Interdepartmental Professional Collaborations: Barriers, Advantages, and Possibilities

Tim Murphey
Stephanie Farrell
Takako Inada

Abstract

In this article we define professional collaboration, note why it is desirable for teachers, describe some barriers to collaboration, some advantages, and some possibilities especially in our own school environment. We look briefly as some Japanese contexts and more closely at the English Language Institute's (ELI) positioning at Kanda University of International Studies (KUIS). We also report on a pilot survey that may help teachers see how collaborative they are and get them thinking about being more collaborative. We conclude with the idea that surely collaboration is not always warranted and needed, but that if we really want to be a "learning organization" (Senge, 1990), then perhaps we should consider the restructuring efforts to promote more collaboration among teachers and staff.

Describing Collaboration and Barriers and Advantages

Teachers are constantly working together or at least in close proximity, so what counts as professional collaboration? There are many similar terms: teamwork, coordination, partnering, or networking. Kesar and Lester describe some of these words in their book *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration* (2009, pp. 6-7):

Networks are not deliberately designed, do not necessarily have shared goals, and depend more on the exchange of information and ideas. Cooperative arrangements are usually more formal than networks and may involve a memorandum of agreement or other formal structure (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). They typically involve coordination in which partners share information or work on tasks together but usually do not fundamentally alter their work (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). Partnerships and collaboration involve joint goals and a reliance on each other to accomplish the goal. Collaborators try to align goals and identify a similar mission, such as student character development. They then try to work at a more fundamental level, which entails joint planning and power sharing (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). In order to be considered collaboration, it is essential that the process entail an interactive process (relationship over time) and that groups develop shared rules, norms, and structures, a task that often becomes their first work together (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Not everyone is in favor of more collaboration. Talbert and McLaughlin (2003) looked closely in their research at the fear of the community/collaborative metaphor:

In his stunning critique of the 'communitarian movement', Michael Huberman (1993) argued that strong school community most likely undermines teachers' independent artisanship by taking up time and limiting professional judgment. Through the experiences and voices of teachers in high schools we studied in the early 1990s, we argue that artisanship in teaching is influenced, for worse or better, by the character of teachers' professional community. In weak teacher communities, the most innovative teachers were demoralized by a lack

of collegial support in addressing needs of non-traditional students; in strong traditional communities, teacher artisanship was squelched or marginalized by the standardized curriculum and assessments that enforced student tracking systems. In contrast, strong collaborative teacher communities engendered artisanship in teaching—by sustaining teachers' commitment to improving practice, through dialog and collaborations around engaging students in school and content, and by sharing and inventing repertoires of effective classroom practice. (p. 325)

Turning to ethnomusicology to drive this point home, Talbert and McLaughlin note that, "individuals' success in learning to improvise depends on their participation in such communities of practice. Jazz musicians grow professionally through apprenticeship relationship and collaboration with fellow musicians… community is the context in which they create innovations of practice" (p. 342). Unavoidably there will be some dissonance when diverse individuals are attempting new things, however incorporating mistakes and less able members is part of what jazz is all about, inviting diversity and risking a lot in order to innovate.

Murphey and Sato (2005) note in the introduction to their edited volume on *Communities of Supportive Professionals* that:

[A]fter reading and editing the chapters in this volume, what we expect of an effective TLC [teacher learner community] includes not only such positive characteristics as being welcoming and open, but also conflict, doubt, and confusion. Productive TLCs face important issues, and teachers' values come into question. When people are truly open within a group, self-doubt can be a

positive result that helps them learn and change; confusion can be profitably generated and scoiocognitive conflict provoked (Murphey 1989), allowing for transformative learning (Schroeder, 2005) stemming from different perspectives, changing assumptions, and new behaviors. When discussion, argument, tolerance, and forgiveness are also working characteristics of the community, people develop and learn faster and better. (p. xv)

Thus, while collaboration is preferable it is not always easy and conflict free. Indeed, a recent PhD dissertation by Terry Nelson at Macquarie University, looking at the group project work done by groups of Korean high school teachers, concluded, among other things, that even adults benefit from being pre-trained in collaboration skills (in press). Others believe that it is indeed working through the problems, sometimes referred to as socio-cognitive conflict (Murphey 1989), that provide many of the advantages of collaboration. Research on *belongingness* also tells us that one of the greatest needs for human beings is the feeling of belonging to a group (Baumeister & Leary,1995).

