected, without specific direction, to prepare students in the Gemeinschaft model in the senior years. Not only were they obliged to service a different model of educational agency, but also to meet the challenge to the organisational capacity of the middle school teams imposed by a different mode of accountability. Teachers’ commitments are
divided between responsibilities to two competing modes of education namely; school structures and conceptions of teacher agency. It is the life space of the teacher in the TSG after 1997 that I seek to represent. An account of their thinking is offered, rather than a theory of the TSG. I have worked particularly to represent features of ‘our’ (I include myself in the Maroon staff here) circumstances that would otherwise go unnoticed, rather than to attempt to represent or picture a state of affairs. Two conventional elements, structure and agency, of this social representation of TSG teaching are interconnected in framing the account of the possibilities of social transformation and teachers as cultural agents.

2.3 Social representation of TSG teaching

2.3.1 Structure

Bhaskar (1978) and Markova (1996) observed that schools are social institutions, reliant upon structures, practices, conventions and the members who reproduce and transform them. The members of these social institutions are the students and the teachers and the social institution is reliant upon its members in order for it to be conceptualised by each collectively and individually, and thus to exist. Often such interdependent concepts are defined in terms of their constituent parts, but ultimately inhibit deeper understanding of either social structures or the agency of members. This study aims to analyse the conversations of the teachers engaged in producing the TSG culture in this school. It is this social structure that dictates everyday practice for the teachers and gives rise to their conversations.

The teachers’ TSG is a broad descriptor, not only of an educational model but also of its interdependent parts. Apart from setting up teaching teams and table groups, the teacher must provide particular curriculum and social situations to enact the culture of
TSG. In this way, TSG is a universal entity, a gestalt, where the resulting product of the experience of TSG far outweighs the sum of the particulars that created it. However, as a social entity, TSG is articulated through the ‘particular’. Using the conversations and experiences of the teachers the TSG is seen as an interdependent social entity, given life through teachers’ knowledge, and creating a comfortable and predictable environment for middle school students and teachers, thereby enhancing their Umwelt. The teachers’ TSG is not, and cannot be, that of the Principal.

2.3.2 Agency

Giddens’ (1993) concept of social structures as ‘rules and resources’ highlights the interface of the structures and agency that develop social institutions. Within a school situation, structure and agency shape the experiences of teachers and students alike. A teacher shows their agency and is responded to within a social context through their interactions and, in many cases, their conversational acts. In this study a teachers’ agency centres upon their lived encounters in the school and their provision of experiences for their students. A teacher’s agency can be understood only at a particular point in time. The culture these teachers are working in is implicitly understood as the TSG model. These encompass not only the specialised building structure and team ideals but also the development of students through school-based community activities like ‘Kidstuff’ (see box 4.2, chapter 4), ‘Round Table Interviews’ (see box 4.3, chapter 4) and ‘I-day’ which is a celebration of the Indonesian and Italian cultures (appendix K). The local moral order of the school, allowing teacher and student agency to be enacted, has been reliant not only on installing the TSG structure but also upon the depth of knowledge and commitment of the teachers involved at all levels of the school organisation. It is the combination of the embedded TSG culture of the school and the discursive actions/ agency of the
teachers and students that develops the educational experience as individuals perform within the social scene of the TSG at Maroon Secondary.

2.3.3 The possibilities of social transformation in education

Teachers have a major responsibility for the production and transformation of the educational environment of the school. It is their conversation and negotiation which makes the TSG/VCE a lived reality and it is their continued conversation and negotiation which shapes the experience of the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft community of learning which they are enacting, despite external pressures and increased workloads. The identities of the teachers as agents here are in a state of near constant flux, ebbing and flowing with each experience and conversation. They are a product of their own agency, striving to develop the best for themselves and their students. It is unrealistic, given these considerations, that the dialogue of teachers be isolated and interpreted without an understanding of the school and its culture, and the setting of the conversation itself. The speech is not separated from the act referred to, so that discourse analysis can allow the teachers’ lived world to be explored. What was sought was a privileged and actual understanding of the institutional conditions and responses and expectations of teachers in the distribution of duties and responsibilities that accompany institutional adjustment in schools.

2.4 Teachers as cultural agents

Teachers in this study have constructed themselves as social agents, within the ‘rules and resources’ upon which the TSG and school itself was founded. In this research I am faced with the complexity and uncertainty of agency. Teachers have often been represented as cultural heroes, authors of their own destiny (Shulman, 1986; cited in Elbaz, 1991) and life narratives (New, 1994) while sociocultural theorists such as
Foucault (1977), insist that the individual cannot be removed from the constraints of social environments to truly become independent thinkers, and thus authors of their own destiny. To separate these interdependent components of social agency seems foolhardy. However, this does not diminish the conflict and so to rescue the possibility of agency in transformative action within educational contexts requires the recognition of agency as socially constructed, and not a wholly independent concept. Contrary to post modern cynicism conceiving the possibility of intentional social transformation, this research explores a variety of conditions of possible agency, including forms of teacher knowledge leading to deliberate social transformation of educational opportunities within the TSG. There would, of course, be differing interpretations of the types of interventions teacher agency would inspire and constrain within the school. Despite this, TSG *Gesellschaft* is taken as a social representation, and indeed a culture, at Maroon Secondary which positions teachers with the agency to produce individual and personal acts allowing the TSG culture to be made and remade via the creation of personal meanings and predispositional knowledge. Predispositional knowledge acts, or habits of mind, include choosing to be part of a school which has this TSG model, accepting a place in a team and the jobs associated with working closely with a small group of students. In this way the teachers have constructed their own agency, before any classroom involvement has occurred. Once within the school situation the teachers’ agency develops to become a form of cultural agency and engagement in social change (Ratner, 2000), which the teachers are expected to control and own. The TSG here was at the outset, in 1992, an embodiment of the ‘modern’ in schooling.
2.4 Discursive co-constructions of the TSG

The premise that TSG is a real entity for the teachers within Maroon Secondary is encompassed in everything they do on a daily basis, with each new discovery and experience they articulate further their contact with their Umwelten. The teachers' Umwelten is a product of joint action and conversation. The teachers and students who are committed to communicating within the 'TSG Team' sustain the TSG society through their combined action. Not all systems of discursive practice can provide a viable human form within the social reality portrayed. Those discourses that do are: essentially truth telling, recognise the values that develop, and maintain the invented social forms. There is an acknowledgment of responsibility for actions, a distinction between what 'I' do and what merely happens. Achievement through joint action with a class or a colleague requires the recognition of, and accountability to others as equals within the construction of the discourse, thus creating opportunities within their established relationships within the TSG. The reality of the social constructions develops from the moral inconsistencies encountered within the discourse and the strategies employed by the teachers to resolve these.

The TSG model relies heavily on the teachers' commitment to work closely with students on a variety of levels. Within the TSG model students are encouraged to develop 'executive intelligence' (Dewey, 1938) over their own educational and social futures. This intelligence is developed through the interactions of the student 'table group' and the teachers. Learning in this Gesellschaft model foregrounds the social context of the contemporary experience and ideas that emerge from shared experience rather than foregrounding cognitive development through the individual transmission of culturally significant ideas of the long-dead. The Table-Group conversations we
take to be *Umwelten* centred conversations pertaining to social challenges and the understanding of important ideas appropriate to their personal identity projects. The curriculum is designed through tasks reflective of students’ social maturation and is based upon cooperative experiences that are locally derived and thus particular to the students (Garrison, 1996). As Dewey has pointed out the central challenge of any progressive *Gesellschaft* teaching is to connect their social experiences so that the ideas bear fruit in future experience.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Teacher research: Defining cooperative research in schools

I am writing as a teacher-researcher. The teacher researcher relationship has implied disadvantages including unstated ‘biases’ and undefined assumptions that pertain to workplace commitments but also advantages in terms of privileged access and insight (Anderson and Herr 1999, p.15) into the subject agency in what is effectively a longitudinal study, in this case over the five-year period of my involvement in the school. The close working relationships, which I had developed with my colleagues, permitted me to maintain personal relationships and analyse cultural projects without systematic misinterpretation.

This study concerns itself with the agency of certain Year Seven team teachers in a middle school setting, all of whom are introduced by pseudonym. The study importantly took the form of cooperative research in which those who were teaching in this environment were invited to participate in this study with a view that reflective review may benefit my colleagues and myself.

Wagner (1997) defined three types of cooperative research agreement between the researcher-practitioner (figure 3) against five commonplace dimensions of educational policy research, which I have used to characterise this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Data extraction agreement</th>
<th>Clinical partnership</th>
<th>Co-learning agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus of research</strong></td>
<td>Regarding the nature of schooling and education.</td>
<td>Developing ways that practitioners and researchers can work together to improve knowledge and practice within schools.</td>
<td>Addresses the cross over of education within schools and that of educational research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research process</strong></td>
<td>Direct, systematic inquiry, designed, conducted and reported by the researcher.</td>
<td>Systematic inquiry cooperatively designed and reported by the researcher and the practitioner.</td>
<td>Reflexive systematic inquiry, stimulated in part by ongoing collegial communication between researchers and practitioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context and stance</strong></td>
<td>Researcher is outside the school, engaged in reflection. Practitioner is within school engaged in action.</td>
<td>Researcher is outside the school, engaged in reflection. Practitioner is within school engaged in reflection and action.</td>
<td>Researchers and practitioners both participate through action and reflection in processes of education and systems of schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model of change</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge generated through research can inform educational policy and contribute to improved instruction and reform.</td>
<td>Researchers and practitioners conduct cooperative research on problems of practice to help practitioners improve their own effectiveness.</td>
<td>Drawing on knowledge gained through cooperative research, researchers and practitioners are responsible for initiating complementary changes in their own institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert roles</strong></td>
<td>Researcher as researcher; practitioner as practitioner.</td>
<td>Researcher as researcher and collaborator; practitioner as practitioner and collaborator.</td>
<td>Researcher as researcher-practitioner and practitioner as practitioner-researcher in their home institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3:** Three types of researcher-practitioner agreement. (After Wagner, 1997)
The data extraction agreement is the classical university based research paradigm, the clinical partnership agreement explores a shared clinical problem where participants have their own separate concerns and priorities, and the co-learning agreement that enacts a fusion of intentions and interests of the researcher and practitioner. The cooperative research design implemented in this study had features of each of the three types of agreements described, but is closest to a co-learning agreement.

- **Focus of research:** The research concerns the nature of teachers’ educational agency in the middle school and centres around planning and the practices in a teaching team. On this focal question the research sits in the co-learning realm where the researcher (me) and the practitioner (team teachers including myself) are collectively investigated.

- **Research process:** The research process which has been implemented lies somewhere between a data extraction agreement and a clinical partnership. A list of questions and topics were developed which would get teams to talk about their collective agency (Appendix B). The conversational interview (Coulter, 1999) was directed towards some or all of these questions. After transcription the teachers were asked to annotate, then certain points from the group interview were pursued through individual based interviews. Further annotation was sought via written feedback regarding their individual interviews. These processes contribute to the social representations of social cultural knowledge that I presented (eg Kidstuff). At all times, while people had volunteered, I was hesitant to use more than 20 minute blocks of time for interviews. This was due to the after-school nature
of the interview times and other scheduled meetings. As a result, the conversations were conducted throughout a full school year.

- Context and stance: In this dimension the research falls between a clinical partnership and a co-learning agreement. As a teacher, I have been a colleague for five years and share concerns and practices within this study. I am also the interviewer, final author, and researcher responsible, with the principals’ and staffs’ approval, to interpret and report what people say, to develop a thesis in which I have sought not to influence their responses. On one level I can easily engage my teacher persona through joint reflections in formal and informal conversations, strengthening the co-learning agreement by sharing perceptions towards a ‘fused horizon’ (Gadamer, 1975; cited in Skinner, 1985) my contribution in this scenario, if withheld, would have been conspicuous and inhibiting. However, on another level I adopt a researcher persona, particularly in capturing and encouraging personal reflections from which it is more appropriate to distance myself in a clinical partnership where ‘biases’ are assumed to be important in defining agency in both parties.

- Model of change: As a researcher I am working with practitioners to reflect upon their agency and improve their organisational capacity. However the knowledge generated was also perceived (by both myself and the subjects) to have general theoretical and professional significance in other institutions, initiating middle school teaming strategies and used in university teaching. In a co-learning agreement there are a number of parties interested in the middle school as a model
of change and the models of teacher agency that may support or diminish it. At this micro level of structure and agency it was not expected that systemic or even school-wide change would result from this study. However, it was felt by all concerned that participation in this study may inform agential choices of individuals and teams and hence the viability of the TSG model in changing times.

- Expert roles: The people with whom I was working were my colleagues and in some cases had been teaching for longer than I. As we all had our experiences and expert knowledge within this structure, it was felt that my role as researcher-practitioner and theirs as practitioners was more characteristic of a co-learning agreement.

3.2 Theory of Interpretation

When interpreting the agency of teachers in this study the classical dualism in hermeneutics (Ricouer, 1970, cited in Skinner, 1985) needs to be considered. One part of the hermeneutic tradition takes the historically constructed experience as truth itself, the other is sceptical, questioning claims made from historical experience. The conversations recorded provide the teachers autobiographical accounts of their agency in this setting. In the stories they either claim or don’t claim personal authority for various social practices, positions or rhetoric acts and include or don’t include various social episodes in their biographies. The hermeneutic theory applied here attempts to show how persons construct their own Umwelten through their conversational histories while being analytic of their discursive location in these conversations. It takes the conversation as the basic social entity (Harrè, 1993).
The analytic interpretation of the teachers’ conversations is based on the notion of discursive positioning. The concept of positioning in this social psychology is considered as a dynamic alternative to the more static concept of role (Harrè and Van Langerhove, 1999) and draws explicitly on an emergent ontology of social entities, such as the TSG itself. Social acts, including speech acts, are seen as the ‘matter’ of social reality and persons are viewed as the location for social acts and the social realm is viewed as involving three processes: conversation (the most basic substance), institutional practices and the use of societal rhetoric’s. These three processes are viewed as forms of discursive practice.

The analysis of everyday discursive action is central to this institutional study. The discursive processes that construct a dialogue between people, by their nature, lead the participants to jointly locate or position themselves. In the past, this experience in a dialogue was reduced to coding for analysis. However conversational coding separates components of the interview as individual acts rather than a joint construction of ‘truth’ through mutual speech acts. A dialogue is more than a series of words to be coded. It is an interaction that develops meanings, actions and realities of the participants involved (Harrè, 1993). The dialogue is constructed as a result of the interactions of agentive persons who have individual histories, identities and emotions (Benhabib, 1992) which agents share as a result of a particular cultural communication. In this study the interaction is through a semi-structured conversational interview. In order to give insight into these jointly constructed actions and meanings, complete passages of dialogical interactions in a social episode will be analysed using ‘positioning theory’ (Harrè & Van Langerhove, 1999).
Positioning theory allows the ethnographer to take into account the local moral order involving the distributions of duties and responsibilities (Bhaskar, 1990) and the agency (Woods, 1994; Harrè, 1993) of those involved to analyse the conversations from a realist viewpoint. Howie and Peters (1996) introduce positioning theory as a way of addressing the 'imbeddedness of culture within discursive practice'—(p. 51) or for our purpose, a way of exposing the dynamic relationship between structure and agency within Maroon Secondary. Howie and Peters (1996) develop the foundations of positioning theory as a form of social constructionist psychology based closely upon the works of Vygotsky, Wittgenstein, Bakhtin and finally Harrè and Van Langerhove. Individuals in conversation are not acting as a discrete unit, but as associates in the creation of the positioning and conversation story lines that develop (Howie and Peters, 1996 p. 59). Harrè and Van Langerhove (1999) suggest that the dialogical interactions presented in conversations embody the reality of the persons experiences, Harrè (1993) develops this argument to empower 'the person' or 'agent' within the dynamic of a conversation to expose the Umwelt. In this study and in the Gesellschaft, more generally the operating curriculum is the lived curriculum of the teachers (Leonard, 1978) as opposed to the academically rationalised curriculum. Harrè's ontology, as presented by Scott and Stam (1996), sits between those ontologies already in wide use for narrative analysis (figure 4). Harrè has extended the social constructionist ontology (see 3 in figure 4) to include the individual as an agent within the emerging social construction. It is this extension of the social constructionist ontology that enables the material and biological influences upon the agency to express the Umwelten via conversations.
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Locative System</th>
<th>Entities</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>Structural Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newtonian (1)</td>
<td>Space and time</td>
<td>Things and events</td>
<td>Causality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science (2)</td>
<td>Referential grids</td>
<td>Ideal cognitive objects</td>
<td>Powers and dispositions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Construction (3)</td>
<td>Arrays of people</td>
<td>Speech acts</td>
<td>Rules and story lines (convention)</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrê’s agentive person (4)</td>
<td>People in conversation</td>
<td>Persons (not individuals, but as agents actively constructing realities via conversations)</td>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4:** Ontological models, adapted from Scott and Stam (1996)

Linehan and McCarthy (2000) describe two types of positioning within conversations:

1. Interactive positioning, where the speech acts of one person positions others in the conversation.

2. Reflexive positioning, where one person positions and repositions themselves during the conversation.

These types of positioning can be explored through the analysis of the pronoun grammars employed in the teachers’ conversations. To make their personal positioning meaningful this analysis also encompasses the assumptions in the conversations of teachers in the workplace. For example the local moral order within the school and the teams influences the types of conversations and language/ jargon used. The local moral order encompasses the distribution of responsibilities and duties of a teacher in the teams within the TSG model, and the problematic issue of moral capacity and power in the *Gesellschaft* model, including individual obligations to their
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own development and professional practice. In this way the complexity of teacher interactions can be shown as a combination of the society and the individual.

