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ABSTRACT

In recent years the changing face of Further Education has led to significant and widespread divergences away from the traditional curriculum approach. Such changes have predominantly arisen in those courses which have emphasis on the integration of various disciplines and on inter-connections between students' range of skills and aptitudes.

Course team work has meant that lecturers with different disciplines, teaching styles and educational philosophies have had to come together to find ways of working as a team, with often little or no previous experience of working in this way.

The effectiveness of the course team approach, therefore, lies in the ability and willingness of different types of staff to weld themselves together as a team.

While such work is being encouraged by various courses, there appears to be a very varied response to the needs of teams within the colleges themselves.

The focus of this study has therefore been to investigate and understand course team members' thinking with regard to team work, their perceived difficulties and possible ways of developing the process.

In the context of student-centred learning and quality assurance, the research expanded this exploration to investigate the notion of a wider team encompassing all those groups who may hold expectations about the course and its outcomes, and whose individual perceptions need to be acknowledged and understood by the whole team.

The research design model employs a methodology which is both "adaptable and eclectic", and which includes surveys, interviews, observation, and in particular repertory grids, to provide an in-depth picture of lecturers' thinking in this area of work.

As the enquiry develops from this foundation of empirical data, a more naturalistic approach emerges as pertinent to the needs of the study. This encompasses a Personal Construct Psychology/Action Research philosophy to generate guidelines and models for practice.
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B.Ed Bachelor of Education
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTL</td>
<td>Return to Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Return to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Visiting Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTS</td>
<td>Youth Training Scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Course Team

The term "course team" is used throughout this research to mean a group of staff working together to deliver a specified course, scheme or programme.

Course Team Leader

Where the definition of a course team was fairly specific, the terminology used for the person who led a course team seemed to vary, with terms such as "course tutor" "course co-ordinator" being used to mean either the same role or very different roles.

In order to be clear about the role to which I refer, I have used the term "team leader" throughout the research, as the person responsible for co-ordinating the team itself and its delivery of the course or programme in question. I have particularly emphasised the co-ordination of the team, as this research focused predominantly on the human resource dimension of teamwork.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"Teamwork requires that everyone works for the benefit of the group rather than the more typical style which involves scoring points and gaining personal advantage." (Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.115)

1.1 THE BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

This chapter seeks to explain the starting point for this research and examines those catalysts which led me to undertake an exploration of course team processes.

The origins of this research lie in my work as an Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) advisory lecturer between 1986 and 1988, a period which saw the beginnings of uncertainty about the ILEA's future amidst a series of radical changes in provision and in approaches to Further Education in general.

While it is not relevant to discuss the implications of the former to my research at this juncture, it had an influence on my investigations and as such, will be discussed in the sections on research methodology at the beginning of each chapter.

In 1981, Parlett and Hamilton wrote:

"Innovation is now a major educational priority. For nearly two decades it has expanded and proliferated." (Parlett and Hamilton, 1981, p.10)

It was in recognition of this fact that in 1970 the ILEA established the Curriculum Development Project. I joined the project in 1987 with a brief to support and
develop new curriculum initiatives in schools, colleges and adult education institutes. In this time of general change in education, the Education Reform Bill(1988) was beginning to create a climate in which there were calls for more accountability from teaching staff. Even before its effects were widely experienced, there were general feelings of uncertainty amongst staff regarding tenure (FEU,1982,a) and anxieties about increased workload, particularly in an ILEA whose future had begun to be uncertain. Within this climate of uncertainty I was given a particular remit to support course delivery through integrated approaches. This was a philosophy which saw learning as a holistic activity in which a range of skills and disciplines, which had traditionally been perceived as separate, were brought together.

The development of course structures such as the Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE), Access, Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI), General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), Business and Technical Education Council (BTEC) and Youth Training Scheme (YTS) had accelerated the pace of change with far reaching effects on the curriculum. At the basis of these initiatives was a move away from teacher-centred towards student-centred education, with a rethinking in terms of the autonomy of the learner. (ILEA FHECDP, 1984)

An integrated approach was central, for example to the delivery of CPVE schemes (CPVE Joint Board,1985), and other documents such as "Supporting TVEI" (FEU 1985,a) were urging a greater collaboration between teachers/lecturers in order to establish:

"A network of interlocking provision, offering young people a variety of opportunity to plan logical, progressive and individually relevant programmes of education and personal development." (FEU,1985,a,p.18)
Likewise validating bodies such as BTEC (1984) were stressing the existence of course teams as the vehicle for course design, delivery and evaluation. This implied a fresh look at the role of the lecturer and an investigation into different approaches to teaching methods. This necessitated the adoption of an approach which was both flexible and varied and which assumed a holistic view of course delivery. (CPVE Joint Board, 1985).

Such an approach therefore requires a strong working group in which staff work closely and supportively together and in which the identification and facilitation of particular skills and competences for students was not the province of any one member of staff or any one subject area. The effectiveness of a course therefore lay in the ability and willingness of different staff to weld themselves together as a team (FEU, 1982a).

1.2 A BACKGROUND TO THE COURSE TEAM

The requirements of validating bodies had begun this move towards using course teams, although other advantages were seen in their use: participative planning, joint decision making and an integration of disciplines (Challis and Russell, 1984). Teamwork also meant that members were equally accountable for their particular contribution to the course, thus involving a shift away from hierarchial management to a more devolved model (Adelman and Alexander, 1982).

The concept of the course team had first surfaced in the Open University when teams were responsible for producing integrated course material (Squires, 1975). Teamwork was seen to have considerable importance in the Open University (Bates, 1974). The role of these teams, however, was more that of course developer than course deliverer because, having produced materials, the members then disbanded leaving a much
smaller team to collect any feedback from students (Riley, 1975). Therefore, many of the concerns documented about course teams in the Open University would appear to have limited relevance to those in Further Education.

However, the same major justification as in Further Education for adopting a team approach also existed in the Open University - that of planning and offering interdisciplinary courses. Likewise these teams also needed a more flexible organisational structure than that used in a departmental approach (Riley, 1975).

In 1985 the FEU published a report entitled 'Working Together', which emphasised this point:

"The increasing need for a wide range of vocational preparation courses in colleges, many linked with courses in schools, necessitates a more flexible and integrated approach than has previously been adopted". (FEU, 1985, b, p. 1)

This report arose out of a project concerned with the promotion of an integrated curriculum of which curriculum-led staff development was an important feature. While much of this project focussed on the mechanics of organising such a curriculum, the report also made several interesting observations about course teams, stressing the importance of suitable membership for a team, time for staff to adapt to the new method of delivery and the need for strong support from management if there was to be effective development of course teams.

A year later, the FEU produced another report called "Investing In Change" (1986, a), in which it continued to stress the need for teamwork skills and team awareness:
"In the past many trainers, particularly F.E. teachers have taught their own specialism, often in isolation and sometimes with little recognition of what is being taught in other parts of the provision...Schemes involving new combinations of skills and greater flexibility of delivery have highlighted the need for staff to work together as a team to devise and implement training programmes." (FEU, 1986, p.15)

Until the introduction of these new initiatives, the mainstream of Further Education had not put any particular emphasis on teamworking. Lecturers had been used to working as individuals in the privacy of their own classrooms (Everard and Morris, 1988), and the move away from this freedom to collaborative working was sometimes perceived as an invasion of their professional autonomy. Having established a stable occupational identity, some were reluctant to let it go and tended towards inflexibility in the face of new conditions requiring new approaches. In contrast, the designers of courses based on an integrated approach appeared to assume, perhaps working with an industrial model of teamwork, that staff would perceive themselves as members of a coherent team in which there were agreed aims and objectives.

The role of such a course team was of particular importance where a course cut across departmental boundaries, and where there were obvious needs for a mutual knowledge of the whole course, and a co-operative approach in order to achieve common ways of working.

This has been highlighted in a Further Education Staff College (FESC) report (1989), in which the need for cross-curricular course teams is reiterated by reminding practitioners why they came about:
New multi-discipline courses such as the CPVE, the integrated team teaching approach necessitated by BTEC, aspects of some YTS programmes, the provision of GCSE and A level, the decline of traditional skills and the growth of transferable skills have all led to a marked increase in the amount of work which crosses the traditional boundaries of the departmental system. (FESC, 1989, p. 114)

These theoretical developments began to influence the philosophy and practice in colleges. Around this period, for example, the Principal of the college in which my project was housed issued an internal paper in which he stressed the importance of teams and the need for positive interaction between staff:

"The very rapid nature of change and the increasing thrust of responsibility on institutions to develop courses and syllabuses themselves rather than have them handed down, makes consultation and interaction essential..." and that "interaction and stimulation within teams of colleagues is essential for ideas to flow and support to be given and received." (Bradley, 1987, p. 3)

In the same year the FEU (1986, b) began to identify other teamwork issues. These included: individual perceptions of professional freedom, the importance of: meeting and review time, commitment and cohesion, clarity of communication, and the composition of the course team. In its final discussion the report stressed the need to prioritise team development:

"It seems that relatively little consideration has been given to the development of staff as course teams, as against their professional development as individuals." (FEU, 1986, b, p. 97).

It was becoming increasingly apparent from my own experience that lecturers were coming together from a variety of disciplines, teaching styles and philosophies into a team situation for which they had had little experience or preparation. Another factor which became evident was a feeling that the ability of most course teams to work
together for the benefit of staff and students relied very much on the willingness of lecturers to "let go" of both their traditional didactic approaches to teaching and learning and of the perceived autonomy of their subject specialism.

When it is recalled that these changes were occurring in a climate of uncertainty and often diminishing resources which did not always allow for sufficient staff development to meet changing work patterns, then a point made by Everard and Morris (1988, p.137) becomes pertinent: that there can often be considerable resentment when people feel themselves "caught between the pincers of cuts in resources on the one hand and demands for change in curriculum on the other".

1.3 MY INVOLVEMENT WITH TEAMS

A combination of these factors was very evident amongst the group of people with whom I worked during my period as advisory lecturer. As a result I found myself spending a considerable amount of time working with teams, the definitions of which rarely appeared to match those stated in the literature survey given in the following chapter.

The courses delivered by these teams varied from CPVE and YTS to Return to Learning courses. However, at that particular time one of my main responsibilities, in terms of team maintenance, was Access to Higher Education courses and I had particular responsibility for two course teams. I was asked to support team A as there was considerable overt conflict within the team. The inspectorate had noticed this was affecting both course delivery and staff morale and this was being sensed by the students. This team did not have timetabled meetings but, because of the difficulties,
it had been given weekly remission to work on improving team cohesion and the integration of subject disciplines.

Team B, on the other hand, had always had timetabled meetings and, while it was not immediately evident whether or not this increased team cohesiveness, the team members appeared to work well together. Unlike team A, team B members had a fairly positive attitude towards both the course and the idea of working as a team.

While it is not applicable to discuss either of these teams in depth, for the purposes of this research it is important to note that it was as a result of these two very different experiences that I became increasingly interested in possible reasons why some teams worked together more effectively than others.

For the purposes of the introduction to this research, I am using the term "effective" to mean, "working together in such a way as to benefit the course, the students and the members of the team." This was my own definition at this stage in my work and it arose from my own observations and understanding of the aims and objectives of course teams generally. In order to proceed with any investigation, however, the research clearly needed to have a more appropriate working definition of course team effectiveness. This proved to be more difficult than first appeared in that there was a wealth of literature on effective teamwork from an industrial and commercial perspective and very little on educational course teams, particularly in Further Education. An in-depth discussion on the difficulties attached to arriving at such a definition appears in Chapter 2.

While there were a number of different perspectives I could have taken to examine team effectiveness, such as the importance of leadership, differences in course type, organisational change and college structures and the place of the course team within
them, all of which can be found in the literature of management and of social science, from my personal experiences of working with teams and being part of a curriculum team, my main interest lay in the human resource dimension of teamwork.

My experience had led me to believe that groups which were "teams" by name did not fit the definitions of writers such as Argyle (1972) who viewed teams as groups of people who worked together co-operatively to carry out a joint task. Neither did they appear to fit one of the main criteria laid down by, amongst others, Torrington and Weightman:

"However varied the nature of working teams, the one thing they have in common is the desire by all members that the team should succeed." (Torrington and Weightman, 1985, p.198).

Certainly some teams appeared to be little more than a number of subject specialists working on the same course and thus constituting what Payne (1982) would call a work group (see discussion Chapter 2).

From observations and informal conversations it appeared that although there were often individual members who wanted to work together in a team approach to course delivery, there was considerable anxiety and resistance to the perceived loss of subject status, and also the feeling that expertise in one subject area did not equate with the ability to understand, and sometimes teach, what was conventionally associated with another subject area. Even when the course product of a "team" was seen as reasonable, there was often a visible lack of enthusiasm for participants working together.

Change in education had been rapid and frequent, particularly since the middle nineteen eighties and, as Morrish (1976) observes, change and innovation affect people and their attitudes as well as institutions and their methods of working and
organisation. Morrish feels that people do not easily change their highly valued principles and practices, particularly when it involves a change in professional role and identity.

This view was echoed to a certain extent by the FEU in their publication "Teaching Skills" (1982, b) although they had also felt that teaching staff could be helped and supported in this process:

"There is probably no satisfactory psychological analysis as to which types of teachers take more kindly to change than others, the variables are too many and complex. We would do well then, not to set up stereotypes of teachers - some of whom we choose for innovation, others we ignore. We should set up the expectation that, given sufficient participation and encouragement, all teachers are willing to attempt new work." (FEU, 1982, b, p. vii)

This view which rejects the matching of perceived teacher qualities to innovatory approaches and which stresses the possibility of all teachers taking a positive role in processes of change, has important implications for staff development and therefore extra resources such as remission time. From what I was able to observe in my advisory lecturer work, very little staff development on how to work as a team existed in practice. It was also apparent that resourcing in terms of meeting time and time for integration of course material was poor and extremely uneven, depending on the course and college concerned.

The wide variations in teamwork that I witnessed, and the informal conversations that I had had with both course team members and leaders, therefore led me to formulate a number of initial research foci which would guide my literature review and allow me to arrive at a set of refined research questions upon which to base my fieldwork.

1) Given the emphasis placed on collaborative working, I needed to explore those
variables which could affect people working together and whether there was any interconnection between them.

2) Time for meeting and review had appeared to be a concern amongst the teams I worked with, and therefore I needed both to evaluate their importance and their place in collaborative working in a wider group of teams.

3) Commitment to teamwork seemed to vary, and therefore the factors which might impinge on such commitment needed to be clarified if I was to understand the issues which might affect team members.

4) My experiences revealed varying support for teamwork from managers. The importance of such support needed to be explored more generally.

1.4 A NOTE ON CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 has introduced the background, rationale and motivation for this study. Chapter 2, in reviewing the educational and commercial literature, establishes theoretical parameters for teamwork which will inform the fieldwork. The rationale for the general methodological approaches and the research tools for data-gathering are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapters 5 to 9 detail the rationale for what follows, describe the particular data collection methods used, and analyse the resultant data. The iterative approach is developed further in Chapters 10 and 11 which focus on a grid approach allied to action research, so describing the evoluation towards a practical model of team development, the synthesis of which is the theme of Chapter 12.

1.5 A POSTSCRIPT

It is interesting to note that towards the end of my fieldwork and as a response to
changes in the culture of Further Education, reports and studies began to appear which highlighted the importance of the course team, but in the context of increased demands for quality and accountability. The growth of National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) brought changes in the curriculum and its delivery, and with it an extension of the role of the course team from devising and delivering discrete programmes to supporting lecturers in their changing roles - all of which required a commitment to resources and staff development which was not always acknowledged by management. (FEU, 1989, a)

During the same period four other reports were made available to colleges: the Training Agency commissioned two reports (Miller and Dower, 1989, and Miller and Innis, 1990) on improving quality with the course team as the focus, regarding it as the 'primary agent for the activity of quality control' (Miller and Dower, 1989, p.14) and as the quality assurance link between students and the college.

The FEU documents "Professional Accountability and Course Teams" (1989, b) and "Course Evaluation and Development through Course Team Activities" (1988) placed a similar emphasis on the importance of the course team as a vehicle for evaluating and monitoring, and "developing a greater awareness by staff of their professional accountability" (FEU, 1989, b, para.58). However, the latter pointed out that teams might see this as still more responsibility, and stressed the need for it to be introduced positively and supported with staff development.

While all reports focussed on this particular role for the course team, they only touched on the possible difficulties that might be encountered in terms of teamwork processes. They also appeared to assume, or at least not question, the willingness of team members to work together and demonstrate the cohesion and support necessary to be
able effectively to carry out those processes advocated by the FEU and Training Agency reports.

There also appeared to be little mention of how teams arrived at a joint clarity of intentions in order to perform these tasks as a collective body rather than as a number of individuals with possibly widely differing views on what the team was supposed to be achieving.

The importance of this was highlighted by Miller and Innis (1990) who pointed out that:

"In order to work at the task effectively the team require time to meet; they require carefully devised agendas with which they can plan improvement; and they may well require assistance with setting objectives, clarifying attainable standards, and achieving managed change." (Miller and Inniss, 1990, p.14)

Towards the end of my field work, Tansley published a book entitled "Course Teams in Further Education" (1989), which sought to document the different types of course staffing structures arising within Further Education; to investigate the roles played by senior college staff and full and part-time lecturers in the provision and organization of course teams and to explore experiences and attitudes of lecturers working in different staffing situations. Although there was some overlap in areas of interest and enquiry with my own research, the foci, the emphasis and the research methodology were in general very different. Areas of similarity and difference between my own research and Tansley's will be noted where relevant throughout the thesis. At this juncture, however, it is salient to note that the very production of Tansley's work highlighted the concern generated by the implementation of this innovatory approach to course delivery.
CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS A TEAM?

"Good managers know that a group of people who have become a team will achieve far more than those who have not." (Stewart, 1986, p.197)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

My first contacts with teams had given me a few research ideas, which a survey of the relevant literature would both refine and put into the context of what, according to other studies, was meant by teamwork in general and what might constitute effectiveness in teamworking. My aim, through the exploration of these two themes, was therefore the refinement of my existing questions and the possible addition of other questions on the basis of which, through surveys, I could take forward the empirical component of the research.

The developmental model for this process is shown in Fig.1 (see next page) which provides the reader with a visual pathway through the literature review.

This chapter therefore explores the contexts I had chosen - teamwork and its effectiveness - through the teamwork literature, and analyses them into their key aspects for further study.

It also highlights the mutual interdependence of structural and functional factors for the smooth working of a team.
DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL FOR THE LITERATURE REVIEW
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2.2 DIFFICULTIES ATTACHED TO FINDING A DEFINITION OF TEAMWORK

2.2.1 Structural and Functional Definitions

The literature concerning educational course teamwork was fairly limited and tended to be confined to such issues as the need for teamwork to carry out specific course functions (FEU, 1988, and 1989,b). On the other hand, the literature on human resource management and industrial psychology offered a plethora of definitions, not all consonant, pertaining to the structure of teams and their processes.

2.2.2 The Relevance Of Management and Industrial Psychology Literature On Teamwork Versus Group Work

However, a number of difficulties arose in determining the relevance of such literature. For example, a preponderance of the literature focused on groups (Handy, 1981, Robertson and Cooper, 1983, Adair, 1987 Reich, 1987 and Kolb, Rubin and McIntyre, 1984) and appeared to use the words "group", "workgroup", and "team" synonymously thus invoking ambiguity in definition.

A question of what kind of group constitutes a team emerged. Adair (1987) in his book on effective teambuilding talked of the focus being "workgroups", implying that the two terms were interchangeable. His view was that a team was a group in which there was a common task to which everyone contributed jointly and where everyone's strengths were used to full advantage.

The importance of joint achievement of a task was also highlighted by Barlett (1974) who pointed out that a group could only be considered as a well-knit team if it was achieving its objectives. Later Honey (1988) emphasised the cohesive nature of teamwork set against the work of a group:

"A group is a collection of individual people who come together to achieve some purpose. A group is a lesser thing..."
This transformation from workgroup to team therefore appeared to centre on the importance of all members working together to accomplish a given goal. However, according to Payne (1982), for teamwork to exist this goal also needed to be owned and shared. It was therefore clear from the literature that teamwork was as much about the collaborative processes as about task achievement. However, it was not clear whether a group of people achieving a task, despite the fact that they might not be working collaboratively, constituted a workgroup or an ineffective team. Therefore, while the literature on groups formed an important basis to the understanding of teamwork, it was necessary to explore the literature further to extrapolate other elements which might be said to constitute effectiveness.

2.2.3 Descriptions And Advice Not Founded In Theory And Research

While many management texts were concerned with teambuilding (Merry and Allerhand, 1977, Woodcock and Francis, 1981, Dyer, 1987 and Maddux, 1989), they said little about team processes.

These texts presented practical ideas and exercises on team development, but it was difficult to assess their relevance to Further Education as there appeared to be little stated general theory underpinning them.

Such approaches to teamwork as those of Hastings et al, 1986, Nolan, 1987, Blake, Mouton and Allen, 1987 and Peters, 1989 appeared to be based on personal experience of industry-based consultancy with little, if any, description of how or why or with whom this was done, making it difficult to evaluate its relevance to an educational context.
2.2.4 Applicability And Transferability From Industry To Education

It was becoming apparent that applying commercially and industrially based team literature to an educational setting might be problematic, particularly in the area of values, over which there was little common ground. To take an instance, the stress placed by Hastings et al, (1986), Armstrong, (1988), Peters, (1989) and others, on financial rewards, incentives and bonuses for teamwork,

"Train them, recruit on the basis of teamwork potential, pay them for performance and clean up the bureaucracy around them." (Peters, 1989, p.237)

is certainly relevant to education, but resourcing and the "stick and carrot" approach are more difficult to equate with current college situations where education is constrained financially and legally to act in this way. Furthermore, payment by results could be viewed as counter-cultural especially if "results" were translated into pass rates.

There was more potential commonality in the proposition of Kanter (1991,a) who suggested that rewards did not have to be financial but could include such alternatives as time off or choice of the next project. She also stressed that rewards should not always be linked to improved status as this might not be appropriate to some members of a delivery team. Such a reward system might act as an extrinsic incentive if introduced into an educational context. It could also be an alternative reward for those lecturers who preferred to remain at the delivery end of a course when the only reward would be promotion to a management level, especially since this would take them away from the kind of work they preferred and might be more suited to.
2.3 WHAT IS A TEAM?

It was clear that while there were valuable insights in industrially-based team literature, I would have to be relatively selective in order to get closer to a working definition of the team in an educational setting. Then it would be possible to move on to the deeper insights that the literature might offer regarding teamwork processes.

Woodcock and Francis stated that:

"A team is a group of people who have a common task which needs their combined efforts." (Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.115)

There appeared to be general agreement in the literature that a team was a group of people who came together to carry out a particular task.

Several writers on teamwork (Gray, 1979, Woodcock and Francis, 1981, Payne, 1982 and Robertson and Cooper, 1983) also observed that one of the main reasons people grouped together was to achieve a particular task that they could not do as effectively on their own. Such observations, however, made the assumption that people wanted to work together and perceived a reason for doing so. They also presupposed that a team was a positive thing and necessary to the task in hand.

Such assumptions will be explored more fully within this research because informal contacts with teams had indicated that while they were being labelled as a "team", much of the teamwork was very sporadic. Indeed, it could be said that the results which had been obtained could equally well have been achieved by individuals working on their own and coming together at essential times such as assessment periods.

While team members may say or think that they are "working together", there can be a wide spectrum of definitions of this concept within a single team. There was
therefore a need to clarify individual perceptions in order to provide a joint vision which all members could work towards.

Although the literature on course teams in education was very limited, the few definitions which existed also stressed the idea of working together. In her study devoted to an overview of course teams Tansley defined a course team as:

"A group of staff working together to deliver a course scheme or programme." (Tansley, 1989, p.9)

This was similarly supported by the definition given in the FEU document, "Course evaluation and development through course teams activities," which described a course team as:

"A group of teaching and support staff, full and part-time, appointed to plan, who share the activities and responsibilities amongst themselves and meet regularly while the course is running to evaluate and improve it." (FEU, 1988, p.3)

Apart from these definitions, the other apparently relevant literature tended to emphasise task orientation (FEU, 1986, a and 1989, b) and said little about processes.

2.4 THE BENEFITS OF TEAMWORKING

Using these definitions of the team in the educational setting, I was nearly ready to investigate those "shared activities and responsibilities". But before I reached this stage, there was one barrier to overcome, that of justifying the team as an operational entity. To put the question bluntly, what was better about teamwork? Why choose the team approach rather than other options for course organisation and delivery?

Teamwork has been central to most organisational management in the industrial and commercial world. While not as common in education, recent developments have emphasised the place of teams and given them an important role to play in a number
of areas such as course delivery and quality assurance (FEU, 1990).

The benefits of teamwork advocated by management writers can be grouped as follows:

a) the opportunity to utilise a range of skills and strengths to the benefit of the task and the team as a whole;

b) the ability to be more flexible and responsive, particularly to change;

c) the benefit of being efficient and effective through collaboration and mutual support.

An expansion of each of these follows:

a) The benefit afforded by a range of skills on a team is essential to good integration and assignment production. This benefit was recognised by such validating bodies as BTEC and City and Guilds who saw the importance of teamworking and made it the delivery mechanism for their courses:

"A cohesive team can provide the range of skills and attributes unlikely to be found in one person, but needed to manage the course." (FEU, 1990, p.5)

The FEU report, "Working together" (1985,b) highlighted an additional benefit by describing how having a range of skills would heighten the awareness of other team members to disciplines that were not their own. They also stressed that far from depriving people of their own specialism, they would provide tutors with job satisfaction by emphasising the importance of individual contributions.

b) Teams could provide a more flexible management structure in organisations that were aware of and responsive to the need for change (Leigh, 1988). More recently they have been afforded a central role in quality control and new product development "in a period of rapid and largely unpredictable market
change." (FEU, 1988, para. 18). Miller and Dower in their report on quality for the Training Agency saw course teams as the communication and quality assurance link between students and managers:

"The course team is potentially a conduit of information to the management of the college, but of equal importance it has the potential from notifying managers and others of the changes it perceives as necessary for further improvement of the provision." (Miller and Dower, 1989, p.14)

The flexibility which course teams allow also meant that absence of a team member need not have such a detrimental affect on students because other team members could then substitute more easily. Such flexibility of course and team structure also enabled the teaching team and the student group to be varied according to the situation in hand. (FEU, 1985,b)

c) A further benefit of teamwork devies from a team's ability to operate collaboratively. The mutual support and satisfaction which this can afford benefits the task (course delivery through integration), individual members and the team as a whole (Adair, 1987), while the effects of an overt team spirit can also have a positive influence on students (FEU,1990). Kanter, (1985), also pointed out the motivational benefits of participation, in that members are involved in shared decision making and problem solving processes.

While the benefits of teamwork have been emphasised strongly by most management writers, Payne (1982), Critchley and Casey (1986) and Miller and Dower (1989) reminded us that teamwork may not always be appropriate for either the task in hand or the individuals. While the needs of integrated courses and a student-centred approach strongly suggest that collaborative teamwork is
the only effective delivery mechanism, Miller and Dower pointed out that:

"A course team does not have to operate always as a whole group. It is appropriate and useful to identify tasks which can be carried out by two and threes for example . . ." (Miller and Dower, 1989, p.36)

This reference to specific tasks was the point at which an overview of some general benefits of teamwork began to shade into the particular processes and individual elements which constitute it.

2.5 TEAM PROCESSES

Early contact with teams and team leaders (see Ch.1) emphasised three broad and overlapping issues, (collaboration, communication and commitment), which would be starting points for an investigation of the literature of team processes (see p.11). The fourth priority identified by teams (management support) would need to be addressed later in the research. Meanwhile, the other themes in the above order were explored as a preliminary to a discussion of team effectiveness and, finally, the development of more refined research questions. Common elements within each theme will become obvious as the review progresses.

2.6 COLLABORATION AND CO-OPERATION

Adair saw co-operation as essential to the cohesiveness of the group and emphasised that:

"The cohesiveness of a group is determined by the strength of the bonds that bind the individual parts together into a unified whole." (Adair, 1987, p.19)

The idea of sharing and co-operation between members was emphasised by a number
of management authors including Argyle (1972), Brill (1976), Stewart (1986) and Dyer, the latter of whom saw teams as:

"Collections of people who must rely on group collaboration if each member is to experience the optimum success and goal achievement." (Dyer, 1987, p.4)

Woodcock and Francis (1981) described the essential characteristic of a team as the ability to put team objectives before personal aims so that everyone gained from the team's joint activities.

However, it was also recognised that a team was a group of individuals and that for collaboration to be effective, members needed to be able to express themselves freely without "tyranny of the minority" (McGregor, 1960, p.232). There also needed to be a willingness to help other members develop their full potential (Likert, 1961) and a need for respect to be shown for the contributions of others (Merry and Allerhand, 1977).

2.6.1 The Difficulties Of Collaboration In An Educational Context

However in a time of change (FEU, 1982,a) within a context of the Educational Reform Act (1988), the abolition of the ILEA (1990), delegated budgets for colleges; the threat of job losses and more recently, the White Paper on Education and Training (1991), it is difficult to envisage a climate of collaboration in colleges. This situation is exacerbated by competitive market forces producing ever increasing workloads coupled with changes in lecturers conditions of service (NATFHE 1989/90).