Advantages

Kesar and Lester (2009) describe the many advantages of collaboration, echoing Kanter (1996) and Senge (1990) who themselves were convinced that successful organizations were ones that could stimulate collaborative activities among their participants. Kesar and Lester further insist that "These collaborative advantages are reasons that business and government have supported and will continue to support collaborations" (p. 9), especially with funding which has turned the heads of many universities in the United States.

The most important advantage cited in the literature is that collaboration creates more innovation and learning (Paulus & Nijstad, 2003; Hooker, Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). On the other hand, many studies demonstrate that "bureaucratic and hierarchical organizations reinforce the routine following of policies and procedures . . . If people are focused on routine and follow policy exclusively they will not question ineffective practices and policies or work to innovate. However, organizations that are set up in a matrix fashion …encourage more interaction, information sharing, communication, and collective problem solving [and] result in innovation and learning" (Kesar & Lester, 2009, p. 10).

Other advantages include of course increased communication, cognitive complexity (i.e. multiple perspectives on a single problem leading to enhanced solutions), and better service to, for example, students. "Service offered through siloed organizations typically involves more time to resolve a problem, sending the client to multiple locations, and often leads to incomplete or inaccurate information" (ibid. p. 12). Research also shows that collaboration is more cost effective and efficient, and it increases employee motivation, commitment and job satisfaction (ibid. p. 13). Then, there is a great amount of research that shows the advantages of shared responsibility and collaborative learning for students and how teachers collaborating create a model for students (ibid. p. 15-16). Finally, it is openly acknowledged that people do better research when collaborating and this also happens with governance and management, and operations and service in higher education (ibid. pp. 17-19). Many researchers refer to these advantages as social capital (Bourdieu, 1972) the rewards stemming from being well connected in resourceful social networks.

Japanese Contexts

Adamson (2009) investigated interdepartmental collaboration in four different higher education contexts in Nigata prefecture and found that English teaching staff were not positioned in esteemed or professional ways and thus had few opportunities to cross borders and interact with other faculty. Much of the English teaching staff being part time or contracted may have added to this. Adamson states that:

> Qualitative analysis of questionnaire and interview responses has been supported by historical documentary evidence to reveal a number of institutional and personal cognitive constraints (Heintz and Origgi, 2008) on interdisciplinary communication and collaboration. Data from both faculties across the cases verifies Hofstede's (1990) stereotypes of Asian educational establishments' rigid hierarchical and disciplinary boundaries and Japanese teachers' reticence to engage in interdisciplinary collaboration unless institutionally required (Takagi, 2002).

Murphey, Okada, Iijima, and Asaoka (2008) at a university in Saitama stress the importance of three areas: architecture in gathering people together, having publications available for part-timers and full-timers to write for, and groups that can create and adapt curriculum collaboratively.

Architecture can create opportunities or barriers to collaboration by how much it encourages people to meet by chance and talk with other teachers they may otherwise have little contact with. At KUIS, there is the Balcone 2nd floor restaurant specifically for teachers to meet and socialize. Other than that, teachers with offices in different buildings may rarely see teachers who have offices in other buildings,

depending on chance meetings in the hallway or at the mailbox, which all too often consist only of the acknowledging nod. Indeed, the architecture of most educational institutions worldwide have a kind of egg carton feel about them in that classes and teachers have their own areas and offices and do not seem to mingle enough. Urban architects need more mixing and meeting mentality in their designs.

Publishing opportunities often occur by chance, but the less we meet others the less we know about what their primary interests are and how we might collaborate with them. At KUIS, the ELI has done a good job posting their teachers' interests on The Teacher Development Network website so that others know about their background and interests. The rest of the university could easily follow their lead and it would boost collaborative possibilities.

Curriculum innovations are a great place for teachers to begin collaborating (see also Murphey & Sato 2005). While some people seem to have to wait forever for their own schools to change courses, many teachers move ahead by collaborating with teachers in other universities, part-time teachers, or even teachers from abroad on the internet, matching up their students to do research and practice their language skills. We are also aware that Kanda is involved with several collaborations with other schools near and far, but most teachers know little of these programs or how they might take advantage of them for their research and activities. Collaboration especially with neighboring schools in which our students might do teaching internships seem especially inviting.