Central to the local moral order of the Gesellschaft is the relative abandonment of hierarchy and the equality of participants in the teaching team conversations. In this model there is implicit agreement to an accountability to students expressed interests in classroom teaching. The ‘Quality of School Life’ (QSL) instrument was first developed for use in Australian secondary schools to gauge student and teacher attitudes towards the various functions of schooling (Wilson, 1987), an adapted form of this instrument was used more recently in the MYRAD (Middle years research and development) project, a large state-wide program funded by the government to focus attention on the quality of education in the middle years of schooling, and to which Maroon Secondary is a signatory. The scales used in the school based MYRAD surveys, closely link to those used in the QSL instrument and were drawn upon in shaping the interviews and their subsequent analysis. The four domains of societal expectation from the QSL instrument were used to analyse the language used by the teachers. The four domains [and organisational indicators] are:

1. The development of technical competence in tasks valued in society [certification];
2. Personal development in terms of physical, emotional and intellectual abilities [instruction];
3. Sustaining social integration of individuals and cultural groups with schools [socialisation];
4. Guide each student's sense of social responsibility for his or her actions [supervision].
The above four domains were developed by the QSL into six sub scales, two of which were general affect and relationship with teachers and the other four relating to student development; status, adventure, opportunities and identity. It is interesting that these subscales were later adapted for use in the MYRAD project and included in a scale entitled 'attitudes to school' under these subheadings: Connectedness (opportunities), Treatment (identity), Activities (adventure and opportunities), Responsibility (Status and opportunities) and Teachers (status and identity). Other scales in this survey included ‘attitudes to teaching and learning’, ‘attitudes to classroom behaviour’ and ‘attitudes to bullying’. Summary data produced by the students and teachers responses to this instrument are included in appendix C.

3.3 The research interview

Scheurich (1995), in his critique of research interviewing draws attention to the positivist misconception, after Mischler (1986) that an interview will draw the same data, regardless of who the interviewer is. He points not only to the subjectivity but also to the general controlling influence of the research interviewer and to the general misinterpretations due to this perceived controlling influence.

First he observed that the interview is not a free flowing conversation; it is usually structured, with a purpose and the interviewer is often a researcher with no previous contact with the interviewee. This sets an artificial situation and influences how the interviewee will respond to the interview.

The second area of misinterpretation identified by Scheurich, concerned the transposition and analysis of data from the interview. When the interview is
transcribed onto paper, the tone and inflections used in speech are lost. This leads to the loss of parts of the meaning of the interview. Researcher bias may also influence how the data is analysed.

Both the artificiality and bias arguments apply less convincingly to practitioner research where the researcher is committed to a co-learning agreement and the dialogical form, which, as Diamond (1992) argues, assists in embedding and embodying the accounts of the teachers. Diamond argues further that an emphasis on the use of dialogue and research collaboration grants the informants within this model authority over their accounts and allowing communication of their experiences beyond the interview. Continued collaboration has the potential to allow interactions beyond interview data to develop a shared understanding of verbal labels given by the interviewee to their working world. The presentation and analysis of data gained from a co-learning agreement strives to overcome the misconceptions and artificiality Scheurich identifies in much interview based research.

3.4 Social reality
Sheurich’s post-modern critique of the interview denies the purpose of constructing of a shared social reality. The resistant position has been refuted by Harrè who proposes that ‘the primary human reality is persons in conversation’ (Harrè, 1984, p.65), and that speech is indissoluble from action (Harrè, 1997). Harrè thus provides a tool for understanding social engagement and institutional transformation.

By ‘conversation’ in this thesis I mean, following Harrè not only speech exchange of all kinds but any flow of interactions brought about through the use of a public semiotic system, such as, among other things, physical interactions and gestures, or in
this case, team practices and structures developed in the TSG at Maroon, eg: round tables and 1-day.

The social position of the teacher, as represented by teachers’ everyday discourse, is also important for analysis, as this will indicate the position that is felt within the local moral order of the school. The influence of the team structure takes the social development of the child beyond a mere consideration of their place in the school system. Teachers consider the position of the child in relation to broader social purposes of schooling. These dimensions were elaborated in the QSL instrument and adapted for the MYRAD survey. The transcripts will by analysed through the use of “positioning theory” (figure 5) to identify the individualistic and cultural modes of teacher agency in various situations via the language that they use in everyday conversation. (Harrè & van Langenhove, 1999; Corson, 1994). To explain the triad in figure 4 in the context of the school situation; teachers have certain rights, obligations and duties (‘social forces’ in figure 5) which contribute to their position in a given situation (‘position’ in figure 5), and the ensuing dialogues which take place for these teachers both within and outside the workplace convey and construct their psychological experiences (‘storyline’ in figure 5) as a reality. In this triad the language used in teacher discourse is what gives life to the storyline while allowing insight into the role/position of the interviewee and the local moral order/s social forces affecting the situation.
Figure 5: Positioning Theory Triad (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999)

The research is an enquiry into the maintenance and transformation of agency of the Year Seven teachers in the TSG program at Maroon Secondary. At the intersection of personal intentions and social necessities the teachers construct themselves and their social realities, their Umwelten. My purpose is to access the privileged insights of my colleagues in order to describe their personal and collective agency in developing and responding to emergent structures within this TSG Gesellschaft framework of schooling. In the process of analysing the dialogue, I will be reporting my own perceptions which as openly as possible indicate any conscious or unconscious positioning that I may have taken in the construction of these complex ‘realities’.

The first interview questions were designed to locate the teacher in the research project in terms of their interests and intentions, to implement the tacit collaborative research agreement between the interviewee and interviewer. The use of the ‘critical incident’ (Woods, 1994) of team planning was used to prompt positive and negative teacher positioning in the TSG setting. It also aimed to show the dynamics and genesis of practice, not just report the successes, in order to represent the teachers’
own learning and through the research support PD (Professional Development) in other similar settings which are becoming increasingly common in middle schools.

In further considering the social structures of the study, the ‘local moral order’ in the TSG at Maroon Secondary has been incorporated into the discourse analysis. (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Corson, 1994). In many ways the TSG teams are autonomous, mini schools within a school, with moral capacity to make daily decisions that affect their own students and themselves, but slowly not about the survival of the Gesellschaft model. A focus on these structures is essential to indicating teachers’ agency in the school and their teams, in creating and maintaining the local moral order of TSG against the traditional curriculum subcultures of the academic departments in the whole school organisation (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Siskin, 1994; Woods, 2000).

3.5 Team Interview Process

Two teams were interviewed during their team meetings and asked to reflect upon the types of planning which occurred during the year. Very early in the interviews it became apparent that the teams had different focuses in their planning. These two team interviews will be presented and analysed in terms of their story line and pronoun grammars (Linehan and McCarthy 2000), before exploring the individual interviews of the team members.

The team interviews took place within a twenty-minute block during team meeting time on a Monday night after school. As a researcher I felt that I was imposing enough on the little common time all team members shared and so tried to be as succinct as possible. As a teacher I knew that this time was sacred to the workings of
the team within this model. In my role as a teacher-researcher I believe that the shared agency I had developed over four years (at the time of interviews) with my colleagues allowed frank and candid responses in the conversations, and thus privileged access to the secret stories of the teachers.

The team meetings took place in a variety of locations around the school. Perhaps the richest social representation of TSG is developed at Year Seven, and the teams interviewed, known here by their pseudonym ‘O’ and ‘H’ teams, provide different interpretations of the TSG. In the case of ‘O’ and ‘H’ teams, their team meetings usually occurred in a classroom next door to their respective team offices. In each case this classroom represented one the team used to hold meetings with students, parent teacher interviews and ‘talk time’ (see box 4.1, Chapter 4). For this reason it is often referred to by the team as their ‘team room’. This context was comfortable for the teachers as much of their work within the team was situated in these rooms while planning and most decision making occurred during the team meeting. In terms of positioning all teachers in the teams were in a ‘natural’ setting. As these meetings were the main planning times for the whole team, the conversational interviews in both cases quickly developed into discussions about the agency of teachers in planning various educational experiences for their students.

The team interviews were transcribed within two weeks of the interview and copies circulated to those involved in an effort to obtain reflective feedback during the individual interviews. Beyond the discussion points raised in the group interview (appendix B), there was very little new insight from individuals mentioned in these
interviews. More feedback was sought following the individual interviews, this time in written form (appendix J). Three of the five individual interviewees responded.

The sequence of the presentation and analysis of team and individual interviews follows the order in which the interviews were completed. Both group interviews were completed first, with team ‘O’ a week before team ‘H’. The individual interviews were completed within a month of the team interview, with the exception of Tom, whose individual interview was completed early the following year.
CHAPTER 4 TEACHING IN THE TSG *GESELLSCHAFT*

4.1 Teachers accounts of planning experiences in 2000

4.1.1 Background to team ‘O’
Team ‘O’ consists of five teachers, all of varying experience. Tracey had been associated with this team for the shortest time, as she was replacing a teacher on maternity leave, and so only comments briefly during the group interview. The other team members: Brian, Tom, Leo and Angela had all been part of the team since the beginning of the year. Leo was in his first year of teaching during the interviews, while the others are all teachers with a minimum of eight years experience.

Each teacher holds two roles within the team. The first of these is as a person with responsibility for the welfare of the child and as a role model. The second is as an expert in their learning area. Brian is a technology teacher with many years of experience in schools. Tom’s learning area is geography, which has been extended to SOSE (Studies of Society and Environment) and English while at Maroon Secondary. During his time at Maroon Secondary Tom has also been involved in developing ‘fair assessment’ across programs. Leo’s expertise lies in Music and the performing arts, while Angela is a Maths and Science teacher, who at the time of the interview was also the Maths KLA (Key Learning Area) Leader (Maths subject head). Tracey, in her replacement role, has taken on SOSE and Italian within the team. This diverse range of curriculum expertise allows those in the team to provide the majority of curriculum to their team of students, increasing the stability of the learning environment for the students.
With regard to my own agency within this interview, I had worked with Tom in our previous team the year before the interviews and had also worked closely at a faculty level with Angela for a number of years. Brian, though one of the older staff members, had a wide variety of interests and experience which permitted us to have professional and personal conversations in the past as our previous teams had shared office space for a year or so before. As Leo was in his first year of teaching we had not previously developed a working relationship.

The interview was closely aligned with the questions I had drafted (Appendix B), however this list of questions may have intimidated some team members as some declined to comment widely during the interview. The team and I were focussed on addressing as many questions as possible in the twenty-minute time frame. Since this was my first interview, some of the spontaneous comments that appear in later interviews do not surface in this interview. Despite this awkwardness, Brian and Tom managed to address the questions and expand on their concerns about the planning and programs they had developed in the early part of the year.

4.1.2 Story line: Team ‘O’ and Integrated Curriculum

Team ‘O’ identify their story line early in the group interview (appendix D) as organising planning time as a team to develop two integrated work units for their students. The conflicts between the Gesellschaft and Gemeinschaft come to the surface in the form of a middle school/ VCE comment from Tom:

(from line 27)

Tom: I think what became really obvious very early on is that we were doubly hit by the fact that not only do we have... two or three teachers teaching outside the team, but they were teaching VCE classes. As soon as you have middle years teachers
teaching in senior years, *um, they’re pretty much locked into that. We found that when we reviewed the timetable the VCE timetable was completely inflexible and locked in ...... in terms of the logistics it becomes a bit depressing when you realize that’s the priority of the school. I think it’s a good example where the philosophy of the school and the logistics of the school are not backed up, or aren’t meshing together. I think practice and policies aren’t co-ordinated.*

While this statement highlights the frustrations felt by the team in terms of their planning, it also shows a varied use of pronouns as Tom’s own experiences and agenda intertwine with those of the team. Tom positions himself as the ‘leader’ in this passage, flagging the problems he feels strongly about and explains on behalf of the team. While he begins his statement with ‘I’ signifying his personal commitment, he consistently uses ‘we’ to encompass his shared agency with the team and their frustrations. The phrase “we were doubly hit” clearly displays the feeling of embattlement this team has felt. The cause of this deeply felt frustration, or betrayal of principles, is identified as the ‘VCE Timetable’, which controls ‘our’ timetable, a distinction made by Tom that shows his feeling of disconnection from the external people ‘you’ and ‘they’ who develop the timetable. These pronouns seem to shift the responsibility of planning from those in the team to anonymous individuals elsewhere in the school community. Tom then reverts to using ‘I’ at the end of this monologue, confident that he has presented the team difficulties as a standard experience in the school, limited by the agency of those, “you” and “they”, in the administration of the school. The changing ethos of the school expressed in its policies and philosophies is also identified, and the frustration of Tom and the team in this scenario is evident. The gestures of the participants in this interview were polite, with Tom and Brian
interacting the most. During the interview two team members (Leo and Angela) were taking turns to check on detention students and so were disconnected from the interview somewhat, which was evident in their few comments. The Umwelten from this interview is negative, the social meanings of the school with it’s changing middle school philosophy and shift to VCE means that the physical structures in the school, including teachers and resources, are split between these two competing priorities. The teachers themselves are not united as a team, as they are divided in their teaching areas and priorities, and while trying to set the cover story of an innovative team, the secret story is inconsistent. This seemingly negative storyline and positioning carries through the interview, but the ability of the team to meet their goals of providing two integrated units is a triumph in light of the problems faced.

4.1.3 Story Analysis
Team ‘O’ places great importance upon all team members being involved in planning and decision-making. The interview has input from all team members, but is dominated by Tom and Brian. Tom and Brian supported each other in the conversation and other team members agreed with Tom and Brian’s sentiment. Their frustration when time cannot be organised becomes central to their feelings of working as a team. Brian is the first to describe the difficult nature of curriculum planning as a team:

(From line 17)

Brian: where we tried to sort of set out common times off and that planning just never happened, it became an impossible task.

The time and space allocated by the school to enable planning is not seen to be sufficient.
(From line 29)

Tom: ...As soon as you have middle years teachers teaching in senior years they're pretty much locked into that. We found that when we reviewed the timetable the VCE timetable was completely inflexible and locked in and we found that one VCE teacher was pretty much controlling our timetable, in terms of the logistics it becomes a bit depressing when you realize that's the priority of the school...