Furthermore co-operation is not an easy concept to promote when there appears to be a number of differing attitudes towards an integrationalist approach. (FEU; 1990). Team members with varied backgrounds and philosophies may be drawn together by necessity rather than desire into a situation for which they have had little preparation or experience.
For those accustomed to working as subject specialists, team collaboration can bring with it the feeling that professional freedom and subject specialism autonomy is under threat by the demand for different working patterns.

In a recent report (1990, p.3) the FEU found that it was still difficult for tutors to come to terms with their new roles where previously "... their status and experience was based on subject expertise."

2.6.2 Factors Influencing Collaborative Working

For clarity of presentation, these have been divided into the following categories, although there are clearly interactions and overlaps between the three:

a) trust;

b) leadership;

c) team image.

2.6.3 Trust

Despite the potential difficulties of fostering a climate of collaboration it is important to understand what factors encourage people to work together. Larson and Lafasto described a collaborative climate "as being one of trust," without which they felt collaboration could not flourish. Stressing the importance of trust they felt that:

*It allows team members to stay problem focused ...... absence of trust diverts the mental concentration and energy of a team away from its performance objective and onto other issues. The team becomes politicized. Communication becomes guarded and distorted. Alliances and personal agendas begin to take precedence over the team goal.*

(Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.87)

The importance of trust was also highlighted by Drucker (1985), Adair, (1987) and Maddux (1989). While the latter emphasised that this needed to be established through open and honest communication, mutual respect and goal sharing, Drucker
(1985) focussed on the time it might take to build up this mutual trust, a factor particularly pertinent to educational course teams. Those embedded in a college culture might note that apart from the staff turnover, the demands of the curriculum and the college timetable often mean that teams do not retain the same membership long enough to build up this mutual trust and understanding. The need for trust, however, was seen as critical if tutors were to become more generalists and help on a variety of course teams without fearing criticism. (FEU,1990)

2.6.4 Leadership

In an educational course team context, there are two terms, course tutor and course team leader, which are often used interchangeably to mean the same position. A full discussion of these terms appears after the 'Abbreviations' page, but it is important to note that in this section the term 'team leader' is used to denote that person who has responsibility for co-ordinating and leading a course team on a day-to-day basis. Leadership of a team is obviously a core element of effective teamworking and as such has been the subject of much research into leadership models and a proliferation of specific literature in management studies, sociology and psychology. As already discussed on page 9, this research is not focusing specifically on leadership, but on issues of teamwork in general. Thus, while its importance is recognised, it is not given greater emphasis here than the other factors which facilitate collaboration.

a) Focus Of Communication

Leadership was viewed by Nolan (1987) as the focus for information transmission within a team, between teams, and to and from management. Such a focus was seen as particularly important when members were coming from different areas of work and different sites and was therefore crucial to the integration of disciplines.
The importance of this communication role was reflected in the need to create an environment of trust so that members felt part of a team and not isolated through a lack of information (Nolan, 1987).

Leigh (1988) also saw the leader's role in the communication process as an essential part of promoting the goals and values of the team. By having an overview of the task, the team and its members, the leader was also in a position to clarify roles and provide guidance on those areas in which individuals and the team had autonomy to make decisions (Nolan, 1987).

b) Motivating The Team

Armstrong (1988) saw one of the main tasks of the leader as having an understanding of what motivates individual members. He felt that a leader needed to take responsibility for building up a feeling of team spirit and shared responsibility through satisfying both team and individual needs. A similar sentiment was echoed by Nolan (1987) who noted the importance of establishing with members a strong relationship which was based on mutual respect and recognition of roles.

c) Co-ordination

Miller and Dower talking about course team leaders, emphasised how:

"Groups need someone to co-ordinate their work and it is appropriate for the course team leader to exercise this function." (Miller and Dower, 1989, p.35)

Co-ordination was seen as crucial to ensure a constant interaction within a team (Leigh, 1988), where the leader had a responsibility not only to initiate things, but to review the team's activities and take action if things were not being pursued (Payne, 1982).
In an education context very little has been specifically written about the team leader, although more recently McNay (1988) accentuates the need to recognise the importance of this role for effective team delivery.

An FEU report (1990) commented that despite the importance and the diversity of their role, team leaders had generally received little training to equip them to carry it out. Indeed Tansley's (1989, p.123) research showed how most team leaders were not specifically appointed to the position, but "took it on as natural progression, because they were asked or because there was no-one else to do it."

Leadership also subsumes power relationships. How the tactics of powerholders influence the dynamics of groups or teams has itself been the subject of diverse literature too extensive to address in depth here. However, the reader is directed to Worchel, Wood and Simpson (1992) for an up-to-date review of salient issues which have influenced thinking and debate in this area.

However at this stage it is worth noting the influence for good or bad on the effectiveness of the team and team leader of the institutional power structure and power context in which both function, a theme which is elaborated at various points in the research. This influence may manifest itself in a number of ways, for instance, if real power remains the sole province of the Head of Department or other manager but the ideology of the institution nevertheless a devolved model, the result can be a resort to politicking on the part of the team, which is and is felt to be ineffectual, frustrating and divisive. Other problems connected with the realities of power in the institution can result from an unwillingness on the part of managers to supply teams and team leaders with the information which they need to function at least semi-autonomously. One way to approach both these difficulties might be to establish very clearly at the
start the functions of both team and leader, although this is by no means easy in practice.

2.6.5 A Team's Image

Adair (1987, p.19) referred to cohesiveness as the "strength of attraction of the group for its members", while Hastings et al (1986) recognised that a team's image was important in determining its credibility with outsiders. Team attraction appeared to have particular relevance to the educational situation in that certain courses were often valued very differently depending on the culture of the college (Tansley 1989). This in turn appeared to have an effect on whether or not people were attracted to membership of the course team, resulting in implications for staffing and resourcing.

2.7 COMMUNICATION

2.7.1 Communication - The Process

Kolb, Rubin and McIntyre (1984) observed that effective teams were recognisable by the desire of their members to communicate for the benefit of all the team - a sentiment echoed by Likert (1961) who emphasised the need for communication processes to serve the interests and goals of the team.

This was often not the case in a number of the teams I worked with, and occasionally there were feelings that members were withholding communication for reasons apparently best known to themselves. Thus the desire to communicate information needs to precede the process of communication itself.

In addition to communication within the team, the issues of communication between teams was highlighted by a number of writers (Woodcock and Francis 1981, Blake, Mouton and Allen 1987, Everard and Morris 1988, and Davies et al, 1990) who viewed
inter-team relationships as an important element of collaborative working.
In an educational context this was recently identified as an area in need of development and it was reiterated that course teams need to share experiences with other teams if they are to be truly effective (FEU 1990).

2.7.2 Communication - Meetings

Having regular meetings was one of the FEU's (1989,b) defining attributes of a course team, building on a plea from staff for time allowance for discussion and planning noted in an earlier document produced by them (Teaching'Skills, 1982,b). Similar comments were made by course teams in the informal stages of this research during which it was noted that very few had any formalised time for meetings.

However, while the FEU stressed the importance of meetings, they also acknowledged that there were difficulties:

"Teamwork is not easily developed, particularly when staff are under pressure, with little time to meet together to discuss, but experience indicates that teamwork develops as staff meet to talk about provision and agree common objectives. Such meetings are an essential part of staff development." (FEU, 1986,a, p.16)

2.7.3 Factors Influencing Team Meetings/Communication

The literature highlighted three main issues influencing teamwork which have particular relevance to team communication, again these overlap and influence each other to some degree:

a) physical proximity;

b) size of the team;

c) a relaxed constructive climate.
2.7.4 Physical Proximity

The advantages gained by the physical proximity of team members was underlined by a number of people (Bartlett, 1974, Payne, 1982, and Adair, 1987) and has important implications for team cohesion (Adair 1987). Working closely together offers better opportunities for building rapport in a team than if members are scattered geographically.

To quote Bartlett:

"This accessibility to each other more readily creates a team identity and stimulates individual contributions to the team's efforts through frequent face-to-face communication."  
(Bartlett, 1974, p.17)

Peters also emphasised its importance for team communication stating that:

"Numerous studies chronicle the astonishing exponential decrease in communication that ensues when even thin walls of a few dozen feet of segregation are introduced. Hence all team members must 'live' together."  
(Peters, 1989, p.216)

Certainly, teams I encountered working on split sites found it more difficult to collaborate on a regular basis. In contrast, those who not only worked in the same building but shared the same staff room appeared to have much stronger communication systems - an issue also identified by the Tansley's research (1989).

2.7.5 Team Size

The size of a team appeared to have relevance for communication, identity formation, stability, skill diversity and productivity.

Team size was listed by Adair (1987) as an important factor leading to cohesive teamworking in that he believed that a smaller team would have more likelihood of developing stronger bonds. Larger teams made it often practically more difficult for
information to be circulated and for all members to be brought together for meetings (Turner 1982).

Rice (1958), from his research into teams, opined that a group of six to twelve members was satisfactory, but that eight should be aimed at as an optimum number. Similarly, Belbin concluded that:

"Ten or eleven seemed to be a number that was large enough to give adequate variety in the possible range of social permutations that can enrich life, but small enough to allow the syndicate to retain a sense of intimate group identity." (Belbin, 1981, p.114)

Seaman (1981) developed the theme of size by relating it to the productivity of the team, commenting on the danger of having more members than was needed to complete a task. He also pointed out that, as the size of the team increased, so did the potential problems of organisation. This was endorsed by Dyer (1987) who saw a particular problem associated with large teams:

"One can hide or coast for a time in the large team, but if any one member tries to coast it is immediately noted in a small unit." (Dyer, 1987, p.26)

While size of the team seemed to be an important dimension from a commercial and industrial team perspective, it appeared to be hardly mentioned in the literature on educational course teams. Tansley (1989) pointed out that actual size tended to be dependent on the requirements of the course, the number of students and staff available, and emphasised that the number of staff in a team was not open to the same kind of choice that was often available in industry. Size in an educational context was therefore not determined by some concept of optimum for purpose, but by practical experience or expedience.
2.7.6 A relaxed constructive climate

Francis and Young (1979) talked about the importance of a constructive climate where people felt relaxed and able to communicate freely. This, in turn, enhanced the amount of trust which prevailed amongst team members and provided an atmosphere in which members were less likely to be critical of others.

This was echoed by Larson and Lafasto (1989) who recognised the importance of giving people the opportunity to meet to discuss matters in a relaxed atmosphere. However this suggestion was also derived from a commercial context - in educational institutions finding both the time and the space seemed to be a major problem quite apart form the additional parameter of "relaxed" because of the pressures on tutors from a variety of directions. Such a climate may be achieved if the team is fairly small and if its members are based near each other so that communication is frequent.

2.8 COMMITMENT

Underlying most aspects of teamwork discussed so far is the assumed parameter of commitment to a team and its goals. The literature discussed so far implies a need for a willingness to collaborate, to communicate and to support others and such a willingness, while enhanced by the practical factors already highlighted, can provide a spirit of teamwork even under less satisfactory conditions.

Adair (1987) suggested that commitment could be quite simply recognised as a positive response to the question "Are you with us?" However, the difficulties of defining team commitment were acknowledged by Larson and Lafasto who recognised that:

"Unified commitment is a very amorphous property of successful teams. It is difficult even to conceptualise let alone deliberately and systematically build." (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.77)
Interpretations of commitment seemed to vary depending on the source. However the most frequent definitions concerned commitment to either the task in hand (which in an education context meant the course) or the goals and intentions of the team.

According to Turner (1982), Hastings et al (1986) and Larson and Lafasto (1989) commitment to teamwork required high levels of time and energy expenditure if a team was to be truly effective, although there were high returns in terms of opportunity, satisfaction and rewards (Larson and Lafasto (1989). However, from my conversations with team members it was apparent that one of the things they did not have was time, while many complained that they were fast running out of energy. In addition, the above stated returns were also not always immediately evident, and an apparent lack of these rewards in many cases left some members feeling demotivated and frustrated. It therefore has to be borne in mind that while this statement may well have some credence in a commercial situation, it is not easily transferable to an educational context, particularly in the political context of times of cuts and uncertainty.

2.8.1 Factors Which May Enhance Commitment To Team Working

The following factors have all been cited as conducive to commitment to the team:

a) team membership;
b) length of membership;
c) team review and training;
d) ownership and involvement in decision making;
e) clear goals and objectives;
f) clear roles and responsibilities.

Again, overlaps and interactions are discernible between these factors and those discussed previously.
2.8.2 Team Membership

Maddux (1989, p.34) described human resources as "the most critical part of any organisation's success," therefore one of the most important effects on commitment must be the desire of a member to be part of a team. The process whereby tutors become members is therefore often critical to the effectiveness of team (Tansley, 1989) in that it needs to be a positive one which ideally takes into account the member involved, the team as a whole and the task in hand.

The importance attached to the selection of suitable members was stressed in a number of the criteria listed for effective teamwork (Francis and Young 1979, Belbin 1981, Adair 1987, and Maddux 1989). However, a number of difficulties were identified. Firstly, it was clear from the commerce based literature and from my knowledge of education that the main selection process occurred when applicants first presented themselves to an organisation. In the case of industry this process often involved some form of psychometric testing and possibly an array of other selection procedures. Indeed, much of the literature dealing specifically with selection debated the place and suitability of various mechanistic methods of testing personality, attitudes, interest and sociability. Such a debate would appear to have little relevance to education where such testing is generally not carried out in such a structured way nor considered appropriate. The main criteria in education has been academic performance.

Individual writers placed differing emphasis on the importance of what a potential member needed to bring to a team, some placing it on skills for the task (Drucker, 1977) and some on personal characteristics (Seaman 1981, Belbin 1981). Seaman (1981) concluded that a team needed to recruit those not only with a wide variety of
skills, but also those who were disposed towards working in a team. While Adair (1987) divided his selection criteria for team membership into three main elements: technical or professional competence, the ability to work as a team member and the relevant desirable attributes such as the ability to listen and build on others contributions.

The process of selection was seen to be one in which the desires of the individual concerned should be taken into account (Torrington and Weightman, 1985), a feeling echoed by Bradley in reference to course teams in education:

"It would involve identifying which members of the subject team should contribute to which courses, and involves an understanding of the needs of course and the strengths and wishes of subject colleagues." (Bradley, 1987, p.7)

The political undertones, noted on page 29, about perceived prestige of a course would also have ramifications here. The majority of the literature therefore appeared to assume that selection of team members should be a positive process, taking into account the needs of the potential member and the team and involving the leader where possible. (Payne, 1981, Hastings et al, 1986).

While such a process normally takes place for initial appointments into education, once in the organisation, "selection" may often be dictated by pragmatic considerations such as teaching specialism, availability and timetabling requirements (Tansley, 1989). In some instances the process may therefore be less than positive, in that suitability to a team, or the desire to be part of it, may be sublimated to the necessity of filling a gap in the timetable. This may result in what Drucker (1977, p.80) referred to as the "least fit" where there is "a tendency to start out with the job and then look for someone to fill it."
This was reinforced by Tansley, who pointed out that:

"Staff who asked to join a particular course or who are quite happy to teach on it are likely to be more committed to it and to the course team than lecturers who were asked to teach on the course either because their hours were low or because the course was short of staff."

(Tansley, 1989, p. 164)

However, even in an industrial context it was recognised that it was not always possible for leaders to select a completely new team:

"It is rare that a manager is given permission - and an open cheque to go out into the world and choose whoever he pleases for his team. There are constraints on the pool of people from whom his choice must be made, as well as constraints of time under which he has to operate."

(Adair, 1987, p. 127)

While the literature highlighted the need for positive membership processes, the acknowledgement that this might not always be the case, required a consideration of the need for team review and training in order to discover team needs and build on strengths (Payne, 1981, Adair, 1987).

### 2.8.3 Team Review And Training

The importance of team review or appraisal, and subsequent training and development, are viewed as inextricably linked by the majority of management writers.

The role of team review was to guide a team in how to function more effectively in the future by indicating how it was functioning in the present (Merry and Allerhand, 1977).

Davies et al (1990) saw it as a positive process of recognising strengths and overcoming weakness and felt that any planning and action should automatically be followed by a review process.
Review and development were viewed by Adair (1987) as important particularly where team members may not have been deliberately selected. However, the need for a commitment from both the organisation and the team in terms of time (Everard and Morris, 1988) and money (Crick, 1980) was also strongly advocated if review processes and subsequent training were to have any validity or credibility.

Training Emphasis

Review and training focused on team tasks rather than processes, especially in literature about an educational context, where stress was placed on training in new skill and curriculum areas in relation to integrated assignments (FEU 1982,b) and curriculum evaluation (FEU 1989,b).

However, Davies et al believed that:

"Review is axiomatic to the working of effective teams and is not a post facto activity, but implicit in every aspect of the team in terms of task and process."
(Davies et al, 1990, p.80)

They urged that training should centre far more on process skills such as decision making and communication skills and less on tasks. This in turn would help a team to reach the "performing" stage noted by Tuckman (1965) as a sign of a mature team.

2.8.4 The Importance Of Ownership And Autonomy


"People increase commitment to a team when they are allowed to contribute to its success and if they are involved in goal-setting and problem solving, they have more of a sense of ownership." (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.78)"
George, (1978) and Pomrenke (1982) pointed out that such participative decision-making led to more effective team performance because:

"People are likely to have a greater commitment to a decision and its implementation if they have been involved in making it." (Pomrenke, 1982, p.41)

George (1978, p.97) recognised that teams should be responsible for the planning of their tasks as well as their implementation. He believed that this model would reduce the risk of conflict since it was a "bottom up" planning process. However, such an approach would necessarily involve the support of management who need to appreciate the benefits of teamworking (Leigh, 1988) and allow teams to have the necessary autonomy to realise these processes.

Ownership is a particularly important issue within an educational context as it was often presented as a difficulty within a number of teams who had little or no control over the course content or delivery, particularly those funded by outside agencies. Although explored more fully in the body of the research there appears to be clear indications that lack of involvement in the process for whatever reason can affect commitment to both the team and the course. Tansley, for instance, concluded that:

"Team members who have been involved in either of these activities (designing the original curriculum for the course or modifying it) would probably have more of a feeling of 'ownership' of the curriculum and consequently be dedicated to delivering it and supporting the course team."

(Tansley, 1989, p.165)

In addition to team autonomy there also needs to be a consideration of the autonomy of the individual (Nolan, 1987) and his/her individual values and objectives.
Nolan recognised that:

"Ideally methods of working are developed which integrate the cohesion and consistency of a good team with the personal autonomy the individual needs to work with full commitment." (Nolan, 1987, p.18)

Turner (1982) and Astin (1987) also reminded us that the educational experience of most people joining course teams tends to be one which has fostered rewards related to individuality. Turner believed that given such a background, some people find it difficult to work in a way which encourages shared responsibility and ownership. He felt that, to counterbalance this, team building needed to be a deliberate and planned activity so that people could appreciate the benefits of teamworking.

2.8.5 Goals And Objectives

The need for a commonality of purpose appeared to underpin much of the literature concerned with commitment to teamwork. Everard and Morris emphasised that:

"All systematic approaches lay stress on the importance of the team defining and agreeing its objectives (what has to be achieved) for no team can work effectively unless everyone in it knows where it is going." (Everard and Morris, 1988, p.133)

Similarly, in their research on effective teamworking, Larson and Lafasto (1989) came to the conclusion that:

"... whenever an ineffectively functioning team was identified or described, the explanation for the team's ineffectiveness involved in one sense or another, the goal." (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.27)

In an educational context the FEU (1985,b) also expressed the need for course teams to be both aware of the course aims and to share them, while Tansley's (1989) research, referring to the importance of course aims, demonstrated that co-ordinators
listed agreement on aims as being among the main factors which had facilitated the functioning of the course team. This is not disputed. However, this review of the literature indicates that a focus on course aims to the neglect of team aims would be an inappropriate balance.

Type Of Goal

Seaman (1981) described the importance of goals in terms of measuring team outcomes as well as in providing direction for a team. A similar point was made by Everard and Morris (1988) who stressed the need for quantifiable goals which could be observed and measured. These viewpoints seemed to make the assumption that all team goals were capable of being measured and that they should be subject to quantification. However, it is equally important in this culture (as noted in 2.2.4) to have goals related to team processes which are not totally results centred. This is explored more fully in the empirical part of this research.

A number of writers also pointed out the need for clear goals which all team members could understand (Francis and Young, 1979, Adair, 1987, Maddux, 1989). The reality of the situation in education, however, often appeared to be that course goals were often clearer than team goals, while agreement varied very much depending on the attitude to the team of the member concerned. The suggestion of Woodcock and Francis (1981) that mechanisms needed to be found to explore differing viewpoints in order to learn to live with these possible differences therefore seemed a particularly relevant one and will be explored during this thesis.

2.8.6 Roles Within Teams

Commitment to course team aims can probably only be effective if the team member concerned understands what his/her role is within the team. Lack of clarity or
misunderstanding in role definition was seen to be equally as important as clarity of those goals to which a team was working (Adair, 1987). As Payne pointed out:

"If a group of people are sharing a job of work and all contributing to it, they naturally have to define clearly what they are doing in relation to one another."
(Payne, 1982, p.22)

However Dyer (1987) suggested that since teams did not spend enough time considering the roles of individual members, lack of clarity and overlapping responsibilities could result in demotivation and conflict. Certainly this was observed during my own work with teams, in that often roles and responsibilities, particularly in the area of integrated assignments, were confused. This then resulted in either duplication of effort or, more frequently, activities not being completed as members often made the assumption that it was someone else's responsibility.

This clarity was particularly important when members belonged to several teams and sometimes had varying roles within them as well as conflicting responsibilities. (Payne 1982).

Payne (1981) also emphasised the need to distinguish between roles and tasks. He described tasks as parts of a job to be carried out and roles as expectations linked to the position held within a team, while Westerlund (1979) pointed out the problems that could occur when there was incompatibility of expectations within a team regarding role area.

Belbin (1981), who was particularly conscious of the issue of roles within teams, spent considerable time studying several hundred teams and explored the importance of roles in terms of success and failure. He accepted that there was a need to identify individual's aptitudes and needs and to match them with the requirements of the team and he set out to describe people in terms of the team roles to which they were most
suited. Belbin was able to create new teams and experiment until he found the right recipe for the context. He concluded that there were eight different and complimentary roles needed for a team and made the assumptions that a successful team need to contain all eight and that people could switch roles. He also placed a strong emphasis on personal characteristics as well as the skills people possess and the way they interacted.

While this is clearly an important consideration and has obvious implications for the selection of members, it may well have limited value particularly in an educational context as is discussed in section 2.8.2. Indeed, Belbin (1981, p.96) himself added that "it was impossible to forecast how this would work out." For instance, the pool of people with the necessary specialisms and skills may not be sufficient to allow choice of people for other attributes. On the other hand, this work may have some value in the identification of those assets currently in a team or for assisting members in understanding their possible limitations.

2.8.7 Issues Around Individual Differences And Team Conflict

From the preceding discussions it is evident that conflict within a team can have a variety of sources eg. unclear goals and role definitions. In addition, differences in needs, objectives and the values held by individuals (Hunt, 1981, Gray, 1982, Maddux, 1989) and clashes of personality rather than ideas (Adair, 1987) all need to be examined. If as Hunt (1981) stated, the degree of team cohesiveness depends on belief in the group goals, then the differing perspectives of course team members may result in conflict which does little to enhance constructive group interaction.

However, we are also reminded that while conflict can have a very negative effect on
teamworking, there are many instances were it can be healthy for a team and can enhance its creativity (Maddux, 1989). Hastings et al (1986) felt that if conflict were properly managed it could in fact lead to more understanding within a team and prevent members becoming complacent. However, it is important (Payne, 1982) that conflict is brought out into the open and not avoided - a factor borne out by a number of my initial informal encounters with teams, where conflict avoidance had resulted in covert hostilities and communication breakdown.

The literature therefore highlighted the need within team development to be clear about those areas of teamwork which could produce conflict. Such an exploration was clearly vital for this research as the isolation of such factors would pinpoint further ways of ensuring more effective teamworking.

2.9 DISCUSSION AND INTERIM CONCLUSIONS:

TOWARDS THE EFFECTIVE TEAM

The next stages of the research will focus on teams and their effectiveness. The examination of the previous literature had to some extent confirmed the outcomes of my early sampling of the views of course teams, which suggested that the way to enhance effectiveness was by concentrating on team processes, in particular those analysed and elaborated on in this chapter. Previous doubts regarding the usefulness of outcome-based measurements of effectiveness found in industrial and commercial team literature had been reinforced.
Indeed Hunt, himself writing for and in an industrial context, pointed out that:

"Holding only the final outcome to be significant denies the continuous shift in members motives, attitudes, satisfaction and interactions. Interactions are continuous and on-going and it is the interactions now that are important for the cohesiveness of the group. It is the social reward of cohesiveness in the group now which affects productivity not the pursuit of productivity itself." (Hunt, 1981, p.90)

Blake et al (1987) saw effective team performance in terms of the human process elements of productivity, creativity and satisfaction, a view which equates with Adair’s (1987) emphasis on the importance of both the team as a whole and of its individual members as being central to achieving a task. At the same time it would be wrong to dismiss the work of management authors, particularly where differences in terminology disguise fundamental agreement for instance, that teamwork, as opposed to group work, was about task achievement through all members working together in a way which was satisfying for each as individuals and for the team as a whole. The literature demonstrated that while teamwork was about achieving a task through combined skills and strengths, effective teamwork encompassed the dimension of collaborative working - a concept to which everyone was committed because they recognised the personal and professional benefits of working in this way. For this reason, notions of effectiveness must also incorporate the degree to which a team successfully carries through processes which benefit its members, the course and the students. The complexity of these processes have been illustrated: to take an instance, the way in which the reluctance of a member to join a perceived low status team can effect both that member’s commitment and the cohesion of the rest of the team. This might in turn lead to a lack of trust between members, a consequent lack of attendance at team meetings and a decreasing motivational spiral. The literature
demonstrated that this phenomenon was by no means uncommon, and probably resulted from allocation for a variety of practical reasons, rather than selection and choice being applied. Management however, needed to acknowledge this by ensuring training and staff development in teamwork as well as in curriculum areas.

Physical considerations represented another "sub-process" and it was pointed out that the structure of a team in terms of size and physical proximity should be considered if the team is to achieve effective communications.

Communication within teams was emphasised as important to collaborative working, with the leader playing a central role in this process, to ensure that all members played a part and shared responsibility.

However, it was clear that for teamwork to be successful, it not only required effective leadership, a suitable structure and committed members, but support from management and an organisational culture which encouraged people to work in this way. Administrative needs should not take precedence over the needs of effective teamwork. As the FEU (1985,b) pointed out, teamwork has considerable benefits, but it also needs careful planning and timetabling that enables suitable people to be free to be part of a particular team, and allows time for meetings when the majority of people can attend.

2.9.1 The First Step

The issue of management's contribution to effective teamwork and its influence on processes would be investigated further during the research, as would the various processes already identified; this investigation would also be based on the analysis of the various contributing sub-processes derived from the literature. At this point in the research I had a clear overview of all the main areas of concern within teamwork.
derived from these sources. I had also gained a well defined map (see Fig 1, page 15) of how one team process could affect other areas of collaborative working if attention was not paid to them. The research could now begin to explore whether any of the theoretical concerns were pertinent to course teams themselves, particularly in the context of Further Education.

However, before embarking on any data gathering, it was necessary to decide on the most appropriate research paradigm to adopt and also to come to some conclusions, albeit subject to review about the research design and instruments for data gathering. The next chapter therefore explores understandings of these methodological processes.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY - AN ECLECTIC JOURNEY

(Such a process) "entails immersion in the everyday life of the setting chosen for study, that values participants' perspectives, that views inquiry as an interactive process between the researcher and the participants, and that is primarily descriptive and relies on people's words as the primary data." (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p.13)

3.1 INTRODUCTION

It was important at this stage to check whether respondents working in a real team context saw the same factors as being important, how factors were prioritised and what the implication of those were to their own situations.

A closed model for the questioning of teams might bias their responses and prompt their answers; my research questions needed to be more open-ended in order to gain members' independent perceptions. The broad-based questions for working on reflected themes identified previously, in particular those of effectiveness (combined here with collaboration, communication, commitment) and a theme running throughout the research, that of managerial influence. These broad questions were as follows:

1) what do informants see as the factors promoting effective collaborative working?
2) what do they see as the constraints to achieving this?
3) to what extent are teams able to communicate regularly and if there are factors that prevent them from doing so, what are they?
4) what do informants see as factors facilitating individual commitment to the team and course?
5) what autonomy do the team members/leaders have in the organisation and planning of the team course?

This chapter therefore sets out to describe the rationale for a naturalistic approach to the research and explores issues of reliability and validity in relation to this approach.