The English Language Institute (ELI) at Kanda (KUIS)

Whereas Adamson (2009, see above) in his article laments the poor state of

inclusion and collaboration among most of the EFL staff in four institutions in Nigata, at Kanda University of International Studies (KUIS), the ELI seems to have enviable status and many teachers in other faculties probably wish they could participate more with them in many ways. Stillwell (2008) and Stillwell and Murphey (forthcoming) describe collaborative professional development as the process in which teachers help one another improve their craft. They write, "In collaborative professional development through practices as uncomplicated as casual conversations with colleagues, teachers tap into what Cosh (1999) refers to as a valuable and free resource in their midst – other teachers."

In his earlier research, Stillwell (2008) investigated the state of professional development incentives in the ELI at KUIS with 40 ELI teachers. Data was compiled through questionnaires and informal interviews, in which teachers were asked about their views on professional development.

Research results revealed that the ELI has evolved tremendously within the last four years, developing many professional development incentives for teachers. Stillwell and Murphey identified five factors which helped to foster an environment encouraging collaboration. The factors are: 1) individual autonomy, 2) administrative support, 3) models, 4) structure, and 5) awareness and convenience.

Individual Autonomy

While Peake and Fraser (2004) posited that professional development ought to be completely voluntary and self-directed, Stillwell's (2008) survey results indicated that respondents were divided on the matter. Some commented that professional development need not be completely voluntary – an external source of

encouragement was sometimes helpful. One respondent wrote, "Sometimes a slight kick in the ass is useful and motivating…The trick is finding the balance."

Administrative Support

Survey results indicated that 75% of the participants agreed that professional development required support from management. Many stated that administrative endorsement helped to instill a sense that professional development was key to becoming a better teacher. According to Stillwell and Murphey, the ELI administration has worked in many ways to show support. It calls meetings regularly, where teachers can be informed of each other's work, as well as administrative matters. The administration also funds the Research Institute for Language Studies (RILS) research. Furthermore, the submission of portfolios gives teachers an opportunity for communication with the administration about their practice.

Models

Stillwell and Murphey (forthcoming) note, "History and psychological research show that as a species we are prolific modelers of our peers, sometimes for our good (Piaget, 1962) and sometimes to our detriment (Lorenz, 1967; Zimbardo, 2008)." People tend to unconsciously imitate those around them. In the ELI, teachers work in close proximity, and are highly visible. Being around positive people who take professional development seriously generally has a positive impact on the individual.

Structure

Stillwell and Murphey note that structure in various ELI professional development initiatives has contributed to their success. In the mentor development program, teachers work in teams of three. Stillwell and Murphey assert that, "all parties gain

deeper understanding of the challenges involved with giving feedback, and develop greater self-awareness with regard to their own skill at sharing and receiving it." Participants in the survey responded favorably to the peer observation circle.

Another PD activity is the reading discussion, open to any teacher who is interested. Teachers meet every two weeks to talk about select literature on pedagogy/SLA. Stillwell and Murphey reflect, "Consistent techniques for managing and facilitating discussion emerged. . . , such as patterns for getting started, promoting participation, and building rapport and camaraderie (particularly through running jokes), as well as stimulating discussion by challenging the authors, turning ideas on their heads, and adapting the ideas to the KUIS context." This structure creates a comfortable and secure atmosphere for the participants.

Awareness and Convenience

Stillwell and Murphey maintain that "the degree to which any of these initiatives [for collaborative PD] thrives is at least partly dependent on the degree to which ELI members are aware that they exist." The survey results show that the majority (95%) of the respondents preferred to learn about professional development opportunities through email.

The survey also addressed another factor, convenience, necessary for professional development. Respondents indicated that whether or not they would consult professional development books depended on their general accessibility and convenience of location. Currently, there are approximately 60 teachers and learning advisors in the ELI. Stillwell (2008) writes, "As the ELI grows, it can become easier for new members to disappear in the crowd, with opportunities to learn from one

another missed" (p. 247). To support collaboration amongst teachers, the ELI has set up the *Teacher Development Network* on a server in which teachers can identify colleagues with similar pedagogical interests and expertise. In this way, teachers are able to exchange ideas, or embark on collaborative research.

Stillwell and Murphey recognize that teachers may feel too overwhelmed by their immediate work to participate in various professional development initiatives. Nevertheless, they raise a valid point when they observe, "Ideal professional development offerings will make teachers' lives easier, showing them new ways to conduct their classes effectively and avail themselves of existing resources, in terms of the school's offerings, the potential collaboration and support of colleagues, and even useful resources on the internet."