As a teacher in O Team, Tom taught only within the team, while he is not directly blaming the teachers in his team for the VCE timetable, his realisation that one teacher in VCE controlled the timetable seemed to automatically make VCE the enemy of TSG. The “philosophy of the school and the logistics of the school are not backed up.... I think practice and policies aren't co-ordinated.” (line 36) This statement embodies the ongoing internal struggle of Maroon Secondary, the shift from a seven to ten campus to a P-12 college over the space of 3 years still has a ripple effect as the school re-establishes its identity in a new time and space, trying to balance its curriculum delivery models. Tom positions himself in the Umwelten of the original TSG in the Gesellschaft model. He is able to verbalise frustration that the school has adopted other priorities. The ‘timetable’ is publicly accused rather than his colleagues. It is also publicly conceded that the teachers are locked into the Gemeinschaft in the senior school but there is recognition in what is not said here that the local moral order supports the VCE. Tom’s realisation that the time and space in which the German model is run is contrary to that in which the model is run at Maroon Secondary:
(From line 121)

Tom: It all comes back to the fact that we really aren't autonomous in a school which is modelled on an autonomous situation. So, we've picked the eyes out of the German model but we really haven't as successfully brought it across to our circumstances.

While Tom is not alone in his frustration, he was the most vocal in his team during this interview. His observation that the school needs to be autonomous if the structure of TSG is to be enacted in this situation can also be interpreted as a 'reminiscence' for the early years of Maroon Secondary, when it was a 7-10 campus, running a 'pure' form of TSG. During this early time of the school, teams and the school as a whole were given a great deal of latitude in units and reporting methods eg: CSF requirements were more flexible during this time, teachers had a great deal of freedom in developing units of work around teams and wider community needs, and there was little 'top-down' discipleship associated with the Gemeinschaft of the 6th form VCE structures permeating the middle school structures. During the early years of Maroon Secondary, team teachers taught subjects and students within the team and there were no extra pressures or deadlines upon teachers from the VCE. Tom's lament seems to be 'if it ain't broken, don't fix it' and in his opinion of TSG, nothing needed to change, however change was imposed and has limited the original vision and flexibility associated with the school.

Brian also supports Tom's statements throughout the interview with nods and "yes's" of agreement. Brian is a more experienced teacher who, while he sees the limitations of the situation, is realistic about the way TSG has been organised, once you work as
a team this consumes all available time. In its nature the Gesellschaft TSG model requires an extended time commitment from teachers to develop relationships beyond classroom or subject level to include social development and welfare of the students. The Gemeinschaft/VCE model also requires an extended time commitment from teachers, however this time is generally used in preparation of content and assessment of student work. While both models require an extended time commitment from teachers, the workload created in the Gemeinschaft model can be completed by the teacher as required. In contrast, the nature of teams in the Gesellschaft model requires teachers to create time to work together regularly so all have a share in the development of students in the team.

(from line 24)

Brian: It becomes an after school thing, in that once you work as a team basis here and try to have all the teachers in the team (present), it becomes an impossible task to have time off. (Author added for clarity)

This intensification of teaching in the Gemeinschaft model may also be a problem. The TSG demands that fewer teachers contact with a smaller group of students, however the nature of the growing school and the combination of professional expectations of teachers from a state and school level combine to consume teachers time, as Brian has stated above. The time issue is one that is recurrent through later interviews and the general feeling is that there is not enough time to meet all of the demands placed on teachers in this model. Creating the time to plan and act as a team falls to after school, showing a commitment from the teachers to the ideas of TSG. This after school planning was in addition to the attendance of other meetings within the school and fulfilling their student welfare role.
The sense of frustration from this dialogue conveys a negative *Unweltten* around the
teams’ efforts to get the physical time and resources to plan their ‘integrated
curriculum’. The teachers in the team extend their daily time commitments beyond
what they feel is reasonable, however they feel that this is their only option to meet
their goals for the students. The conflict of the *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* in this
situation can be clearly seen in this interview. Tom and Brian’s dissatisfaction with
the school structures that force teachers work between these two incompatible models
is the basis for the negativity of this interview. At the time the team possibly saw this
research interview as an opportunity to declare these frustrations with the local moral
order. The storyline and positions show a psychological defence against a chance that
they have not done as well as they might using integration in the pure *Gesellschaft*
model.

4.1.3 Background to Team H.
Team H also consists of five teachers, again with varying experience. During the
interviews only three of the five teachers were present for the group interview and all
of these three were followed up with individual interviews. Four of the five teachers
are experienced teachers, Bob, Kathy, Emily and Rachael. The fifth team member,
Ricardo, was a first year graduate teacher of PE and science. Bob is a Technology
teacher and at this time was the Technology KLA leader (Technology subject head).
Kathy teaches Maths and Science in the team in addition to fulfilling the role of Daily
Organiser in the school. Emily is the team’s English and SOSE teacher, while Rachael
teaches LOTE (Languages Other Than English), SOSE and is the LOTE KLA leader
(LOTE subject head). Unfortunately Bob and Kathy were not available to be
interviewed because Bob was meeting with some VCE students and Kathy, who was Daily Organiser at this time, was attending to this position.

My agency and sense of position with team ‘H’ is somewhat different to that experienced with team ‘O’. I had taught with Bob and Emily in a previous team. Bob was my mentor when I first began teaching and we taught within the same teaching team for three years. In our previous team, Bob took on the role of the father figure with some of our students; his broad range of experiences in life gives his presence a calm wisdom that was responded to by students and teachers alike. Emily had worked within our team for a term the previous year and we had developed a friendship. My experiences in teams with these two teachers had built up close, almost family like bonds, between us. Indeed, Bob had been a constant support over the first three years of my teaching experience, as had other team members, and even after the team dissolved we still created social gatherings for our past team teachers. It is unfortunate that Bob arrived at the end of the allotted interview time, as his comments and insights would have been an interesting support of the other team members. Rachael had been on staff longer than I had and, while I knew her before the interview process, I had not worked closely with her in the past. I knew her as a quiet, reserved and hardworking teacher who was the KLA leader for the Italian section of LOTE. Ricardo’s teaching load included taking a Year 10 Science class. The Gemeinschaft subject model had allowed us to build up a working relationship as I had also been developing and teaching the Year 10 science course. Ricardo was an enthusiastic member of the team and school community, which I witnessed in our joint subject area and in general school contact. His enthusiasm at being involved in this study was exemplified when he found that pseudonyms would be used in the thesis, so he chose
his own after some discussion of possibilities. It is these relationships that set the interview in a more relaxed atmosphere from the beginning. It felt very much as a chat around a series of questions, and that is how it developed.

4.1.4 Story Line: Team ‘H’- Planning in TSG

In an effort to set this interview in a positive light, this interview began with team members discussing Integrated Curriculum, rather than planning problems in the team. After this short discussion the team members revealed that they did not feel that they had planned ‘curriculum’ as a team. Instead the interview (appendix E) became a discussion of other types of planning the team had taken on over the year. Teaching for this team is disclosed as being a combination of planning for the social development, organisational skills and knowledge of students, which is beyond simply presenting the same curriculum again and again. The story line and positions in this team make determinate the unity that the three members present feel towards each other and their students:

(from line 57)

Rachael: For example, during talk time (box 4.1) we organise brain games for the students... Instead of just spending that time going through, for example, what excursions are coming up or what notes need to be passed onto students. We play a brain game with them.

Emily: It’s just team organization, isn’t it.

Ricardo: Yeah

Emily: Who’s going to meet with which parent. You know, I’ll organise this excursion if you’ll organise the next one – or we’ll organise it together. We don’t do very much cross curriculum, I mean we share curriculum but there’s not much organization, is there?
Emily uses the word ‘organisation’ to encompass the shared thinking in this team. The team does not use its time to plan cohesive curriculum in the terms that the Gesellschaft model would employ, establishing a different local moral order in this discursive action than that displayed by O team. Gestures used throughout the interview included smiles, nods of encouragement and body movements towards whomever was speaking at the time. In addition to this Emily, Rachael and Ricardo take turns to explain points throughout the interview, and support each other by contributing further examples or simply adding their agreement. A sense of shared workload, accountability and responsibility comes through both the dialogue and gesture used in their interaction.

**Box 4.1 – Talk Time**

In a TSG school team teachers have a lot of contact with their students. At Maroon Secondary there is no allocation of time for a daily home group/pastoral care session in the morning or afternoon. In lieu of this a twenty minute block of time is allocated before lunch on a Tuesday, this is known as ‘talk time’. The times for classes on Tuesdays are adjusted so that the first four periods each loose 5 minutes. All team teachers are present with the team during talk time. This time provides a weekly contact session for the team to debrief, present information about excursions, upcoming school events, present certificates, sign diaries for parent contact or read the riot act to the students.

The legal attendance roles are taken during class time by teachers on central roles during periods 1, 3 and 5.
4.1.5 Story Line Analysis
In this interview the *Umwelten* created by the team is quite positive. While they share
certain frustrations as a team, the feeling of moral authority as a team within TSG and
the school is quite pronounced through the interview. The importance of cultural
meaning within this structure is exemplified as integrated curriculum is discussed.

(from line 28)

*Rachael:* We haven't done it at all this year.

*Ricardo:* There's no intentional...

*Emily:* nah, I can't think if it's this year or last year, sometimes like English or
SOSE might cross over...

*Ricardo:* Yeah, I did a bit of PE and science crossover.

*Emily:* Yeah, you might do that, but not planned.

*Rachael:* We haven't sat down and planned.

*Ricardo:* You can see how it could probably be integrated pretty well.

The identification that the team had not used integrated models of curriculum and are
in a sense supporting the *Gemeinschaft* model of curriculum with individual teachers
teaching their own subjects and sharing where possible, allowing this interview to
explore other aspects of team work within this model. In terms of Leonard's (1978)
'rules for curriculum dialogue', the above exchange exemplifies the first and second
rules. The first rule, dealing with the "self in communion with other selves" (pg 23)
and the second rule of "the integrity of formal disciplines" (pg 23) are framed in the
exchange of H team, while such a free discussion did not occur with O team. Emily
and Ricardo are positioning themselves as subject experts in their team to give
examples of how they have both developed their learning area to support more
cohesive learning in their students (second rule), and in this exchange both Ricardo
and Emily are able to present their views (exposing the thoughts of 'self') and support each other in developing their explanation (first rule).

The focus of the next part of the interview moves from the curriculum planning side to the welfare planning within the team.

(from line 90)

Rachael: It's organising and teaching the students how to be organised, to have the right equipment and books and their time table, making sure they can read it properly.

Ricardo: And dealing with their own issues that arise.

Emily: And just making them social, kind of turning them into social animals, cause they're sometimes .... [laugh].

Rachael: You get a lot of the teasing and bullying and harassing so just trying to mediate, we're doing a lot of mediation.

Emily: Yeah, we're doing a lot of mediation.

The passage illustrates the focus this team has on transition issues of students in Year Seven. Team H members support each other in explaining that their main time goes into organising students and mediating and teachers acknowledge the shared nature of these aspects of teaching. This task takes time and effort from all team members, who have used this passage to demonstrate their open support of each other in this pursuit.

The teachers in this passage show a commitment to developing the 'whole person' and take on the role of mediator, as someone would in an industry, to negotiate solutions with students and create a 'safe' learning environment. The word choice 'mediation' is also an important aspect of language use in this conversation. The team

---

1 Safe learning environment: in this sense the development of a supportive learning environment, the mediation centred on working out bullying issues within the table group and class.
have used this word instead of 'discipline' in this situation, I feel that it develops a sense of the Gesellschaft for this team, in that there is an awareness of teachers and students working together to support students in developing tolerance for differences rather than punishment.

Other team planning has included the preparation for 'Round Table' (see box 4.2) parent teacher interviews.

(From line 114)

Emily: We struggle to get parents up here a lot of the time.

Ricardo: First semester was very successful...

Emily: We're doing round tables.

Ricardo: Yeah.

I: And they were effective..

Emily: Yeah, I love round tables.

(Group agreement)...

When the school began in 1993, it was with a view to develop a learning environment the would involve the students and their parents. The expansion of both the school and the surrounding community has made it increasingly difficult for parents to come up to the school for various reasons, including work commitments and caring for young families. Emily's statement of this in the beginning of the passage leads on
Box 4.2 – Round Tables

The ‘Round table Parent/Student/Teacher Interviews’ are an alternative format to the traditional parent/teacher interviews. Held during the regular mid semester parent/teacher interview times the first trial of this process was at Maroon Secondary in June 1997 with a Year Eight team. In this format students prepare a folio of their work from the semester, including an example of work from each KLA and may also be used to show success/challenges in other areas of school life eg: a ribbon from a sports carnival or a certificate for improvement in work etc.

The focus of the interview is taken away from the teacher simply reporting on the student’s progress to the parent. The students present their work to both the teacher (of choice) and their parent/s. They use the work they have chosen as prompts to explain particular strengths this piece developed or areas they may improve on next time.

The team structure allows the ideal situation for this style of interview as the parents need only see one teacher in the team. This teacher has copies of reports and comments from the remaining teachers of the student, which can be discussed during the 20 minute interview time. Students generally use between 10 and 15 minutes of this time to present and discuss their work and set learning goals. If necessary parents are able to have a short conference with other teachers as well.

These interviews have been found to be quite positive in terms of feedback for all three parties. As the onus is upon students to prepare their folios (help is given by teams for this), students will just as likely show areas for improvement as areas for success. Many teams have taken on and developed these interviews over the last few years. ‘H’ team is an example of one such team.
to a discussion of why first semester was more successful, through the use of the
'round table' interview process for parent teacher interviews. The team's success with
this format of communication of student achievement to parents, was not repeated in
second semester and the disappointment of the team comes through in the next
passage.

(from line 132)

Ricardo: First semester was good, second semester it fell away. There was
only about 50%, might have been a bit over 50%.

Emily: A bit more, not enough anyway, yeah.

I: That's a big drop, yeah.

Emily: It's not very good, there's still parents we haven't met, only one or two,
but, they just don't come and it's hard to get them up here. We've just got a
few coming now, 'cause we sent out "at risk" letters so,...

I: They're all panicking...

Emily: Yeah, they're all panicking and appearing so that's why we've got 2
meetings tonight, yeah. But they run well and I think they get good feedback
but getting them up here, that's the difficulty.

Here the team dialogue conveys a disappointment at the lack of support from parents.
However this does not disable the group, rather the group develops a certain
colleaguality, which is shown through their discussion and their loyalty to their
students. Teachers see reporting student progress as an important role, beyond
external accountability, developing support for the students in their learning. Emily's
assertion that they 'get good feedback' from parents once the interview has taken
place seems to steel the team to continue to try to get parents back up to the school.
Through this passage the team states that they have a few parent interviews from kids at risk of failing shows not only their frustration at this struggle to have personal contact with parents, but it also shows a positive group commitment of the teachers in the team to give their time after school and meetings to try to support the students.

The Umwelten indicated throughout this interview is that of a positive and supportive group, who feel a part of their team and school. Their frustration lies in the resistance they feel from some students and parents to their goal of educating these students.

4.2 Individual Interviews

4.2.1 Individual interview 1: Team experiences for teachers and students

Background to teacher: Emily
Emily is an English/SOSE teacher in her mid twenties. She had been teaching for five years at the time of the interview, and had spent three of those years at Maroon Secondary. Emily has had a wide experience within Maroon Secondary, including being involved in taking interschool sporting teams out to competitions, developing reading programs and teaching in three different TSG teams. Starting as a short term replacement teacher, Emily has become a part of many students’ team experience at Maroon Secondary. In her previous team experiences, Emily had worked with Year nine and ten students in already established teams. Her experience in ‘H Team’ is her first in starting with a team of Year Seven students with a view to working with them over an extended period.
Story line: Planning as a team for a team experience

In both Emily's team and individual interviews the conversation centred around her stories of organising and planning team experiences. The following two excerpts from her individual interview (appendix F) focus on the planning of the team's 'kidstuff day' (see box 4.3) activities. Her reflections on this event, and the terms she uses to describe it, are positive.