3.2 COMMENTS ON METHODOLOGY - A NOTE

Due to the nature of the research question it was thought that the design of the fieldwork needed to follow an interactive reflexive pattern in that the results derived at each stage would suggest the focus for the next. A particular feature of the fieldwork was therefore an alternation between in-depth data collection and data gathering on a broader perspective to confirm, substantiate or note the individualistic nature of the more qualitative, less quantitative, preceding stage. As an advance organiser to the reader, Figures 2 and 3 (see pages 51 and 52) show how this worked in practice, although it should be noted that these are retrospective, since at the end of each cycle only the immediate next one would be clearly formulated in detail. The rationale for moving from one focus to another and the techniques used to investigate each will be described in the following chapters which chart the progress of the investigation.

Descriptions of the different instruments that I used within this approach are not given in this section. I believed that it would be more appropriate to debate these at the beginning of each chapter concerned with the relevant data collection where discussion could highlight the issues concerned in that particular part of the data collection process. At each stage decisions about the choice of instrument arose out of that particular situation, as described above, and therefore the descriptions of the rationale
for each instrument sat more easily within their own sections.

Within each section, the style of reporting is more narrative in that it attempts to highlight the stages, issues and thought processes which led to decisions about employing instruments.

This procedure also allows for the development of my own understandings, skills and confidence to unfold as they evolved during the course of the research, which took the form of a journey from the initial intuitive theories to the production of propositions for Action Research based on a Personal Construct theory approach.
EMERGENT RESEARCH PROCESS

Intuitive theories and subjective evidence derived from personal experience about teams and their working

- **Literature Review**
  - What is a team? What is an effective team?
  - A comparison of educational and industrial teams.

- **Questionnaire 1**
  - Based on general issues derived from the literature
  - Eg. membership, development training, meetings, conflict, responsibilities.

- **Interviews**
  - On specific concerns identified in Questionnaire 1
  - Eg. meetings, membership, proximity, communication, autonomy, integration.

- **Questionnaire 2**
  - Based on main theme derived from interviews
  - Eg. membership, commitment, cohesion.

- **Interviews**
  - About selection issues / membership processes

- **Observation**
  - Case studies

- **Questionnaire 3**
  - Focused on good practice

- **Constructivist workshops to identify staff development needs**
  - A staff development exercise to identify perceptions and develop sociality and commonality with regard to the team.
PROGRESSIVE FOCUSING OF RESEARCH

Course teams and their difficulties

Strengths of and limitations on teams

General overview of nature, purpose and process of teams in action

Issues around membership, communication and integration

Selection issues and cohesion

Processes of team membership and cohesion

Focus on good practice, processes

Evaluation and review of findings

Focus on team development view, perspective sharing

Personal experience

Literature review

Questionnaire 1

Interview series 1

Questionnaire 2

Interview series 2

Questionnaire 3

Exploration

Constructivist workshops to identify staff development needs
This chapter therefore seeks to serve as a preamble to the individual methodological discussions by examining the rationale behind my choice of general paradigm.

3.3 AN ECLECTIC JOURNEY AND CHOICE OF APPROACH

Development of the Research

This chapter intends to report on the factors which influenced the development of the research. These factors, which recur throughout the journey in a dynamic interplay, include the growth in personal learning and confidence as a researcher, the influencing elements that were learnt at each stage of the research and the ever-changing context in which the research took place. The result was an evolving process in which approaches and techniques used were eclectic in the sense that, although the whole process was underpinned by humanistic ideas of seeking participants' viewpoints on their problems with teamwork so as to provide solutions which would inform and facilitate their practice, what was meant by humanistic developed over time and, consequently, techniques deemed appropriate changed. The specific rationale for techniques used at each stage are elaborated on in the relevant chapters, while the context, personal growth and changing perspectives on the overall approach, will be documented and supported in this chapter.

The educational context in which the research is set is one in which there were the beginnings of a strong emphasis on student-centred learning. There was a move away from didactic teaching methods and the autonomy of subject specialists towards an integrated approach to subject teaching through collaborative teamwork. This was demonstrated particularly in the work of Access courses which offered mature students a non-traditional route into Higher Education by offering alternative entry
requirements. However, the status of these and other courses such as CPVE and YTS, also based on an integrated approach, varied depending on the culture of particular colleges and departments. This, in turn, had implications for resourcing, in terms of finance, time and membership of teaching teams. Where courses were viewed as prestigious they attracted staff more easily and were often given additional resources for meeting time and staff development. Where this was not the case, staff were often less willing to join a team, resulting in tutors who were low on hours being timetabled in. Shortly after the beginning of the research there were indications that the ILEA, in which I was working, was likely to be abolished. This led to enormous uncertainty amongst staff and was followed by cuts and a jobs freeze. This impacted severely on the morale of teachers as many saw not only the chances of promotion being limited, but also the security of their current post was at risk. This, in turn, affected the research in a number of ways: staff had less free time to devote to helping with the research, time for staff development was restricted and respondents were often worried about offering information which might be viewed negatively in a climate which was full of anger, suspicion and uncertainty. This meant that tape recording interviews was difficult and anonymity particularly had to be safeguarded so that individuals and colleges could not be identified. As a researcher working in the ILEA this also meant that my own free time was restricted and the choice of instruments used was also partly influenced by such practicalities.

Over the periods that the research was taking place, the context of Further Education generally was also changing. While the industrial and commercial literature reviewed at the beginning was deemed to be less transferable to education at that time, towards the latter part of the research an industrial metaphor was being imposed on education.
particularly as colleges moved initially towards local management then to incorporation for 1993. Tighter financial management, a closer control on the use of teaching resources and a stress on performance indicators and on quality assurance became increasingly important, as did an emphasis on the viewpoint of the student as one indicator of quality.

Within this ever changing context and in recognition of my own limited experience as a researcher, at the beginning of the journey I felt I needed the safety of conventional approaches to data collection so that I could systematically follow through the emerging issues in a way which I believed would ensure a solid foundation for any recommendations and way forward that the research might offer.

As a researcher I learnt to develop questionnaires to corroborate or otherwise the previous literature, and to gain information on the field first hand. I learnt from the process of the first questionnaire and recognised its possible weaknesses as I moved towards more open-ended interviews and developed two subsequent questionnaires which I believed had gained from the design of the first one. At each stage the data from the questionnaires was elaborated on by interviews which in turn were informed by three case studies. These demonstrated the reality of teams in practice and the difficulties they faced on a day-to-day basis. The data they provided was both exciting and discouraging in that, while it brought the issues to life, it also made me realise that my observation and recording of the facts would not necessarily help to change them. It was these feelings of helplessness that put me on the road towards a model of action research and personal construct psychology.

However, before I felt confident enough to leave the investigative stage behind, I needed the last hold on the relative safety provided by a final questionnaire which
would act as a check on all my previous findings. The teams I had been researching up to this point were those which for the most part were experiencing difficulties. I needed to check the data against those teams which were perceived as "successful", taking an opposite standpoint as a final check.

The data that arose from this final questionnaire, composed predominantly of closed questions, provided the solid foundation for the research to start the final stage of the journey. These teams were also experiencing similar difficulties and with the context of education beginning to change firmly at this point, there needed to be a way forward to manage change in which practitioners could own the process. This led the research into its action stage where the collection of data was superceded as a purpose by attempts to design a staff development tool with which participants could act as co-researchers on their own problems. In this way the degree of "humanism" in my approach was greatly enhanced. Thus developments in the research context and in my own expertise, competence and confidence as a researcher interacted with the information derived from the research. The various changes and developments in the educational milieu also transformed my perspectives of the research data at a time when I had begun to recognise the deficiencies of a highly structured researcher-led investigation.

Choice of approach

In striving for a reflexive approach to the development of my research, in which the choice of methodology reflected the exigencies of the situation and the nature of the questions to be addressed at each stage, I was close to Denzin's view(1971) that it is important to consider the research problem and its relevance to particular methods.
However, while agreeing with Parlett (1981, p. 17) that such an approach was necessarily "adaptable and eclectic", this eclecticism meant, in practice, a tendency towards choice within one of two overall approaches, the collection of quantitative and qualitative data. My choice of a broadly qualitative approach stemmed in large measure from the conclusion derived from my own experience and from the literature that the multiplicity of factors influencing teams made each team unique; I would therefore need to describe the situation as perceived by members of different course teams in varying institutions and geographical areas and, in the process, I would need to attempt to do justice to the internal world of the person (Pope 1982).

This focus further suggested a humanistic, naturalistic set of approaches committed to "seeing the world from the point of view of the actor" (Bryman, 1988, p. 77) and avoiding "predetermined constraints on outcomes" (Patton, 1990, p. 40). This broadly implied a rejection for my own research purposes of a "hypothesis-testing" approach (Cohen and Manion, 1989) in which the research setting may be manipulated and in which the reactions of large numbers to limited sets of questions are measured (Parlett, 1981) in favour of a methodology based on the view that the social world constitutes some form of open-ended process (Morgan and Smircich, 1980), a view which fitted well with my overall choice of a reflexive pattern. A philosophy which emphasised process as opposed to product, and a strategy which illuminated rather than predicted would, I hoped, give me a research paradigm which offered meaning and predictability (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Rist, 1977) and an adaptable and eclectic research approach in which different techniques are combined to illuminate a common problem (Parlett, 1981).
Naturally, there were risks attached to a focus which stressed the qualitative at the expense of the quantitative, however eclectic the approach within this overall paradigm. One of these was the risk of distortion as a result of researcher bias and the difficulties which might therefore be encountered in the credibility of my findings: the use of techniques such as triangulation and care with objectivity would be vital if these were to be surmounted (see discussion, page 59).

However, the risks inherent in a totally quantitative methodology were probably greater, also carrying with them the possibility of distortion. Undoubtedly an emphasis on scientific method brought with it the virtues of reliability and replicability. On the other hand, in the context of a philosophy which emphasised the uniqueness of teams, the tendency to manipulate and control research settings and to generalize findings at a high level of abstraction inherent in the quantitative approach, could result in reductionism and lost opportunities for subtler considerations of human phenomena.

These were my reasons for stressing the qualitative approach overall. However, a reflexive methodology would, I hoped, enable me to utilize the most valuable features of each of the two approaches according to different situations and needs at the various stages of my research. Later, this emphasis on reflexivity would lead me to consider the role and approach, in his or her own practical context of the teacher and student as investigator, when an action research and personal construct psychology approach began to be stressed.

3.4 RELIABILITY

Reliability in the sense of being able to obtain consistent results over time with the same subjects is an issue which has small relevance to naturalistic enquiry in that it
explores reality as perceived by individuals and by definition this will be constantly changing, especially when they are encouraged to articulate and question their own perceptions.

When dealing with human behaviour, unlike the physical sciences, the variables such as attitudes to teamwork, will be difficult to control (Rist 1977). Investigating processes with a team influenced by different factors in varying degrees at different times mitigates against definite reproducible results between teams - that is intra- and inter-team reliability. The issue of reliability in terms of replicability was therefore less appropriate to the research in that the goal was to expand theories (analytic generalisation) rather than enumerate frequencies (statistical generalisation) (Yin 1984).

3.5 VALIDITY

A naturalistic paradigm lays more emphasis on the importance of validity and authenticity in research, particularly in terms of being able to describe and accurately interpret observations.

As Rist pointed out:

"The researcher is encouraged to get close to the data, to develop an empathetic understanding of the observed, to be able to interpret and describe the constructions of reality as seen by the subjects and to be able to articulate an intersubjectivity with regard to the phenomenon being studied."

(Rist, 1977, p.45)

Parlett (1974, p.16) described this as "open-ended explorations" where the researcher "gets his feet well and truly wet" and becomes immersed in the situation.
The term validity is used in several ways:

1) face validity occurs when a study appears to focus on what it claims to be investigating;

2) content validity is established when the content measures what it claims to measure;

3) concurrent validity seeks to assess validity by comparing it with similar well established studies;

4) predictive validity refers to the ability of the study to predict some future criterion measure;

5) construct validity looks at how well the content fits in with the general notion of the psychological nature of the variables and the instrument it claims to measure. (OU 1975)

Concurrent and predictive validity were less relevant to my research in that I was not seeking a one-to one comparison because the criteria used in industrial management literature could not be directly translated to an educational context. Neither was it appropriate for the research to predict some future criterion measure given the dynamic nature of the phenomena under study.

However the issues of face, content and construct validity were central to the investigation given the importance to the naturalistic enquirer of authenticity and usefulness in terms of the practical impact the research could make.

Validity in the aforementioned senses, was safeguarded in three ways:

1) the use of multiple data collection methods (triangulation);

2) the use of multiple sources of evidence;

3) the review of data by key informants.
1) Methodological Triangulation

Burgess (1984, p.153) advised the researcher "to use different methods to look at the same situation."

The choice of a multi-faceted approach which combined a number of research methods enables the establishment of a greater degree of authenticity and validity.

According to Denzin such triangulation:

"Forces the observer to combine multiple data sources, research methods and theoretical schemes in the inspection and analysis of behavioural specimens. It forces him to temporarily specify the character of his hypothesis . . . it directs the observer to compare his subject's theories of behaviour with his emerging theoretical scheme . . . " (Denzin, 1971, p.177)

By adopting several methodological approaches to data collection (see individual chapters) this would strengthen the design of the research and provide triangulated conclusions which would have more stability than any of the individual vantage points from which they were triangulated. (Guba 1978).

2) The Use Of Multiple Sources Of Evidence

It was crucial, given the nature of the research questions, to be able to collect data from a number of different sources such as Heads of Department, team leaders and team members as well as by a number of methodological approaches. Not only would this increase the credibility of the findings, but it would also allow me to evaluate my own perceptions more effectively. In addition, the opportunity afforded to follow through three different course teams over the period of an academic year and on a fairly regular basis (see discussion Chapter 8) meant that repeated observations also
added to authenticity in the manner described by Eisner:

"One of the reasons why it is important to have extended contact with an educational situation is to be able to recognise events of characteristics that are typical. One needs sufficient time in a situation to know which qualities characterise it and which do not." (Eisner, 1979, p.218)

3) Review Of Data By Key Informants

House (1977) emphasised that validity could be ensured by cross checking different data sources and checking information with participants. The perceptions of informants are vital to the validity of naturalistic enquiry in that they give credence to the results and inspire confidence in the reader.

Patton (1990), advocates achieving triangulation by cutting across approaches and combining qualitative and quantitative methods. While there are strong arguments for maintaining the integrity of pure qualitative methods, there are also more practical concerns about gaining the most relevant data. (Patton, 1981). Towards the end of the research a final questionnaire was devised, the design of which tended to be more quantitative in approach in that it contained both fixed alternative and open-ended questions. As Miles and Huberman (1984) noted, qualitative research findings can be very illuminating and evocative, but can also be misguided. While I had confidence in the data, it was the result of a chain of evidence, all of which had been substantiated by informants, but I felt that a final check of the findings using teams which were perceived to be "successful" would add credence to the results (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) by proving an alternative perspective. A full discussion of the use of such a questionnaire is given on page 64.
As Patton (1990) pointed out:

"The extent to which a study is 'naturalistic' in design is also a matter of degree... In practice, the naturalistic approach may often involve moving back and forth between inductive, open-ended and phenomenological encounters with programs to more hypothetical-deductive attempts to verify 'hypotheses' or solidify ideas that emerged from those more open-ended experiences..." (Patton, 1990, p.194)

However, because of my prolonged engagement with teams I was also aware of the need to develop greater objectivity. While one of the strengths of naturalistic enquiry is its ability to get close to the data and immerse itself in the reality of a situation, I was aware of the dangers of a possible subjective bias as a researcher. I was therefore cognisant of the need to demonstrate my neutrality at all points in the research both in terms of the questions I asked and my responses to questions asked of me by informants (see page 97). However as Patton (1990, p.56) pointed out: "neutrality does not mean detachment" and it was my ability to remain empathetic to the experiences and views of others, while remaining neutral, that enabled me to understand and interpret the data.

The research approach was therefore sensitive to the feelings and difficulties that many teams were experiencing particularly at a time of change and instability and I was able to present descriptions which recognised the importance of individual team member's perceptions while affording me an overview of the whole team.
4.1 THE INITIAL APPROACH

A search of the relevant literature had highlighted issues related to teamwork which could bear further investigation, particularly since some of the underlying dimensions had also been raised through my conversations with team members, while others I had observed informally in the course of my work.

However, since the literature focused on teams in industry and commerce and my own experience was limited, it seemed important to investigate whether the issues were also prevalent in teams in other geographical areas.

I was also cognisant of the need to adopt an approach which could "attempt to make sense of the situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the research setting." (Patton 1980, p.410). In my case this setting encompassed a range of college situations and because of this, I recognised that the initial field work needed to take the form of a generalised enquiry. This would aim to explore the nature of course teams, what issues were relevant to team participation, and what possible ways forward might result from this initial exploration.
This deductive process is described by Patton as follows:

"... as the enquiry reveals patterns and major dimensions of interest, the investigator will begin to focus on verifying and elucidating what appears to be emerging ... a more deductive approach to data collection and analysis."
(Patton, 1990, p. 194)

This chapter, therefore, documents the beginning of an enquiry which seeks to be both reflective and iterative in its form. It aims to demonstrate the research process undertaken as it moved from what Guba (1978) calls "the discovery mode" to the "verification mode". It also records the learning cycle of the researcher, since the documented journey itself may prove helpful to others undertaking a similar process.

4.2 THE METHOD

Parlett (1974, p. 17) suggested "beginning with an extensive data base so that the researcher systematically reduces the breadth of the enquiry to give more concentrated attention to the emerging issues."

I decided that the most effective method for my initial exploration into the field would be through the use of a questionnaire. This would enable a better understanding of the nature of teamwork generally, while providing the seedcore for the "extensive data" that Parlett talked about. From this it would be possible to focus more clearly on those recurrent, unique or unpredicted phenomena which might require a more probing approach. (Parlett, 1974) Such a process would also allow the identification of appropriate teams with which to continue the research and the making of more informed decisions about the most appropriate methods to adopt.
In addition, the many issues derived from the literature could be checked out with participants so that continued reading would be more focused but have a less biased perspective. Also, the questionnaire would provide me with confirmation or denial of some of my own experiences and perhaps offer a better feel generally for the field I was researching.

As a result of these considerations, I decided to devise a fairly informal questionnaire asking course team respondents to address an overview of a number of issues. I also thought that the questionnaire would stimulate more in-depth contact with team members and thus open up channels of negotiation for me to gain access to their colleges.

4.3 THE AIM OF THE METHOD EMPLOYED

This initial questionnaire was therefore not aimed to provide the investigation with a set of quantitative information whose results might provide a basis for making certain generalisations. As Guba and Lincoln said:

"Is it meaningful to search for generalisations? Perhaps it might be in a universe that is completely deterministic and that operates out of a single and consistent set of rules that could be thought of in reductionistic terms." (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 94)

It was intended to:

a) provide the kind of overview that would indicate what issues were being raised;

b) provide some general indication of the frequency with which they were being raised;

c) make a comparison with those teamwork issues highlighted in the literature review;
d) describe, rather than explain, some of the concerns facing educational course teams.

Several open-ended questions were included in order to obtain an indication of issues about which I might not yet be aware. However, I was also sensitive to the possibility that, given limitations of time, tutors might not be so willing to complete this type of questionnaire. Their importance in this initial exploration is clear though, because, as Patton stated:

"The open-ended response permits one to understand the world as seen by the respondents. The purpose of gathering responses to open-ended questions is to enable the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selections of questionnaire categories." (Patton, 1980, p.28)

The particular foci of all of the questions emerged from the relevant literature evaluated in Chapter 2.

4.4 THE SAMPLE

"Having weighed the evidence and considered the alternatives, evaluators make the sampling decision, sometimes painfully, but always with the recognition that there are no perfect designs." (Patton, 1980, p. 104)

While it would have been possible to compare a number of different kinds of course teams by stratifying them according to the kind of programme that they delivered, the emphasis of the research lay with those general issues facing lecturers having to work together in a team.

I had links with course tutors through the Access team networks, and it seemed expedient, both from the point of view of interest and from the given opportunity, that
I began the investigation with those networks. However, given that teachers were required to work in a team context regardless of course nature, (eg BTEC guidelines, 1984, CPVE Framework, 1985, Access Submission documents, ILEA, 1987) I did not preclude teams from other courses from my sample. A random sample of one hundred colleges was taken from "The Survey of Access Courses in England" (Eds. Lucas and Ward 1985), and a letter was sent to each Head of Department asking that the questionnaire be passed on to a team member for completion. (See Appendix 1).

Access courses offer a second chance for mature students who are seeking entry to Higher Education, but who lack formal entry qualifications as a result of not having been able to take advantage of educational opportunities earlier in life. Many courses are designed to encourage participation by particular groups such as women and ethnic minority groups. These courses require an approach which puts a premium on issues of support, and the particular needs of adult learners. With all due caution, one might generalise and say that such courses attract teachers who feel able to empathise, often as a result of their own experience, with those who have encountered disadvantage as a result of the inadequacies of educational and other systems.

4.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS
It is important to state at this point that approximately twenty per cent of the questionnaires were sent to colleges within the ILEA. This particular part of the sample initially raised an ethical dilemma as I was asking questions in colleges where I might be known (however remotely) as a member of the Curriculum Development Project working directly to the inspectorate.
In addition, I was a member of the course resubmissions panel for Access course refunding in London, and some of these teams would be looking for course resubmission at the end of that academic year. I was aware that my formal position might have an effect on the questionnaire responses from that geographical area, in that team leaders might either have felt obliged to reply, to avoid replying, or to provide an answer that might give a more favourable picture of team circumstances. In order to minimise these effects where possible, I did not attend the resubmission meetings of those teams to whom I had sent questionnaires, and I included a covering letter to the ILEA teams in the sample, explaining that my work and research were not inter-related and that any information provided by team members would not be discussed within my work situation (see Appendix 2). Although I realised that this would still not eliminate all possible bias in the responses, and I would need to remain vigilant to that fact when analysing the data, it was assessed that complete confidentiality would encourage team members to describe their situation more accurately.

4.6 THE PILOT
The draft questionnaire was piloted within three institutions. Advisory lecturers at the Curriculum Development Project who had previously been in teams also reviewed the questionnaire. A few changes were made and the revised questionnaire (see Appendix 3) was sent out at the beginning of the autumn term.

4.7 THE RETURNS
The questionnaire was sent out with a covering letter to Heads of Department
explaining what the research was about and stating that names and colleges did not have to be given if respondents preferred to remain anonymous (see Appendix 1). However, despite giving respondents three weeks to reply, and a prepaid envelope, the initial response rate was fairly low. I followed up non-responses with telephone calls and a number of respondents told me that this was possibly one of the worst times in the term to be sending out a questionnaire, not only was everyone inundated with accumulated mail from the summer holidays, but they were also busy enrolling and counselling new students. I asked a number of respondents what they considered would have been a more appropriate time. The majority felt that the beginning of the spring term would have been a less stressful time. This advice was heeded for my later questionnaires.

It was also discovered at this point that the few colleagues whom I knew directly responded less promptly than others, thus dispelling a myth that I had held that if I included colleagues in the sample it would speed up the dissemination process. This may have been because, as close colleagues, respondents might have thought that I would be more prepared to wait for an answer. Thirty seven questionnaires were returned in response to letters to one hundred colleges.

With regard to any possible bias in questionnaire answers, it is important to state that, in fact, questionnaire responses from ILEA colleagues did not seem to "paint a particularly rosy picture" of the current situation, indicating an honesty in their portrayal of teamwork problems. However, this might also have occurred because team leaders mistakenly believed that I was in a position to change certain resourcing situations which they were highlighting in their responses.
4.8 QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

4.8.1 Introduction: method and presentation guide.

Where answers to individual questions could be presented in numerical form, they have been given in the form of pie and bar charts for ease of identifying potentially important issues. Frequency of response was only used as an initial guideline since I was aware of the point made by Guba (1978, p.54) that "The importance or salience of an item need not be a function of its frequency of notation."

Where questions demanded a more open-ended answer, responses have been grouped together in categories. Guba (1978) expounded on the importance of looking for recurring regularities and of exploring whether or not the same kinds of comment occurred at different times from different informants and in somewhat different contexts. He also described how such regularities can "form the basis of an initial sorting of information into categories that will ultimately be labelled as 'concerns and issues'" (Guba, 1978, p.54). Such a categorisation would then enable me to identify areas which needed to be pursued in more depth.

Please note that the numbers and letters given in brackets refer to quoted responses which can be found in Appendix 4. All percentages are calculated on the number of respondents for each question.

4.8.2 Profile Of Respondents

The initial questions (see Appendix 3) were intended to identify the range of courses that people taught on, and their responsibility within a particular course. They also established that the course in question was in fact delivered by a team and that the
respondent was a member of that team. This information made it easier to put resultant data into some kind of framework.

43.2% of respondents came from Access teams which was not surprising given the sample discussed on page 66. The implications of this are discussed in the appropriate section.

Status Of Respondents

All the focal courses were delivered by a course team and all but two respondents, who were Heads of Department, had membership of the team. Just under half of the respondents (48.6%) were team leaders and therefore could be said to have a particular interest in the team and its image. It was therefore important to be alert to any bias or ego investment that they might display in their responses. Only one respondent indicated that she was part-time, although personal experience demonstrated that course teams often had a number of part-time members. A possible explanation might be that the questionnaire was not given to them because of their limited availability, an issue which was raised in Chapter 2 in discussions related to information and the management of power structure.

4.8.3 Course Organisation And Planning

Respondents were asked how their course was organised and planned. These open-ended responses indicated that the organisational focus of these courses fell into four groups:
1) the team itself;
2) the meeting;
3) the external co-ordinator/Head of Department;
4) the students.

The Team

Nine respondents (although two were from the same team) described the team as the centre of the planning process, although final responsibility lay with the team leader (2). One mentioned that planning was carried out jointly with the link Higher Education college (3), which is usual in the case of Access courses.

The Meeting

Four respondents put an emphasis on the team meeting as the forum for "pooling and sharing ideas." (10-13), although one response added that planning was around "timetable constraints." (14)

External Focus

Four responses described the focus as being outside the team and in the hands of either a co-ordinator (15-17) or a Head of Department (18).

Students

The final category placed students firmly at the centre of the process (19-21), where work schedules were "continually reassessed and changed according to the needs of the students." This limited set of responses was the only mention made of students.
4.8.4 Feeling Part Of The Team (see questions 6 & 7, Appendix 4).

Fig. 4

Do you feel part of the team

YES: 28
75.7%

NO: 9
24.3%

These questions aimed to investigate how members viewed themselves within the team in question.

Fig 4 shows that the majority (75.7%) felt that they were a part of the team. Given my informal contact with teams I was initially surprised by such a positive result.

However, two important factors had to be taken into account which may have influenced this response:-

a) As previously stated, just under half the respondents were team leaders and while this may not have necessarily led them to feel part of the team, they were less likely to consider themselves complete outsiders. One team leader did qualify her response by adding that, "I feel involved, but separate too, as I have a quasi management role to play." (23)

This and other comments (see Appendix 4) indicated that there were also issues for
leaders about feeling part of a team despite their central role.

b) The second factor to be borne in mind was that 43.2% of respondents were from Access courses. From my experience of working widely in the area of Access courses the very nature of their philosophy tended to mean that tutors volunteered more positively to join them.

4.8.5 REASONS WHY RESPONDENTS FELT PART OF A TEAM

These appeared to fall into four very similar categories:

a) mutual support;

b) meetings;

c) involvement and decision making;

d) roles.

Although responses to these open-ended questions often encompassed more than one category, for clarity of analysis and data layout they have been listed under the category which appeared to have had most emphasis placed on it by the respondent.

a) Mutual Support

Mutual support was viewed as particularly important to team work (2 and 4) and clearly contributed to members' feelings of being part of a group working together (Likert, 1961) enabling members to accept criticism, and make constructive use of it (Kolb et al 1984). Individual commitment to both the team and the course (3) was also seen as facilitating the process of cohesion. Conversely, lack of commitment was highlighted in those reasons given for not feeling part of the team (18).

b) Meetings

The area of team meetings appeared in both negative (22) and positive (5-9)
responses. Although this area is discussed more fully in the next section, respondents saw meeting time as critical to feeling part of a team (9). Not being able to attend for such reasons as timetable clashes (22), was clearly an important factor.

c) Involvement And Decision Making

A number of positive comments concerning group decision-making appeared to assume that meetings were taking place in order to facilitate members' involvement (12-15). Although the small number of returns did not make correlational analysis possible, reflection on individual returns indicated some linking themes. Participation in team and course processes, (10-12) gave members the feeling that their contributions were valued (15). Team involvement also appeared to be facilitated by leadership style (13,14) and the encouragement of other team members (12,14,15). Where a team member felt that he/she had little or no input into the team (20) or course (19) it produced negative feelings of involvement and ownership. (Merry and Allerhand, 1977)

The importance of contact and physical proximity to the rest of the team was stressed by one respondent (21) who, as a result of spending most of her time in a different building, did not feel part of the team.

d) Roles

The last main category concerned the area of roles where the roles that people had or needed to play raised certain issues in terms of their team membership (23,24). One respondent (team leader) felt her "quasi management role" also separated her from the team (23), while another team leader felt responsible for the team but thought the inequality in pay was clearly an issue for the rest of the team who favoured a democratic approach to team relationships (24). Where roles and responsibilities were
not clear, respondents did not feel their place in the team was altogether satisfactory, (25,26), - a factor recognised by Dyer (1987) when he reported that most teams spent insufficient time on ensuring everybody understood their roles and responsibilities.