Stillwell (2008) and Stillwell and Murphey's research affirms that the ELI is dedicated to helping practitioners become better teachers through collaborative professional development. A co-author of this article, Farrell, an ELI teacher in her second year, has had many opportunities to engage in collaborative professional development activities. She admits that due to time constraint and her sense of priorities, she has not taken advantage of all that is offered at the ELI --- in fact, it is *impossible* to take advantage of *all* that is offered. Nevertheless she has been pleased with the professional development activities she has been involved in, and believes that she has already grown in this capacity.

In terms of *autonomy,* like many of the respondents in the survey, Farrell believes that professional development need not necessarily be self-initiated. That said, it is important for teachers to participate reflectively in the personal development

activities, whoever the initiator may be. Merely going through the motions will not improve their craft. Farrell appreciates the fact that there are so many opportunities for collaborative professional development, and that most are optional. One does not have to be part of the reading circle or the peer observation program, if he/she does not wish it. Giving freedom of choice is a sign of the ELI's respect for its teachers.

Another factor mentioned in the research for successful professional development was *convenience.* Sharing offices makes it convenient for ELI teachers to discuss teaching matters with each other in a secure environment. The selection of officemates is done informally by the teachers themselves, which is meant to create a healthy office atmosphere (though sometimes it doesn't work out well). While they may be from different departments (i.e., English, International Communication, International Languages and Culture), being in the same physical space allows for collaborative professional development. Having an office to oneself has its perks as well (e.g., little distraction); on the other hand, this limits interaction with others.

In Stillwell and Murphey's research, email was mentioned as a tool for making communication easier for teachers. Informal and spontaneous collaboration amongst teachers takes place frequently in the guise of email correspondence. It is common for teachers to send out new lesson ideas to others in charge of similar classes.

One ELI teacher's message to his colleagues reads:

> *Dear warriors of writing,*
> *I came up with the attached [lesson] last week. Feel free to use, abuse (modify to suit your needs, improve upon, and/or harass me for the depths of my stupidity), or refuse.*

The following is another example where three teachers corresponded with each other about a lesson idea and co-construct expertise:

Teacher A: *Hi all. Here's a warm-up activity that I want to use in my writing class eventually. I didn't come up with it, but it sounds like fun so I thought I'd share it with you all. I guess the more creative students get with their sentences, the more interesting the stories will be! Have a good day.*

-Have students get together in groups of about 4-5 each. They will each get out a sheet of paper (and pen).
-When the teacher says "Go", have students write a sentence (or more) for the opening of the story.
-After about 2 minutes, the teacher says "Stop"... then have the students hand their sheets to the person sitting next to them.
-When the teacher says "Go" again, have students write sentences to build on the story that was begun.
-After about 2 minutes, the teacher says "Stop"... have the students hand their sheets to the person sitting next to them.
-The teacher says "Go" and the students start writing again to build on the story....
-Etc.

-The cycle continues until group members have contributed (written) on everyone else's paper.
-After that, have the Ss share with the group the stories they came up with. Then finally, the groups can nominate one of their stories to share with the entire

class.

Teacher B: *Hi , Thanks for sending out your great idea.*

Teacher A: *Hi again, Last week, I said I was going to try a "warm-up activity" for my writing class, where they would write stories bit by bit by passing around their sheets. I experimented, and here are my findings:*
- 2 minutes was way too short! I think I was giving them about 5-10 minutes for each round (I have a freshman class).
- This "warm-up" turned into a more major activity as well... I brought in markers and huge sheets... students are now going to illustrate the "best story" (which they chose)... and will present next week. I also collected these "best stories" and am going to proofread them.
- Most importantly, it seems that students were getting into it and enjoyed the activity.
Cheers,

Teacher C: *Hey, Here's a variation on your activity. Use computers but instead of passing the paper, they get up and switch computers. Same idea as yours but on computers. You could use this activity for students to learn about Microsoft Word or just to introduce computers to them as some are like deer caught in headlights. It's truly amazing actually.*
Good luck and thanks for your feedback,

Teacher A: *Thanks! I really want to try to use computers this year, so I appreciate very much your advice.*

As the above sample indicates, it is helpful for both the sender and the recipient to exchange this type of email. Knowing beforehand that ideas will be acknowledged (and even appreciated) promotes a safe environment where collaboration can thrive.