(From line 15)

Emily: ...Organisation; a lot of it happened during lunch times and some enrichment time just so that we could get the kids organized. On the actual day it worked really well, we all supervised, kind of rotated,... it was a really successful day. Our students seemed to be with us all the time. We didn't have any dramas about being disorganised and them not meeting up. We marked the roll numerous times that day just to make sure everyone was still there, as I said a lot of the planning went on at lunch time.

From the continued use of the pronoun 'we' through the above passages, Emily identifies herself as part of the team. The only point the personal pronoun 'I' is used is to restate a point about when planning took place. The rest of the narrative conveys the belonging to and ownership of the team that Emily feels. Her referral to the students as 'our students' shows the powerful connection that the teachers in the team have with their students. Emily's agency in the social world of Maroon Secondary as exemplified in this section of conversation shows her perception of the events as very much a collective experience of working together to create an organised and rewarding day for teachers and students (Linehan and McCarthy, 2000). Emily shows in this interview her commitment to creating positive team experiences for the
students in this school event. The school celebration of Kidstuff Day allows teams to show the Gesellschaft at work within the TSG, teachers and students presenting activities for the community to enjoy while building up relationships within the team. This agency was further shown in the group interview for this team.

Box 4.3 – Kidstuff day

Arts and music are an important part of any school's curriculum. At Maroon Secondary the arts and music are celebrated through an art festival day called 'kidstuff'. Kidstuff involves competitions, workshops, displays, special guests, small stalls and performances for kids to be involved in and experience. The emphasis is on participation and being part of the community.

Every year this event poses itself as an organisational nightmare, but every year the organising staff out do themselves. The logistics of having enough activities running for all teams to be contributing or participating is baffling. However each and every year the ideas and events teams come up with cover a broad spectrum of interests across the areas of art, performing arts and music. For example; teams in the past have run competitions like posters or chalk drawings, they have set up and run cake, toffee or toy stalls, or decorated and set up rooms for displays or activities like a haunted house tour, or a craft workshop, to name just a few.

Teams planning and organisation are important to support the success of the day. As there is no normal timetable, teachers need to organise supervision for their students in their team, either in team based activities or attending other workshops etc. See appendix K for reflections on ‘cultural’ activities at Maroon Secondary.
Storyline analysis
In planning for the team activities on Kidstuff Day, Emily’s discourse allows insight into the cohesion of a team within this TSG model. The *Umwelten* in this case includes the social focus of the TSG with teachers and students working together towards a common, community outcome, and the manipulation of physical time, space and resources by the team teachers in order for this team activity to take place. It was necessary for teachers to use team meetings and lunchtimes with the students to make the time available to plan. Both students and rooms were organised by teachers to make the day ‘a success’, further exemplified by the acquisition of a cd-player for the team to use from the profits of the day.

In terms of the QSL (Quality of School Life) instrument, and resultant survey information based on this from Maroon Secondary, such extra curricular activities allow students to develop leadership skills for school-based projects and encourage parent involvement in the school. The survey reports these successes in terms of increased student self esteem, positive attitudes towards school and increased attendance rates. Generally, student data from this Year seven group’s scores on the questionnaire linked to the QSL were at or above the state average, indicating that student attitudes are positive towards Maroon Secondary, and this is exemplified by their response to a statement about the school providing activities which are interesting to students where the student responses were above the state mean.

4.2.2 Individual interview 2: Reflecting on planning with a past team

**Background to teacher: Rachael**
Rachael has been teaching for nine years, seven of those have been at Maroon Secondary. As an experienced teacher of LOTE Rachael has had a variety of team and
cross team experiences. She has also been a KLA (Key Learning Area) Leader for LOTE for a number of years. Rachael began teaching at Maroon Secondary in its forming years and knew the school when it existed as a 7-10 campus. During this interview, Rachael reflects on her team planning experiences during this period. Because of her teaching area, much of Rachael’s focus is on developing and teaching Year 7-10 LOTE curriculum. However, in the year following the interview, Rachael taught the VCE Italian curriculum for the first time and this endeavour is a source of pride and professional challenge for her.

**Storyline: Planning an alternative unit with a team.**

In this interview (appendix G) Rachael reflected on her own experience of developing two Integrated Curriculum units in her first team. One of these was on ‘communication’ and ran for two weeks

(from line 17)

*Rachael: ...basically ... we ... collapsed the time table within our team...* We chose the topic because ... *we could fit into all the KLA’s and ...we planned it during our team meeting and we worked out the tasks, the rooms we were going to use, who was supervising which classes,...and we ran it for two weeks.*

It is obvious through this introductory passage that Rachael felt very involved as a part of a team in developing this experience. She had been consulted as to the relevance of the topic to her KLA and was involved the in planning of this unit. However, it seems that it was very much a team project and that while Rachael felt a part of the overall team experience, she does not feel a personal ownership and confidence in developing further IC units. The continued use of the plural pronoun
'we' positions Rachael as an active part of the team while distancing herself from total responsibility or control of the unit that was written.

Rachael has outlined some of the organisational needs of running Integrated Curriculum, and goes on to praise the team for their support and experience during this time:

(from line 27)

Rachael: The other staff who were in the team, two of them especially, they had come from teaching in primary school and were used to teaching in that approach, so they had a lot of good ideas and it was good to learn from them. That helped a lot, because probably, if I was on my own or with staff who didn't have much of an idea because we haven't been involved in it, I wouldn't have known really how to handle it or what to do.

Other team members with experience in this area were instrumental in supporting the development of these units. The presence of the primary school teachers was very important to Rachael in this situation because these teachers had experience in this type of planning and presentation. Tasks were divided amongst the teaching team and the timetable was collapsed. Team meeting time was used to plan their curriculum. This effort and support has stood out in Rachael’s mind as a valuable team experience. Her own observation that she probably would not have undertaken such a task if it were not for the support offered by the team exhibits the strengths of working in this environment.
Rachael continued her reflection on Integrated Curriculum in her written response to her interview. She has highlighted her uncertainty about Integrated Curriculum and her desire to see more work samples, so that she may increase her confidence in developing such units. She has also reflected upon her experiences of teaching across teams, where she has found that while all students have a knowledge of school rules, there is a difference in how these are enforced by the teachers in the team. This is where the ‘school within a school’ idea is realised. When teaching into another team, it is often more difficult because the students “show less respect to non-team teachers” (written response, Appendix D).

**Story line analysis**

Rachael expresses much positivity in her interview, focusing upon her successes and professional learning experiences. Despite her previous experience in an early team of planning and presenting an integrated unit of work when TSG was the only priority of the school, she still exhibits much uncertainty towards working in this manner. In her written reflection (appendix J) she expresses a desire to see more units of work to gain ideas and continue the use of such alternatives in education. She also requests that time and resources be allocated to these initiatives.

The *Umwelten* articulated during both of Rachael’s interviews is of Rachael feeling that her professional goals and understanding of TSG are being largely supported by the physical structures within Maroon Secondary as it has been in the past and is currently. For example her pursuit of teaching the VCE Italian course would not have been realised had the school structure not changed to encompass a VCE campus.

Rachael has also mentioned the team building PD provided by the school to assist the
newly formed Year Seven teams. These two separate examples give insight into the structure of the school as it begins to come to terms with its ‘competing curricula’. Though these structures are not acknowledged by everyone in these interviews, Rachael's insight highlights the challenge faced by the administration in trying to balance these conflicting models of education.

4.2.3 Individual interview 3: A First Year Teacher’s impressions of a Team

**Background to teacher: Ricardo**

Ricardo was in his first full year of teaching when these interviews took place. He taught PE and Science mostly within ‘H Team’, and to a Year ten class. He had also taken on the position of sports coordinator (inter and intra school) at the college towards the end of 2000. Schools are often overwhelming places for beginning teachers and Ricardo comments in his written response to his individual interview (appendix J) that his main concerns are to do with time for planning curriculum within a school that has so many meetings. His experience of teaching outside the team is not uncommon, though it has enabled him to highlight some difficulties of rules being enforced differently across various teams. Ricardo, while settling in well at the school and being a cheery and contributing staff member, is also realistic in his assessment of his successes and challenges in his first year of teaching and in this model.

**Story line: Learning to work as a Team**

Ricardo’s individual interview (appendix H) told a story about planning a team camp for their Year Seven team.

(from line 41)
Ricardo: *I* suppose it's the camp at the start of the year – it's always the major thing as a total team point of view, which it still ended up falling down to probably Kathy who did the most, organizing for it though we did try to divvy up each with each person getting set duties, *I* think it always works out somebody just ends up doing more work than the others, which doesn't seem fair, we did try to break up what we thought was in equal sorts of areas, we try and make sure we had money up to date, the kids permission, the whole time table worked out with the buses...

Ricardo uses two pronouns throughout his introduction to the camp story, *'I'* and *'we'*'. He freely intersperses his own opinion to support his explanation of how the team camp was organised. The extensive use of *'we'* shows his confidence as part of the teaching team and even though the work seemed to be done by one other teacher, the team also took responsibility as a group for sorting out the money and permission for the students in the team. Ricardo's use of pronoun grammar shows that he feels he is an integral part of the team and that he feels that the united teacher approach to organising a camp is effective within this whole team extra curricular activity.

While he says that most of the organising fell to another team member, he also highlights many other roles that he and other team members took on. This monitoring and support role is perhaps just as important as organising the event, with everyone pulling their own weight it is easier to work as a team. This learning experience of a first year teacher was supported further by other team members who were willing to help Ricardo with any problems he was having:
(from line 59)

Ricardo: ...I was able to get help from the others and they were able to give me advice, ... on ways to approach parents about getting money for camp — getting enthusiasm for the kids to actually go on the camp. The best thing about working in the team was just getting advice from everyone.

It is perhaps this nurturing role of the team and the understanding of the experiences of others that helps first year out teachers to take on more responsibility in future team or school activities. In Ricardo’s case he is more confident in organising activities and has shown this by taking on the role of the sport coordinator. In his second year at Maroon Secondary he has also worked closely with new graduate teachers in this capacity.

Ricardo was not only a team teacher in his first full year of teaching, he also experienced teaching PE and science in a Year Ten team. In a written response (appendix J) to this situation he found there to be great differences between the approaches used by his Year Seven Team and those used by the Year Ten Teams. These differences, he thought, were due to different strengths and commitments of the teams. It was more difficult to follow up on students when you are not situated in an office with them, and may only see the class in question once or twice a week. His observation that ‘All teams need to adhere to the same rules and procedures for this (teams in the school) to be effective’ (author added for clarity) highlights the struggle of teaching across teams, essentially the differences between teachers in different teams and their approaches to discipline.
Story line analysis

Ricardo's easy going and honest nature was displayed through both the team and individual interview. His references to the supportive nature of other team members and his ability to ask for help as he needed it give further evidence to the relaxed working environment created in this team. As a beginning teacher Ricardo has not only found his feet teaching within his team and across another year level, he has also taken on an organisational role which involves him working across the school. This move can be taken to show an eagerness to contribute and develop as part of this school community. Ricardo indicates his perception of the Umwelten through his interviews as one of support, challenge and opportunity.

Ricardo displays two frustrations in his written responses. The first pertains to the meeting structure and constant debate of the same issues 'over and over again', which he feels take time away from planning curriculum. His second concern shows the split in the priorities of the school in that different teams enforce school rules to different levels, leading to inconsistency across the TSG model in the school. If the school had remained as a pure TSG model, the sense of community may have lead to more consistent application of school rules, however with teachers spread across year levels Ricardo has experienced the break down of these structures.

4.2.4 Individual interview 4: Planning and teaching an integrated unit.

Background to teacher: Tom

Tom had been teaching for over ten years at the time of the interview, and he was one of the very early staff members at Maroon Secondary. Tom had always seen himself
as a team player and was often relied upon by staff and administration to consistently carry out disciplinary roles within his team. I had worked with Tom in a Year Ten team the year before, prior to and upon his return from long service leave, as a result he had been encompassed in our previous team’s social schedule. Trained as a geography teacher, Tom had increased his teaching methodology to include English, and in the earlier days of the school had developed much of the English curriculum. Tom had also expressed interest in continuing his studies by completing a postgraduate degree and we had conversed many times about my studies and areas of common interest. Tom is an honest teacher who asserts constantly through action and word that he is there for the good of the students. Tom has made choices within the structure of Maroon Secondary to remain as a team teacher and not take on VCE teaching roles. He identifies with the aims of the TSG model and has witnessed its development from the foundation years of the school.

Tom’s individual interview (appendix I) took place early in the year following the team interviews. Our discussion was very focussed on the differences in planning for the two integrated units the team undertook the previous year, those of ‘Life after work’ and ‘The Olympics’. The setting was at his desk, in the team office and this was a very noisy location. In retrospect, I should have insisted that we use another classroom, as I had with the other individual interviews. The time constraints were similar to all the other interviews, it was straight after school, Tom needed to leave to pick up his children from day care and school and I was late for a curriculum committee meeting. Other people in the office, having various meetings and debriefing sessions, interrupted the interview. Despite this Tom was able to present
his viewpoints on developing and challenging others to try to plan and run integrated units of work.

**Story line: Starting the year unprepared**

In comparing the units Tom’s first reference is to the structure of delivery for these two units.

*(line 16 and 24)*

*Tom:* ...*life after school we basically threw the timetable out and it was just a block of time.*

*Tom:* ...*the Olympics unit was a little bit more rigid, it was down to individual teachers delivering the content.*

Essentially, the life after school unit was the more flexible of the two, while the Olympics unit relied on individual teachers to carry out tasks under the topic of Olympics in their own classes, the life after school unit allowed:

*(from line 30)*

*Tom:* ...*three of us are standing in a classroom, working with students and they’re actually able to select what they want to study from the matrix we have provided to them, which would then go back and answer their questions.*

The passage above shows Tom’s ideal IC unit and his use of the pronoun ‘we’ implies a group effort to set up a detailed matrix for students to use and to be on hand as a group ‘us’ to tackle students queries and act as a guide. Tom’s position here is very much as the informal leader, of students and teachers in the team.
Tom’s preference is the set up for ‘life after school’ where the teachers are working with the students at the pace of the students, without the constraint of subject area.

This disparity was felt in the Olympics unit:

(from line 39)

Tom: ...they came to English for the Olympics unit, then they pretty much did what was being prescribed.

He feels that this is a loss for the kids; his idea of IC is to provide range and scope to:

(from line 47)

Tom: ...(deal) with individual differences, individual learning skills or that type of thing, which I do believe we took the time and the effort to allow for students there.

Tom’s concern as a teacher, who sees the TSG as a model which helps more students to succeed is obvious here. He sees the opportunity to provide for individual differences through curriculum initiatives like IC, and is clearly disappointed when these opportunities cannot be replicated in other areas. His commitment to the education of the students in this model shows his struggle with the changing face of the school. His joy at the use of a flexible program and access to a range of staff expertise is dampened by the realistic constraints of timetable in a 7-12 campus:

(from line 59)

Tom: ... in the purest sense you wouldn’t run VCE in the school- as soon as you need to tap into other teams for expertise, blocking the time table, whatever the case may be, as soon as you’ve got that, you are externally constricted.

Then:

(from line 65)
Tom: You almost need autonomy in that you shouldn't have someone teaching from outside the team either... as soon as you have to take in that extra consideration it locks you down so much. I mean I'm talking at the purest sense – I know logistically it has to happen, but, if you were going to do it to the best of your ability that would be the case.

When talking about the ideal situation for this type of curriculum delivery, I cannot help but feel that Tom is reminiscing about days gone by, when the school was autonomous and flexible. His statement about logistics seems to mirror his feeling of the cold hard truth about sacrifices in education, which in this case seems to be VCE vs middle school, or even growing school vs original school philosophy.