4.8.6 Meetings - Frequency, Remission And Administrative Arrangements

(See questions 8-14 inclusive in Appendix 4 p.iv)

Fig. 5

**How often does the team meet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Frequency Of Meetings

Results shown in Figure 5 indicated that 57.1% of teams met once a month or more, while 28.6% met only once a term. However one respondent added that this referred to formal meetings as the team met weekly on an informal basis ("other" Fig 5). Three teams never met, another met only annually and another met whenever they could make it ("other" Fig 5). Some writers (eg. Payne, 1982) would therefore query whether they then actually constituted a team.
Although it could be argued that the apparent infrequency of meetings might indicate a lack of commitment to meeting other members formally, the data also indicated that 88.6% of respondents did not receive remission for attending meetings. This would imply that they gave up their free time to attend, and thus were committed to meeting as a team however infrequently. (see Fig 6)

b) Who Attended

It was interesting to note that of the attendances twenty-three were part-time staff, indicating a fair level of commitment on their part, particularly if they were also amongst those who did not receive remission. Equally noteworthy was the fact that student representatives were part of team meetings in five teams, an inclusion which seemed to demonstrate a recognition of the student as part of the wider team. (This was later found to be relatively uncommon and may well have been a result of having a high percentage of Access teams).

Another point was the number of team members above lecturer level who attended meetings as ordinary members. While it was not evident how many of these were
actual members of the teams in question, it indicated a possible area of potential conflict in that lecturer grade team leaders might well be co-ordinating members of a much higher grade than themselves.

d) Meeting Organisation And Management

As few respondents received remission, the effective management of meetings appeared even more crucial if members were to give up their own time to attend. Of the twenty four different teams represented by the respondents, twenty two had meetings organised and led by the team leader. The other two were organised by the senior lecturer who was not a team leader and another by the whole team, who rotated the chair. It could be said that the latter organisation reinforced teamwork (Larson and Lafasto, 1989) while the former might provoke the kind of conflict situation previously mentioned.

89.2% said that their team meetings had agendas, although in terms of the time needed to prepare for meetings, only 46% said that these were sent out in advance.

4.8.7 Effective Teamwork - Analysis Of Respondent's Definitions  (See questions 15-17, Appendix 4 p.vi)

Introduction

Respondents were asked to define what they thought constituted effective teamwork and whether or not the focus team met this definition.

Definitions appeared to fall into nine categories:

a) commitment to teamwork and the course;

b) sharing goals and objectives;
c) supporting and sharing;
d) meetings;
e) communication and co-ordination;
f) team reviews;
g) team composition;
h) roles;
i) the importance of a team approach.

Two examples of each definition are given within the main body of this analysis and additional quotes are presented in Appendix 4 p.vi. The numbers in brackets within this section indicate the representative quote.

Some Examples Of Respondents' Definitions Of What For Them Constitutes An Effective Team:

a) Commitment To Teamwork And The Course (see also Appendix 4 p.vi)
   1. "It should be committed to working as a team"
   2. "People of like minds, committed to the work they're doing with similar goals, able to work well together, hardworking, thorough and efficient - both in terms of teaching and meeting other staff and students"

b) Sharing Goals And Objectives
   3. "Committed and sharing similar objectives."
   4. "Aim for a common purpose and goals"

c) Supporting And Sharing
   5. "Tutors exchanging ideas and sharing experiences. Giving support to one another."
   6. "Each member has full ownership for total course and feels positive and is supported by the rest of the team."

d) Meetings
   7. "Regular meetings at a time when the majority of staff can go - minutes are circulated to absentees - preferably an agenda in advance."
   8. "Where most members turn up, decisions are unanimously agreed in a relatively harmonious atmosphere."
e) Communication And Co-ordination
9. "Able to sit down together in advance to plan and co-ordinate."
10. "One whose work is well co-ordinated and interlinked and one which discusses student progress regularly."

f) Team Reviews
11. "That has regular reviews of the course and contributions from all the team."
12. "Constant monitoring of effective teaching/learning strategies."

g) Team Composition
13. "It shouldn't be made up of people involved in too many teams."
14. "Two student reps, course tutor and other SL, librarian, student counsellor, ie a committee which represents the students' needs."
15. "Strong leadership, sense of purpose and relevance of course."

h) Roles
16. "One which works together, exchanges ideas and appreciates the role of other team members."

i) Importance Of A Team Approach
17. "That produces necessary results which could not be produced through alternative organisational models."
18. "Ideally the team is more efficient than individuals and certainly more creative."

Perception of effective teamwork appeared to differ considerably. However, although the emphasis varied, there was considerable overlap where the issues within them affected each other. This overlap has been taken into account where possible, both in the breaking down of individual definitions and in the analysis.

a) Commitment

These definitions encompassed both commitment to working together as a team (1,2,19) and commitment to the course and its students (2,20). Although definitions which emphasised the need for common goals were categorised separately, this was also stressed in one of the other quotes (2), describing the kind of commitment needed to work together.
b) Sharing Goals And Objectives

Commitment to a team or course would assume a willingness to share similar objectives. (3,4,21), while a number of other definitions stressed the need for clarity of goals if the team was to be effective. (22-24)

c) Sharing And Supporting

Part of team commitment was perceived as being supportive to other team members and to sharing ideas (5,6). These definitions probably accounted for the area of effective teamwork most frequently highlighted by respondents and would seem a fairly natural result of members being committed to working together. However, since commitment to a course may not necessarily mean commitment to the team delivering it, the importance of sharing was seen as a very important aspect of successful teamwork, particularly in the exchange of ideas and information (25,26).

Equal involvement (27-29), joint responsibility and ownership (6) were also emphasised, although one respondent expressed concern that such equality should not be allowed to hinder team processes (30).

d) Meetings

Meeting time was seen to facilitate the processes of sharing and involvement with an emphasis on the timing of meetings so that the majority of staff could attend (7,32), with remission for attendance (33). Meetings were viewed as vital to planning, decision making and reporting on student progress (8,34) and needed to be held regularly (7,35). Four references were made to the management of meetings and the importance of having an agenda and minutes (7) and an effective chair (32,34).
e) Communication And Co-ordination

The importance of communication and co-ordination was stressed (9,10,37) in relation to planning and monitoring student progress.

f) Team Reviews

Two respondents indicated the need for the whole team to contribute to a regular review process (11,12).

g) Team Composition

A concern was voiced that a team should not be made up of members belonging to too many other teams (13) - an issue which was raised again later in the questionnaire (see paragraph 4.8.11). Strong leadership (15) and a team membership which saw students as its focus were also recommendations (14). No other comments were made on leadership despite its prominence in team literature. This might have been due to the number of respondents who were team leaders and who therefore did not feel it appropriate to comment.

h) Roles

Although only one respondent remarked on roles (16) their importance would seem to underpin many other definitions of an effective team, such as equality, co-ordination, support and negotiation, which were seen as central to team working.

i) The importance of a team approach

Two respondents stressed the benefits of effective teamwork over individual working (17,18).

It is notable that most of these themes reiterate those found in the literature discussed in Chapter 2.
4.8.8 WHETHER OR NOT THE TEAM MET THIS DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS

Introduction

Respondents were then asked to state whether their focus team met their prescribed definition.

46% replied positively, 13.5% negatively and 40.5% said it sometimes matched the description.

Explanations fell into the following categories which were similar to those given for an effective team (see Appendix 4 p.vii).

a) Meetings
b) Sharing and co-operation
c) Team size and membership
d) Ownership
e) Resources
f) Conflict

a) Meetings

Many of the reasons given for poor teamwork related to meetings: lack of time; lack of remission and poor management. Their importance for team communication was also emphasised such that members felt isolated if they missed meetings (5,6). Conversely, productive meetings with remission to attend and commitment from members, were given as reasons for having an effective team (8,9).
b) Co-operation And Sharing

The next largest perceived area of concern was the need for co-operation and sharing, particularly of expertise. (13,14). Six respondents talked positively about co-operation and sharing within their team, (12-17) whereas "individualism" was perceived as contrary to collaborative working (10).

c) Size And Membership

Large teams, particularly where they were physically separated (18), was given as a reason for not being effective. The same respondent also talked about the difficulty of having "a course director who teaches on five other courses", highlighting the problem of membership of several teams.

Being marginalised because of a subject specialism (20) and constantly changing team membership (19) were also seen as negative influences on teamwork.

d) Ownership Of The Course

Three respondents commented on ownership of the course, or lack of it (21-23). Clearly, when some people did not feel they had much of a say in a course (22) or a large enough part to play (23), a team could not be said to be fully working together. On the other hand with "owning a course" comes the need for considerable team commitment and as one team leader expressed it, "ownership can feel burdensome" (21).

e) Resources

Lack of resources (24-26) and external constraints (27) were also perceived as problematic areas. Respondents felt that even where "they worked well together in the interests of the students and ourselves", a lack of resources was a handicap to real effectiveness (25).
f) Conflict

Team conflict was seen to create harmful divisions particularly where there was a small yet powerful disruptive element in the team (28).

4.8.9 WHETHER OF NOT RESPONDENTS CHOSE TO BE MEMBERS OF THEIR TEAM

Fig.7

Did you choose to join the team

YES: 31
83.8%

NO: 6
16.2%

Introduction

83.8% of respondents (see Fig 7) had wanted to be members of this particular team. Experience of working with teams had led me to suspect that the percentage would be considerable lower as team members often appeared to be given little or no choice in this matter. Membership was frequently the result of having a particular specialism or being free at a particular point on the timetable (see Appendix 4 p.ix). However, it
However, it has to be remembered that 48.6% of respondents were team leaders and therefore more likely to have been offered the choice about leadership.

Demands Of The Timetable And Specialisms Required

Although only nine respondents elaborated on this (see Appendix 4 p.ix), some of their responses indicated that team members might not enjoy the same level of choice that was probably offered to team leaders:

"They wanted someone with my particular expertise to teach this aspect of the course, and I was asked to do it because I was likely to have more ‘free’ time on my timetable than other tutors." (2)

This seemed to indicate that timetabling and skill area were the main influences on membership: "It is the demands of the timetable". (3) However, the fact of teaching on a course also assumed commitment to the team: "It is an inherent feature of these courses, choice does not come with it, if you don't wish to be a member of the team-you don't teach on the course." (1)

As previously discussed, a large number of respondents were from Access teams. Such courses appeared to attract staff who were more committed to teaching on those types of courses and therefore it was not surprising to receive responses such as, "I was asked, but said yes." (4) or "By choice." (9)

While the nine responses indicated the variety of processes for membership, they did not provide sufficient data to obtain any clear overview on membership and as such I felt it would need more exploration.
4.8.10 IN-SERVICE TRAINING OR INDUCTION COURSES ON TEAM BUILDING

Fig.8

Has the team had any training

- YES: 6 (16.2%)
- NO: 31 (83.8%)

83.8% of respondents belonged to teams who had not had any training and only 37.8% of individual respondents had ever had any individual staff development in this area. This indicated an assumption on the part of managers that staff did not need to acquire teamwork skills although their importance for success was highlighted in such reports as "Investing In Change." (FEU 1986).

4.8.11 RESPONSIBILITY TO OTHER COURSE TEAMS

This question was analysed in conjunction with questions 23-25 (see Appendix 4 p.ix), which asked respondents whether membership of more than one team presented difficulties and what they were.
Do you belong to any other teams

**YES:** 30
81.1%

**NO:** 7
18.9%

**a) Lack Of Time**

81.1% of respondents had responsibility to other teams covering a range of courses. Some were members of up to four other teams, and 53% said that this created difficulties for them. The majority of difficulties concerned time (1-5), especially a lack of it and the pressure that resulted from this (12-16).

Some respondents emphasised the amount of time spent in numerous meetings (6,7) and the difficulties of attending meetings with overlapping times (8-10). This was seen to lead to less effective courses particularly when members were being spread too thinly (12) and having to diversify their energies.

**b) Different Approaches**

Difficulties could arise as a result of respondents comparing their various teams, as this led to either favourable or negative perceptions of the various teams and sometimes resulted in a conflict of interests and loyalties (17).
4.8.12 EVALUATION OF TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

46% of respondents said no team evaluation was undertaken and of the respondents who replied to the question regarding frequency just over half of those said that it was carried out continuously and 10% weekly. The remaining 35% indicated a less regular commitment.

Descriptions Of Team Evaluation

A complete list of descriptions appears in Appendix 4 p.xi. Although the emphasis of the question was on the evaluation of teamwork, at least half of the respondents answered in relation to course evaluation (1-4) and student progress (5-9). It could, be argued that such answers are equally valid if the team in question was evaluating its effectiveness more in terms of product and outcomes than its teamwork processes. This will depend to a large extent on how the team defined effectiveness and what sort of criteria they were employing to evaluate themselves against.

Other descriptions left it unclear as to whether evaluation was of the course or the team (12-13), although one respondent (10) did mention the evaluation of team meetings as well as course evaluation.

4.9 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this chapter the dual function of this preliminary questionnaire was outlined. It was to provide an overview of teamwork in practice and to identify areas which needed more in-depth exploration. There were four of the latter:

1) the area of team meetings, including their timing, and remission for attendance;
2) those factors which may have an effect on commitment to the team/course:
i) allocation of members to teams;

ii) the willingness of team members to be mutually supportive and work in a collaborative way;

iii) the importance of shared goals;

iv) the need for ownership and involvement.

3) the importance of team review and evaluation;

4) the need for staff development, particularly in the light of allocated team members and team review processes.

The whole area of team meetings had raised a number of important questions regarding timetabling and remission and their effectiveness was often at the mercy of administrative practicalities. Their importance for team communication was particularly emphasised and where members were unable to attend, they often felt isolated from the rest of the team. Attendance was especially problematic where members belonged to several teams.

Larson and Lafesto (1989) saw involvement in meetings as an important part of the collaboration process, while in an educational context both the FEU reports, "Investing in Change" (1986,a) and "A Fragmented View" (1986,b) emphasised the need for meetings, while acknowledging the difficulties that members had in getting to them. Meetings facilitate integration and allow staff to be "To be free together so that discussion about coursework assignments and assessments can take place." (FEU, 1986,a, p.15). Infrequent meetings and lack of remission time may be due to resource constraints which are not always something which can be rectified easily in a time of budget cutbacks. The FEU report (1989,b) recommends avoiding a structure which
relies heavily on full team meetings unless resources are available. If a course is viewed as important by a college it should be prioritised in terms of resource allocation and, as far as possible, an absence of administrative constraint: there may be practical and political objections to this on the part of a management struggling with limited budgets, increasingly obliged to be accountable for its actions, particularly to external funders, and as a result perhaps less willing to allow devolutions to teams. However, there are strong counter-arguments which stress the effectiveness of teams which have a major role in running their own affairs.

Team commitment also appeared to be enhanced when a team had a degree of autonomy in its planning and organisation and where members felt part of a sharing process and valued for their contributions. Commitment might be further guaranteed if a member joined a team willingly and for positive reasons. While demands of the timetable and subject specialisms required seemed to be one of the main membership factors, such criteria may not always have a positive effect on the cohesion of the team and the willingness of its members to work collaboratively. As the FEU report pointed out:

"It is essential to choose the right kind of staff in the first place . . . and create the right attitudes in them, the development of skills being secondary to this."

*(FEU 1982,b, p.17)*

For this reason training in teamwork would seem particularly important if members are to learn to work together and share common goals. However, the data had shown that this was not an issue which managers appeared to take seriously. Finally it is clear that if teams and their delivery are to be truly effective, the process of reviewing team
performance is an important one which needs to be continuous if a team is to move forward. As Woodcock and Francis pointed out:

"Regular review of performance is essential to the development of competence . . . a team will gain from periodic reflection on its performance and a dispassionate enquiry into missed opportunities and inadequate performance." (Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.143)

While this appeared to be taking place to a certain extent, most of the emphasis was placed on evaluating the course with very little about team processes - an element which is clearly vital to both the well-being of the course and its students.

4.10 A REVIEW OF THE PROCESS SO FAR

This part of the research had been an important learning stage which had enabled me to clarify my ideas and make more refined decisions about my research design.

With hindsight evaluation of the questionnaire, I realised that, while it was a useful start point, it would have been helpful to have reached more team members, as well as leaders. In addition, I might have had more significant data, in the sense that I might have had a clearer idea of why there were concerns, if the questionnaire had explored some of the issues more deeply - that is, asked for tentative explanations rather than just statements in some of the question areas.

I also felt that, were it possible, it would now be helpful to talk to whole teams in order to obtain varying perspectives. I would then be working with both the individual member and the whole team.
This would be in line with the thinking of Guba and Lincoln:

"The major task of the constructivist investigator is to tease out the constructions that various actors in a setting hold, and so far as possible, to bring them into conjunction - a joining with whatever other information can be brought to bear on the issues involved . . . ."
(Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p.142)

I had identified certain issues within teamwork and I was now excited by the idea of exploring these in more depth to see which would emerge as the wider concerns.

As Marshall and Rossman pointed out:

"Identifying salient themes, recurring ideas and language and patterns of belief that link people and settings together, is the most intellectually challenging phase of data analysis and one that can integrate the entire endeavour." (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p.116)

4.11 THE WAY FORWARD

The initial questionnaire had reinforced those factors which I had observed during my informal work with teams. While my research journey could have started with an in-depth exploration of these factors, this stage was important to me as a researcher, since I had only observed these factors in a limited geographical context and therefore needed to investigate them more widely. In addition, the dynamic nature of teamwork and the ever changing context of education may have brought different concerns to the fore. The research needed this underpinning in order to move to the next stage of the journey.

While the questionnaires had proved useful in that they had provided this initial overview and enabled me to make contact with teams, I was aware that this was a learning process. On evaluating them, the questionnaires could have provided more focused and elaborated information if I had included far more open-ended questions
which would have obviated the need to follow up responses. My concern with the time it might take people to complete these and their willingness at a time of constant other demands, had led me to be over cautious.

As a result, the issues of communication through meetings, team review and development, and commitment to collaboration through positive membership, needed to be explored in more depth. I believed that at this point the way forward would be through semi-structured interviews picking up the points emphasised by respondents so that I would have a research tool appropriate to elaborating on the data.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE NEXT STAGE

"Qualitative methods can be used both to discover what is happening and then to verify what has been discovered."
(Patton 1980, p47)

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The questionnaire had provided an initial overview of the nature of course teams and had given me a clearer understanding of those issues from within the teams and from within institutional contexts which teams felt affected their working. However, the concerns raised needed elaboration. More in-depth responses were therefore sought.

5.2 THE METHOD

In line with the iterative model that this research had adopted, semi-structured interviews would be the most appropriate tool for obtaining such information as opposed to a further questionnaire or structured interviews. There were now certain question areas that begged to be pursued which might form the core of "conversations" with team members and leaders, for which a semi-structured interview would provide a framework. The interviews were not intended to be standardised, since that process might constrain interviewees or prevent them from full disclosure.

(Parlett, 1978)
As Burgess (1984) stated,

"This strategy, it is argued, gives informants an opportunity to develop their answers outside a structured format."
(Burgess, 1984, p.102)

Checklists resulting from individual questionnaires were used as the basis for "questions in the course of conversation" (Burgess, 1984, p.102). Because I was seeking "conversations with a purpose" (Kahn and Cannell, 1957 p.149) the questions reflected back to the questionnaire responses, allowing the interviewees to elaborate on their original answers.

5.3 THE AIM OF THE METHOD

The purpose of such interviews, along with other methods was to provide a multi-faceted approach to data collection. The proposed triangulation would then offer a more illuminative description of the current views of team members and leaders on the perceived efficacy of course team delivery, and the difficulties attached to it.

5.4 THE SAMPLE

Twenty-one respondents had indicated a willingness to help further with the study. Fifteen of these were interviewed as the other six were unavailable at that time. (See follow-up letter Appendix 5.) While it is acknowledged that from their volunteer status and the fact that they answered the original questionnaire, it could be inferred that these respondents were more interested in teamwork, every effort was made during the interview process to understand and find explanations for any possible bias.

Barnes (1970) highlighted other questions which researchers should ask themselves about the prospective interviewee: the reliability of the person involved, her
competence to know and be able to tell the truth, whether or not her opinions were
coloured by her position and whether or not she was an eye witness or participant in
any of the issues or events reported. All these points were carefully noted and taken
into account when carrying out the interviews.

5.5 THE SPREAD OF RESPONDENTS

The geographical spread of colleges and the nature of the courses involved were
determined predominately by the fact that interviewees had offered to take part.
There was a spread of six different kinds of course: Return to learning, CPVE, YTS,
Access, GCSE and Restart. Geographical areas covered included: three London areas,
the Home Counties, the Midlands and the North of England.

5.6 BACKGROUND TO THE INTERVIEW PROCEDURE

5.6.1 Difficulties Encountered

A) The interview schedule took longer than anticipated as, at this point in my
research, the abolition of the ILEA became a certainty; resource cutbacks were
implemented and lecturing posts were frozen. In these circumstances a number of
those people whom I wanted to interview had their availability restricted.

B) Within ILEA colleges, the atmosphere and general fears created by impending
abolition made interviewees uncomfortable about having interviews taped. The
majority of interviews were therefore recorded by taking down verbatim notes which
were read back to respondents at the end of each interview to check that they were a
fair account. Interview transcripts were also sent back to interviewees to verify the
data. No transcripts needed changes of any substance.

C) Some of the interviews had to be conducted in staff rooms or canteens which caused distractions and made confidentiality more difficult. Noise and the lack of privacy made it extremely difficult to use a tape recorder.

D) Interviewees also asked me about my background and experience, mirroring the findings of Burgess (1984). While I did not want to refuse a response to this request, I was aware that I could be influencing replies to questions and so I managed to maintain a good relationship by explaining that I was happy to talk about my advisory background as long as it was after the interview.

I was also very careful not to indicate any bias in questions which might encourage interviewees to respond in a particular way, e.g., by question wording or sequence or 'loaded' vocabulary.

5.6.2 Advantages of Interviewing More Than One Team Member

While the previous paragraphs have outlined some of the difficulties encountered, there were also advantages in being able to interview team leaders and members in their own surrounding as I was able to obtain a more rounded picture of the team situation. I also gained access to two teams where I was able to interview more than one member. In these instances I derived a more holistic picture of the team and potentially reduced any bias contained in the responses of the team leader or single team member. On both of these occasions I spent at least half a day with team
members, conducting formal interviews, and talking to them informally at lunch and coffee breaks. I was able to sit in both team meetings before I carried out the interviews which gave me a useful insight into the workings of the team and the context of their activity. This made it easier for me to identify issues which might be of individual team concern rather than generally salient as well as issues that applied only to one member but not to others within a team.

5.6.3 The Importance Of The Individual Member

Where I was able to only interview one member of the team, I took into account possible bias and the fact that this was only one member’s viewpoint. However, from an illuminative and humanistic standpoint, I believed that the perception of any team member was important and valid. While individual constructs may not be relevant to other team members, they are important to the member who holds them and therefore potentially significant to the rest of the team since they will contribute to interactions. Bannister and Fransella, discussing this from a personal construct viewpoint, reminded us that:

"Each of us sees our situation through the "goggles" of our personal construct system. We differ from others in how we perceive and interpret a situation, what we consider important about it, what we consider its implication, the degree to which it is clear or obscure, threatening or promising, sought after or forced upon us."
(Bannister and Fransella, 1986, p10)

5.7 THE ANALYSIS

Interviews were analysed into recurring themes as described in Chapter 4, page 70. Analysis was carried out as research progressed, thus enabling an even clearer focus
on the "agenda of topics" (Burgess, 1984 p. 107) that the interviews needed to cover.

As Guba stated,

"Collection, coding and analysis of data go on concurrently as an interactive process, unfolding, building and contouring itself to the reality that exists in people's experiences and perceptions." (Guba, 1978, p. 50)

Through this continuing analysis, it was also possible to note if similar concerns were being raised in different interviews.

5.7.1 The Results Of The Analysis

The data from the interviews has been tabulated for ease of reference. Recurrent themes have been categorised as follows:

1. Team Meetings: the difficulties, their effects, perceived solutions.
2. Membership of More Than One Team: the difficulties, their effects, perceived solutions.
3. Team Planning and Review: the difficulties, their effects, perceived solutions.
4. Integration: factors influencing integration, the difficulties.
5. Commitment To The Course and Team - positive commitment, lack of commitment and their effects.
6. Team Membership - reasons for membership and their effects.
7. Influences on ownership and autonomy and their results.

(For extracts from a complete interview, see Appendix 7)