Furthermore, rapport building with colleagues outside the workplace can enhance trust. This trust goes a long way; it can help break down barriers between people. There are numerous occasions for social functions: departmental dinners, the annual teachers' trip to the countryside, Christmas parties, or low key get-togethers at a pub. The ELI members also organize picnics, where families and significant others are welcome. While a high degree of professionalism is expected in working with colleagues, social functions can strengthen camaraderie.

We note that Chris Stillwell has been working hard to promote collaboration at Kanda with his original forms of peer observation groups, reading meetings (organized with Ben Fenton-Smith), and the online Teacher Development Network—several of these already open to any teacher on campus, although some may not know of them. We suspect that indeed having energetic leaders interested in forms of collaborative professional development is important to the success of any such initiatives and we wonder how we might encourage such innovators more, or at least find ways to support them.

A Pilot Teacher Collaboration Survey

We prepared and piloted a teacher collaboration survey (Appendix 1) and had the time to give it to ten people to complete before our article deadline. We see the survey as also an *instigator of teacher collaboration* in that it can get those who fill it out to think a bit more about collaboration. As Thaler & Sunstein (2008) point out:

Those who engage in surveys want to catalogue behavior, not to influence it. But social scientists have discovered an odd fact: when they measure people's intentions, they affect peoples' conduct. The "mere-measurement effect" refers to the finding that when people are asked what they intend to do, they become more likely to act in accordance with their answers. This finding can be found in many contexts. If people are asked whether they intend to eat certain foods, to diet, or to exercise, their answers to the questions will affect their behavior. In our parlance, the mere-measurement effect is a nudge, and it can be used by private or public nudgers. (p. 7)

Thus, we need to ask more directly in our future questionnaires how much teachers intend to collaborate and work in groups if we want them to try it out more. (See such an attempt in Appendix 2.)

The Teacher Collaboration Survey (Appendix 1) itself still needs many adjustments before we administer it to a larger audience. Still the authors were impressed with the professional engagement of the few who responded. We had five from the ELI and five from outside the ELI. While they did not show a great use of collaboration, it did show a good amount of it, especially in research projects, which are required among ELI staff. Five respondents said they were content with the amount of collaboration they had, one did not answer that question, three said they wanted more, and one said she wanted much more. The second half of the pilot questionnaire generated qualitative data on how the teachers perceived collaboration.

The respondents unanimously agreed that collaboration is time-consuming. Collaboration also restricts one's independence in deciding how the project might

go. One respondent wrote, "… sometimes I just want to have more independence and freedom in what I do." Furthermore, another respondent commented that collaboration was energy-consuming. She wrote, "…selection and change of project members has to be done with extra care." Another wrote, "Weak points should be compensated. For example, one might want to collaborate with an expert of statistics in order to analyze the data after doing classroom research." In deciding whom to approach, one must consider matters such as *compatibility* and *expertise.*

As for advantages, the respondents agreed that collaboration allowed for potentially a greater end-product. One respondent stated, "Two heads may be difficult, but they are better than one." Another responded, "I prefer collaboration because I learn a lot more about teaching." These remarks seem to indicate that collaboration stimulates one's professional development. In light of all that has been said, perhaps it is helpful to recognize that collaboration is not *the be all and end all* of professional development. As one respondent wrote, "Just like with everything else, a healthy balance is needed." Some are more inclined towards collaboration than others, and what is important is that teachers have the option to work together, whether they take it or not.

The respondents of the pilot questionnaire also provided feedback on how to improve the survey for future use. In general, it seemed that some of the wording used in the questionnaire was too ambiguous. For example, the heading *observed classes,* a respondent wondered what the difference between *observing classes alone* and *observing classes collaboratively* was and we must concur, it is confusing. (We thank our pilot respondents for collaborating with us to improve it).

Possibilities

So what can we do to increase our possibilities for having effective collaboration at our institution? Kesar and Lester (2009) insist that in order to be more collaborative, institutions need to consider restructuring in the following ways:

(1) mission and vision and educational philosophy, (2) values, (3) social networks, (4) integrating structures, (5) rewards, (6) external pressure, and (7) learning. Although these seven context features all support collaboration, a few of them are essential: mission and vision, a campus network, and integrating structures. Without them collaborative activities will fail. (p. 60)

In the official web site of KUIS there is no mention of collaboration in the vision and mission statements of the school, the ELI, nor the Sano foundation although it does seem implied in the goals to promote effective communication and a peaceful world. In web material on the SALC they mention briefly that students can work cooperatively or individually.