(from line 81)

Tom: You can't have staff looking at their watch going - "well I'm half way through a negotiation session, I have to go off to my VCE class", or "I've got to go off to my three periods a week of Year 7 English" when you're in a Year 8 class. So they are constraints and that really controls how greatly you are able at extend yourselves I suppose.

Staff teaching across a range of year levels is common at other schools. However in the tradition of Maroon Secondary and the German TSG model it has employed, even teaching one class outside your team cuts back on team time and contact with your team students. Within the TSG this impacts on the welfare of the students in both your own team and the team you are teaching into. Ricardo and Rachael have also highlighted the difficulties of teaching across teams.
In discussion of a team planning episode, Tom chose the planning of the ‘life after work’ unit. He felt that ‘it really highlighted the various roles a team might have with in them.’ *(Line 92)* He continued by explaining the roles taken on:

*(from line 93)*

*Tom:* ... as an initiator I probably came through with a lot of ideas, looked at developing up a matrix. Then you have other people coming along such as Jane, who is a finisher, who would dot the I’s and cross the T’s and work it through and keep getting meeting dates and putting things into place. Then we have other people like Angela and Brian and even Leo with their own particular skills coming along and putting their insight into it.

While we saw Tom as a dominant figure in the team interview, here he defines himself as the ‘initiator’ and sees himself as a person who presents things to the team and helps to get an idea started. He then encourages others in the team to contribute as they see fit. Tom points out that some teachers in the team were:

*(from line 102)*

*Tom:* ... apprehensive about it, and as we moved along – as the students got to be more comfortable with it I think a few teachers got to be more comfortable with it and letting go of the reigns, realizing that how switched on the students were becoming to it made them more comfortable and they were able to feel more comfortable about letting go of their KLA as such.

A similar uncertainty was exhibited by Rachael in her interview, but again as the programs get underway they seem to be well received by the students and this gives confidence to the teachers, there is an understanding of the greater goal of such
projects, and this results in a release of the KLA subject area. Tom attributes this uncertainty to the change in format of the program:

(from line 129)

Tom: ... day one, day two you start to think, well, I’ve never started the year so unprepared, but I think we probably finished the semester off in a real positive note.

This passage indicates that there is a learning curve for teachers as well as students, it took a semester for the benefits of the integrated approach at the beginning of the year to be felt through the entire team. Teachers are used to entering classes at the beginning of the year with a unit plan and lesson structures in mind. By changing this structure and challenging the teachers to a different approach to teaching, teachers do feel uncertain, apprehensive and unprepared. Tom explains why he thinks their approach was successful:

(from line 131)

Tom: ... The thing is I think everyone still took their own personalities and teaching styles with them and ... worked with that and I think people put their point of view across. It was really quite a ... cohesive sort of approach to it I think. It’s just tapping into who can do what best and allowing them to pick that up and go with it sometimes, but its also the other way, give these people a chance to do something they don’t normally do that well so they may be able to improve you know.

He has exposed one of the most confronting things about taking on this type of initiative, the challenge. Teachers are used to bringing their own personalities and ideas into the classroom, they have a prepared idea of how they want to present their curriculum and the outcomes they want the students to meet. This situation, where
teachers are learning new formats and processes and even just working with another teacher in the classroom, presents a great professional challenge to the agency of a teacher. Tom’s point about comfort zones and developing skills is important because as teachers we challenge students to develop such skills in each different lesson every day. The uncertainty teachers show in taking on new initiatives or trying different approaches shows the value they place on the students’ learning and, especially when the teachers set and meet these planning challenges, they show their own agency as learners.

**Storyline analysis**

Tom’s story shows the challenges faced by staff when developing an IC unit of work. It not only requires the understanding and commitment to the theoretical constructs of curriculum, but the physical space and flexibility to manifest such an initiative. While ‘O’ team was able to run two such units, the stretch on resources and the flexibility for planning time and timetable readjustment was felt throughout the team. This exemplifies the conflict upon the *Umwelten* in this scenario. On the one hand the goals and priority of the team was to set up IC units for their students and this is supported by the administration of the school whilst on the other hand the logistics and the reality of the schools’ physical structure and resources (including teachers) limits and in some cases undermines the achievement of these goals.

In the team interview, Tom seems very frustrated with the system and the demands that have been placed on the team. Given these constraints, I feel that the team has shown a great deal of success at running two such units in the face of adversity. In this individual interview, Tom gives a much more balanced view of what occurred in the planning and running of these units and, while still frustrated by the limitations of
working in this structure, is able to celebrate the teams agency in the development of their units of IC.

4.3 The secret stories of Maroon Secondary

The TSG structure at Maroon Secondary, and its interpretation by the two teams interviewed, exemplifies that even within a well defined structure there is more than one approach to education. Though H Team used a more fragmented subject based version of the Gesellschaft they represent the way the compromised TSG program will go. H team retain many aspects of shared team experiences and social ideals of the TSG and Gesellschaft models. O Team focused on developing the coherent Gesellschaft model across their curriculum in addition to social team experiences, and may represent what the school is most likely to lose. Both of these teams, though using different methods, are developing an educational experience with their students in line with the Gesellschaft and TSG models.

Through the conversations, members of both teams display their professional concerns for their interpersonal accountability. Tom wants to have his team together to plan and share the vision and the burden of this responsibility, of living up to the demands of two educational models. Team H relies on each member’s expert knowledge and, as a group they have not challenged the Gemeinschaft subject model instead they enact a curriculum structure to ease the students into the tradition required of them in the VCE. Emily, Rachael and Ricardo all emphasize the Gesellschaft in the interactions with students external to the classroom, through activities like camps and Kidstuff. The teachers in both teams define themselves and each other as TSG teachers in their many conversations. It is through the analysis of their ‘secret stories’ that we can understand the differences between the TSG
*Umwelten* of the two teams created in response to their exploration of rule and limits which they do not control and of which they may not be conscious. In the team and the individual conversations, the teachers’ agency is co-constructed in social interactions. It is through this internal accountability that the organisational capacity emerges in the TSG teams. Teachers are able to explore and expand their *Umwelten* and the TSG *Gesellschaft* is continually enriched and equips those students and staff to manage their educational futures. The final purpose is not after all to achieve understanding of this or that authenticated rule, algorithm, or concept but rather that student and teacher achieve the feeling that they can ‘move on from here’.
CHAPTER 5 STRUCTURE, AGENCY AND CULTURE

5.1 Reflections on Maroon Secondary

Maroon Secondary is a unique setting in many respects. Not only is it a young school in a rapidly growing area, it is also a living trial of the TSG Gesellschaft model of education where students and teachers develop joint responsibility for learning ‘how to move on from here’. The effect on the Umwelen of the committed teachers by the swing of the social pendulum from the architectonic association model to the traditional academic community model is palpable; like being hit by a moving object. It is not that the needs of the students or their evolved or embodied strategies for serving these needs have changed. The installation of the VCE Gemeinschaft afforded the TSG teachers a professional Umwelten that makes the exercise of their embodied skills impossible.

The teachers’ positions in the reported conversations in the previous chapter make determinate their everyday day discursive practice to each other and us. The conversations locate the person through their self positioning, the illocutionary force of their utterances and their story line help us understand the TSG Umwelten within Maroon Secondary. The discursive analysis sought to offer an account of the TSG teachers’ social agency, which they see as very different to that required of them in traditional teaching. The Umwelten of the TSG teachers in these two teams is developed through complex social interactions that are vital for the growth of the individual. In designing the lived experience of TSG for their students, and their own conversational histories, the teachers in Team’s O and H have organized themselves differently. Team O has taken a united approach in the classrooms by executing two IC units in a year and fighting for the time together to plan. Team H have left the day-
to-day curriculum to the individual teachers and concentrate on building relationships with students in whole team situations outside the regular curriculum. This approach protects disciplinary categories and is more likely to be successful in the adaptation of the *Gemeinschaft* moral order. The staff enacted the TSG differently, feeling bound by the same social construct. TSG is a social representation of the *Gesellschaft* model of social organisation, which can be understood implicitly in the teachers’ speech acts, and activities in their interactions. The TSG *Gesellschaft* is understood also through the contrast with the VCE *Gemeinschaft*. The TSG is a stable social model of schooling that is very much alive, if increasingly threatened, in the language and changed moral order of the school. Such locally constructed rituals as Kidstuff and round table interviews are dynamic phenomena used to confirm and elaborate shared meaning in the TSG, they need to be experienced to be fully understood (Markova, 1996), as does the TSG itself.

In the everyday conversations of the teams the concepts of the ‘universal’ ideal and the material ‘particular’ (Markova, 1996), so often separated and considered to be independent of each other in a social representation, can be thought of as unified. The TSG *Gesellschaft* is the ‘universal’ which is expressed and experienced through the ‘particulars’ of for example; the architectural design of the classroom, the social interactions of the team or the Kidstuff inventions. The TSG is the interdependent thought and action of staff and students at Maroon Secondary. As a consequence, the TSG *Gesellschaft* is not static, but co-developed in mutual interaction through the particulars of teachers’ knowledge.
5.2 The stories of teachers from Maroon Secondary – use of narrative research

The teachers’ stories presented in the previous chapter permit the reader to experience a snapshot of TSG teaching at Maroon Secondary during 2000. The variety of viewpoints and experiences disclosed in the narratives highlight the explorations, struggles and triumphs of teachers committed to a broader societal agenda of Gesellschaft within a school that has installed a competitive, individualistic, and academic Gemeinschaft. The school as a social institution must respond to expectations of that society, in particular of concerned parents for academic success at senior examinations. The school may have explored a senior Gesellschaft but the response time and lack of resources would have made this difficult. Perhaps if the TSG survives it’s moral order will eventually grow up to Year Twelve. In relation to such policy options, the narratives reveal some common themes. The most common is the ‘time factor’, where teachers feel that they are struggling to find time to plan a variety of educational experiences for their students. The commitment of teachers’ time to meetings and other school activities often take over time, which should be spent on planning as a team. In a Gemeinschaft model this would not be as much of a hindrance as teachers would be individually responsible for their subject area and so could plan at any time which is convenient, however in the Gesellschaft model teachers are reliant upon the presence of others for planning particular experiences (curricular and extracurricular are merged) and so are at a disadvantage when this time does not eventuate. Interestingly, despite the common hurdle of planning time, teachers are still committed to creating a range of educational experiences and opportunities (see appendix K for reflections on the range of opportunities) for their students. This can be seen as a triumph of internal accountability of organisational
capacity, and often is by students and staff members when it works. The teachers organize and create time to plan outside the school day and meeting schedules, often putting in later hours to divide roles and meet deadlines; 

_Brian:_ “It becomes an after school thing, _in that once you work as a team basis here and try to have all the teachers in the team, it becomes an impossible task to have time off.” (Line 24),

_And Emily:_ “we’ve got 2 (parent) meetings tonight” (Line 146).

Teachers working within the TSG model have additional responsibilities placed upon them. There is the normal class planning, assessment and student follow up required at all schools and the options for involvement in the wider school program. However there is also the team responsibility at Maroon Secondary where all teachers take on the role of a year level coordinator as well as the increased demands of working closely with students to develop team skills and working relationships. It is these additional demands of the democratic TSG model that leaves the ‘leaders’ feeling that to find time to plan different styles of presentation is “an impossible task” (Brian, O team interview, line 25). Within the traditional structure the local moral of the _Gemeinschaft_ model invested in the moral capacity of the Principal and the subject department heads to define the social organisation and the distinct duties and responsibilities of the teachers’ world is well understood.

A variety of tools have been used in the narrative analysis. These included the analysis of teacher _Umwelten_ using pronoun grammars (Mühlhausler & Harrè, 1990) their storylines (Phillips, 1997), and the social force of their utterances (Linehan and McCarthy, 2000). These tools have allowed the social representation of teacher’s _Umwelten_ to be anchored and globalised. The conversational interviews have
provided privileged access to the teacher professional *Umwelten*, and extend insight into the complex social construction processes the teachers invent themselves and the structures in which they act as agents for change. In the research I have sought through the conversational analysis to hold both the context and the person in focus. With this research approach I would agree with Linehan and McCarthy (2000) that the teachers’ experiences can be shared by others affected by and effecting similar changes in the social ethos and practices of schools. The interactions, and lack thereof in some cases in the group interviews enabled the development of form and meaning as the professional experiences of the teachers were shared. Despite all the teachers working in the same school environment the research shows how often the *Umwelten* of each teacher is co-constructed, dependant upon the demands of the day over which they have little control, and the people it is experienced with.

5.3 Regarding the Umwelten in narrative analysis.

The sociological constructs of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* in representing the scopes of the social reform attempted in importing the German TSG to Melbourne has supported the conversational analysis of teachers’ *Umwelten*. In most policy analyses of educational reform and theories of resistance to mandated change (Hall & Hord, 2001) the person of the teacher is reduced to role playing and the contextual detail inadequate for an understanding of the social constructive process. Considering the German foundations for TSG, the framing of analysis in terms of German educational constructs seemed to add an extra comparative dimension to the narrative analysis tool kit for this educational research.
In comparing Maroon Secondary version of TSG to that of the German version the analysis of the Umwelten, especially in Tom’s conversation, expressed his lack of power or moral capacity in defending the TSG Gesellschaft against the capacity of senior school figures in Gemeinschaft to distribute responsibilities and whole school duties creating alternative career pathways for middle school teachers at Maroon Secondary. Tom’s professional Umwelten is restricted, exemplified in his frustration at not finding team time for co-curriculum planning. Tom is publicly critical of his team members, if the choice was theirs they would deny the new social order. The other team adapts consciously or unconsciously to the Gemeinschaft model and their Umwelten changes to reconcile what is achievable within Maroon Secondary community to create meaningful learning experiences for this team. There has been no suggestion, up to 2002, that the TSG be totally abandoned by either of these teams, despite constant difficulties and frustrations of working in a school with a split institutional identity.

While the majority of teachers have had teacher education grounded in the traditional intellectual community/Gemeinschaft model, the adaptation of many teachers to Maroon Secondary model of TSG and the social association/Gesellschaft model has, on the surface, been surprisingly smooth. Perhaps this is due to the predominance of young teachers in their first appointment and the energy with which they each explored their professional Umwelten. Speaking from personal experience, the support of the team teachers in this intensive situation, and the positive self perception of many of the teachers that they ‘belong to’ the societal associations created within the TSG of Maroon Secondary have also been important in maintaining commitment. The academic columns of knowledge supporting the cultural transmission edifices of subject committees and curriculum content are the created institutions of the
Gemeinschaft model. The traditional Gemeinschaft social model reinforced and developed in the senior part of the school (Year Ten to Twelve), to serve the mystique of the sixth form rite of passage to university in England and Australia, has efficiently connected the school program directly to selection onto preferred education in universities. This reasoning does not address problems that arise in the classroom to do with establishing purpose and commitment that impact upon the quality of learning, teaching and motivation for all students or the organisational capacity of the school to respond or create a responsive learning community. A study, after Woods (1994), of the commitment and ability of particular teachers in teams at Year Seven to Nine to develop a learning community rich in social and educational opportunities and associations true to the TSG Gesellschaft would require further narrative research, as would their professional education in the TSG.
CHAPTER 6 TOWARDS A REASSESSMENT OF THE NATURE OF TEACHERS’ CULTURAL AGENCY

6.1 Academic discourse and conversational realities.

Hirst (1969), in his monumental work in the epistemological foundation to the liberal curriculum, considered the philosophical difficulties of the United Kingdom’s education system in providing a general secondary education for adolescents. His main concern was towards the grammar school system and the over specializing which occurs through subject areas, leading to the fragmentation of students’ knowledge. On the other hand he argued a general, progressive education tailored for students broader needs may lead to ‘over generalizing’ education. In Hirst’s view educational objectives are two fold, to educate the mind with sound (academic) knowledge and to educate the person in a rational (social) capacity. Despite the education being either through the academic or the social, Hirst believed that the purpose for education should be the development of cognition and the rational mind of the teacher and student, creating ‘maps of knowledge’, giving both power as agents in wider society and their culture. All schools aim to develop these ‘maps of knowledge’ for their students through organized interactions and school policies. The central contribution that emerges from this study is the light it throws on the nature of teacher and educational agency.