Numbers in brackets in the tables below, refer to quotes in Appendix 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULTIES</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>PERCEIVED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Timetabling Difficulties:  
  "We do try to meet once or twice a term, but we have to get timetables together. Working across departments is a problem as the course is serviced by different departments." (1) | "It is very difficult for everyone to attend at any one time." (1) | "Meetings are timetabled at the beginning of the previous summer and the few members of the core team can always meet" (2) |
<p>| <strong>b) Timing of Meetings</strong>  | &quot;I feel meetings are important, but we don’t get a lot of them. Fridays is a bad time for meetings!&quot; (3) | &quot;Not being able to meet regularly means we haven’t got a focus&quot; (4) | &quot;I think the team is effective because we meet regularly to discuss student progress and on the whole the work is well co-ordinated&quot; (5) |
| <strong>c) Siting and Proximity</strong> | &quot;If the tutors are based on another site - - -&quot; (6) | &quot;- - - it becomes more difficult to co-ordinate support subjects - - -&quot; (6) | &quot;all those on the course had desks in the same work room provided for the course. Communications were therefore a lot easier.&quot; (7) |
| <strong>d) Regular Meetings</strong>    | &quot;I think an effective team should have regular meetings - - -&quot; (8) | &quot;This doesn’t happen so I feel very out of touch.&quot; (8) | &quot;There should be a time when the majority of staff can attend and minutes should be circulated to absentees with an agenda in advance&quot; (8) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULTIES</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>PERCEIVED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) <strong>Membership of more than one team</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Meetings are a problem. College meeting time is between 9 and 10am on a Thursday for all staff, and I for example, am in seven teams.&quot; (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Out of ten tutors I have never got more than six at a meeting, and part-timers are always a problem.&quot; (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) <strong>Remission</strong></td>
<td>&quot;There is no remission for these---.&quot; (10)</td>
<td>&quot;The majority get it. It was structured to the course when it was set up---.&quot; (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;People come out of goodwill. However they do come because it's important to know what they are taking on.&quot; (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;---liaison is sometimes difficult.&quot; (11)</td>
<td>&quot;Tutors who are part-time are paid to come to meetings, and full-time staff are given remission.&quot; (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(About part-timers remission)</td>
<td>&quot;It is difficult but I work it---.&quot; (14)</td>
<td>&quot;This is an historic situation, and they will slowly be replaced by full-timers.&quot; (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) <strong>Dissatisfied members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Those who were not keen on teaching on the course, don't come to the meetings.&quot; (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) <strong>Cost of meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The MSC has never been asked for any money for meeting time, and it is expensive to have meetings.&quot; (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Although it is said that the course is making money, there are still no paid meeting times.&quot; (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. MEMBERSHIP OF MORE THAN ONE TEAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>DIFFICULTIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>EFFECTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Lack of Ownership</td>
<td>&quot;Membership of other teams was sometimes a problem&quot; (17)</td>
<td>&quot;People had to fit in with criteria in which they felt they hadn't had much of a hand.&quot; (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Time</td>
<td>&quot;I have too little time to dedicate to a proper job of co-ordinating staff in-put.&quot; (18)</td>
<td>&quot;Lack of co-ordination&quot; (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Overload</td>
<td>&quot;One problem is that she is overloaded.&quot; (19)</td>
<td>&quot;Her energies are split in different directions.&quot; (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. TEAM PLANNING AND REVIEW</strong></th>
<th><strong>DIFFICULTIES</strong></th>
<th><strong>EFFECTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCEIVED SOLUTIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Inappropriate Time</td>
<td>&quot;We could use the reading week for staff development but it's probably not possible.&quot; (20)</td>
<td>&quot;There is no staff planning time only at the end of the year when it is no good. Basically it is reactive management to the team.&quot; (20)</td>
<td>&quot;Remission was given for staff and curriculum development in two day blocks as they found it easier to create time in this way.&quot; (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No Time Allocated</td>
<td>&quot;There is no staff development and certainly no pre-planning time for the next year that I know about.&quot; (22)</td>
<td>&quot;In fact quite a lot of things have been allowed to stew, like the issue about students.&quot; (22)</td>
<td>&quot;Team monitoring was done constantly on an informal basis and formally at certain meetings when we looked at how the team was operating.&quot; (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. TEAM PLANNING AND REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULTIES</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>PERCEIVED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Pressure</td>
<td>&quot;At the moment we are doing some forward planning, but it is very adhoc.&quot; (24)</td>
<td>&quot;On the new course we tell the tutors that we will review their work to see if they can stay or not.&quot; (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We are under tremendous pressure and have no time off for part-timers to join in.&quot; (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. INTEGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS AFFECTING INTEGRATION</th>
<th>THE DIFFICULTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Lack of Experience</td>
<td>&quot;If a tutor is on the course who hasn’t had that integration experience it is very difficult.&quot; (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I feel Access needs a team approach because of the course and its ethos.&quot; (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Planning</td>
<td>&quot;--- because it is a student centred course, the nature of the work only allows us to plan a few weeks ahead. We therefore have to meet on an ad-hoc basis.&quot; (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Liaison and integration are essential ---&quot; (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Subject Specialists</td>
<td>&quot;--- But the team didn’t fancy the idea of teaching other subjects and retreated into their own subject area.&quot; (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We tried to integrate ---&quot; (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Lack of Meeting Time</td>
<td>&quot;Not being able to meet regularly means we haven’t got a focus.&quot; (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We sometimes work in pairs.&quot; (on integration) (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. COMMITMENT TO THE COURSE AND TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACK OF COMMITMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To the Course</td>
<td>&quot;He has asked for work since, but the teams were so hurt by his comments that he has not been taken on again although it isn't a really effective team, they did rally round to block him out.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Last year one team member said that teaching on the course was dead easy.&quot;</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To Integration</td>
<td>&quot;I did need to remove one tutor who was very indifferent to the students and the course and therefore his delivery became problematic&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;He made no attempt to integrate despite attempts by me to integrate with him.&quot;</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To The Team</td>
<td>&quot;I hardly ever see or talk to 'X'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I feel I have a commitment to some individuals within the team although maybe not to the whole team.&quot;</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE COMMITMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To The Course Philosophy</td>
<td>&quot;They are committed to its' philosophy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They all chose to work on Access.&quot;</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To Teamwork</td>
<td>&quot;There was a real commitment to the concept of a team.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Our team was very much an egalitarian creature which had a common understanding of the concept of a team that needed a leader and that needed to iron out definitions.&quot;</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. COMMITMENT TO THE COURSE AND TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACK OF COMMITMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>To the Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;This is a small college and tutors have a lot of values in common. One of the team's strengths is that they are all from a sociological background.&quot; (35)</td>
<td>&quot;They co-operate well, and are a small cohesive group.&quot; (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We all work on the course because we wanted to---.&quot; (36)</td>
<td>&quot;We gave up more of our free time (to work on the course).&quot; (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. TEAM MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCES ON CHOICE OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>THEIR EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) <strong>The Timetable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There has been a different tutor for the past three years, this is something to do with the timetabling.&quot; (37)</td>
<td>&quot;It was who ever was free - the team didn't get to choose.&quot; (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) <strong>Status of The Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The problem is that this course is timetabled last for full-timers - - because I think it has a low priority.&quot; (38)</td>
<td>&quot;Well membership can vary.&quot; (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Well, because the course had a high status - - -&quot; (39)</td>
<td>&quot;- - - there was an emphasis on the team to add to this status.&quot; (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>Head of Department Decision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Head of Department agreed in principle - - -&quot; (to the leader selecting a member) (40)</td>
<td>&quot;- - - but in actual fact it was a fait accompli.&quot; (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) <strong>Subject Specialism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Expertise in subject area, but also knowing the person was keen to do it and had not just chosen it as a soft option.&quot; (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6 TEAM MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCES ON CHOICE OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>THEIR EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| e) Availability
"I was able to choose four out of the seven members, and the other three were on the team either because of their subject area or their availability." (42) | "Selection was carried out right at the end of the summer term and this wasn’t very satisfactory as there had not been any time before September for team planning." (42) |
| f) Low on Hours
"The Head of Department said that I had a say in the timetabling of the people I wanted, he said it was OK." (43) | "but I also had to take people if they were short on hours." (43) |
| g) People Who Demand to be on a Course
"Theoretically I have no say as course coordinator - - -" (44) | "I am left with those people who are not wanted very often or those with the very strong personalities who demand what they want." (44) |
| h) Sympathetic to the Course Philosophy
"I looked for people who were sympathetic to the ideals of Access." (45) | "I have a choice in most of the subject tutors, but there was less choice in the supporting subject areas." (45) |
| i) Commitment and Experience
"I was selected as far as I can tell for two reasons - interest, commitment and experience with adults." (46) | |
| j) Recruited Specifically for the Course/Team
"The team were recruited specifically for YTS and they were recruited with team cohesion in mind in that they were selected as much for their course philosophy and personality as they were for their subject area." (47) | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INFLUENCES ON CHOICE OF MEMBERS</strong></th>
<th><strong>THEIR EFFECTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k) Financial Constraints</td>
<td>&quot;None of us were selected.&quot; (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;- - their hands are tied by redeployment and the financial situation.&quot; (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Leader Recommendation</td>
<td>&quot;Well we don't get people foisted on to us, the timetabling is done by the principal lecturer and sometimes I have to take someone because I am asked.&quot; (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;- - I usually approach people I want or they approach me.&quot; (49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Preference</td>
<td>&quot;Selection has never been an issue but it will be as there are less and less staff and more courses next year.&quot; (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have sent out a preference sheet to all my staff - - management have so much to do that they allow me for more autonomy than usual for a lecturer and I have played the system.&quot; (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Volunteers</td>
<td>&quot;The BTEC people are asked what kind of courses they want to have on their timetable and this is how a team is composed.&quot; (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think selection needs to be voluntary rather than conscription.&quot; (51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. OWNERSHIP AND AUTONOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCES ON THESE</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Head of Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Head of Department views Access very supportively as it's been successful.&quot; (52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We have total freedom to do what we like.&quot; (52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Talking about the Head of Department) &quot;We are not in a position to say that this is our course.&quot; (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Roles are not shared out and it's all on my shoulders.&quot; (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Team Leader</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The team has very little control over decisions because basically I don't let them have much.&quot; (54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The team have very little control over decisions.&quot; (54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) The Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Principal didn't consider how people would work together as a team --- &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;--- but he's supportive to teamwork.&quot; (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.8 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The data arising from the interviews appeared to both substantiate and elaborate on the responses given in the questionnaire. Interviewees identified a number of issues which they saw as either contributing to or detracting from effective teamwork. It also became apparent that there was considerable interaction between the various concerns expressed, as well as a division between those problems which were domestic/organisational and those which were associated with team members themselves.

Ramsden (1973) stresses the need for members to see themselves as part of a particular team. The impossibility of attending team meetings left some members feeling isolated, which suggests that the opportunity to meet other members (or not)
is a key influence on this process of identification. Indeed as Woodcock and Francis emphasised,

"Without regular meetings there is no basis for the growth of the informal relationships which characterise an effective team. From joint activity comes commitment to team achievement." (Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.75)

However from the data it appeared that a number of interacting variables made meetings increasingly problematic. Where members were not geographically close, meetings were more difficult to arrange. As a result, communication and integration generally became less effective. This was vital to teamwork in that, as Adair pointed out,

"Cohesiveness will be greater if members can communicate easily with others, and less if distance, noise or organisational arrangements make communication difficult."

(Adair, 1987, p.19)

Some members also belonged to a number of different teams and, as this often involved working across departments, timetabling for meetings became even more complex. Meetings timetabled in advance may at least enable the core team to meet, although it was emphasised that meetings were expensive of staff time, especially if part-timers were paid to attend. Even where there was an attempt by a college to have set meeting times for college teams, there were clashes of meetings, especially where both subject and course teams were meeting at the same time.

However, although membership of more than one team could give rise to such practical difficulties as lack of time and work overload, it was also acknowledged that the variety of experience that members brought with them could also be of benefit. The majority of members spoken to did not get remission for attending meetings and
part-time tutors, in particular, found it difficult to attend for this reason. However, in some cases, the non-employment of part-time tutors could lead to team membership by full-timers which was not necessarily based on personal choice.

The lack of a suitable and regular time for teams to meet made integration and the process of team review problematic. Their necessity was noted by Adair (1987) who stressed that highly effective teams were characterized by the regular and searching self-evaluation of their work together. Most of the comments made during the interviews described how difficult it was to carry out this process and most interviewees saw evaluation as related to course delivery and student progress; the difficulty of achieving real team-process evaluation was compounded by the unwillingness of some members to relinquish their subject specialism. In practice, only one interviewee drew a distinction between the evaluation of team-processes and team-product.

A second important issue centred around the need for commitment to both the team and the course. Tutors appeared to identify more closely with a team when they were committed to its goals and philosophy, a view supported by Maddux (1989, p.4) who felt that the "highest level of achievement is attained when a team is committed to the task and full use is made of each members' talents." Concerns about commitment seemed to be related to the willingness of tutors to be part of a particular team and their suitability to the current team profile. A number of interviewees described membership criteria which might not necessarily be viewed positively. The variety of reasons (most of them negative) for people becoming team members suggested a lack of autonomy for team leaders in choosing their teams and also for their members, who were chosen (by others) rather than choosing. The results were feelings of non-identity with the team and a lack of commitment on the part of members who had been placed...
in this situation. As Stewart pointed out,

"Selection should seek to match what the job offers with what the individual wants." (Stewart, 1986, p.58)

Adair (1987, p.127) viewed this positive choice as the "first principle of team success". Commitment to and identification with both the course and the team is clearly "part of the magic of a highly successful tactical team" (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.69).

While some renunciation of personal autonomy is inevitable in a successful team situation, its importance to the identification process, together with that of the autonomy of the team as a whole, should not be underestimated. (Francis and Young 1979). As one team leader stated, "ownership of a course is an important issue to a team" - a view supported by Dyer (1987, p.167) who emphasised that, "There is ample evidence to indicate that people will have greater commitment to decisions, goals and actions they have participated in developing."

5.9 CONCLUSION

Patton (1990, p.278) described the purpose of carrying out interviews as the exploration of "what is in and on someone else's mind" and "to find out from them things we cannot directly observe".

Concerns had been raised as a result of the initial questionnaire which had been both confirmed and elaborated on in the face-to-face situation of an interview. This evidence might not have been available to me through observation (although the issue of observation as a research tool will be discussed more fully in Chapter 8).

The interviews had also highlighted certain areas which I felt needed to be extrapolated from the rest of the data and examined further. The area of commitment to and
identification with a team and course seemed to underpin many of the other issues and was enhanced by a positive valuing of teamwork from a team member, leader and Head of Department.

While it is recognised that these interviews only represented a sample of the original respondents, they had provided a greater depth of understanding of other issues raised by them through the questionnaire.

Communication within teams through team meetings and team reviews was a factor which highlighted the difficulties of meeting and the resultant feelings of isolation of members who found it hard to attend. This was exacerbated by members working in different departments or in a number of teams whose timetables did not necessarily coincide with those of other team members. There also had to be a willingness on the part of members to attend meetings and a commitment from members and management to prioritise meeting time when the majority of people could attend. In addition, there was very little remission time allocated to meetings which was inevitable where management support was lacking.

However, it was clear even at this stage that many of the above concerns were organisational, needing resources and management support and commitment to bring about change - a factor not always easy in times of financial constraints.

Another group of concerns focused predominantly on commitment to the team itself - an important issue if true collaboration is to be achieved. Issues concerned with membership of the team as a subset of commitment brought into question the willingness of people to attend meetings and the status of the course within the college. Where prestige was attached to course membership, this would attract new members and a team membership which was committed to the philosophy of the course. This
raised the question of member suitability, the way in which tutors became members of a particular team and the criteria for selection which in some instances was already being shown as one of allocation rather than choice.

Commitment to teamworking through effective membership appeared to affect both collaboration and communication and was an area where changes could perhaps be made more easily, requiring positive processes rather than resources. This was borne out by the observation of three teams which I was beginning at this time (reported fully in Chapter 8).

I decided that this was an area which needed exploring more widely to investigate whether these issues were relevant to other teams. I felt that at this stage of the journey a second questionnaire dedicated to the issue of membership would enable me to examine these concerns more fully.
CHAPTER SIX

EXPLORING TEAM MEMBERSHIP

"As a next step after categories are initially defined, the naturalistic investigator will go back to the field to "flesh out" his categories." (Guba 1978, p.54)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reflects on the issues arising from the previous interviews and describes how this part of the iterative process enabled a decision to be made about the most appropriate method to adopt for the next part of the research.

The analysis of the interviewees indicated that certain concerns were recurring more than others. While Guba (1978) stressed that the frequency of an item need not denote its importance, it was at least a rough guide to those areas which might need further investigation. In addition my observations of interviewees' posture and verbal emphasis allowed me to assess the salience of an issue to a particular participant, thus providing me with further evidence. This focusing process was also supported by my own original observations as an advisory lecturer, the overview provided by the questionnaire and the importance attached to an issue by the relevant literature.

At the same time as the interviews were being completed and analysed, I was also beginning that part of the research schedule in which I hoped to undertake observation in a Further Education college. (see Chapter 8) While it is not relevant to discuss the
outcomes at this point, the ongoing experiences of three different course teams also helped to refine the areas of concern currently in focus.

The triangulation of methodology coming together at this point in the research acted "as a check on reliability and theory confirmation" (Denzin 1970, p.20). I therefore felt in a position to identify those areas I wanted to pursue further. It would not have been practically possible to follow up every issue emanating from the previous fieldwork, nor is it suggested that these themselves are necessarily comprehensive. However, as a teacher working with other teachers, immersed in the focal study area, I felt that further work on some of the emerging issues would be relevant and productive.

6.2 AREAS OF INTEREST TO BE PURSUED

One theme which appeared to affect or underpin a number of other issues was that of team membership. This was emphasised in the team literature (see page 35) and had appeared as an important concern in my advisory work. Respondents also commented on membership issues, although they had not featured prominently in the questionnaire for the reasons discussed on page 86. Data from my observations also indicated similar concerns. It was therefore of interest to gain a broader perspective on this particular category of effects.
6.3 THE METHOD

I realised that a spread of information would be most appropriately gathered by a second questionnaire. As Guba stated:

"... even a well refined category system based upon an initial wave of observations or interviews is likely to be inadequate ... such an initial formulation represents a "discovery phase" which will then lead to a "verification phase"." (Guba 1978, p.54)

While I did not intend to compare one course with another, I thought it would be helpful to continue to look at a variety of teams to prevent a particular team type from over-influencing the results.

6.4 THE PURPOSE OF THE METHOD

The purpose of this questionnaire, therefore, was to check out information gained from the interviews and follow up issues in more depth with a larger number of team members.

The questionnaire aimed to investigate the following areas concerned with team membership:

1) the criteria used for selection;
2) the process by which people became team members;
3) difficulties attached to selection;
4) the issue of 'unsuitable' members.

6.5 THE SAMPLE

A random sample of one hundred colleges was taken from the DES handbook of colleges, The Directory of Technical and Further Education, (CRAC 1986). The
sample was taken from those colleges appearing to deliver courses which were based on a course team and did not include colleges who had received the first questionnaire. The sample was not intended to be representative of all course teams as this would have been an impossible task given the variety of colleges and courses and the limits on time resources.

6.6 THE PILOT

A small pilot study of six colleges was undertaken in order to identify any potential problems with the questionnaire design. Two minor changes were made during this stage.

6.7 THE DESIGN

The initial questions sought to gain a profile of the team and its leader including his/her grade, as it was felt that this might indicate the amount of influence the leader had outside the team, particularly in terms of selection. In order to establish possible continuity of membership, respondents were also asked the length of time the team had been together.

The core of the questions (8-14) focused on the routes by which people became team members, the difficulties attached to finding suitable team members, and what criteria, if any, were used in the process.

Respondents were also asked to describe what they considered to be an effective selection process.

PLEASE NOTE:
I had used the terms "recruitment" and "selection" in this questionnaire although I was
aware from my own experiences and previous data that in reality the process was more likely to be one of allocation rather than selection. However, I felt it would be better from a research point of view to use the term "selection" so that respondents would not be biased in their responses by what I was beginning to expect was the norm.

6.8 THE QUESTIONNAIRE SCHEDULE

The questionnaires (see Appendix 9) were sent to the relevant Head of Department with a covering letter (see Appendix 8) explaining the nature of the research. They were asked to pass the questionnaire on to a team leader to complete. Questionnaires were sent out in the middle of the term to avoid the difficulties encountered with the first questionnaire (see para.4.7 page 68). Contact was made with those colleges who had not responded after a month. The final response rate was 24%. This, although disappointing from a research point of view, perhaps is to be expected given the pressures previously noted on teachers at this time.

6.9 ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE FOCUSING ON SELECTION ISSUES

6.9.1 Introduction

Within this analysis the word "selection" is used to mean any kind of process or systematic procedure through which a course team acquired members. In fact, one Vice Principal returned a questionnaire stating that "with respect, you will find that in Further Education staff are allocated to course teams rather that "selected" or "recruited"."
6.9.2 The Team Profile

Questions one to six covered biographical data concerning those teams who had responded. The completed team profiles from these questions are in Appendix 10 p.i). The spread of course types was slightly wider than in the previous questionnaire. Although no particular courses were specified, 41.7% of the responses were from Access teams, a similar result to that obtained with questionnaire one. This could have been due to the fact that Access was listed first on question one or that Access team leaders were more interested in the issue of teamwork. It may also be an effect of Access courses being a readily identifiable course of those which by design are intended to be the product of teamwork.

Respondents - Although Heads of Department were requested to pass the questionnaire to team leaders, nine respondents were either section heads or Heads of Department. This had to be considered when analysing their responses.

Continuity - 81.8% of the teams had been together for less than four years which might reflect the fact that course team delivery is a fairly new initiative in most areas. Continuity of membership within teamwork was indicated by 68.2% of teams being together for at least one year, although 79.2% of the courses being delivered had started before the team in question had been formed, indicating a change in membership.

Size - 45.8% of the core teams contained five people or less indicating that the central part of the team, at least, was fairly manageable, as defined by Belbin (1981). (See reference Chapter 2 page 31).
ISSUES WHICH MAY AFFECT TEAM COHESION

6.9.3 When The Team Was Chosen

50% of responding teams were chosen in the term prior to the course start date. This seemed to demonstrate that time had been allowed for some kind of selection process and pre-planning to take place, although a question in this particular form was not asked. 20.8% said that some team members were chosen just prior to the course start date, - a factor which could lead to a lack of time for planning and could result in only certain staff being available to join the team. Others appeared to be chosen at various stages in the life of the team (4,5,6,8 & 9). One respondent implied that there was team continuity because of careful timetabling and preferences. (7)

(The numbers in brackets indicate the appropriate quote in Appendix 10)

6.9.4 Ways In Which Members Were "Recruited" To The Team

Fig.10

Method of Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Recruitment</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int Advert</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext Advert</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD Rec</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Rec</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Leader</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Grapevine</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 119
A) Recommendation By Others

Recommendation By Team Members

38% of members from responding teams came from team leader recommendation with an additional 12.4% through team member recommendation, indicating a level of team involvement. In these instances, selection would appear to be a fairly positive process as these people were known to the team as tutors who, presumably, would fit the team's explicit or implicit criteria for membership. It was not clear if tutors, for their part, chose to become team members or having been identified, were allocated in the manner defined in 6.9.1.

By The Head Of Department

Recommendation was also by the Head of Department (9.3%) and by senior lecturers. This meant that at least 59.7% of all membership came through some form of recommendation. While these responses do not appear to reinforce the previous remark by a Vice Principal (see 6.9.1), this situation may vary from department to department. In addition it is not clear whether Head of Department recommendation would indicate a positive choice inspired by close knowledge of the needs of the team in question or another way of allocating people to teams, perhaps less positively inspired.

B) Voluntary Participation

External Advertisement

14.7% came through external advertisements which seemed to demonstrate that tutors responded to an advertisement to teach a particular course. It could be assumed,
therefore, that they at least had a certain level of commitment to that course philosophy, having had some choice at least about responding.

Volunteers

The 15.5% who volunteered to be on a team would also appear to be positive in their reasons for wanting to join, although it has to be said that there was no indication as to why they volunteered. Only one person elaborated on his answer, "We all volunteered to work together as the most suitable means of achieving our goals".(1) Information about whether the volunteers were recognised by the standing team members as being appropriate is not available.

6.9.5 Criteria Used For The Selection Of Team Members

Fig.11

Criteria used for selection

![Criteria Used for Selection](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Philosophy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Integration</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Team Prof.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Specialism

While more than one selection criterion could have been applied to a particular member, it is interesting to note that subject specialism was the most strongly emphasised. However, it is not clear whether these tutors were needed for the team purely because of their subject expertise or whether they also fulfilled other selection criteria.

Commitment to course philosophy and integration were the next two most important considerations, followed by a positive commitment to teamwork and a match with the current team profile - all criteria which could be viewed as important to team cohesion.

Availability

Less positive were such criteria as "tutor happened to be available" (six members) and "low on hours" (four members).

6.9.6 Whether The Same Criteria Were Applied If A Team Member Was Replaced Mid-Year, And If Not, What Criteria Were Used?:

69.6% of those who answered this question said that the same criteria would be applied. However, there were some modifications: two respondents talked about it being true in theory, but that in practice it was really about whoever happened to be available (3,5). Five respondents who answered no to the original question qualified their answers by indicating that it essentially concerned availability. (1-4), especially for those who were low on hours. However simple, timetable availability might not necessarily mean that the person interviewed wanted to teach on the course or was committed to teamwork.
6.9.7 What Respondents Saw As The Main Difficulties In Selecting And Recruiting Team Members

Responses concerning selection difficulties were categorised under the following four headings, although there are clear links between them.
- timetabling and availability;
- specialist members;
- the status of the course;
- commitment to the course and to teamwork.

A) Timetabling and Availability

Comments were made on the difficulties of staffing generally (5,8), in particular those attached to timetabling "suitable" staff. Whether suitability was in terms of subject expertise or team commitment, availability was particularly affected by tutors belonging to more than one team (3,4).

One respondent commented on the fact that "timetabling requirements took priority rather than the course philosophy" which he felt made it very difficult "to develop appropriate teams".

Where a course was dependent on last minute outside funding, full-time membership sometimes appeared problematic, particularly if the course was not perceived to be important:

"The team gets what is left over. This is characteristic of full cost work in the college." (9)

In other words, while it would seem essential to timetable in those members considered important to a team, the requirements of the timetable appeared to take precedence over course team needs.
B) Issues Concerning Experienced Specialist Team Members

Comments covered the following issues:

i) the shortage of certain specialist staff (1,2) especially those who had experience of a particular course (2) and who were committed to teamwork and the course philosophy (3). This led to some inflexibility in staffing a team because choice was therefore limited (4);

ii) the problem of using specialist staff with a more traditional viewpoint who may not fit in with a team approach (5);

iii) the cost of attracting specialist staff into low-salaried work which could result in less experienced team members being allocated to a course (6).

C) The Effect of the Course Status

It appeared that the perceived status of a particular course within a college either attracted potential members (7) or had a much more negative effect so that a low status course might only be allocated to those tutors who were short on hours or who happened to be available. (8,9)

D) Commitment to the Course and to Teamwork

This final category reflected on the need to find, and the difficulties attached to finding, "those committed to the course philosophy" (10-13), especially where the philosophy of a course was not widely understood (12). One respondent talked about meeting the needs of the team in general when recruiting new members (14), indicating the need for careful consideration of potential members.
6.9.8 What Is The Procedure If A Team Member Proves To Be Unsuitable?

A) Where This Was Hypothetical

78.9% of those responding to this question stated that it had never happened. However, of these, 26.7% reported positively about the need for counselling and staff development for the particular person perceived as not suitable. 40% commented on processes of removal (5-10) while 33.3% felt that little or no action would be taken (11-15). One leader added that this would only apply "in terms of discipline or poor teaching", as "at present this notion (of unsuitable membership) would have no bearing on teamwork." (12)

B) Where a Member Had Proved Unsuitable

One team had formulated strategies for dealing with this problem although they were not described (19). A process of counselling and staff development had taken place in two teams (16,17) with the leader explaining how he had talked to a member who had "realised there was a mismatch as he felt uncomfortable with our style and ethos and subsequently left." Another team member credited the skill of the team leader for dealing with the situation without causing any bad feeling(18). The influence of the course leader (13) or of an outside funding body (14) would also appear to be significant in this situation, although this did not necessarily make the process easy. As one respondent indicated, "this might take time, but if eventually the hierarchy can be persuaded that they are no good, they then get passed onto another team". (15)

While this might appear to be a solution, it could well be a matter for concern that unsuitable team members were being passed from one team to another.
6.9.9 Descriptions Of What Respondents Considered Would Be A Practical And Effective Method For Recruiting Course Team Members

Whilst responses have been categorised under separate headings, there are clear links between a number of the categories.

In line with the responses for question nine on selection criteria, (see paragraph 6.9.5), one of the most frequent comments concerned the difficulty of obtaining appropriately skilled specialist staff. Responses have been categorised into those describing:

1) a specific method;
2) criteria for selection;
3) commitment to team and course.

In some instances respondents also gave the reasons for using a method and the constraints or the requirements needed to carry it out. (See table on following page).
## METHODS FOR RECRUITING COURSE TEAM MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC METHOD</th>
<th>REASON FOR USE</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The grapevine</td>
<td>provides information about member suitability. (1,2)</td>
<td>liaison with HOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Selection as part of staff development and planning. (3,4,5)</td>
<td>prevents &quot;chop and change&quot;. (4) allows for informed choice. (3) allows tutors to choose rather than be enlisted. (5)</td>
<td>timetabling liaison with HOD. Careful planning. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Advertising within college by informal memo. (6)</td>
<td>Allows interest to be shown. (6)</td>
<td>Arrange meeting. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Leader/team/students all keeping records and contact suitable tutors. Can also draw from wider support team. (7)</td>
<td>Get good tutors of the right sort for the team. Get a multi-skilled team. (7)</td>
<td>Need flexibility in adapting the course to the real quality of new tutors and vice versa. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Leadership decision on membership. (8,9)</td>
<td>Good for cohesion, but time consuming if no members are suggested. (9)</td>
<td>HOD leaves it to the leader to recruit staff. Can rely too much on the leader. (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Identification of commitment to team, course philosophy and integration. (10,11,12,13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader needs to ensure members are aware of course philosophy and agree with it. (11,14) A need to put personal preferences second. (10) Meetings and teamwork need to be a timetabling priority. (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Flexible staff. (18)</td>
<td>Members of staff considered to be resource and not departmentally bound. (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC METHOD</td>
<td>REASON FOR USE</td>
<td>REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Identification of staff with subject specialisms/teaching approaches/personality required. (20) or who can be developed as required. (20)</td>
<td>Identification of members with appropriate attributes. (20)</td>
<td>Need to sell the project to the staff identified, facilitate the operation of the team through appropriate timetabling, resourcing, etc. (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Identification of volunteers. (21,13)</td>
<td>Will be committed. (13)</td>
<td>Need to know the subject and develop new curricula. (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Allocation on the basis of clearly thought out departmental-philosophy and policy which aims to meet the needs of staff and course. (22)</td>
<td>Meets needs of staff and course. (22)</td>
<td>Needs reviewing in light of individual differences and any modifications to the course. (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Recruit part-timers, give them experience of teaching on full-time courses. (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Advertise in National Press. (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Allow averaging. (24)</td>
<td>Makes better use of part-timers. (14)</td>
<td>Ask prospective members to spend some time with the team. (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Look at the needs of the team. (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Identification of relevant vocational qualifications and experience. (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>That are willing to take on board new ideas/methods and materials. (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While some of these descriptions gave theoretical models for finding and selecting team members, only two respondents stated that a particular method was carried out in reality in their team. One Head of Department responded, "Is there one?" (27) as his answer to what was an effective method of recruitment, perhaps indicating the difficulties attached to this whole area of course team work especially if, as one member stated, "So few staff have any interest in teamwork." (28)

While other respondents did not talk specifically about the difficulties of their described method, the requirements, where listed, indicated implications for agreement from management, resourcing for staff development, meeting time and planning. In addition, difficulties with timetabling and the availability of tutors with specific subject specialisms compound these problems.

6.10 SUMMARY

Summary of points arising from the questionnaire

1) From the responses to this questionnaire it was not always apparent whether the term "allocation" or "selection" of team members was the most suitable description of the process which took place although there appeared to be more emphasis on the former.

2) While the process of recommendation did not appear to be either a specific or a rigorous procedure, it could be regarded as more positive in its approach, especially where the team and its leader were taking a fairly active part in the process. However, it is not clear how far recommendation was a two-way process or whether it was another form
of allocation.

3) Head of Department recommendation may have been based on positive criteria, but it is possible that given some of the responses concerning "low on hours" and "availability", management might be "recommending" on that basis. In such instances, a team might then find it difficult to refuse, especially if the tutor recommended had the appropriate professional if not interpersonal skills.

4) Even where members are recommended according to those criteria concerned with commitment to the team and its course, the actual emphasis was still on the subject specialism of the person concerned. Such an emphasis might have an effect on the team profile and cohesion if a member who possessed a suitable skill was not necessarily committed to the team and its philosophy, - a worry expressed by some respondents.

Adair made the point:

"It is rare that a manager is given permission - and an open cheque book - to go out into the world and choose whoever he pleases for his team. There are constraints on the pool of people from whom his choice must be made."