As for networks, the ELI staff especially seems to be well connected, however, it seems to be less so for the rest of the academic staff. As for integrating structures, we must admit we need to do more research—as is often the case, as teachers, we are not always certain of the administrative structures in our own institution and how it might be better structured. As far as rewards for collaboration, we suggest that the Research Institute and other funding organizations could encourage more interdisciplinary collaboration, reserving some grants for mixed interdepartmental groups and collaborations even with part-timers to encourage such mixing. In general, all of academia needs to look more highly on co-written and researched

publications as opportunities for people to learn and collaborate. Indeed, the isolated academic usually has many less resources and ideas and administrators should be encouraging more collaboration.

The authors feel no external pressure to collaborate but we need to look more closely at the grants and funding in Japan to see if there actually is external pressure to collaborate or not—and we hope there is. Finally, more teacher-learning should be a continual goal of any educational institution. We wonder though, how much the ELI PD enthusiasm and expertise might cross departmental borders to enrich the whole school more, as well as better part-time teacher involvement (Williams, 2009).

Concluding for now…

Is collaboration always necessary? No. There is nothing worse than people forcing collaboration on a situation that simply does not require it. Not all decisions need multiple forms of expertise; sometimes a program can be better offered by one unit, some policy issues cannot be broadly shared because of privacy, and sometimes learning needs to be focused within a specific discipline to master a competency. (Kezar & Lester, 2009, p. 8)

The authors strongly believe that professional development of the solo kind is also of value. A good balance seems to be what we are after, and also the agency to decide ourselves when and where we collaborate and when and where we go it alone. We do feel that siloed departments that restrict opportunities to interact with diversity may be shooting themselves in the foot.

Collaborative or solo, teachers are individuals with different preferences. Some are more comfortable working together than others. Realizing what works for oneself is an important ingredient to successful professional development. Stillwell and Murphey (forthcoming) state, "Perhaps the best anyone can do is to create *structures* so that teachers have a variety of possibilities, are *aware* of the choices, and can experiment and try out different ways *conveniently* to start participating." It is the authors' contention that the ELI is doing a good job of that and perhaps the rest of the university might model them in some ways or join them in others. Maybe we all would benefit from rubbing elbows a bit more. How this can be done need not wait for administrators to condone it or organize it, indeed some individuals in our pilot study are already doing it. Promoting more collaboration can be helped by administrative decisions, but it more often than not is simply promoted by individuals taking the time to stop and talk. Somewhere along the expressway corridors of our schools we need a "no-nodding zone" that slows people down to talk, and learn. Collaboration can be just a conversation away.

Again, collaboration is not a perfect solution for all things and may need social massaging at times. It does not always come naturally or without conflict and it should not be seen as a requisite for everyone. However, it has shown itself to be far more productive in the long run than the lone artisan model or the isolated cowboy. And when it really hums, universes turn.

References

Adamson, J. (forthcoming). ELT and Interdisciplinary attitudes: Insights from Asian contexts. Monograph *English for Specific Purposes: Through and Across*

Disciplines conference at Shih Chien University, Taipei, Taiwan, April 25-26th, 2009.

Cosh, J. (1999). Peer observation: a reflective model. *ELT Journal, 53 (1),* 22-27.

Bartlett, Leo. 1990. Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds), *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 2002-214). New York: Cambridge University Press

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529.

Bourdieu, P. (1972). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hagadoorn, J. (1993). Understaing the rationale of strategic partnering: Interorganizational modes of cooperation and sectoral differents. *Strategic Management Journal, 14,* 371-385.

Heintz, C. & Origgi, G. (2008). Rethinking Interdisciplinarity. *Interdisciplines.* Retrieved 15th October, 2008 from

http://www.interdisciplines.org/interdisciplinarity/papers/11

Hofstede, G. (1990). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* London: McGraw Hill.

Hooker, C., Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2003). The group as mentor: Social capital and the systems model of creativity. In P. B. Paulus & B. A. Nijstad (Eds.), *Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kanter, R. (1996). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review,* 96-108.

Kesar, A. & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A*

guide for campus leaders. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.