Teachers are not shown in the study to be passive recipients of a school’s ideals and culture, they are agents in their creation. Through their discursive action the teachers’ not only explore and develop their own Umwelten, but create or limit the explorations of these around them, teachers and students alike. The TSG teachers’ act as cultural agents for their students and society. Cultural agency is however a contested reality.
Bruner (1982) is a cultural psychologist who speaks for individualistic cultural agency, postulating that the individual negotiates their life space more or less cognitively, individually or interpersonally. He would see Tom and the others actively participating in cultural construction simply through face to face conversations.

Bruner does not consider negotiations about meanings that occur in organised groups where group processes/dynamics transcend individual behaviour (after Durkheim) or negotiations about meanings that occur in administered institutions (after Weber). Nor does he consider negotiations about meanings that arise in practical activities like education which are organised in definite roles like "middle school teaching" versus "sixth form teaching" that carry differential power, opportunities and rewards.

The assumption underlying my study is that the teachers' life spaces are negotiated through semiotic exchanges that are not restricted to interpersonal communication, primarily through dialogue. The prevailing ideals of the educational institution and climate and the 'structure of feeling' (Williams, 1968) of the time combine in the Umwelt of the teachers to limit and afford professional exploration. Ratner (2000) claims that the tenets of individualistic cultural psychology contradict the theoretical and empirical research that is currently available, and in light of my own study, concepts of teacher agency in theory and practice need to be understood to encompass the presence and influence of the society in which it is enacted. It is not sufficient to suppose that an individual is unaffected by the society, or indeed that the individual can be believed when he sings 'I did it my way' (Anka, Revaux, Francois, 1967) since in the absence of a society no action, individual or otherwise, would take place or have importance.
6.2 Points to Describe a Critique of the Individualistic Model of Teachers’ Cultural Agency.

1. The ‘unique’ actions and conversations which influence the Umwelten of the teachers at Maroon Secondary in fact are selectively constructed from the combination of Gesellschaft social ideals and practices at Maroon Secondary. Their conversations, actions and meanings are developed from their personal ideals of education and enacted insofar as the practices and philosophy of the school allows. For example O team’s IC units were enacted within the constraints of the timetable and teacher availability, staying as true to the Gesellschaft as the structures within the school would allow.

2. In other government schools the traditional Gemeinschaft model is the standard model run throughout the school. The personal meanings developed by teachers at Maroon are different to those developed in another government school. The meanings are no more or less important than those developed by teachers in other schools, they are different in that the competing structures within Maroon Secondary are more obvious because of the imposition of the Gemeinschaft curriculum in a Gesellschaft oriented school.

3. The social institution, structure and dynamics effectively become entities which influence the teachers Umwelten. The institution, structure and dynamics are not just suggestions which can be ignored
by teachers or students, they are the social constraints which dictate everyday action and discourse. In a Gemeinschaft school these constraints are controlled by a minority, often dictated by government bodies through sacred stories, and rarely negotiated with the majority, however in the Gesellschaft ideals upon which Maroon Secondary was founded, there was a commitment to consensus decision making about these structures. Once the Gemeinschaft was introduced to the senior school, the impact of the external (Board of Studies) expectations required that Maroon Secondary place VCE as a priority and removed much of this decision making power from the teaching staff. Effectively this displaced the amount of influence felt by the teachers in the creation of their life space within the school.

4. The social realities (Gemeinschaft & Gesellschaft) of Maroon Secondary cannot be diminished to meanings nor to interpersonal decisions, they are a collective and changing representation. The Umwelten of each individual teacher differs due to the contact they have with either the Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft model and their previous experience and ideas. For example Tom has clearly made choices to teach only within the team at the level of the Gesellschaft, while Rachael has embraced the opportunity of teaching a subject in the Gemeinschaft. With each of these perspectives and experiences the Gesellschaft in Maroon Secondary changes.
5. It is through challenges to social influences that individual change can occur. The Gesellschaft at Maroon Secondary was isolated for four years, when the challenge of the traditional Gemeinschaft was imposed individuals' Umwelten was required to adjust to encompass a contrasting set of educational ideals for their students. This challenge has rippled through the school, influencing consciously and unconsciously the changes in teacher practice and the institution of Maroon Secondary.

6. The changes that have and will occur at Maroon Secondary will occur via organised social groups, like the TSG Teams, rather than procedural changes in personal thinking and behaviour. Only structured groups that emerge for a social process that transcends individuals can be dubbed real social entities. Aggregate groups, or taxonomic groups, where a group is the sum of individual traits, like the typical school committee comprising representatives, the social processes are derived from individual acts rather than the individual behaviour being a function of the group organisation of roles and relationships. Within the TSG teams the quality of agency depends upon the social experience and social conditions that foster a particular Umwelten. Where social relations are democratically controlled by the majority of members, their agency is stimulated in the process of deciding important, complex issues. This is as true for the Gemeinschaft as Gesellschaft mode of schooling, however the Gemeinschaft at Maroon Secondary was imposed. A small group of
TSG teachers saw this as a powerful and external force, wresting control of social relations from the majority of people.

7. Teachers' agency is influenced by social interactions. The conversational act of the teachers is dictated by their experience within the social realm of the school. The life spaces of the teachers in O team and H team, though in the same year level, are in many ways different. Both teams enact a Gesellschaft model, but the secret stories shared show differing purposes and social responses of the teachers.

6.3 A concluding consideration of cultural agency and teachers' Umwelten

Teachers' cultural agency operates through social structures. Without socially generated language and action, agency is merely a word. Their cultural agency is given life through conversations with colleagues, clarification of ideas and tackling challenges. So too, with the structures of Maroon Secondary, teachers' cultural agency gives life to both the Gemeinschaft and the Gesellschaft in their everyday practice. The everyday conversations of the teacher display both their agency and their Umwelten. While the assumption of cultural agency empowers the language of individual teachers and provides a glimpse at the collective Umwelten, it is not an analytical tool with which to evaluate the worth of the teachers' discursive interactions in the life of the school. It may be important in shaping policy research that attends more adequately to person and context. As is shown in this research, the lived and operating world of the teachers is formed at the intersection of the daily constructive processes that are involved in the transformation and maintenance of the professional identity of teachers, and the Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft structures that frame the multiple social purposes of the school.
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Appendix A: Maroon Staff Information Package
TEACHING TEAMS

😊 All teachers belong to a team
😊 All students belong to a team
😊 Approximately 75 students per team
😊 4 to 5 teachers per team
😊 Students and teachers stay together
😊 Welfare, discipline and learning is team based
😊 Knowledge of students
😊 Personalised learning
😊 Teacher/student relationships
😊 Student centred learning
😊 Teacher/parent relationships
😊 Student/student relationships
Team Development Wheel

Stage One

Forming
Testing
Polite
Impersonal
Watchful
Guarded

Stage Two

Norming
Getting
Organized
Developing Skills
Establishing
Procedures
Giving Feedback
Confronting Issues

Stage Three

Storming
Infighting
Controlling Conflicts
Confronting People
Opting Out
Difficulties
Feeling Stuck

Stage Four

Performing
Mature Closeness
Resourceful
Flexible
Open
Effective
Close and
Supportive
TABLE GROUPS

😊Student working units

😊4 to 6 per group

😊Selected by team teachers

😊Fixed from class to class

😊Cooperative learning

😊Students support each other

😊Efficient use of teacher instruction time

😊Students act as teachers

😊Classrooms are organised around them

😊Programs are organised around them

😊Working together

😊Group tasks

😊Planning and organising

😊Common goals
TEAMS Four phases:

- forming
- norming
- storming
- performing
Team Rules

Listen, attend to the speaker

One person only in a group speaks at a time

Be your own chairperson

Give feedback if asked for it

Be aware of our physical reactions

Communicate using “I”

Questions should be “real” questions

Express own opinion

Look at the person being addressed
Dealing with Conflicts

Describe annoying behaviour, do not evaluate it

Describe behaviour-how it makes you feel

You instead of he/she

Listen to......

Find a consensus

There is no loser.
Appendix B: Drafted Interview Discussion Points

The following list of guide questions has been devised to guide discussions in the individual and group components of the interviews. Some questions are repeated in both sections for individuals to expand on the responses they may have given in the group interview. These guide questions were circulated to the teachers involved before the interview takes place.

Group Interview

★ Time allocated for team to get together to plan: common periods/ after school meetings.
★ Team dynamics: How the team was chosen?
★ How was the timetable organised?
★ How do you define integrated curriculum?
★ What does each teacher see as the purpose of using the teams and integrated curriculum?
★ What is the educational vision/ ideas of team members? (Is the teachers purpose to educate for the future? For social development? For welfare? How do they see their role?)
★ After running the integrated curriculum for 8 months are these aims/ philosophies being fulfilled?
★ Has there been a point in planning where it was difficult to accommodate a particular subject (eg PE/ science) within the curriculum? How was this overcome?
★ How has the team dealt with Parent/ Teacher interviews? Have ‘round table’ interviews been used? (This is where students present a folio of work which encompasses all KLA’s to their parents and a team teacher of choice. Parents only attend this one 15 minute interview. By the end of the interview the student comes up with 3 goals for learning in the next semester.)
Appendix C: Student and Teacher data Related to MYRAD and QSL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES TO SCHOOL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel I belong at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I enjoy being at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel good about being a student at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I want to come to school on most days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I like my teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TREATMENT**

1. Teachers at this school are friendly to me. | 3.8 3.7 | 0.9 1.0 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.1 1.2 | 3.8 3.8 | 0.9 1.0 |
2. The teachers at this school treat the students with respect. | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.8 3.7 | 0.9 1.1 |
3. My teachers respect my opinions. | 3.4 3.2 | 1.2 1.2 | 3.3 3.4 | 1.2 1.2 | 3.5 3.2 | 1.1 1.4 |
4. My teachers treat students fairly. | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.5 3.5 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.7 3.6 | 0.9 1.1 |
5. My teachers take a personal interest in me. | 3.0 3.0 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.2 2.9 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.0 3.1 | 1.1 1.1 |
6. If I have a personal problem, there is a teacher at the school I would go to for advice and help. | 3.8 3.8 | 1.3 1.4 | 3.5 3.4 | 1.1 1.2 | 3.7 3.6 | 1.1 1.2 |
7. My teachers listen to what I have to say. | 3.5 3.6 | 1.1 1.2 | 3.7 3.6 | 1.3 1.5 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.2 1.3 |
8. My teachers take a personal interest in me as a student. | 3.0 3.2 | 0.6 0.7 | 3.0 3.1 | 0.9 1.0 | 3.5 3.3 | 0.6 0.9 |

**Activities**

5. The student activities at this school offer something for everyone. | 3.8 3.8 | 0.8 0.9 | 3.9 3.8 | 1.2 1.2 | 3.7 3.7 | 0.9 1.2 |
6. I have plenty of opportunities to do things at school that interest me. | 3.7 3.8 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.1 1.2 | 3.7 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 |
7. I have the chance to do at least one thing at school that I'm very good at. | 4.2 4.2 | 0.9 1.0 | 4.2 4.3 | 1.0 1.0 | 4.3 4.1 | 0.9 1.0 |
8. There are a lot of interesting activities outside the classroom. | 3.5 3.8 | 1.2 1.2 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.5 1.5 | 3.5 3.6 | 1.1 1.2 |

**Responsibility**

4. Teachers think we can make responsible decisions about our school and our work. | 3.7 3.6 | 0.9 0.9 | 3.6 3.5 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.6 3.7 | 0.9 0.9 |
5. Students at this school are given an opportunity to participate in decision-making. | 3.7 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.8 3.6 | 0.9 1.1 |
6. Students are treated as responsible people in this school. | 3.8 3.8 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.8 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.7 3.6 | 0.9 1.1 |

**Teachers**

5. My teachers enjoy working with students. | 3.5 3.5 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.5 3.5 | 1.1 1.0 | 3.6 3.6 | 0.9 0.9 |
6. My teachers are enthusiastic about the subjects they teach. | 3.6 3.8 | 0.9 0.9 | 3.7 3.6 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.7 3.7 | 0.8 0.9 |

**SCALE A: STUDENT ATTITUDES TO SCHOOL**

**ATTITUDES TO TEACHING AND LEARNING**

Help
50. My teachers encourage me to ask for help if I'm stuck. | 3.8 3.9 | 0.9 1.0 | 3.8 3.8 | 0.9 1.1 | 3.9 3.9 | 1.0 1.0 |
51. My teachers help me when I have trouble with my work. | 3.8 3.8 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.7 3.7 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.7 3.7 | 1.1 1.1 |

Skill
52. My teachers explain things clearly to me. | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.0 |
53. My teachers understand how I learn. | 3.4 3.5 | 0.9 1.0 | 3.4 3.6 | 1.2 1.2 | 3.5 3.6 | 0.9 1.0 |

Organisation
54. My teachers are well organised and prepared. | 3.6 3.5 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.5 3.5 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.1 |
55. My teachers correct and return my work quickly. | 3.3 3.3 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.3 3.2 | 1.1 1.0 | 3.3 3.3 | 1.0 1.1 |

Interest
56. The work I do in my classes is interesting. | 3.7 3.7 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.5 3.5 | 1.1 1.0 | 3.7 3.7 | 1.0 1.0 |
57. My teachers use a variety of activities in my classes. | 3.7 3.7 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.4 3.4 | 1.1 1.0 | 3.7 3.7 | 1.0 1.0 |

Feedback
58. My teachers praise me when I do well. | 3.7 3.6 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.5 3.5 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.0 |
59. My teachers often let me know how I'm going with my work. | 3.6 3.5 | 1.0 1.1 | 3.6 3.5 | 1.0 1.0 | 3.6 3.6 | 1.0 1.0 |

Decision-making
60. My teachers let us have some say in what we do in class. | 3.3 3.5 | 1.1 1.1 | 3.2 3.2 | 1.2 1.0 | 3.4 3.5 | 1.1 1.1 |

My Work
61. I work hard in class. | 3.9 3.6 | 0.6 0.7 | 3.9 3.6 | 0.7 0.7 | 3.6 3.5 | 0.6 0.7 |
62. I do the homework that is set. | 3.8 3.8 | 0.6 0.7 | 3.9 3.6 | 0.7 0.7 | 3.6 3.5 | 0.6 0.7 |

**SCALE B: ATTITUDES TO TEACHING AND LEARNING**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATITUDES TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Students talk back to teachers in my classes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students make too much noise in my classes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students annoy teachers by misbehaving in my classes</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I get into a lot of trouble at school</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO SCALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATITUDES TO BULLYING/SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel safe at school</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am picked on by other students at this school</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is a lot of bullying at this school</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I do not bully other students</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO SCALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>St Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES TO SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel I belong at this school.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I enjoy being at my school.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel good about being a student at this school.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I want to come to school on most days.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I like my teachers.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers at this school are friendly to me.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teachers at this school treat the students with respect.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teachers don't put students down in front of other people.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers take a personal interest in me.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If I have a personal problem, there is a teacher at the school I would go to for advice and help.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My teachers listen to what I have to say.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My teachers take a personal interest in me as a student.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The student activities at this school offer something for everyone.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have plenty of opportunities to do things at school that interest me.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I have the chance to do at least one thing at school that I'm very good at.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. There are a lot of interesting activities outside the classroom.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers think we can make responsible decisions about our school and our work.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Students at this school are given an opportunity to participate in decision-making.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Students are treated as responsible people in this school.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My teachers enjoy working with students.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teachers are enthusiastic about the subjects they teach.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE A: ATTITUDES TO SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES TO TEACHING AND LEARNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My teachers encourage me to ask for help if I'm stuck.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My teachers take time to help me with my work.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My teachers explain things clearly to me.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My teachers understand how I learn.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My teachers are well organised and prepared.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My teachers correct and return my work quickly.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The work I do in my classes is interesting.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My teachers use a variety of activities in my classes.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My teachers praise me when I do well.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My teachers often let me know how I'm going with my work.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My teachers let us have some say in what we do in class.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I work hard in class.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I do the homework that is set.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE B: ATTITUDES TO TEACHING AND LEARNING</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Year 8 Mean</td>
<td>Year 8 St Dev</td>
<td>Boys Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Our Diff Sch</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATITUDES TO CLASSROOM BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Students talk back to teachers in my classes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students make too much noise in my classes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students annoy teachers by misbehaving in my classes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I get into a lot of trouble at school</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATITUDES TO BULLYING/SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. I feel safe at school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am picked on by other students at this school</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is a lot of bullying at this school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I do not bully other students</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Team O Group Interview
13-11-00

5 members present: Tracey, Brian, Angela, Leo, Tom

I: Interviewer

Setting: The interview took place at the beginning of a team meeting in an empty classroom. It took approximately 20 mins of the meeting time. There were several disruptions to the interview eg: phone calls, PA announcements, detention kids.