(Adair 1987, p. 127)

However, if one accepts Blakes et al's (1987) view of the necessity for team members and leader to assume responsibility for creating a distinctive team vision, then where possible a team should have a part in the decisions regarding future membership. Moreover in what ever way selection is done, it is important to bear in mind Adair's caution that:

"The importance of choosing the right people as team members from the collection of possible members can hardly be over emphasised." (Adair, 1987, p.127)
Membership and getting membership right, is clearly fundamental to team success. So far, the broad issues involved have been isolated. In the next stage of the investigation a more in-depth exploration of factors that might impinge on membership processes was undertaken.

The purpose of this questionnaire had been to develop the issue of commitment through positive team membership as one of the underpinning issues arising from the interview data. It was not intended as a substantiation of the previous data, but as a wider check on the concern over membership and the emerging issue of allocation to teams for a variety of reason.

The results from the questionnaire (see summary page 129) indicated that the emerging issues about membership were concerns amongst other teams and that the processes and criteria for membership were not always positive. This questionnaire had served to provide a basis for exploring whether or not the issues of membership was one which should be pursued more fully in that it might be an area in which changes could be made notwithstanding the constraints of financial resourcing.

The questions asked of respondents were predominantly closed in order to maximise returns as it was felt that if concerns were emerging, this would best be explored in more depth in one-to-one interviews. The next stage of the journey therefore sought to elaborate the data through interviews with those respondents who had agreed to help further with the research.
CHAPTER SEVEN

INVESTIGATING MEMBERSHIP MORE CLOSELY

"What should be paramount is selecting people who are best equipped to achieve the teams objectives." (Larson & Lafasto, 1989, p.59)

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The second questionnaire had reinforced a number of specific issues raised during the first stage of the research. It had also highlighted a number of membership processes and their relationship to commitment and cohesion in teams.

This section, therefore, goes on to explore issues which arose from interviews carried out with team members and leaders. The term "selection" is used throughout to mean any process by which a lecturer becomes part of a team.

7.2 THE METHOD

When returning the second questionnaire a number of respondents indicated that they were willing to elaborate on their answers. This would clarify any points raised in the questionnaires and provide further information. Thus a decision was made to carry out in-depth interviews with those respondents who had agreed to help further.

This approach was in line with what Guba described as the basic style of the naturalistic inquirer in that:

"... he does not manage the inquiry situation, but uses it, he is less a stage manager than a member of the audience. He watches the entire plan and then selects from it those aspects which he considers critical for his purpose." (Guba, 1978, p.14)
Although, I was also observing three separate teams during this period, (see Chapter 8), I believed that the opportunity to talk to a wide range of members and leaders would give me greater insights into team processes.

As with the first round of interviews (Chapter 5) these were carried out in a semi-structured form using checklists of issues resulting from individual questionnaires. However, the checklists were to act as a framework for interviews and were not applied in a way which would restrict comments on issues not already noted. Respondents were encouraged to expand on comments, add information or retract emphases.

7.3 THE SAMPLE

Fifteen respondents had indicated that they were willing to be interviewed. Interviews were carried out with ten of the fifteen respondents who were able to participate at that point in the term. In all except two instances, the interviewees were team leaders. The other two were a deputy team leader and a Head of Department. The geographical spread of the colleges concerned was fairly wide: East London, Bristol, North East London, Surrey, South East London, Sussex and Kent. Teams covered BTEC, Access, YTS and CPVE courses.

This sample was self selecting and therefore likely to be made up of respondents interested in teamwork. I was therefore particularly careful to recognise and note any bias in responses.

7.4 LOCATION OF INTERVIEWS

Interviews took place either in the respondents' colleges or, in some instances, in their homes if they were being interviewed in their time off and this was more convenient for them. Those that took place in colleges were often subject to more interruptions as interviews were often held in staffrooms. Interviews were tape recorded or taken
down verbatim depending on the wishes of the interviewee and the situation in which the interview was taking place.

7.5 ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS

The interviews were analysed under categories denoting the main areas of concern and focused primarily on team membership. Wiseman (1978, p.115) indicated the importance of deciding "what data should become the major focus of the analysis and what data should be relegated to the position of "background" or "givens"". He stressed that failure to make this type of organisational decision would make analysis impossible because of the amount of data which was in major focus. With this caveat in mind, comments made by interviewees which were simple reiterations of the questionnaire answers have not been included. Remaining comments have been broken down into three categories to which the following summarising titles have been given:

1. membership - the process;
2. membership - control;
3. membership - commitment.

The first category emphasised the reasons why tutors become team members, the process by which this happened, and in some instances, the results of the process. The second category addressed the amount of control team leaders and members had over the selection process and how this had been achieved. The final category was concerned with commitment, the issue of unsuitable members and the ramifications of their presence in the team. Results have been tabulated to enable processes and outcomes to be more easily identified. (A complete list of these quotations can be found in Appendix 11. Extracts from a complete interview are given in Appendix 12).
### A. MEMBERSHIP - THE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>REPORTED RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) <strong>Teamwork</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Team leader asks potential member, &quot;I hope you want to do it.&quot;&quot; (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Whether they are going to get on with other members and contribute.&quot; (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) <strong>Availability/Light On Hours</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Various people were approached.&quot; (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It was a case of who could do it.&quot; (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) <strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>&quot;The co-ordinator asked me if I knew anyone.&quot; (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;He was light on his timetable and had geography experience.&quot; (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) <strong>Skills Relevant To The Course</strong></td>
<td>&quot;People were actively sought out.&quot; (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Placing an emphasis on the young people and the skills.&quot; (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### A. MEMBERSHIP - THE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>REPORTED RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Experience</td>
<td>&quot;Lots of experience, were familiar with the college and were good administrators.&quot; (8)</td>
<td>&quot;Leaders were pre-selected&quot; (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;They needed experience of working with unemployed students.&quot; (9)</td>
<td>&quot;They mostly came through external ads.&quot; (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He was the nearest in expertise. He had industrial and educational experience.&quot; (10)</td>
<td>&quot;I chose him because I thought he wanted to do it.&quot; (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;As a person I thought that if the team fell apart he would still deliver as he was personally loyal to me.&quot; (10)</td>
<td>&quot;- - - but he wasn't any good.&quot; (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Wanted To Teach On Course</td>
<td>&quot;People who end up are the people who have always done that work, want to do that work and have some expertise in that sort of work.&quot; (11)</td>
<td>&quot;Only in the last two years has there been an attempt to allocate people to particular areas and keep them there for 3 years.&quot; (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Expressed preference or expertise.&quot; (12)</td>
<td>&quot;It's tricky - there are unpopular areas.&quot; (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;They develop some expertise and perhaps some recognition.&quot; (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A. MEMBERSHIP - THE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>REPORTED RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) Commitment To Course And Its Philosophy</td>
<td>&quot;Empathy with the course and its philosophy.&quot; (13)</td>
<td>&quot;Looked for these kind of tutors.&quot; (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Chose those people who are sympathetic to adult students.&quot; (14)</td>
<td>&quot;Selection wasn't formal, I selected on what I know about them.&quot; (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Minimum levels of commitment and a readiness to work with others - - - share and integrate.&quot; (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Recommendation/Friend</td>
<td>&quot;- - - she knew them.&quot; (16)</td>
<td>&quot;The team leader recommended some members - - -&quot; (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;- - - approaching who he wanted on a friendship basis.&quot; (17)</td>
<td>&quot;The team leader started approaching - - -&quot; (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Personal Development</td>
<td>&quot;Wanted to give him BTEC National as staff development.&quot; (18)</td>
<td>&quot;I picked someone with BTEC experience.&quot; (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He decided he didn’t want it, but offered it to ‘X’ instead.&quot; (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### A. MEMBERSHIP - THE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>REPORTED RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Appointed To The Job</td>
<td>&quot;People although they were actually appointed to teach general studies a few years ago, will say they have no expertise in this area, and that they teach ‘A’ level sociology.&quot; (19)</td>
<td>&quot;There's a flight in some areas.&quot; (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. THE AMOUNT OF CONTROL OVER MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CONTROL</th>
<th>WHY THIS CAME ABOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Principal just pulled her out of the team, but luckily I was able to choose her replacement through my informal networks.&quot; (20) (team leader)</td>
<td>&quot;I was able to play the political game.&quot; (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I am given a slack teacher.&quot; (21) (team leader)</td>
<td>&quot;This department and myself don't see eye to eye over maths servicing.&quot; (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I'm the senior lecturer responsible for the co-ordination of the team, it's a bit of a non-job. I couldn't decide who I had, they were imposed on me.&quot; (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I was lent on to have her because of her availability.&quot; (23) (team leader)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I wanted to do communications and I was a bit sulky as I wanted to do this.&quot; (24) (member)</td>
<td>&quot;The team leader was so very committed that it was an inspiration, so that eventually it seemed like a good idea.&quot; (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME CONTROL</td>
<td>WHY THIS CAME ABOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I get some people I want and some I don't want, I have some control.&quot; (25)</td>
<td>&quot;Because of departmental politics.&quot; (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Set out by the steering committee, but it is fairly easy to get the people I want.&quot; (26)</td>
<td>&quot;Because most people want to work in course teams in different subjects.&quot; (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The team leader seems to be able to short circuit and go to the Vice Principal.&quot; (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE A LOT OF CONTROL/SHOULD HAVE A LOT OF CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Anyone can recommend someone for the team.&quot; (28)</td>
<td>&quot;There is a laissez-faire attitude and the new HOD has played it quite well, and won't foist things onto people, but can be manipulative.&quot; (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Would be better to have complete control over selection at the beginning.&quot; (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;You need control over who is in the team as you have got the core and support team and the support team is not committed, only to the department.&quot; (30)</td>
<td>&quot;You need to sort the different HOD perceptions out. There's either no autonomy or too much. You need a clearly defined structure to the team.&quot; (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. COMMITMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT/LACK OF COMMITMENT FROM MEMBERS            RESULT OF THIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There is one hanger on who is not so committed.&quot; (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Her heart wasn't in it, she would never have volunteered for the course.&quot; (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Another male tutor was very anti the idea of the course - he was a very embittered old hand who had no promotion.&quot; (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. COMMITMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITMENT/LACK OF COMMITMENT FROM MEMBERS</th>
<th>RESULT OF THIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There is one member I would have preferred not to work with.&quot; (34)</td>
<td>&quot;He was timetabled for it and this is one of the constraints.&quot; (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I can get rid of bad people quite quickly as they are part-timers.&quot; (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;By and large I don't have the problem as I get them to teach what they are actually interested in.&quot; (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The team leader made it obvious that he wanted him to go. He didn't like being moved, I think it lowered his self esteem. He left at the end of term.&quot; (36)</td>
<td>&quot;He didn't try to be part of the team and he didn't tell anyone what he was doing.&quot; (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We managed to change someone, for someone better, without causing offence.&quot; (37)</td>
<td>&quot;The HOD was not obstructive. It was a change to good effect, she was reliable, and committed.&quot; (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The selection of the team made them a team with a lot of shared understandings.&quot; (38)</td>
<td>&quot;They were very supportive.&quot; (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It's not so much that, (committed) as the fact that there is nowhere else to go.&quot; (39)</td>
<td>&quot;It's a good thing for the course, but people get stale.&quot; (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.6 DISCUSSION

Comments made by interviewees revealed a variety of selection processes. Robertson and Cooper (1983) pointed out that the use of systematic selection procedures could produce a more efficient work-force than randomly matching people with jobs. However, the data from the interviews indicated that many of the criteria described arose from a particular situation and not as a result of any pre-planned process. Apart from the use of external advertisements, only two interviewees talked about "people
being actively sought out", or being "pre-selected", and the latter was only for team leaders; other processes appeared to be far less planned. These are discussed at a later stage in this section.

Although a more formalised pre-planned process may not always be possible given both the internal and external constraints already discussed by tutors earlier in this research, there would seem to be a need to employ fairly positive criteria for membership. Reasons given such as "low on hours", "availability" and "loyalty to the Head of Department", may do little to form a team which willingly works together, unless, as in one instance, the team leader is able to subsequently inspire members.

While this may be possible, it is reliant on the strengths of that particular leader who may not always have the time to support individual members in that way. Allocation to a team because of availability is especially difficult where a course is unpopular with staff. When "people are just timetabled in", with little or no consultation, it can have a negative effect on the rest of the team (see Chapter 8) and serves to emphasise the power of the Head of Department and his/her influence for good or ill on the functioning of staff groups: decisions made with a view to simply allocating available resources may work against the needs of the team, and therefore against its effectiveness (see Chapter 2). In this context there may be something to be said for the view that devolved rather than 'top-down' staffing structures are more favourable to the creation of successful teams and that 'flattened' matrix structures might be more sensitive and responsive than traditional departments. However, a full elaboration of this is neither possible nor appropriate here, and the reader is referred to Tansley 1989 for a fuller discussion.
Even where people are first appointed to a particular area of work, strong reasons may be given by potential members for not getting involved in unpopular courses. While it is probably better for both the team and the course that such a person does not join, in some cases there can be a legitimate and practical reason why a tutor is nevertheless allocated to a team particularly if there are no other tutors to act as replacements. Bartlett (1974), in his notes for effective teamwork, emphasised that it was particularly important that a manager selecting an individual for a team considers the potential compatibility of the individual within the team. Clearly it would not be easy to include such a criterion in selection if potential membership was based purely on "it was a case of who could do it".

While this may be the reality in some circumstances, such a situation should be monitored very carefully in terms of the effect it is having on the individual tutor and the rest of the team. A number of other criteria given by respondents can be viewed more positively in that they are concerned with teamwork and commitment to course philosophy. However, being committed to a course philosophy may not necessarily mean that a member is also eager to be part of a team.

One response showed that even when the criteria of commitment to team work was used, the actual process of choosing a suitable member to match this criterion was not necessarily so positive,

"I hope you want to do it."

Criteria related to skills and experience were acknowledged by five different respondents.

Such criteria are obviously very important when thinking about course delivery, but as Hastings et al pointed out:
"In selecting people, the leaders are not only on the look out for specialist knowledge, they are equally concerned to assess the individual's teamworking ability, the unique contribution that they could make to how the team works, as opposed to what it does." (Hastings et al, 1986, p.48)

This sentiment was echoed in the FEU report (1982,b) where advisers to pre-vocational teams felt that the identification of skills was less important than the identification of appropriate attitudes towards a course. Such additional criteria were not present in the comments made by respondents in this study regarding the importance of skills and experience.

Where selection was based on recommendation by the team leader it did not necessarily follow that the person identified actually wanted to be in the team. While friendship may appear to be a positive criterion, the results of such relationships within a team situation demanding trust and equality may lead to all kinds of difficulties for other team members. As human beings they are no more immune to suspicion, jealousy etc. than any other profession.

The amount of control over membership exercised by the team as a whole varied from none, in most cases, to the comment of one respondent who said that anyone could recommend for the team.

Lack of control over membership had clearly led one course tutor to feel that his was "a non-job" as members were just imposed on him. In some instances control seemed to vary depending on the "departmental politics". One leader talked about getting some of the people he wanted and some he didn't, while another felt that "because of departmental politics" he had no control, which resulted in his being given a "slack teacher".
Other interviewees described situations where there was little or no control in theory, but in practice they were able to work through "informal networks". One leader found no difficulty in getting the people he wanted because tutors wanted to work in course teams.

Choice of members is not a simple task, particularly as it is concerned with "trying to measure such intangible attributes as capacities, abilities or motivations" (Lewis 1985, p.25)

Hastings et al (1986, p.83) discussed the ways in which a team leader could contribute to creating a positive climate within a team and cited the importance of the leader being able to select or influence its composition. For a variety of reasons already discussed, it was clearly not often possible. However, even though, "it would be better to have complete control over selection at the beginning", the chances of many leaders of being in this situation appeared low and unless a new team was started from scratch to deliver a new course, most teams were inherited (Adair, 1987).

While complete control by the leader may appear to answer some of the difficulties, comments made by one team member highlighted what might arise from such a situation. In one instance, some people had been approached by the leader on a friendship basis to join the team. This had resulted in the uneven treatment of members and feelings of resentment (see page 137). As Torrington and Weightman also recognised:

"Picking one's own team is a luxury few managers are able to enjoy and it can be a dangerous privilege, leading to the appointment of sycophants, instead of creating a robust balanced group of individuals working with rather than for the person in charge."

(Torrington and Weightman, 1985, p.8)
While it would seem important that both team, team leader and the prospective member all have some control over membership, the reality is probably that "there will be little scope for creating an entirely compatible team, and that a leader can only effect improvements when additions or replacements are required or when he is able to remove someone who is entirely unsuitable." (Bartlett, 1974, p.16) Replacing unsuitable people may be easy in some cases and less easy in others and may have a very negative effect on both the team and the member involved. Clearly where there is time spent on selection, and the process is both as planned and positive as possible, within other college constraints, this can result in the kind of team which has "a lot of shared understandings and is very supportive."

This process was summed up clearly by one London college Principal in a report to his Heads of Department on course teams:

"This will involve identifying which members of the subject teams should contribute to which course teams and this will involve an understanding of the needs of the courses and the strengths and wishes of subject colleagues."

(Bradley, 1987, p.7)

POSTSCRIPT

The previous use of a checklist for semi-structured interviews had proved to be rather restrictive. While I did use individual checklists for each respondent interview arising from their questionnaire responses, I ensured that these did not confine the interviews as may have previously occurred. I was cognisant of the fact that most of the interviewees were team leaders (as the original questionnaire had been sent to them) and realised that the views of members might differ. This would need to be explored during the next stages of the research as it was in the case studies which were being undertaken simultaneously.
The varying criteria for membership, and the resultant commitment or lack of it, were again highlighted and elaborated on; it was becoming clear from both the interviews and the case studies that whether or not the processes and criteria were able to be changed, the attitudes of those members arriving on a team for whatever reason, needed to be understood and acknowledged if a team was to move forward effectively. This was therefore setting the stage for the most significant part of the journey in which a process for managing change could be developed (See Chapter 10).
CHAPTER EIGHT

OBSERVING TEAMS IN ACTION

"Interaction is fundamental to a team's existence. The nature of a team's identity in fact is dependent upon a high level of interaction being demonstrated." (Douglas, 1983, p.126)

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the stage of the research which allowed close work with course teams over three terms. It explains how this came about and what was learned from it.

8.2 THE METHOD

The data derived from both the questionnaires and the follow-up interviews had isolated a number of issues which seemed to be fundamental to team-based approaches and to be significant for their success or the lack of it. These issues had been isolated and defined by tutors in situations (questionnaire-completion, interviews) at one remove from the reality of the team in action and then further refined and abstracted as a result of the analysis. It was now time to observe them being worked through in the actuality of the team process. Other teamwork issues (some of them unique to particular teams) might also emerge from the observation and interpretation of real team encounters.
8.3 THE METHODOLOGY AND ITS PURPOSE

This approach would enable movement beyond the stage of testing out existing theories and focus on those issues which relate to educational teams in practice - a grounded theory method advocated by Glaser and Strauss (1967). In this way, educational analogies for "main stream" team processes which have their roots in teamwork in industrial or commercial settings and for the team theory derived from them, could be explored.

Observation of team meetings would enable me to identify the issues at first hand while at the same time remaining as objective as possible in order to interpret events as they happened. In addition it would permit me to investigate and take into account other aspects of team behaviour such as discourse and a whole range of non verbal communication.

As Nisbet and Watt stated:

"One of the strengths which we have noted in the case study method is its capacity to take into account the uncontrolled variables which you have not clearly foreseen at the time when you begin to gather your data." (Nisbet and Watt, 1978, p.10)

8.4 THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS

Towards the end of the interview stage on membership entry into a London college was being negotiated. Through a variety of networks meetings were arranged with a Head of Department from college X whose department delivered a number of courses necessitating a teamwork approach. While he was very supportive of course teams, he was aware of a lack of team development within the department and felt that a number of teams were not operating very effectively. There had also been complaints
from funding bodies. It was agreed that I could attend the team meetings of three
different teams for two or three terms. My role was essentially to be that of an
observer of team processes, but given my advisory role and experience I should also
participate in or facilitate any team development where I found it applicable and where
it would not impinge too greatly on my role as observer.
It was not the ideal research situation, but it represents the reality of negotiations that
have to be made in order to gain access, especially when participants are aware that
their practice is a long way from exemplary.

8.5 THE ADVANTAGES OF UNDERTAKING OBSERVATION

Despite some important considerations which are discussed in 8.6, I considered that
observation would make it possible for me to check issues and discover any possible
distortions which interviewing alone would not necessarily reveal - an advantage
highlighted by Pearsall:

"There are distinct advantages to this 'outsider' role since
people are often willing to express private views and feelings
to an attentive stranger that they would not report to their
boss . . . In the course of extended contact, respondents who
react only to the stimulus of direct questions become
informants who instruct the investigator in the intricacies of
their personal and social worlds . . . In this version of the
role it is possible to collect minutely detailed data on a wide
range of topics and verify them by careful cross-checking
from multiple sources." (Pearsall, 1970, p.342)

This proved to be particularly true of the teams I was working with, as my role enabled
me to share coffee breaks and lunch periods with individual team members as I
became more and more accepted by the teams. In such situations individual and
private views were expressed apparently freely and these gave me an even wider insight
into issues other than those gained from merely attending the formal meetings.
Zelditch referred to the use of informants when he said:

"There has never been a participant-observer study in which the observer acquired full knowledge of all roles and statuses through his own direct observation."

and he went on to emphasise a particularly important role that the informant can play:

"... a single observer cannot be everywhere at the same time, nor can he be 'everywhere' in time for that matter... so that, inevitably, something happens that he has not seen, cannot see, or will not see." (Zelditch, 1967, p.225)

In addition, being with the team for its meetings provided only snapshots of their work. Many occurrences and interactions, which could be significant for my research, might take place during my absences. To minimise the effects of this I needed to ensure that I was informed of any significant events. Where possible I kept weekly telephone contact with team leaders in order to build up and maintain as broad a picture as possible of the workings of the teams. This process was also helped by meeting team members socially in the staff canteen while visiting the college to attend a different team's meeting.

8.6 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

a) My Role Within The Teams

While I remained cognisant of the possible disadvantages of observation, its advantages in relation to the study that I wished to undertake seemed to far outweigh the difficulties. I recognised from the start that one area of difficulty lay in the researcher's objectivity and that any form of close relationship within the teams might
affect my judgement and the internal validity of the research, - a point made by Cohen and Manion:

"... the critic of participant observation studies will point to the dangers of 'going native' as a result of playing a role within such a group. How do we know that the observer does not lose his perspective and become blind to the peculiarities that he is supposed to be investigating." (Cohen and Manion, 1989, p.129)

For this reason my role needed to be made very clear to members of all three teams: that essentially I would be acting as an observer, but that there would be times when I would facilitate certain very specific and identified processes in order to give something back to the team.

It was also made clear that I was not working for either the inspectorate or the college management and that anything written down would be presented to all members. I was aware that even when my role was explained to the three teams they might feel that they were being singled out for negative rather than positive reasons. Therefore the facilitation side of my role was emphasised as a positive contribution towards the teams' staff development. While seeming to recognise my presence in the teams as potentially a positive one, members were aware that I was there at the Head of Department's invitation. Although the proposal had not met with any overt opposition, I was aware that, at least at the beginning, my presence was viewed with a degree of unease, although this was fairly soon forgotten in the business of team affairs. However, I felt that in the circumstances I should have minimal contact with management after the start of my observations thus enabling me gain and keep the trust of the teams more easily.
b) **External Validity**

I had decided to observe all three teams chosen by the Head of Department as it would enable me to recognise some of the similarities and differences between the teams, all of whom were operating within the same department and within the same culture.

I also needed to consider the possible questions surrounding external validity which the adoption of such an approach might raise. Such questions centred on how far such observations were applicable to other situations. However, as Cohen and Manion (1989) stated, certain "situational interactions" can be so complex that any observation can have meaning only for the actual context in which it occurred.

It seemed likely that the kind of processes I might observe would be peculiar to a particular team with particular membership and in a particular situation. To offer generalisations could only be in terms of what Denzin (1971) calls a "representative situation" in that I might be in a position to make certain statements about team characteristics which might have wider applicability. Notwithstanding these points, it was likely that although each team and team situation has unique aspects, the kinds of pressure that they would be experiencing from both within the college, (micro-politics, resource issues etc), and from outside would be similar to those in other colleges eg; staffing, external funding, so that other teams in other colleges would recognise scenarios and see the advantages of such work even though essentially unique.

Such unprejudiced accounts of events and feelings were to be a vital element of the research, and while the importance of maintaining a level of detachment from the teams was recognised, so too was the unique opportunity afforded. My position in the
teams gave me access to a much broader range of information than if I had come into the college to interview team members in isolation.

c) Recording Data

Another consideration was a possible lack of immediacy in recording the totality of events. In addition to the unease already present within the teams because of internal difficulties, there was also a climate of instability created by the announcement that the ILEA was to be abolished.

Because of the combined factors of my role ambivalence and the uncertain future of the ILEA, the general climate which prevailed in the teams was not conducive to tape recording team meetings, as it may well have been seen as threatening. At a more mundane and practical level, another contra-indication came from the fact that team meetings for one team were always held in the staff common room where the general background noise made it virtually impossible to tape record conversations. However, I was aware of possible misreporting as comments and events often had to be noted retrospectively. Every attempt was made to avoid this, in that where possible notes were made during sessions with the respective teams and, if this were not appropriate, the process of meetings were recorded immediately following a visit, usually in my car where I kept a hand-held recorder. Body language indicated that note taking was viewed with less distrust as time went by, and I was viewed as someone that could, for the most part, be disregarded. My synopses were later checked by at least two participants for perspectives of interpretation and for any omissions of events etc, and as a further control, the notes were cross-checked against minutes of the meetings.
d) **Objectivity**

Other queries arise with respect to the accuracy of interpretation by an observer. Although the literature review had enabled me to bring a number of theoretical perspectives to the situation, I was aware that any preconceived ideas could mask other issues which might arise during observations. For this reason, no form of checklist was used when observing. However, the choice of such a research mode also brought into question the danger of weighting or misinterpreting observations in order to lend support to previous conclusions. In order to minimise the possibility of this occurring, I ensured that any interpretations I made were checked with each individual team member, the team leader and/or the Head of Department in order to compare and evaluate perspectives and help illuminate the possible reasons behind any mismatch of perceptions. By these means, the study incorporated triangulation of perspectives just as the research as a whole incorporated triangulation of technique (Chapter 3). Bruyn suggested that objectivity is a condition of reporting without prejudice, but felt that "it need not be a report without feeling or sentiment." He goes on to say that it is possible for feeling and objectivity to coexist:

"... it is possible for the investigator to have a feeling of respect for his subjects and remain open and unprejudiced in apprehending and reporting about their way of life. Secondly it is possible for the sentiments of people being studied to be conveyed without prejudicing the accuracy of correctness of the report itself." (Bruyn, 1970, p.284)

---

**8.7 THE TEAMS**

**8.7.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section gives background information and a profile of each of the teams I was to observe. It covers membership and an overview of any concerns expressed by the
Head of Department (X) and Principal Lecturer (Y) during pre-observation negotiations. The Head of Department suggested that three teams responsible respectively for three types of different courses should be observed. These courses are not identified here since such a profile might identify the college in question. Suffice it to say that the three courses had already been represented in previous explorations using other techniques, and were relatively common courses in Further Education colleges. Similarly, each course is identified from the other two by using a colour name, in this case to protect, as well as possible, individual identities.

In all such research confidentiality is important, but it is particularly so here when I was allowed to be party to extremely sensitive issues. The following background information came from an interview with the Head of Department and therefore represents his viewpoint.

8.7.2 THE YELLOW TEAM

This course was externally funded and conformed to specific guidelines laid down by the funding agent.

There was a core team made up of five lecturers, one of whom was part-time, and a support team of six. According to X "Those not in the core team do not act as though they are part of the team."

Again according to X, none of the core team chose to be on the course, they were there due to their subject, their availability or not having anywhere else to put them. According to Y, half the core team were politically against outside government funded work, which this was, seeing it as interventionist and therefore did not want to teach on the course.
This vocationally-orientated course required full-time attendance of 16 to 19 year old students and took place during the normal working day. The course centred around integrated assignments and contained a certain amount of practical work in the vocational area.

Team Members

8.7.3 Introduction

The majority of the information concerning team members was provided by X and Y. Some information came from members themselves and some from my own observations. The various sources of information will be identified during the different sections.

The following information came from a discussion with X before the observation period began.

8.7.4 Yellow Team Members

The raw data contains details of subject specialisms etc. which informed analysis, but general categories are given here to aid confidentiality. The team leader (lecturer grade one) had started out as a practical subject tutor but had moved to be in charge of integrated studies. She had been allocated to the Yellow team as course leader and had not initially been very happy with the situation. X saw her as "difficult to get on with" and "not a good course team leader." Y (Principal lecturer grade) was new to the college and was responsible for all integrated work including externally funded courses. Although he was also responsible for other courses he spent a lot of time on externally funded work because he felt he had built them up from the start. The Head of Department believed he was not very confident and felt insecure in the college.
A lecturer grade two was responsible for the social science components of the course and another lecturer grade two was responsible for the natural science component. The latter was considered by X to be "good at this job", but "not interested in this kind of course" as she was thought to be more interested in higher level work. She was also a member of the Green team. The final full time lecturer was responsible for general skills. In addition, there was a part-time tutor of an arts component who, despite his part-time status, was regarded as a very conscientious course team member.