Lockwood, A. (1996). School-community collaboration. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED426479.)

Lorenz, K. (1967). *On aggression.* New York: Bantam Books

McLaughlin, M. & Talbert J. (2001). Professional communities and the artisan model of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8,* 325-343.

Murphey, T. (1989). Sociocognitive Conflict: Confused? Don't worry, you may be learning! *Et Cetera* winter, 46 (4) 312-315. (Journal published by the International Society for General Semantics.)

Murphey, T., Okada, K., Iijima, Y., and Asaoka, C. (2008). Crossing borders: Examples in practice. *The Language Teacher* 32 (1) 11-15.

Murphey, T. & Sato, K. (2005). *Communities of supportive professionals.* Alexandria, Va: TESOL Inc.

Nelson, T. (2009). Group work projects: Participants perspectives from a teacher education program in Seoul, Korea. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Paulus, P. & Nijstad, B. (2003). *Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Peake, K. & Fraser, M. (2004). Steps towards establishing a system for professional development. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Teaching.* Kanda University of International Studies. Chiba, Japan.

Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams, and imitation.* New York: W.W.Norton & Co.

Schroeder, C. (2005) Evidence of the transformational dimensions of the scholarship of teaching and learning: Faculty Development through the eyes of SoTL Scholars. In S. Chadwick-Blossey & D. Reimondo (eds.) *To improve the*

academy, Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development. Bolton: MA: Anker.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Stillwell, C. (2008). Networks of Collaborative Professional Development. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Teaching* #19, pp. 233-252. Kanda University of International Studies; RILS publication.

Stillwell, C. & Murphey, T. (forthcoming). Sowing the Seeds of Collaborative Professional Development .

Takagi, N. (2002). PIGATE: Affecting EFL teacher education change from the grassroots level in Japan. *The Teacher Trainer,* 16 (2), 5-10.

Talbert J. & McLaughlin, M. (2001). Professional communities and the artisan model of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8,* 325-343.

Thaler, R. & Sunstein C. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness.* New York: Penguin

Williams, D. (2009). Connetivity: A part-timer's perspective. *PeerSpectives #3* p.6-8

Wood, D. & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences 27* (2), 139-162.

Zimbardo, P. (2008). *The Lucifer effect.* New York: Random House

---

Appendix 1

Teacher Collaboration Survey date _____Years teaching _____

School_____Department_____Circle one: Female /Male   Full/Part-time

---

1=never 2=once a year 3=several times a year 4= monthly 5= weekly 6= daily

---

1. How often do you have <u>conversations</u> about education issues, class management, materials, curriculum, and/or planning…

<u>with your immediate colleagues in your institution.</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with other teachers OUTSIDE your institution</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with non-teachers</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6

2. How often do you go to <u>professional development sessions (PD</u> workshops, reading group meetings, invited speakers, research groups) …

<u>with your immediate colleagues in your institution.</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with other teachers OUTSIDE your institution</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with non-teachers</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
alone	1 2 3 4 5 6

3. How often do you meet to write materials or articles or do conference presentations ….

<u>with your immediate colleagues in your institution.</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with other teachers OUTSIDE your institution</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
<u>with non-teachers</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6
alone	1 2 3 4 5 6

4. How many of each of these have you done THIS PAST YEAR approximately (put a number in the blank) alone or with others?

	ALONE	COLLABORATIVELY
Planned a lesson	____	____
Created materials	____	____
Wrote an article, or book review	____	____
Engaged in a research project	____	____
Observed classes	____	____
Read teaching related articles to discuss	____	____

5. I would like to collaborate at my school …

Circle one   Much Less / Less / Same as Now / More / Much more

6. What are the bad points of collaboration?

_____

7. What are the good points about collaboration?

_____

8. Last thoughts about collaboration for the researchers:

_____

Please return to Tim Murphey when done, thanks!

Appendix 2 – **Collaboration Now and Future**

How much do you collaborate NOW……………..**WANT TO IN THE FUTURE**

With the people below:

different L1 speakers? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

different genders? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

people older than you? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

people younger than you? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

other nationalities? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

students? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

Non-teachers? **little, some, a good bit, a lot_____little, some, a good bit, a lot**

I want to collaborate more especially with the following kinds of people:

_____

_____

I want to collaborate with the following school committees or volunteer groups:

_____

_____

What areas would you like to collaborate more in? Who might be collaborators? When?

_____