I: We’ll start on the first one (referring to list of guide questions each participant has) with timetabling, were there any problems at the beginning? Tracey may not know this.

Tracey: No, I’ll just listen.

Brian: Well, my knowledge of that is that basically is that where we tried to sort of set out common times off and that planning just never happened, it became an impossible task. Because people teach not just in the team but outside of the team. But even failing that they need to cover team classes anyhow.

I: It’s very hard to get people in the one place.

Brian: It becomes an after school thing, in that once you work as a team basis here and try to have all the teachers in the team, it becomes an impossible task to have time off.

Tom: I think what became really obvious very early on is that we were doubly hit by the fact that not only do we have two teachers teaching out of the team, two or three teachers teaching outside the team, but they were teaching VCE classes. As soon as you have middle years teachers teaching in senior years, um, they’re pretty much locked into that. We found that when we reviewed the timetable the VCE timetable was completely inflexible and locked in and we found that one VCE teacher was pretty much controlling our timetable, in terms of the logistics it becomes a bit depressing when you realize that’s
the priority of the school. I think it’s a good example where the philosophy of the school and the logistics of the school are not backed up, or aren’t meshing together. I think practice and policies aren’t coordinated.

I: So you pretty much had to overcome these major problems with timetables and....

Tom: If you call overcoming those problems just accepting defeat, because there were no options, we didn’t have any options at all so we could not do what we wanted to do.

I: Ok, so that put planning out then to after school, did you get any leeway for after school planning, did you get meetings off or did you pretty much just have to do it through these meetings?

Tom: It restricted it to a very short space of time, it restricted it to only part of the team being able to participate, it restricted it to outside of school hours, things like that. Informal times, because even the Monday afternoons we have it determined for us, we don’t even have that time as potential planning time. It’s all laid down here even before we sit down at 3:30.

I: Uh huh, um I suppose. Leo, do you want to put in?

Leo: No, I think they’ve wrapped it up.

I: Cool, OK, I suppose the next thing would be to see what our view of integrated curriculum is, are we coming from the same point. Because I’ve read very widely and each thing I’ve read has a slightly different view of what it actually is. SO it might be an idea to quickly go around and give a quick viewpoint each. Do you mind doing that?

Tom: The Integrated Curriculum for me is where it draws all of the, as many of the KLA areas together and wherever possible you can seek out a reinforcement of particular work you are doing with the students rather than repetition, and I think where students get an
opportunity to spend their time on learning, regardless of whether it is blocked into
English time or blocked into Science time. The fact is they’re working on a particular
focus and you know we support that somehow.

I: (Leo had left to attend to some detention students), We might go to Angela next.

Angela: Um- I’ve been a bit confused about integrated curriculum because I went to a
conference once and there was like two types mentioned: a thematic one where you have
a theme and this other approach and I really didn’t know what the other approach was
but, I don’t know, I guess my idea of it is having some major ideas and just making
strong links.

I: hmm, between the KLA’s, yeah.

Angela: Yeah, but then sometimes I think when, you know, for instance when we term
something ‘careers’ I think we are teaching to a theme and we are looking for where it
springs up in each KLA. So, I mean I haven’t done a lot of reading or research on
integrated curriculum and I would love to, and I still feel very inexperienced and not
knowing too much about it.

I: Cool. (Looks at Brian)

Brian: Well I see it more as, rather than the actual themes or whatever, it’s the concept of
integrated curriculum is to tie in together the context of the subjects into a useful sort of
way, rather than doing the Math’s and then English, whatever the whole thing is
producing a particular outcome which takes the skills and knowledge from each area of
the curriculum, that way the themes sort of simplify that. But I don’t see it as the only
way it’s going. There are other ways too, that sort of looking at the work the kids are
doing and expecting that kids could, say, use their research skills in a project they are
doing in another subject and will see it as the skills of writing are not just the English
skills, it becomes a skill of writing an answer and expressing yourself in written form, um…

I: So it's drawing on lots and lots of skills instead of a common theme…..

Brian: I think it's the idea that those skills really are skills in life that we use throughout life rather than saying 'this is the Maths', 'this is the English', should be seen as... (break for PA), that's the way I see it basically.

Tom: I think really form our experience this year, we've had a bit of both. I think our Olympics unit has probably been very thematic in that we've agreed to do the Olympics wherever possible, each person has done their own thing pretty much, it's just been a common direction, where as I think certainly the work we did in 'life after school' with the careers was probably a bit more detailed, a bit more interwoven. (agreement from Brian) We collapsed the timetable and we were there as educators giving advice to students about whatever they came up with, I think that's probably my ideal version of integrated curriculum. I think it's something that resembles what primary educators do.

I: It's more valuable for the students I suppose...

Tracey: unclear

Tom: valuable for the students and I think it's more valuable to us, It's not always easy to do. It certainly has lots of logistical challenges attached to it, we had to work really hard in term 2 to do what we did and even then it took a lot to collapse the timetable down and even then there were times when students were going back and doing their other classes, which is understandable. It all comes back to the fact that we really aren't autonomous in a school which is modeled on an autonomous situation. So, we've picked the eyes out of the German model but we really haven't as successfully brought it across to our circumstances.
I: Cool, so perhaps Tracey and then Leo, about your views of integrated curriculum; then we’ll probably finish it up because it’s about 20 mins and you can go on with your meeting.

Tracey: I think integrated curriculum has a lot of definitions and a lot of people are confused about it. It is just a very broad umbrella term people use to describe lots of things. Um, I think it’s very hard to do, I don’t think we get enough time or resources to allocate to it. So, I think it’s a great concept because a lot of students can’t make the links between subjects and it’s all segmented and we expect them to make those links, I think we just have this assumption that they make links and they don’t, so I think it’s really important. I think the school needs to define it in really…

I: Definite terms….

Tracey: Yeah- in really definite terms. I think at the moment everyone is doing their own thing at school, they’re doing great things, but no one really knows what’s happening.

I: So white team is doing something different to blue team and each integrated curriculum is different…

Tracey: Yeah. And I think it depends on what subjects you teach. If you are an English teacher and you put together an integrated curriculum it will have more of an English slant, where as if you are a science or math teacher it has more of a science or math slant, so there is always that sort of bias, cause you can see that in your sort of subject area “oh, this would link with this” but sometimes I have problems seeing how it would link with science or maths or…(agreement from Tom)

I: Yeah, you really need to have that contact to step out of that mind set I suppose.

Tracey: Yeah, it’s difficult.
I: And Leo.

Leo: My understanding of it was, regardless of everyone saying that it is not meant to be thematically presented, as a theme so to speak, but that seems to be the clearest understanding that I can gain that it’s all about. Just taking a theme and trying to find a common thread, that theme becomes a common thread through a variety of KLA’s, but I guess what we are trying to do is not divert away and still aiming to teach what was in the Year 7 curriculum at the time, whether we moved things from term 4 to term 1 so they worked, it was just like reshuffling so the things lined up with the theme. And again, with what Tracey said, I prepared an integrated curriculum while I was at University with the three methods that I did, it was quite, I mean, it’s exhausting work, but it’s much easier to do when you are a professional, so to speak, at these things. Finding the time to plan with everyone here...

I: Is just impossible...

Leo: Impossible, unbelievably impossible. For the amount of work and time that needs to go into it, it’s really difficult to find the time to plan for them.

I: Alright, well we might stop there then. I appreciate your time.
Appendix E: Team H Group Interview
20/11/00 3:15pm

3 team members present: Ricardo, Rachael & Emily.

I: There you go, it’s rolling (Ricardo had started talking about IC)

Emily: Start again.

I: What is IC to you?

Rachael: It’s say, choosing a topic like communication and then seeing how
you can integrate that into all the different KLA’s like setting up activities and
tasks that relate to a topic in the different KLA’s, or most of them.

Ricardo: So they don’t get repeated sort of thing, which we find we’ve been
doing a little bit this year, things getting copied over different KLA’s.

I: And the kids say ‘but we’ve done that in English’ or whatever.

Ricardo: yeah, hopefully IC would be to do a big section across different
subject areas on different parts of a certain part of curriculum, maybe work it
out that way.

I: Have you guys actually done any, like, IC things yet or-

Ricardo: No, not me.

Emily: ahhh....

I: I suppose you haven’t had a chance to do much planning together.

Rachael: We haven’t done it at all this year.

Ricardo: There’s no intenital...

Emily: nah, I can’t think if it’s this year or last year, sometimes like English or
SOSE might cross over...

I: and if you are teaching both-

Ricardo: Yeah, I did a bit of PE and science crossover.

Emily: Yeah, you might do that, but not planned.

Rachael: We haven’t sat down and planned.

Ricardo: You can see how it could probably be integrated pretty well.
(general Hmmm)

I: So what sorts of things do you find yourself planning as a team?

Rachael: Nothing, it's just sort of...

Emily: It's not curriculum based.

Ricardo: No, it's just all the day to day running, isn't it.

I: All this stuff (indicating documentation of an harassment issue being discussed earlier.)

Rachael: For example, during talk time we organise brain games for the students...

I: Cool.

Rachael: Instead of just spending that time going through, for example, what excursions are coming up or what notes need to be passed onto students. We play a brain game with them.

Emily: It's just team organization, isn't it.

Ricardo: Yeah

Emily: Who's going to meet with which parent. You know, I'll organise this excursion if you'll organise the next one - or we'll organise it together. We don't do very much cross curriculum, I mean we share curriculum but there's not much organization, is there?

I: We're doing this and here is what we've done, do you want to have a look?

Emily: Yeah.

I: Ok, cool, so what is the 'educational vision' of the team? So what do you kind of see as your role in teaching? Is it, um, I suppose beyond the welfare stuff, is it a mixture of different things? Being in a year 7 team it becomes very focussed I suppose, on discipline stuff.

Emily: And welfare.

Ricardo: Yeah, it's social and welfare sort of side of it, I'm finding out.

I: It's a big focus isn't it!
Rachael: It's organising and teaching the students how to be organised, to have the right equipment and books and their time table, making sure they can read it properly.

Ricardo: And dealing with their own issues that arise.

Emily: And just making them social, kind of turning them into social animals, cause they're sometimes.... {laugh}.

Rachael: You get a lot of the teasing and bullying and harassing so just trying to mediate, we're doing a lot of mediation.

Emily: Yeah, we're doing a lot of mediation.

Rachael: That kind of thing...

I: Cool, so anywhere from just the basic "you walk into class and you sit down and take out your books and don't hit the kid next to you" to big problems.

Rachael: Yeah.

I: Good, um, ok. Parent teacher interviews and stuff, how is purple team coping with those?

Emily: We struggle to get parents up here a lot of the time.

Ricardo: First semester was very successful...

Emily: We're doing round tables.

Ricardo: Yeah.

I: And they were effective..

Emily: Yeah, I love round tables.

(Group agreement)

I: I'd only ever had round tables, until this year, but that's me and I'm not being interviewed.....

{laugh}

Ricardo: First semester was good, second semester it fell away. There was only about 50%, might have been a bit over 50%.
Emily: A bit more, not enough anyway, yeah.

I: That’s a big drop, yeah.

Emily: It’s not very good, there’s still parents we haven’t met, only one or two, but um, they just don’t come and it’s hard to get them up here. We’ve just got a few coming now, ‘cause we sent out “at risk” letters so,...

I: They’re all panicking...

Emily: Yeah, they’re all panicking and appearing so that’s why we’ve got 2 meetings tonight, yeah. But they run well and I think they get good feedback but getting them up here, that’s um, the difficulty.

I: Cool, um, (Reading through the questions) a lot of them are more ‘myrady’ sort of ones...oh, nah...long pause on tape (laugh).

*End transcript here*
Appendix F: Individual Interview 1: Emily December 5th 2000

F – my first question for you is what do you want to get from this study?

E – Well, a good thing to get from this study (laugh) is some more ideas a on integrated curriculum.
I haven’t really done much of it, I have only done little bits, so maybe some more ideas on how to integrate topics from different KLA’s would be good.

F – Now do you have an individual story about team planning that you would like to share?

E- Ok. Kid stuff this year was a team based activity. It was like a whole school fete day and our team organized to have some stalls and some competitions. It worked out really well, the kids were fantastic. Organisation; a lot of it happened during lunch times and some enrichment time just so that we could get the kids organized. On the actual day it worked really well, we all supervised, kind of rotated, um, it was a really successful day. Our students seemed to be with us all the time. We didn’t have any dramas about being disorganised and them not meeting up. We marked the roll numerous times that day just to make sure everyone was still there, as I said a lot of the planning went on at lunch time.

F – That was planning with kids or planning with teachers?

E – Well kind of both. With teachers it happened in our team meetings we divided up who was going to buy what and who was going to supervise which bit and what area.

F – What was your main role?

E– Well basically, I organized the room with Rachael and set it up, I also supervised that room during the day. I was basically in that room all day, supervision of the kids. The thing that I organized the most was the cake stall. Some of the girls baked cakes and cookies and muffins at home and brought them in and I kind of organized that bit mostly. That was probably the one that needed the most because you had to go and buy the ingredients and things I went and that. Did the money, got the money from “kids stuff” and paid it back and we made a bit of a profit actually and bought a CD player, so it was pretty good. Yeah, a CD player for purple team which is good. You see I think my role is just organization and supervision on the day, and clean up. I mean it went well and we all did our part, divied up all the jobs, who was going to go buy what, the prizes and yeah it worked well it was a good day.

F – thanks Emily
Appendix G: Individual Interview: Rachael December 5th 2000

F - So first of all, what do you think you will get out of this study or will be involved in this study?

R - I think it would be good to see samples of integrated curriculum units of work. For example the unit of work Tony and Rom put together, to see that and see other samples of work, as well as getting more ideas. Because I think that if you see samples in front of you, you understand it better,

F - and it gives you ideas too-

R - yeah - and I have been involved in integrated units of work, not with purple team, but in the first team that I was in, which was blue team. That was a few years ago and we actually organized two units of work. I remember the first one we organized was on the topic of “communication”, it ran for two weeks and basically what we did was just collapsed the time table within our team, and decided that our unit would run for two weeks. We chose the topic because we thought that it was a topic we could fit into all the KLA’s and because I was teaching Italian that was the section I was focusing on and um, basically we planned it during our team meeting and we worked out the tasks, the rooms we were going to use, who was supervising which classes,

F - And assessment and that sort of stuff-

R - Yeah, and we ran it for two weeks and did an evaluation on it, but like, that was my first experience of integrated curriculum. The other staff who were in the team, two of them especially, they had come from teaching in primary school and were used to teaching in that approach, so they had a lot of good ideas and it was good to learn from them. That helped a lot, because probably, if I was on my own or with staff who didn’t have much of an idea because we haven’t been involved in it, I wouldn’t have known really how to handle it or what to do.