8.7.5 CONCERNS

In the month prior to my observing team meetings, there had been a meeting between the Head of Department, Principal Lecturer and the course team leader, together with the representatives of the external funding agency. The latter felt communication between members of the team needed to be strengthened, citing an example of a tutor who had been unaware that material had already been covered in previous lessons. The meeting had agreed that such points needed to be raised at the next team meeting and that the team needed to agree that "unity was strength and that there were benefits to working together and to being perceived as doing so." (minutes of the meeting)

8.8 OBSERVATION REPORT DESIGN

This section reports on my observation of the Yellow team over three visits. It also covers any pre- and between-meetings observation necessary to set the above into context. A scenario is given at the beginning of each report which indicates members present, each of whom will be given an identifying letter.

This report is a synopsis of my original copious notes from which main points have been distilled after co-ordination and reflection. In some instances the direct speech
of the participants has been retained, since some of the atmosphere of team-work in
action would be lost through a précis-format.

Each meeting is reported sequentially, but the discussion reports are structured
according to a series of headings (eg "communication," "management") which not only
summarize particular discussion items but which highlight the relevance of these items
to the broader analysis of aspects of teamwork.

8.8.1 First Visit to the Yellow Team.

Scenario

The meeting was to take place partly over the lunchtime so that all full time tutors had
to come in their own time. One lecturer had to alter his timetable in order to attend.

All full-time members except the natural science lecturer attended:-
J - general skills tutor; Y - the Principal Lecturer; M - the part time arts tutor; G - the
team leader and S - the social science tutor.

Pre-Meeting Information

Y had been asked to liaise with me in terms of any information I might need. He
asked to talk to me before I observed the first team meeting.

His Expressed Concerns;

- anxiety that this team meeting had already been cancelled once. He felt this
  was due to a negative team attitude;
- anxiety over bad feeling between him and the team. He saw this as rooted in
  a clash of personalities and in his dual roles as a manager and team member;
- anxiety that I might be seen as a management "spy";
- anxiety that there had been complaints from the external funders.
Meeting Report

The purpose of meeting was declared as being to discuss difficulties the team felt they were experiencing in relation to the course and their delivery of it as a team.

I explained the reason for my being in the meeting and how I would be with them for their meetings over the next two terms. Members of the team had already been told about it and said they felt comfortable with my presence. There did not appear to be any negative comments or hostile body language.

The team leader asked for comments on the negative feedback received from the external funders.

Group discussion followed. The following issues were raised:

a) that the content of the course was dictated by an outside body and had been changed considerably since the previous year;

b) that they had only been informed of the changes when they returned in September and had not been given time to look at them properly and consider their implications for the teaching and organisation of the course;

c) that meetings were rather haphazard and usually took place in a half an hour of the lunch break. This caused all sorts of problems for team members who were teaching in the afternoon;

d) G said she did not really feel happy with the idea of having meetings in lunch breaks, laying heavy emphasis on the union view;

e) meetings were not seen to be productive because there was no set agenda. This seemed to be because no one took responsibility for setting or distributing it. There was some discussion about whose role it was. This remained unresolved;
f) the team felt they could not air their views with management present at team meetings.

Y felt he needed to be there because, in his view, the team were not doing their work properly.

The Team thought he did not trust them and was unable to delegate.

Some discussion about roles in the team followed.

The team thought there needed to be a re-examination of the roles - not only those in the core team but also those in the wider support team (who were not at the meeting).

Decisions made:

It was decided that the core team should meet with the support team at least once a term. All members expressed the feeling that if this did not happen, "it made a nonsense of an integrated course structure." G said she would ask management to allow the team to meet once a fortnight, for an hour at a time when everyone could attend, so that effective discussion could take place. This proposal had total team support.

S felt that if the team was to work effectively everyone needed to come and minutes needed to be taken. It was also suggested that Y only came to meetings when there was something on the agenda which directly affected him,"You need to decide whether you are a teacher or a line manager." (J)

8.8.2 Second Visit To Yellow Team Meeting - Following Term

All the team were present except W

Pre-Meeting Information

I was telephoned by G who gave me the date of the meeting. She told me that although the team often met in the staff room, this time a quiet room had been booked.
Purpose Of Meeting

At the moment the team only met once a term formally, so this meeting was to also provide some team development.

During Meeting Report

Discussion Around What Is An Effective Team

G asked the team to discuss what they thought an effective team should be.

All members contributed to the discussion and the following suggestions were offered:

- that there should be some cohesion amongst the tutors;
- that there ought to be a consensus in decision making;
- that the members ought to trust each other more;
- that the team should share responsibilities.

G asked them what they thought were the constraints to acting on these.

Individual Observations Were Made:

- finding the time for team members to work on the integration of the curriculum and to share materials:
- team meetings were not seen to be well organised - there was no agenda and a purpose for calling a meeting was not usually given;
- coming to grips with what was seen as a constantly changing management style.

G asked for feedback on how these could be overcome.

Individual Team Members Offered The Following:

- that there should be a rotating responsibility for setting the agenda, chairing the meeting and taking the minutes;
- that the minutes should be taken down as action minutes to save time;
that they should organise more purposeful meetings with an agenda.

**Team Autonomy**

S raised the issue as to whether the Head of Department was, or should be, a member of the team. He saw the role of the Head of Department as being a manager, a trouble shooter and an advice giver. He felt that at the moment X opted in and out of the team. Other members of the team believed this brought its autonomy into question.

The team's autonomy was also seen to be affected by external funders who did not approach the team directly when they had a problem with the course, but went to X.

Y then pointed out what was and what was not negotiable within the course and that although the general framework of the curriculum was not negotiable, within the content there was a lot of flexibility.

At this point there were mumblings from J and S to each other. G moved in her chair said loudly that she questioned the autonomy of members who were encouraged to work as an autonomous team and yet had to be checked in terms of what they did with students. She also queried whether management should ask team members about the whereabouts of other members.

J and S also said that there was a problem of being autonomous tutors within a non-negotiable curriculum.

Y retorted that they all knew this when they came on the course, although G pointed out that two members had been timetabled for the course and not asked.

**Discussion Around Team Roles**

I had agreed to facilitate the next part of the discussion concerning team roles. I asked the members to think about what they thought were the following roles in relation to
the team: their own role, the course team leader, the Head of Department and the Principal Lecturer.

**Individual Team Roles**

Perceptions were very similar as they all saw themselves primarily as teachers, responsible for profiling, marking the registers, curriculum and materials development and attendance at team meetings.

**The Team Leader**

There was initial feedback from all members on what they saw as the role of the team leader. This was seen as:-

- responsibility for the co-ordination of returns and other administration;
- ensuring liaison between all members of the team;
- teaching, devising work and having an understanding of the students on the course and their needs;
- linking between the course and the external funders;
- co-ordinating meetings and passing on information;
- dealing with any problems or complaints from students;

At this point G became very red in the face, and moved towards Y shouting that he had taken over most of her role.

Voices of other members were generally raised with interjections.

J shouted, "I agree it's her role, but we don't go to her, we go to Y because of the way it's set up."

Other members agreed that it was impossible because the line manager (Y) was also a member of the team and therefore tended to take on those responsibilities particularly when he thought they were not being carried out properly.
Y went very red and his voice wavered (seemingly in anger) when he described how he felt the leader wasn't fulfilling her contractual obligations. He added that he had been checking up on her through other tutors. There were cries of "unprofessional behaviour" from all members.

G then thumped the table and shouted abuse at Y. He shouted back. Other members looked embarrassed. G said she was leaving the meeting and went out slamming the door. I suggested there should be a coffee break.

At Coffee Break

I talked to G who said she felt she had a non-role as leader and was being checked up on. However she agreed to come back to the meeting.

More Responsibility

On returning from break it was agreed that G should be given the chance to undertake more of her role. However Y felt that his role was important because he had an historical perception of the course and had been the longest serving team member.

Management

Members then gave their feedback on the role of management:

- that it should be generally responsible for negotiating timetables and other administration associated with delivery of the programme;
- that management obviously had to take up any instances of dereliction of duty;
- that although management was seen as responsible for providing resources, they should also respect a certain degree of autonomy within the team in this and similar areas;
- that it should have some responsibility for liaising with external funders.
Commitment To The Course

M suggested that if the management of the college saw teamwork as important, it should recognise that it needed time to meet. There was general agreement from other team members.

S added that in order to build up mutual respect between management and the team, Heads of Department should also teach on the course so that they would understand the constraints under which they were working.

Team Recommendations

G asked for a summary of recommendations. It was agreed:

- to plan the purpose of meetings prior to the actual meeting;
- to have a rotating chair and action minutes taken;
- to spend more time looking at roles and responsibilities.

Between Meeting Information

Two weeks later Y telephone to say that there would not be another meeting for a while. He explained that he found it difficult to work with G, who was not attempting to arrange another meeting. He had therefore persuaded the Head of Department to give the leader a different post in an area she was keen to move to.

He thought the conflict would be settled as he would now be both line manager and team leader.

8.8.3 Third Visit To The Team

Pre-Meeting Information

I was telephoned by Y to say that another team meeting had been arranged and that he had also invited another team (team 2), which was not studied in depth in this
research, but which delivered a similar kind of course. Y was also a member of team 2 which, apart from himself and the natural science lecturer, was composed entirely of part-time tutors.

P felt that team 2 were much better than the Yellow team and made several references to "problems" with the former which "just don't happen in team 2 because they are part-timers and work harder than full-timers." I queried this with the Head of Department who thought this was true to a certain extent, but that they used outside funded work "as an entry to a job in order to move on to other courses where they really did want to work."

Scenario

Before the meeting Y told me that G was absent. Those present from the yellow team were Y, W, the natural science lecturer J, general skills, M, arts part-time tutor, while G, the former team leader, was absent with influenza. S, the social sciences tutor was also absent.

Team 2 was composed of W who was present for both teams along with D and R, two part-time skills tutors. The third part-time skills tutor was absent. Y was also the team leader.

Meeting Report

Effective Teamwork

Y asked both teams to say what they thought was effective about their team.

Appropriateness Of Attendance

Before anyone answered the question raised, J said in an abrupt tone, "Why are the other team here? This is deliberately being set up to be judgemental. We have to look at
both teams separately rather than comparatively." Y went red and explained that as the
team numbers were small it made sense to meet together and share team practice.

No Commonality
J replied sharply, "We don't have common problems, they are all part-timers, we are not.
Why didn't we continue to build on the successful meeting we had on our own last time.
You are always building up how good the other team are, but they are all part-timers."

Is There A team?
W said that talking about an effective team was "pointless, because we don't feel we are
a team."
J added: "The Yellow team doesn't exist, I work closely with those I see in order to get
information. A team would be good for the students, as it would be beneficial for the
delivery of the course and we would be able to see the links more clearly, but a team needs
time to meet and evaluate."

Communication
"I feel we ought to meet more. All our team liaison is done through individual contact
with Y who tells us what to do. I think as a team we probably meet 'officially' only once
a term and this is because there is always the problem of paying part-time staff."
J felt that the college ought to pay for all their meetings as "they are making a profit"
(from the external funders) Y then interjected: "Well I have to give ten out of ten to
team 2 for good communications, but as for the Yellow team, well as far as that goes . . ."
He was interrupted by a shout from J accusing him of always praising team 2.
"You can't base a team on personal subjective relationships. You've only got a team 2
because you are close enough to pass by their room all the time."
Is A Team Needed?

D asked whether they really needed a team. W responded: "A harmonious working team is certainly related to the course, but I think it is the icing on the cake. Anyway does the course come before the team or which way round is it?"

Autonomy

J answered: "The course is first, the team is there to service it. In this case the servicers have not been part of the body of the course. We are servicing what is not clear. People have been brought in to service what they don't agree with." Y repeated that the course was outside funded and therefore not negotiable. "What is needed is a stable and committed team who can accept the course content and work within an integrated work-related modular curriculum." J added "These things should be made clear at the beginning before joining."

It was agreed that their teams were in a conflict situation. They wanted to have autonomy but many of the decisions were taken higher up.

Y asked for any helpful suggestions; the team offered the following:

- there needed to be some clarity from the external agents as to what they wanted;
- better communication channels needed to be set up between them and the team;
- a review of the course and its students needed to take place with a representative of the external funders and the team;
- representatives of both sets of funders should be invited to course team meetings once a term or, if not possible, once a year;
- more resources in terms of materials needed to be given.
Roles and responsibilities/integration

W raised the issue of team roles, particularly in relation to integration. "There are no clear definition of roles and responsibilities, so consequently there is no integration." J felt that they needed a clearer course outline, and that the course had been badly set up with ill-defined responsibilities.

Future Of The Team

Y then explained how funding might be withdrawn from the following September. J shouted that the team had not been informed and that no team meeting had been called to discuss this.

Y said that certain project work should be introduced onto the course to improve it. J demanded to know why things were suddenly negotiable when the course was going wrong.

Y did not respond and declared the meeting closed as people had to go and teach.

It was agreed that future meetings would be with separate teams.

Post Meeting Information

Following this meeting Y asked me to go for a coffee. He was upset because he could not understand why J had attacked him during the meeting. He believed she was negative because she was politically against outside funded work. He felt team membership needed reviewing in order to avoid getting the wrong members for September. "These courses always get given the worst teachers."

The following week the Head of Department telephoned to say that there might not be any more meetings for a while as membership needed reviewing. He had a meeting with Y who had decided to stop leading the team. The Head of Department suggested that J should lead the team for the moment. Y had disagreed because he felt he was
"not committed to this kind of work." and had wanted M. The Head of Department felt this was not suitable as M was a part-time tutor and fairly inexperienced.

No decision had been made and Y was to continue as leader.

A month later, I received another telephone call to say that there would be no more formal meetings this term, and that there would be positive team recruitment for next September. Team meetings would also be included in the next budget.

Y had just given notice as he had found a Head of Department's post in another college.

8.9 CONCLUSION

I shall conclude this chapter with an analysis of those teamwork issues which were thrown into relief by my observation of the Yellow team. Without giving a full report on the meetings of the other two teams, which would risk merely covering ground similar to that of the Yellow team report, I shall examine the similarities and differences between all three teams which emerged from my observations of them.

8.9.1 Issues Arising From The Yellow Team

As a result of observing this team a number of issues became evident. I subsequently checked the accuracy of these with other team members, the Head of Department and the Principal Lecturer.

The whole area of team membership appeared to have raised a number of concerns:

1) The course itself was not seen as high profile within the department and therefore had difficulty in recruiting staff.

2) All of the team, apart from Y, were either allocated to the team because of their availability or timetabled in because of their subject expertise. Neither
criteria were very positive in terms of team commitment. This had clearly led to a lot of dissatisfaction.

3) The effects of this allocation process were exacerbated by strong feelings about teaching on outside funded courses. This was due not only to the perceived non-negotiable curriculum, but to political reasons relating to government control over education.

4) Individual members seemed to have very little commitment to either the course or the team. This was particularly true of the team leader who felt very strongly about leading such a course. This led to a role conflict: "She wants promotion, but she can't decide whether to be union or management", a situation highlighted by Robertson and Cooper (1983) who described this type of internal role conflict.

5) The dual role of the Principal Lecturer also led to a conflict situation. Team members turned to him rather than to the team leader because, as Westerlund (1979, p.79) emphasised: "roles are the sum total of one's own and other people's expectations relative to a certain position." Y did not discourage these approaches as he felt he had the greatest experience of the course. However, team members saw the Principal Lecturer primarily in a management role and only secondly as a member of the team, leaving the team feeling very uneasy and questioning the professionalism of such a duality of roles.

Rice (1958) pointed to the need to minimise differences of prestige and status within a group in order to achieve stability and avoid conflict.

6) Autonomy was a central issue as members felt strongly that decisions were taken outside the team. The difficulty for most members lay in the conflict
between "having an autonomous, integrated team" in a situation where many of
the decisions were taken higher up and over which they, as a team, had no
control.

Gray, describing an educational context, highlighted the fact that:

"The problem with teams and working groups is that they soon
become a challenge to administrative convenience because they
require people to behave differently in ways that do not fit the
idealised structure" (Gray, 1982, p.48)

- an issue which was clearly demonstrated within this team who wanted
  ownership of what they were delivering.

While outside-funding bodies called for course teams, the amount of autonomy
afforded to them was fairly limited. While it might need some rethinking on the
part of the external funders, the nature of the course and its limited scope for
autonomous teamwork needed to be clearly stated to potential members.

In addition, while there may be certain restrictions on such courses, there needs
to be a recognition on the part of management that as much involvement and
information as possible should be given to teams working within this confined
structure.

7) Team meeting time was only once a term on a formal basis which meant that
for the rest of the time information exchange had to rely on members being free
to meet on an ad hoc basis. This had clearly not worked well: "I only work
closely with those I see in order to get information."

All the members agreed that a team was an important part of the delivery process and
that, while everyone would benefit, time needed to be devoted to it: "A team would be
good for the students as it would be beneficial for the delivery of the course, and we would
be able to see the links more clearly, but a team needs to meet and evaluate."

This problem also existed in Team 2 and was exacerbated by the fact they were nearly all part-time tutors and therefore did not normally get paid to attend. The only way their communication process was eased was because of the physical proximity of their rooms.

OTHER TEAM OBSERVATIONS

8.9.2 The Purple Team

This team was composed of five full-time lecturers. Information regarding team membership came from the Head of Department and in some instances from the team leader.

The course was a year old and delivered a twenty-one hour course for mature students returning to study who were seeking to progress to Higher Education. The team leader had recently been appointed as a result of "going through the bar" and becoming a senior lecturer. According to the Head of Department he was "not appointed to this kind of work on merit, but on grade and availability." He did not have a background in the target profession of the course and was seen to be unconfident about his lack of subject knowledge. According to the Head of Department, "He is very good at getting things off the ground, but is not a good leader."

The lecturer grade two was an ex-member of the target profession who was very keen to become leader. She was asked by the Head of Department to join the team because of her background and availability. She tended to get involved in a lot of similar work outside the college, which she advertised widely to other college members, but did not share her knowledge and experience with this team, causing a certain
amount of friction. In addition there were two other grade 2 lecturers, both of whom were also members of the Green team.

The final member was a lecturer grade one for a non-academic subject who told me that: "Because of my subject area in relation to the rest of the course, I feel very isolated."

She was, however, very committed to integration and tried to make it work. Although lecturers became team members either because of their skill area or their availability, all were very committed to working with mature adults, making this team very different from the other two, who worked with much younger students. In addition it was not externally funded or subject to any external constraints or moderation.

8.9.3 The Green Team

This team was larger than the others having eight members in its core and another five in the support team. (As a result there was some anxiety amongst members about the possibility of effective communication and therefore integration). This team delivered a full-time integrated vocational course for 16-19 year old students focusing on media studies. Integrated assignments were seen by moderators as a vital component of the provision. However, the Head of Department felt that there were still some very strong subject divisions within this team which led to resistance to implementing them.

Membership of the team was not altogether a free choice, "What usually happens is that very early in the previous year before a course starts every member of staff has an individual interview with me and they can make bids for certain areas of work, so it could be that they have wanted to come into this sort of scheme. They haven’t been forced into it, but having said that the timetabling process puts them actually into a particular team."

(Head of Department)
The team leader felt this had not really worked and was negotiating with the Head of Department for an experiment on selection criteria, early selection and team training for the following year.

Team Members

This team leader, (a senior lecturer), had been on the team for several years. Two lecturers from the Purple team were also members together with Y and the natural science lecturer from the Yellow team. The support team was predominantly composed of part-time tutors who never attended meetings.

8.9.4 Summary Of The Similarities And Differences Between The Three Teams

i) Involvement/Membership Within The Teams.

While there were some staff common to two or all of the teams in question, their attendance at the different meetings and their apparent involvement seemed to vary. Although the Principal Lecturer was a member of both the Yellow and Green teams he did not attend the meetings of the latter and according to members of that team "did not spend a lot of time or energy on them."

The natural science lecturer came to the Yellow team meetings but only came once to the Green meetings. While the reasons for this were unclear, members of the team told me that she never attended meetings and "was not happy with integration, preferring to teach on higher level work." A third lecturer with dual membership attended all the Purple course meetings but, having not wanted to work on it, came only once to the Green team meetings. The issues attached to wanting to be on a particular course team, and the resultant commitment, seemed therefore to arise for all three teams. Lack of commitment or interest in a certain course was characterised in particular by
no or little attendance at team meetings.

ii) Communication

There were issues about communication within all three teams. Attendance at meetings was a problem across all of them, with non or erratic attendance from particular members a concern for all three team leaders.

As the Green team leader stated, "How can you make tutors more committed to the idea of a team? How can you make them think they are missing out if they don't attend meetings?" All three leaders believed that non-attendance was partly due to people not feeling teams were important and that education was trying to foster the philosophy of teams while at the same time propagating the idea of the independent, autonomous teacher. None of the teams were given remission for meetings and all had difficulties in finding somewhere suitable to hold them.

All three team leaders felt that meetings were important but very difficult to arrange: "I would love to get them altogether once a week, even if only for a glass of wine, but it's impossible."

iii) Integration

This was acknowledged as a problem for all three teams. The Yellow team attributed this to the lack of time to meet and communicate, while the Green team felt this was in part due to having a large team which affected their ability to integrate successfully. Some members also felt "integration was just dumped on us with no time for planning," together with the fact that there were "still very obvious subject divisions and with a number of subject-centred tutors only paying lip service to an integrated team approach."

However one member of the Purple team felt they were relatively quite effective, "Well
we are not doing badly, . . . of all the seven teams I am on, this is the only one which even calls meetings."

iv) Roles And Responsibilities

Roles were seen as in need of clarification by all three teams.

In two of the teams (Yellow and Purple) this lack of clarity had produced conflict and this in turn had led to poor attendance at meetings.

v) Supportive Climate

While it would appear from discussions with the Head of Department that management was supportive of teamwork, this perception was not held by two of the team leaders. "The hierarchy doesn't really care about teamwork or the course as long as everything is seen to be running smoothly and there are no waves."

8.10 CONCLUSIONS AND POSTSCRIPT

It would be fair to say that these case studies have again highlighted problems which are noted in the literature (Chapter 2) and in the preceding part of the research (Chapters 4-7). Although I was concerned that team uniqueness might obviate the formulation of generalisations, it appeared that commonality did exist although precise detail differs. A particular value of these case studies for me, and I hope for the reader in spite of the brevity of the reportable scenarios, is that they gave abstract issues life. For instance "role conflict" seems logical and clear as it trips along the pages of script and hence an impression is given that an equally logical and clear solution could readily be found. Not only the complexity involved in this concept but also the human dilemmas and pain which it causes become more apparent when it is observed in action. Solutions are not so easy nor yet so logical in real-life.
Another value of these case studies is that they highlight issues with different emphases because they draw attention to what could be done to ameliorate situations rather than what should be done, in a perfectly ordered world, or indeed, what should have been done on the past if the participants had above-normal pre-vision.

In this way these studies served to indicate progressive avenues for continuing the research. In the next chapter a description is given of how the data so far was checked and expanded on to clarify the pathway forward.

That this is an apposite research approach is supported by Usher who stressed the need for research, particularly in the realm of Adult Education, to address the theme of relevance:

"It is important to recognise the centrality of the situational, and thus focus on practice as an activity guided by the informed theory of the practitioners." (Usher, 1989, p.135)

The case study observations had been very effective in demonstrating theory being carried out in practice. The reality of the difficulties which teams face was highlighted over three terms and brought the abstract concerns of the previous data to life in a sometimes dramatic way. They had also provided evidence for the way forward after the initial interviews and had helped to guide the questions in the second questionnaire. I had observed the teams with a mental checklist of issues which had arisen from the previous data. However, a written checklist might have helped to focus my observations and have proved a visual list of areas already highlighted. This would have also acted as a check against any possible personal observational bias.

The amount of data generated by observing three teams over a period of time made it impossible to report in detail on all three teams and any identifying details were also
omitted so that anonymity of both the teams and the college could be maintained at a time of particular insecurity and uncertainty for all concerned. While, as already discussed, the common threads of communication, membership (commitment), collaboration and a supportive climate were again coming to the fore, I observed that situations were not changing and members did not appear to have the tools to begin the process of change. The data was therefore important in further substantiating previous findings and indicating recommendation that could be made, but it was clearly not able to provide a practical way forward. This I believed now needed to come from the practitioners themselves. However, I felt that the data so far had been provided for the most part by teams who were experiencing difficulties. Before the journey would take the road of facilitating team members as action researchers, I felt that the data should be checked against teams who were perceived to be successful and therefore presumably not experiencing any problems. To this end a final questionnaire was produced which would act as a check against previous data and provide a firm foundation for the last stage of the journey.
CHAPTER NINE

CONFIRMATION OF THE ISSUES

"Every data gathering class - interviews, questionnaires, observation, performance records, physical evidence - is potentially biased and has specific to it certain validity threats." (Webb et al, 1966, p.35)

9.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the outcomes of the data analysis so far, and the rationale behind the next and final exploration of the field. This exploration seeks to consolidate what had gone before and to open up avenues for the final stages of the research. Up to this point in the research I had used a multi-perspective approach in order to gain both an overview of team issues and a more in-depth examination of some of the concerns being expressed. The adoption of such a multi-perspective was in line with the statement made by Marshall and Rossman (1989) that:

"Each type and source of data has strengths and weaknesses. Using a combination of data types increases validity as the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another approach." (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p.79)

At each point in the research the data gathered appeared to reinforced that already obtained, enabling me to identify a number of important core areas affecting teamwork.
9.2 THE ISSUES

These have been synthesised into three interrelated groups:

1) **Commitment To Teamwork** - whether members enjoyed participating in a team, their willingness to attend meetings and the value they attach to them.

2) **Team Cohesion** - influenced or determined by members' desire to be part of a team, their control or otherwise over its membership and the level of team communication.

3) **Valuing Teamwork** - the perceived benefits of teamwork for team members and for students, and for the institution.

9.3 THE WAY FORWARD

The next stage of the research needed finally to confirm these issues before arriving at any recommendations which might enable teams to work in a constructive fashion, in other words to achieve the aim set out by Woodcock and Francis (1981, p.130) of "mature teams finding ways to channel conflicting ideas and viewpoints into a synthesis of ideas which has the best components of all opinions expressed" avoiding the group conflict observed by Hunt as arising from:

"... differences among members in motives, attitudes and feelings." *(Hunt, 1981, p.91)*

The process of confirmation would therefore be a first stage towards this channelling, a process highlighted by Patton:

"As the inquiry reveals patterns and major dimensions of interest, the evaluator will begin to focus on verifying and elucidating what appears to be emerging - a more deductive approach to data collection and analysis."
*(Patton, 1990, P.194)*
9.4 THE METHOD

I decided to use a final questionnaire in the manner suggested by Parlett and Hamilton:

"A survey type questionnaire used late in a study can sustain or qualify tentative findings. Free and fixed response formats can be included to obtain both quantitative survey data and also open-ended (and perhaps new and unexpected) comment." (Parlett and Hamilton, 1981, p.20)

The use of such a final questionnaire to substantiate previous findings was also suggested by Oppenheim:

"We often find that as the early stages of research take shape, its aim undergoes a number of subtle changes as a consequence of greater clarity in our thinking. Such changes may require a new and better specification for the instrument of measurement, the questionnaire." (Oppenheim, 1986, p.3)

This quotation is especially pertinent because by this time my experiences had convinced me that a change in research technique towards an Action Research approach, working with teachers to help them to develop their own teams, was required. This is discussed in detail in Chapter 10, but first a firm foundation for that work had to be established.

9.5 THE PURPOSE OF THE METHOD

It was decided that a questionnaire which tended to be more quantitative in its nature would be the most appropriate instrument to use. This approach would consolidate the previous qualitative approaches and establish a solid data base for the final investigation, so that it would have credibility to a range of participants and research practitioners. Patton suggested that qualitative methods are not always appropriate and argued the need to be flexible in approach.
He suggested:

"That this spirit of adaptability and creativity in designing evaluations is aimed at being responsive to real-world conditions and meeting stakeholder information needs." (Patton, 1990, p.194)

This was about being responsive to the situation rather than viewing alternative approaches to research as completely incompatible. This was supported by Pope and Zubir, who felt that:

"A rigid division between these two approaches is quite unnecessary since each approach, we believe, should aim at the desirable common objective of arriving at data that can lend credibility to the findings in each research but which also provides a sound interpretive base." (Pope and Zubir, 1984, p.7)

9.6 THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT

The questionnaire contained both open and closed questions although the emphasis, as previously indicated, was on the latter. The question areas covered were those identified from previous data collection and summarised in paragraph 9.2. Responses were analysed by the use of the statistical package SPSSX and provided a set of descriptive statistics including some cross tabulations which are also given in the analysis (see Appendix 19). Open ended questions and additional comments were categorised in the manner carried out in previous questionnaires (see page 70).

9.7 THE SAMPLE

A random sample of fifty colleges, stratified by location, was taken. This was to ensure that there was geographical variation in the responding teams. The sample was taken from the Directory of Further Education Colleges (CRAC, 1986) ensuring that colleges
approached were removed from the total population before sampling began.