F - so do you have a story at team planning though you’ve just given us one – but one from this year that you would like to share.

R - probably when we organized our school camp in term one – yeah we pretty much all planned it in our team meeting time, when we all divided up our jobs, and that was the main thing – like – mmm – I can’t remember what I did.

F - was it difficult because it was the first thing you did as a team and perhaps not knowing people as well as you do now – were there any difficulties with that?

R - it wasn’t really hard because at the end of last year we had some PD – with getting to know one another in the new team, in those PD sessions at the end of last year – you know – that helped, we felt comfortable, because that was one of the first things we did at the start of the year.

F - it’s a big thing to test the waters on too.
R – yeah –

F – thanks very much Rachael.
Appendix H: Individual Interview 3: Rick December 5th 2000

F - Thank you very much for joining me today Rick.

R - Its my pleasure.

F - Basically two questions - first one what do you actually want to get from this study - or what do you think being involved in this project will give you?

R - In the project you're doing-

F - Yeah-

R - I guess its just to become more educated about IC for a start, being a first year teacher this year myself - until I sort of investigate it a bit it is sort of a strange concept - um - something that's totally new, so -

F - Kind of get thrown in at the deep end.

R - um - exactly - I was totally amused at the start of the year with what blue team were doing with IC, I thought it sounded fantastic, but didn't know much about it myself - hopefully, sort of, provide more information I could use to help my classes as well.

F - So you could do stuff with your team.

R - Yeah, like mixing up your timetable so that, like James did in a couple of our curriculum days, just mentioning how I could teach six classes of PE one week, instead of three PE and three Maths, something like that. Just ways you can break up your classes.

F - So you can get more out of the kids in one way and it's a trade off later on.

R - So you don't have to be so rigid and strict in the straight guidelines.

F - which is good I suppose - being a beginning teacher too you're not sitting there saying - oh - we heard about this in the 70's - you know - you're actually here now and think this is different, this is cool, it could help me to teach in a better way. The other thing I want from you is, basically, a story about team planning - anything you've planned as a team throughout this year, your experience - your story.

R - I suppose it's the camp at the start of the year - it's always the major thing as a total team point of view, which it still ended up falling down to probably Kerry - did the most, organizing for it though we did try to divvy up each with each person getting set duties, I think it always works out somebody just ends up doing more work than the others, which doesn't seem fair, we did try to, ah, break up what we thought was in equal sorts of areas, we try and make sure we had money up to date, the kids permission, the whole timetable worked out with the buses, um, it seems there are all simple things - I don't know if you want more, different, detailed planning that we might have done in something different.
F – Yeah – I want more of how you think it went, what you feel you contributed, whether you feel it was valuable or so more your experience.

R – Yeah – It’s through working with the team?

F – mm –

R - Definitely valuable to see, again being a first year teacher, to see how we get things done as a team, instead of being just lumped with this that you had to do – we were able to break it up and I was able to get help from the others and they were able to give me advice, um, just on ways to approach parents about getting money for camp – getting enthusiasm for the kids to actually go in the camp. The best thing about working in the team was just getting advice from everyone. Having them there beside me or on hand to answer questions and knowing what we are talking about because they are the same kids we are dealing with all the time.

F – I suppose also, if you have a problem of are not sure of something its not going to be that long till you see them again.

R – Yeah – so, a couple of times a day, it’s constantly there if I am not sure about something or to just reassure me if I’m unsure if I’m taking the correct path or something like that.

F – thanks for sharing your team experience.
Appendix I: Individual interview 4: Tom

I – Drawing on stuff we were talking about in the big interview last year- We were talking a bit about how the Olympics unit was different to the “life after school” unit, and I know it was a long time ago, could you maybe give me some information about the different styles of planning that were used, like – what were the differences that made the “life after school” one better than the “Olympics” one?

T – Ok- the life after school one wasn’t constrained by KLA, it was a consideration rather than a constraint. Um- we simply looked at some of the skills and info that they would require, within the um – (whistling and shouting in the background – request from Tom to keep down the noise-) so um-

I – KLA was more of a consideration –

T- well, yeah- only in – when life after school we basically threw the timetable out and it was just a block of time- um, we just looked at some of the skills shared and threw it into a big bag and basically said “ah well they’ll be doing this and we’ll help them work through that, however if they complete this task they will be addressing a number of different tasks, um and we’ll acknowledge that, as when we take it back as, and take a look at it in the light of the KLA – initially we’re looking at it in terms of teachers and how the students were approaching their study and things like that, um, that worked really quite well in that there was a lot of openness but it had parameters placed on the students and they quite enjoyed that in that way. Ah, the Olympics unit was a little bit more rigid, it was down to individual teachers delivering the content, guiding the students on the work, all it was, was integrated in terms we were taking into consideration that someone might do this piece of work, someone might do that piece of work. And so by the time each KLA has done their little bit they have pieced together a complete picture. I don’t see that as completely comprehensive in terms of approach to integrated curriculum. When three of us are standing in a classroom, working with students and they’re actually able to select what they want to study from the matrix we have provided to them, um, which would then go back and answer their questions- it was allowing them to be self paced, it was allowing them to be selective and it was also getting them to focus in and working them through to an understanding that knowledge and skill isn’t constrained to a particular time of the day, isn’t constrained to a particular subject and they, that can follow a pathway if they want to and so there was all that openness. I mean you had a certain degree of expertise in a room that would allow that to happen and they were following their own line of interest – where as if they came to English for the Olympics unit, then they pretty much did what was being prescribed, all it meant was, ( interruption more people in the office), we were addressing each piece of a jigsaw puzzle – and so I had six pieces, someone else had six pieces and by the end of the term everybody had put the picture together.

I – and hopefully the kids did too-

T – Exactly, and but, it was still prescriptive, it wasn’t a way of dealing with individual differences, individual learning skills or that type of thing, which I do believe we took the time and the effort to accept for students there. Some students took all day to get through half a piece of work, other students got three pieced of
work done in a day, so, that was the beauty of it, you weren’t constrained by bells and
times and things like that you just worked around that. Students were able to be more
selective.

F – Ok, very good. Um – we need to get some info from you on your view of what is
needed
in the school for the team model and team planning to be supported.

T- in the purest sense you wouldn’t run VCE in the school- as soon as you need to tap
into other teams for expertise, blocking the time table, what ever the case may be, as
soon as you’ve got that, you are externally constricted. And we found we had a
situation where the whole team was constricted by the fact that one person taught a
VCE subject and that locked out any chance of flexibility of even just teaching one
Maths unit at the same time and opening up the rooms and doing that. Ah, you need a
great degree of flexibility – you almost need autonomy in that you shouldn’t have
someone teaching from outside the team either. Because, as soon as you have to take
in that extra consideration it locks you down so much. I mean I’m talking at the purest
sense – I know logistically it has to happen, but, if you were going to do it to the best
of your ability that would be the case.

F – That would be the “Ideal” –

T – If we followed the line of the German schools when if you couldn’t deliver
something in the classroom from the team then you just didn’t deliver it. So, um – if
you didn’t have an Italian teacher in the team you wouldn’t have Italian, you know.
So that level of autonomy then works for you in that you just simply take so many
periods a week that are available and you play around with it from inside out, and you
work through and say um, this six periods on Monday will be covered by whatever. It
allows you to do your planning as a team, you are not doing it during English class, or
Maths class – I mean team time, um. I think that you just need to have that degree of
flexibility. You can’t have staff looking at their watch going – “well I’m half way
through a negotiation session, I have to go off to my VCE class”, or I’ve got to go off
to my three periods a week of year 7 English when you’re in a year 8 class. So they
are constraints and that really, um, controls how great you are able at extend
yourselves I suppose.

I – Ok – the last thing I would like from you is a team planning story. A story either
positive or negative you have about a team planning episode. Maybe a camp –
excursion or something.

T – I suppose team planning the actual unit of work, “life after school”, probably
epitomizes it. I suppose because it really highlighted the various roles a team might
have with in them. Your key team member style, as it were, um, as an initiator I
probably came through with a lot of ideas, looked at developing up a matrix. Then
you have other people coming along such as Jane, who is a finisher, who would dot
the I’s and cross the T’s and work it through and keep getting meeting dates and
putting things into place. Um, then we have other people like Angela and Brian and
even Leo with their own particular skills coming along and putting their insight into it,
um, some of the practitioner type things, um, some of them happy to follow the line
we’re doing and pick it up and rum with it. And I suppose at least they were being
supportive of it, I suppose that’s a good planning thing – it took a while to get off the
ground, I think a few people were apprehensive about it, and as we moved along – as
the students got to be more comfortable with it I think a few teachers got to be more
comfortable with it and letting go of the reigns, realizing that how switched on the
students were becoming to it made them more comfortable and they were able to feel
more comfortable about letting go of their KLA as such, knowing that eventually the
students were going to address work that would be addressing the KLA assessment
tasks anyway. And so there was reciprocity in there in that they had made an effort as
a general teacher in the classroom that eventually that a piece of work would come
down the line that would be designated that this would be the piece of work that
would meet the science KLA, for example, they understood that there was a benefit
there and they were able to pit on their energies and effort. Sitting around planning
was good fun, I think there was a challenge there to get people to pick up the ball and
run with it, because they weren’t quite sure about it they either didn’t understand what
the process meant or it wasn’t sitting comfortably with them, but after a while it did,
you’ve got to win them over with making sure that what you are trying to get across is
quite tangible and you’ve got to make your plans as tangible in their mind as possible
and the sooner they accept it, the easier you can move on to the next stage, the sooner
they have some ownership of it themselves the easier it is for them to work with the
students. So I think we worked pretty well as a team from that point of view, we,
everyone in the team embraced it, there was no-one who was resistant to it, that meant
there was a great deal of success as a result of that. Um, in terms of problems; I think
I’ve hinted at problems such as –

F – time tabling-

T – yeah, but just from our planning point of view – I don’t think anyone was
completely resistant to it, I think some people were unsure as to where it was going to
go, I think day one, day two you start to think, well, I’ve never started the year so
unprepared, but I think we probably finished the semester off in a real positive note.
The things is I think everyone still took their own personalities and teaching styles with
them and um, worked with that and I think people put their point of view across. It
was really quite a um, cohesive sort of approach to it I think. It’s just tapping into
who can do what best and allowing them to pick that up and go with it sometimes, but
its also the other way, give these people a chance to do something they don’t normally
do that well so they may be able to improve you know. If you say – this person does
this therefore we’ll keep giving them that, I think that a few people were put into
situations of doing things they don’t normally get given, or do, because it’s not their
comfort zone but sometimes it doesn’t hurt to step outside your comfort zone in order
to develop up your skills.

F – Thanks
Appendix J: Written Response to Individual Interviews

Rachael

It seems that your previous Team and Integrated Curriculum planning experiences have been positive. What sort of support do you think in necessary to promote this sort of team planning and experience?

- Understanding what integrated curriculum means.
- Looking at samples of integrated units of work to get ideas.
- PD: getting information from people who have experience in this area.
- Time to work with team members to produce integrated units of work.
- Resources.

You have also experienced teaching across teams. What are the similarities and differences you see between team approaches?

Similarities:
Teachers following basic school rules and expectations re: student management and welfare.

Differences:
Students show less respect to non-team teachers.
Some inconsistency regarding discipline and following school rules, eg: some teams are more lenient with uniform.

Rick

What sort of support do you think is needed to encourage team planning for curriculum and other activities?
Less meetings, too much time is spent at this school debating the same things over and over again. This time could be spent more productively doing the above mentioned activities.

You have experienced teaching outside your team. What are the similarities and differences you see between team approaches? How can teaching into another team be made easier?

Not an easy concept. Breaks down due to the different strengths and commitments of teams. All teams need to adhere to the same rules/ procedures for this to be effective.
Appendix K: Reflections on activities at Maroon Secondary
the spirit of Kidsuff, and organized stalls, came ahead of the organized workshops or events. Successful new events were the Doog Art Show organized by Yellow Team, the launching of her career as well as offering our own students the opportunity of working at the coal face. The Textiles workshop was great and taught quite a few of us the basics of knitting, crochet and weaving. Annie Dutt’s mat weaving interested some students in particular and they showed quite a talent for it. We also discovered that the preferred grasses grew right outside the door of B5. Having the indigenous crafts represented did much to promote understanding between our cultures. The Greek Dancing undertaken by Green Team was a tremendous success in the sense that they totally involved the Primary and Blue Team organized a variety of activities and stalls. Liaison with the Primary School was greatly improved this year thanks in George and the Primary committee did anastic job—the scarecrow competition was the highlight of the year.

and the Multi events by Purple Team. The opening of the Tjirjara Gallery featuring the work of Emily and the Multi events by Purple Team. The opening of the Tjirjara Gallery featuring the work of Emily.

On and the pencil. Lots of organisational things were better this year, like having a ‘beginning and an end’, having teachers assigned to every visitor and the students knew more about the Day and got themselves organized at the last minute. More year 12s came than ever before and having the dressup and the songs around considerably relaxed the atmosphere. There were of course, problems to overcome like how to make the place more festive looking in future: how to keep out aggressive intruders and how to make things run more smoothly on the Day. As usual, I will carry out an evaluation to try to solve these problems. I personally believe that Kidsuff is a great Day, still worth having, despite the work. One of my original ideas was that if you nurtured a passion then life and its awful challenges became a little easier to cope with, because you could immerse yourself in your passion and pass through the dark side in a more positive manner. I am not sure if this was the right approach, but I think it needs to be taught to the younger generation. The students gain a tremendous amount from the Day that is not always obvious at the time. We have improved the Day considerably, but for it to be a complete success everyone has to be involved. Those who did come were fantastic, teachers and students and I thank you all for supporting Kidsuff Day 2000, especially Conrie who helped me organize the Day. She was great!
The year 2000 has been a productive one for the LOTE department. On May the 5th, the LOTE department held its 4th annual cultural day. Once again I Day was extremely successful despite the inclement weather. On this day, students from years 5 to 7 participated in various cultural activities including:

- Dance workshops
- Mask making
- Michelangelo painting

Parents, students and teachers were all invited to be part of this day.

Heavy rain meant that the primary students were unable to walk to the secondary campus to take part in their activities. However, this did not prevent them from taking part. A quick response from the secondary campus ensured that the students could still take part in activities in their classrooms at the primary campus.

The Michelangelo painting allowed students to display their artistic skills while sitting on their backs. Students were asked to paint an Italian theme of their choice on the underside of classroom tables. Of course, most students chose to paint a gelati.

The mask making introduced Italian students to the festival of "Il Carnevale" and Indonesian students to the tradition of warding off evil spirits. Students were able to decorate their masks using coloured feathers, glitter and paint.

For the dance workshops, experts were brought in to introduce students to traditional styles of Indonesian and Italian dancing. After some initial embarrassment, students and teachers were able to dance with confidence.

At lunchtime all students were given a gelati each as a treat. Despite the bad weather and having to wait patiently in line, students still enjoyed their gelati.

All in all, I Day continued to do what it did last year. It successfully blended all things Italian and Indonesian, including their cuisine and culture. This enabled the younger members of the college to gain some first hand experience of the Indonesian and Italian way of life.

In term two, the LOTE department received a project grant from the Department of Education. The money received was put towards an LOTE Expo that was held on November 1st at the region centre. The expo involved various schools in the district displaying the LOTE learnt in their schools. Visitors were able to look at displays as well as participate in practical activities such as spice tasting. This was an opportunity to enable members of our community to witness and appreciate the value of learning a second language. The languages displayed on the day included Indonesian, Italian, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese.

Throughout the year, the LOTE department has purchased various resources to support the curriculum across all year levels. The department also held a curriculum audit to ensure that CSF II outcomes are met next year.

In 2001, the LOTE department plans to build on the success of this year's I Day and also plans to extend the work commenced in this year.

LOTE KLA TRIO
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