The sample is not intended to be fully representative in that it would be extremely
difficult to define a course team sufficiently to ensure that adequate proportions of all
variants were included in the population from which the sample was drawn.

As Munn and Drever stated:

"The idea of constructing a representative sample is
appealing, but misleading. Instead, effort should go into
defining clearly the group or groups of people that the
research is interested in, after which a purely random sample
can be taken from each group."
(Munn and Drever, 1990, p.12)

It was not the intention to make generalisations, but to verify previous findings in a way
considered pragmatic at this point in the research, a view supported by Patton:

"I prefer pragmatism to one-sided paradigm allegiance . . .
The purpose of describing how paradigms typically operate in
the real world of research is to free evaluators from the
bonds of allegiance to a single paradigm. This is quite
different from prescribing that evaluators should or must
always operate within one or the other paradigm."
(Patton, 1990, P.38)

9.8 AIM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

As previous data had tended to identify particular difficulties within teams, it seemed
important also to identify any good current team practice. This, in turn, might help to
offer ways forward for more effective teamworking. The aim was to gather information
from team leaders and members separately to ensure identification of all viewpoints.
This would also enable the noting of any hitherto undetected variations in data.

Questionnaires for members and leaders would ask the same questions, but with a
different emphasis for leaders where applicable.

However, because of the numbers of team members, including support teams, it was
decided, for practical purposes, to send four team member questionnaires and one team leader questionnaire to each college.

The covering letter (see Appendix 13) together with questionnaires and prepaid envelope were sent to the Principal of each sampled college asking each to choose one team to complete them.

The letter then requested the leader to select four members whom he/she considered representative of the team. In practice a number of teams photocopied the questionnaires and all core members completed them.

The letter was addressed to the Principals for the following reasons:

a) to maximise returns;

b) it was suspected that Principals would tend to choose more "successful" teams,

Indication was not provided about to which course team the questionnaires should be given. This would then enable the identification of good practice and would act as a challenge to previous data by highlighting those issues which still remained as problems even in relatively "successful" teams.

(The letter also stated that there would be an opportunity to participate in a follow-up workshop on attitudes to teamwork. This served as a prelude and link to the final part of the research).

9.9 THE PILOT

A pilot of the questionnaire was carried out with three course teams in different parts of the country and some minor changes were made to maximise the clarity of the questions.
9.10 RETURNS

As this was the final survey, seeking to support previous data, a large return rate was required. Applying experience from the previous questionnaires, improvements in the presentation of the questionnaire both in terms of its format and its size were incorporated. By reducing its size it was expected that lecturers would be less daunted by the task of completing it.

At the end of three weeks a reminder was sent to colleges inviting them to return the questionnaire (see Appendix 14). As a result, several questionnaires were returned and some colleges wrote explaining why they were unable to respond. (See sample letter in Appendix 15).

In the event, 32% of leaders and 32% of members returned questionnaires, making a 32% response rate in total.

9.11 ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

9.11.1 Introduction

While the responses from members and leaders were analysed separately, they are presented together in this section to enable ease of comparison and discussion where relevant.

Sixty-four team members replied to the questionnaire, some of whom were from the same team. However, for the purposes of looking at individual team members' perception, respondents are treated in their own right and not in comparison with their fellow team members.

Sixteen team leaders replied. While some team members responded and their leader did not, in no instance did a leader respond without at least two members also
responding. Percentages given have been calculated on the number of respondents for each question.

9.11.2 Team Profiles

As with previous questionnaires within this research, the initial questions (1-9) provided a profile of respondents and their team. In contrast to the other questionnaires, the majority of replies came from BTEC teams. While it is impossible to ascertain the reason behind this, the Principal, to whom the covering letter was sent, may have associated course teams more with BTEC than other courses, or they may have viewed them as the more 'successful' of their teams.

Size

The majority (58.6%) of core teams had between six to ten members, with 83.3% of support teams having between one and ten members.

Integration Of Disciplines Within A Course

55.5% of courses were completely integrated with 41.3% being integrated to some degree, indicating a particular need for a team approach.

Role

87.5% of respondents were from the core team which may have also reflected the team leader's or the Principal's perception of a team; that a team is defined in terms of the core rather than including the support group.

Hours Of Teaching On Course

61% of team members taught for up to 8 hours a week on a course. With a 21 hour average teaching week, this meant members were spending less than a third of their teaching time on a particular course. Team leaders appeared to spend more time
teaching on the course they led. Similar distributions were also found by Tansley (1989). Although the fairly small number of teaching hours might affect a member's commitment to the team in question, a cross tabulation indicated that this did not appear to be the case. (See Appendix 19).

Cross Tabulations

Of those teaching up to eight hours 60% stated that they were "totally committed," 28.2% "almost completely committed," 7.7% "partially," and only 2.6% "not at all.

In a second cross tabulation looking at team enjoyment, 31% of those teaching less than eight hours stated that they "loved being part of the team," 49% "quite liked it," 2.6% "disliked it" and the rest "did not mind." (See Appendix 19).

Grade

a) Members

The majority of team members were of lecturer level (67.2%), with 14.7% at senior lecturer level. However, 8.2% were at senior management level.

75% of team leaders were of lecturer grade, with 25% at senior lecturer level.

It is worth noting here that previous discussion had indicated that having managers as team members could give rise to role conflicts within a team.

b) Continuity Of Membership

66.7% had been members of their team for at least three years indicating a fair degree of continuity of membership. Of these, 86% were still "eager to be part of the team."

9.11.3 Participating In Teamwork

Questions 10 to 13 sought to investigate both member and leaders' attitudes towards being part of a team.
Eagerness - Two thirds of the members were "eager to join the team". The rest were either "fairly eager" (17.2%) or "didn't mind" (10.9%). 6.3% had not wanted to join the team. Half the team leaders were also "eager to be in the team". 43.8% were "fairly eager" and 6.2% "did not mind".

Positive Aspects - Respondents were allowed to give more than one response regarding what they saw as positive aspects of being in a team. Included were: "A commitment to a course philosophy" (37 responses) and "the enjoyment of working in a team" (32 responses), which received the most responses, followed by "commitment to an integrated approach" (19 responses). Responses from team leaders followed the same pattern with the addition of "enjoyment of leading others" (8 responses) and "the desire to broaden experience" (7 responses).

Negative Aspects - Four respondents did not like working in a team and had not wanted to join. Additional comments received from members concerned the lack of time, especially for meetings. This was echoed by team leaders who wrote about the amount of administration and the difficulties of getting everyone together.

Continuation - 81% of members and 63% of leaders wanted to continue on the team. 15.6% of members and 31.2% of leaders said they would probably continue, indicating that the majority were content with the team. However, 6.2% of leaders and 1.6% of members were uncertain about continuing.

9.11.4 The Process Of Selection

Question 14 investigated the selection processes, while Questions 15 to 19 looked at the issue of control over such processes.
9.11.5 How Respondents Became Members Of A Team

Members

26.6% of respondents were actually appointed directly to the team. 23.4% volunteered, and 23.4% were asked by the team leader or a team member (4.7%), - all of which could be viewed as positive processes. 18.7%, however, were timetabled in by the Head of Department, indicating the possibility that a number of respondents may have been allocated to the team rather than making a positive choice. However, responses to open-ended questions indicated that these closed questions may not have allowed all the concerns to surface. (see section 9.11.7)

Leaders

"Asked by the Head of Department" was the main method of becoming team leader (43.8%), followed by being asked by a variety of people such as Vice Principal, team members or other co-ordinators (see Appendix 18 p.iv). The majority of leaders were therefore approached by someone in the institution, with 1.25% being appointed directly. The fairly critical selection of team leader therefore appeared more positive than that of individual members.

9.11.6 Control Over The Process Of Selection

Members

53.1% of members had never participated in this process while 26.6% had done so either "occasionally" or "very occasionally" This meant that 79.7% of team members had either no, or very little, control over who was in the team. In only 14.8% of the cases did the whole team usually take part in selection. The increased percentage of those who never participated in selection given in question 16 may be due to some of
the respondents being from support teams and therefore having even less chance of being invited to take part in such a process.

Leaders

68.8% of leaders had either only "occasionally", "very occasionally" or "never participated" in selection. 18.8% had chosen all the team, but they had done so in conjunction with the Head of Department; 37.5% had not chosen any of the team, while the rest had chosen between one and five members of the entire team composed of core and support members, indicating a very small degree of choice. 31.2% of leaders said the entire team had been allocated by others, while 43.8% had had between one and ten members allocated. A similar lack of leader control was evident when members had to be replaced.

However, 26.2% of members felt that the team should always participate in selection (five times the number who were actually able to). 32.8% said they should participate in most cases. 32.8% said there should be occasional participation and 8.2% said they should either never take part or only very occasionally.

93.8% of leaders thought that they should take part in all or most cases of selection in sharp contrast to the current situation. This has implications for the role of leader and may, as previously discussed, result in a lack of commitment on the part of members. This was emphasised in the FEU report: Teaching Skills (1982, para 34), where it suggested that "members themselves may be sceptical, defensive or hostile dependent on how they have been recruited."
9.11.7 Why The Team Should Take Part In Selection (see Appendix 18 p.v)

Responses were grouped as follows:

a) The Need For Integration (1-4)

Four comments focused on the role of effective membership in ensuring integration.

b) Team Spirit And Cohesion (5-24)

Joint decision making and participation in the choice of potential members was seen to enhance team cohesion and to "maintain a team's sense of identity" (24) The ability to work together was also seen as enabling the students to feel that "the course had a coherent philosophy" (7).

c) The Need To Select Suitable Team Members Who Are Committed And Will Match The Team Profile. (25-41)

Instances of where this had not happened were also quoted as reasons for supporting whole team participation.

"Experience! Unsuitable appointments have been apparent from the start and could have been avoided if there had been team involvement" (25) and,

"We are conscripts who have to produce the goods. Committed volunteers and real management by the team would be great. (but democracy in education? Don't be silly!)

(30)

Team participation in selection was regarded as a positive process which would ensure the recruitment of staff who would benefit the team (33). A worry was expressed that it could be disastrous if this did not happen and the team ended up with "working with someone who didn't fit or pull their weight properly." (34)

Six respondents acknowledged that "staff chemistry" (31) and the "right mix of personalities" (36) was an important part of the choice for them. Current team
members were felt to be generally in a better position to be able to decide on the potential suitability of a tutor as they "often know best what skills/specialisms/personality types are required to balance the team." (40)

9.11.8 Selection Issues - Leaders' Additional Perspectives

Team leaders saw themselves as central to the selection process as they represented the team's views and understood who was most likely to fit in with existing members (4). Leaders also saw their participation in selection as vital to team accountability and effectiveness (12,14,15). "Because forming a team is an essential and important dynamic, influencing the future effectiveness of that team" (14).

Leaders were asked two additional questions concerning membership criteria and the main difficulties associated with selection. Leaders could respond to a number of criteria (see Appendix 18 p.ix). As in the questionnaire on selection (see Appendix 9 p.iii) subject specialism was seen as the most important membership factor, followed by tutor availability and the need to fill up lecturers' timetables. Other criteria received equal status.

An emphasis on teamwork and commitment to a common philosophy were much lower on the list of criteria. In contrast as Lewis (1991) of the Ford Motor company said in his speech on training and teamwork, "You can compensate for a lack of skill if there is commitment, but you can't compensate for a lack of commitment even when someone has a skill." (Training Agency conference on training and staff development, London, April 1991).
Difficulties In The Process Of Selection/Allocation

These followed a similar pattern to those given in chapter six; the problems of "suitable" tutors being available, the shortage of subject specialists who may be needed on a number of courses, and the "off loading" of people who were low on hours (1-12). The difficulty part-timers have in attending meetings and their resultant isolation was also highlighted (13).

9.11.9 Issues Affecting Team Cohesion

a) Communication and Meetings (questions 19-23)

Feelings about how often the team should meet in relation to the amount it currently met, were similar: 43.5% met monthly and 46% felt they should do so. 3.2% felt the team should meet once a week instead of once a month and 8% who met monthly felt it should be fortnightly.

Members seemed to consider that meeting frequency was sufficient. However, 81% did not get remission for attending, indicating a lack of evidence to support what Tansley (1989) reported about remission time increasing. When respondents considered how often people met informally, the frequency rose considerably. 88.7% of members met either regularly or fairly regularly, while leaders met members either regularly or fairly regularly on an informal basis.

A lack of formal meeting time may be explained by the difficulty of arranging it and the expense in terms of staff release.

b) Valuing Team Communication (23-24)

Meeting informally was considered either vital (62% of members) or very worthwhile (30.2% of members). 81.2% of leaders saw it as vital. Only one member thought it
was a waste of time. Members and leaders were more willing to meet informally, perhaps due to the difficulties of meeting formally. Both seemed to regard communication as very important: even if they were not able or willing to meet regularly on a formal basis, they were happy to meet in other ways.

Senior management members saw meetings as very worthwhile and were very willing to attend. (see cross tabulation Appendix 19)

c) Valuing Teamwork And Feeling Part Of The Team (25-28)

55.7% of members and 43.8% of leaders "quite liked" being in the team. While 29.5% of members and 37.5% of leaders "loved it", only two respondents said they disliked their team. Most members and all leaders said that they felt either "completely" (54%) or "almost completely" (28.6%) part of the team. However, 12.7% of members saw themselves as "only partially" members of the team, with another 4.8% feeling that they were either hardly members or not members at all. This may have been one of the reasons why 12.7% of members felt only partially/not very committed to the idea of teamwork, whereas all leaders replied positively that they were totally committed.

87.3% of members saw themselves as also either "totally" or "almost totally" committed to the idea of teamwork. 79.7% of members and all leaders recognised the importance to teamwork of a common philosophy.

9.11.10 Perceptions Of Team Effectiveness (29-34)

a) How Effective Is The Team?

72% of members and 75% of leaders thought their team either very or fairly effective, while four members and one leader believed that their teams were not very effective.
b) Perceptions Of What Influences Team Effectiveness

85.9% of members and 68.8% of leaders believed leadership had a considerable affect on the team. Management was only seen as a major influence by 18.8% of members and 12.5% of leaders. Leaders and members therefore appeared to have similar perceptions about the degree of management influence. Members attributed far more importance to leadership than did the leaders themselves which may be to do with different perceptions of the leadership role.

9.11.11 Does The Course Benefit From Having a Team?

Almost all leaders (93.7%) and members (93.7%) thought the course benefitted from having a team to deliver it.

A cross tabulation indicated that the 6.25% of members who were not sure, also saw their teams as either not very/hardly effective. 76.7% of those who considered a team beneficial also saw their team as either very or fairly effective.

The effectiveness of a team may lend weight to the importance of teamwork in its members' minds while teams which are perceived to be ineffective may feed a myth that teams are not needed to deliver courses.

Benefits Of Teamwork Were Categorised as Follows:

a) The Variety Of Skills And Specialisms

A clear benefit for the course was the "range of people who bring a number of different skills and perspectives to students" (2), with the contribution of specialists seen to be benefiting the students on the course (3). One respondent talked about the benefits derived from "a variety of approaches, interpretations, personalities and talents", but also
warned that such diversity could result in members not knowing what the others were doing (7).

b) Integration

Teamwork was seen to enhance integration: "It ensures the course is integrated, lecturers know what other people can deliver, and can adjust their input accordingly" (11). It also enhanced creativity (26) and joint problem-solving (23). As one respondent summarised it: "Integration without a team is impossible".

c) Mutual Support And Sharing

Sharing was central to many of the perceived benefits given by respondents (27) and was particularly important for new members. "People teaching a course for the first time can give mutual support and help one another with the evaluation of the course" (29). The opportunity to share both ideas and problems (31, 32) also meant that several viewpoints could be obtained and discussed (36).

d) Coherence And Co-ordination

Commonality of objectives (43, 56), philosophy (46) and policy (41) made up the third category of benefits. "You know what other people are doing. You are all moving in the same direction and interpreting the same work" (44).

The coherence (46, 51) and continuity (50) of a team approach was also seen to benefit students (48, 58, 59), "Any team is an amalgam of individual strengths. To amalgamate they must of necessity share essential common characteristics. These values will be imparted to students from successful team approaches." (55)
9.11.12 Respondents Description Of Their Team

Respondents were asked to respond to a number of statements describing their current team, as opposed to what was ideal. (See Appendix 18 p.xv). Both members and leaders appeared to feel that their teams shared objectives (64%) and in many cases assignments were integrated (59.4%).

However, attendance at meetings by all team members was not so common (28.15%). There were also a number of less positive descriptions of teams: some members (7.8%) thought their team did not work well together, while 14.2% said that members were not mutually supportive and did not take decisions together (4.7%). 7.8% felt that members did not take collective responsibility for their course.

While these represent a fairly small numbers of respondents, they were from different teams and therefore indicated widespread concerns. In addition, there were similar levels of response from the relevant leaders.

Additional comments (nine) talked positively about teams which were supportive and sharing and which worked collaboratively, complementing each others skills and working on integrated assignments. Difficulties, however, included poor leadership and a lack of commitment on the part of certain members.

Leaders were more guarded in their positive responses, noting that not all members attended meetings and that not all were committed. Objectives were shared "up to a point" and integration was achieved "where feasible".

9.11.13 Training

70.3% of members and 68.75% of leaders had never been involved in any staff development for teamwork. Out of those who had been involved in training, only six
respondents indicated that it had had a teamwork focus. The rest had attended training concerned with integration and curriculum issues.

9.11.14 Belonging To More Than One Team

20% of respondents replying to this question did not belong to any other teams, 30% belonged to one other team and the remaining 50% belonged to between two and six other teams. 86.7% indicated that they had chosen to be in all their teams. 37.5% of leaders also led other teams and were members of between one and six other teams. One leader reported that she had not wanted to be in any other team, while the rest appeared to be happy to belong to a number of different teams.

9.11.15 Perceived Benefits Of Being In The Team

The perceived benefits of team membership and the benefits to courses attributed to a team approach fell into broadly similar categories.

a) Benefits To Members And Leaders

The largest number of responses centred around the advantages of being able to work together for a common goal (e.g. 1, 7, 45) of mutual support and of sharing ideas and problems: "Share experiences, problems, responsibilities, perspectives and benefits." (23) The "avoidance of the feeling that you're teaching in isolation" was also emphasised (13, 35) as an essential part of this support.

b) Benefits To Students And The Course

Perceived student benefits related to improved course content and delivery arising from better communication, co-ordination and a more holistic approach. This related particularly to course integration which was perceived as being more effective for
students as a result of a "the formation of a whole approach." (5)

The outcome of shared objectives, (24) shared ideas and the "development of common purpose and responsibility" (22) was seen to produce better results for both students and staff (e.g 15,16).

9.11.16 The Difficulties Of Belonging To The Team (as perceived by team members)

a) Communication

Negative responses centred on organisational problems with particular emphasis on the widespread location of members and the difficulties of meeting (1,2) especially in time terms (1-19). This was exacerbated by a lack of remission for members generally (20), no remuneration for part-time members (23) and the size of the team (29-30). Membership of more than one team meant overlapping commitments making it even more difficult to find the time to communicate with other team members (21,22). In addition, four respondents also remarked that team processes could be very time consuming and result in lengthy discussions which might slow down decision making (33-36). It seems possible that the length of such discussions are also increased as a result of poor understanding of others' perspectives because of the other difficulties impinging on communication.

b) The Individual Versus The Team

One respondent highlighted the isolation an individual might feel within the team: "Feeling you are totally different and on a different wavelength to the others." (5). Three respondents expanded on this and talked about a certain loss of individual autonomy (1-3) and a need to compromise in certain situations even when they had a position of
responsibility (3).

c) Team Membership

The final area concerned team membership and the problems associated with uncommitted members (1-9), "members who don't want to share and don't want to be on the team, ie timetable fillers." (2)

Weak leadership was commented on by one member (23), while the largest number of comments focused on personality clashes within teams (11-17) and the difficulty of having to work with people that they didn't get on with. (5,19). Again, this may reflect a lack of appreciation and understanding of others' perspectives derived from poor communication.

While there appears to be a discrepancy between the closed and open-ended responses concerning this issue, this could be explained by the fact that not all members of the focus team completed questionnaires and remarks about unco-operative members may have been directed at those members who had not responded.

Team Leaders' perceptions of teamwork difficulties were similar, but concentrated more on communication and team membership (1,2,4). They also felt there were a number of problems attached to meetings, but comments were more from the point of view of someone who has to co-ordinate the meeting time.

The lack of time generally was also stressed: "Co-ordinating projects, staff timetables, assessments, information and meetings - all the administrative problems of twelve staff in two year groups with only five days a week." (11)

9.12 DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Both members and leaders were equally positive about the benefits of a course team
approach both to themselves and to the students. While it is clear from the data that responses did indeed come from "successful" teams, many of the open-ended responses highlighted issues raised in previous chapters which still remained problems even in that situation. Team leaders still had little control over membership with tutor allocation remaining the main process for acquiring new members. Respondents, however, stressed the need for shared processes and pointed out the possible implications if there was no team involvement.

Other issues such as meeting time and remission also remained areas of some concern even though these were compensated for to some extent by having informal meetings. However, such issues which are organisational in nature, will undoubtedly require change within the team or need institutional support to find ways of alleviating the problem.

It was also still evident that little attention had been paid to team training with the majority of staff development focusing only on curriculum delivery.

Dyer (1987) stressed the importance of team development as offering:

"The opportunity for people to come together to share their concerns, their ideas and their experiences and begin to work together to solve their mutual problems and achieve common goals." (Dyer, 1987, p.49)

Certainly at this point in the research it was becoming apparent that there needed to be a mechanism for providing the opportunity that Dyer referred to, in order to ensure a means of "solving mutual problems and achieving common goals". Equally, teams needed time to clarify and understand each other's perceptions as a start point for collaborative working. This line of thought is therefore developed more fully at the beginning of the following chapter which seeks to pursue a means of facilitating this opportunity and offering mechanisms for teams to explore how they see themselves.
This questionnaire had contained predominantly closed questions in order to maximise returns and provide a final quick check of the previous data taken from an opposite perspective - that of the perceived "successful" team.

I had decided on a final questionnaire as the means to providing this check as I needed the confidence provided by a traditional research path, before leaving the investigative stage of the journey to begin the road towards an action research/personal construct psychology approach. I believed that such an approach would provide the research with a practical model for change which team members would be able to adopt themselves, enabling them to learn and act at the same time.

Team involvement in communication, collaboration and shared processes were still issues even in teams viewed as "successful". Teams clearly needed mechanism for development which they could own so that what they discovered about the team would guide their actions, and this in turn would guide further discovery.
CHAPTER TEN

WORKING WITH TEAMS

"In a collaborative team there will also be regular reviews of team working and goals, whereas less collaborative teams will not see any value in such activities." (Payne, 1981, p.33)

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The first part of this chapter reviews the data in terms of the needs of the teams identified. In doing so, a rationale is provided for the personal construct based Action Research which formed the final part of the empirical research.

By this stage the data had revealed a number of practical problems which affected teamwork and on which recommendations will be made at a later stage (see page 246). While these "housekeeping" factors clearly need to be addressed, realistically they may not be easy to change, certainly in the immediate life of many teams and particularly in the current climate of constant educational change and threatened cutbacks. However, even in a context of operational and resource limitations, there can still exist a fundamental commitment to sharing which can consolidate and strengthen a team.

As the research has indicated, such commitment comes primarily from members wanting to work collaboratively and acknowledging the benefits of doing so. While other factors such as team autonomy, control and ownership may affect future commitment, it can be the initial decision over membership which may cause many of the problems associated with working together which respondents have highlighted.
Potentially negative processes of allocation to teams with criteria dependent on availability, unfilled timetables and possessing the required subject specialism do not guarantee a commitment to teamwork. However, since these are also practical problems to a certain extent, these too may be difficult to change. Nevertheless despite these pragmatic difficulties positive steps to building a team and strengthening its cohesion can be taken. Indeed, Merry and Allerhand (1977) pointed out that a team was far more effective when its members built on each other's strengths, skills and resources. As members will bring to the team a set of "personal assumptions about how to work with others," (Blake et al, 1987, p.27) a major premise in this process must be the ability of the team to identify these assumptions.

However, as Woodcock and Francis pointed out:

"It is a vain hope to imagine that every member of a team can be fully committed to identical objectives. Differences of opinion and conflicting interests will always exist, and the most significant requirement is to develop mechanisms for explaining viewpoints, finding common ground and learning to live with differences."

(Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.119)

Nevertheless, it is important for members to understand where others are coming from, and to ensure that they are "enthusiastically unified in pursuit of a common objective rather than individual agendas." (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.84).

Zimbardo and Ebbesen (1970, p.12) described attitudes as "enduring predispositions", which are learned rather than innate. They also emphasised that while attitudes were not momentarily transient, they were capable of being altered. While such a change may not necessarily result in agreeing with different viewpoints, it can at least lead to mutual understanding.
Dyer (1987, p.116) pointed out that "people have expectations of others in terms of what is to be done, when it should be done and how it is to be done." He also added that:

"While it is not necessary that everyone forms personal friendships, group members should be able to at least trust each other and meet one another's expectations."

(Dyer, 1987, p.116)

This was reinforced in an educational context by Squires (1975) who stressed that disagreements were not always disciplinary ones, but could also be about differences in attitude towards students, teaching styles, political differences or different conceptions of the course.

Given that individuals may come from a variety of disciplines and teaching styles, it is crucial that the needs and attitudes of the individual members are identified early on so that they are understood by other team members and met where possible. Merry and Allerhand (1977), support this and also recognise that participants may not always have acknowledged or articulated to themselves their own needs.

A similar theme is reiterated in an educational context:

"It would perhaps be ironic if the demands of a new curriculum were imposed upon members of staff without their personal commitment and without taking account of their needs as they perceive them..."

(FEU, 1982,b, para.35)

However, if as Hastings et al (1986) believed, many teams do not find it easy to analyse what is hindering or helping their achievements, then they need to be given the support, the time and the mechanisms to facilitate this process. Findings from this research appeared to indicate that little development was carried out with teams as a whole, particularly on issues concerned with team processes.

This was supported by Tansley (1989) who found that very few staff had been on any courses concerned with the management and operation of course teams. In addition,
she discovered that many Principals assumed that staff development would occur naturally through the operation of course teams, although this seldom happens in practice, as has been demonstrated.

10.2 ISSUES AROUND TEAM BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Team building programmes, which are often based on a variety of activities and games such as those centring on outdoor pursuits, are designed to promote team development and cohesion. However, while they may be one way forward, they usually include activities with little obvious relationship to the 'normal' activities of a team so that links are often difficult to make with practice. In addition, as Kast and Rosenzweig (1979) pointed out, their effectiveness depends very much on the willingness of the whole team to work together. Moreover, this team consensus needs to be both retained and developed when the training programme is completed. Critchley and Casey (1986) queried the logic that such programmes would naturally improve the functioning of a team. They concluded that:

"The harsh reality we now came up against was at odds with this cozy view of teams, teamwork and teambuilding."
(Critchley and Casey, 1986, p.413)

This view was shared by Blake (1987) who believed that teambuilding programmes could also give the impression of facilitating progress while leaving the real issues untouched. In addition team building programmes can be time consuming. Since time is at a premium for participants, staff development which is of practical value needs to develop trust and communication and relate closely to the task.

Whether or not team building exercises per se are used, it is important to explore "those real issues" in a way which will bring them out into the open before the team
decides on a course of action. Analysis of all these factors resulted in a conviction that there needed to be a way of identifying individual and team perceptions about what a team was there to achieve. This could provide a basis for team discussion from which differing perceptions and commitments could be identified and perhaps appreciated. Individual and team training needs could then be explored in a more conducive atmosphere since it might then take place as a team-led exercise rather than one imposed on the team by people outside.

This emphasis on the role of the team in taking forward an owned or autonomous process led me to redefine my own role so as to become a catalyst for lecturers to become action researchers, owning a process which they could develop when I had left. Stenhouse (1975) believed that it is both possible and desirable for the teacher to be his/her own researcher. This certainly seemed highly desirable given that action research seeks to focus on a local situation with a view to solving specific local problems. (Fox, 1969).

Lomax pointed out that action research can be an empowering force in staff development if practitioners are the subjects rather than the objects of a study. She goes on to emphasise how,

"It would also have important educational outcomes for all the persons concerned, particularly for the independence and autonomy of the self...". (Lomax, 1990, p.2)

It would also allow participants to be involved as subjects in their own evaluation, rather than take the role of informants (Lomax, 1990). In addition, as two of the key aspects of action research are participation and collaboration, it would ensure that teams as whole units would be working together to improve their practice.
These participating and collaborative aspects are the common threads linking Action Research personal construct psychology in that as Pope and Denicolo (1989) note, they both support reflective learning and make education a positive experience for both the teacher and the learner.

The central role of the teacher in the research process is highlighted by Kelly, who saw it as:

"a co-operative enterprise in which the subject joins the psychologist in making an enquiry." Indeed Kelly was "sceptical of any piece of human research in which the subjects' questions and contributions have not been elicited or have been ignored in the final analysis of results." (Kelly, 1969, p.132)

This approach was taken further by Grundy and Kemmis (1982) who felt that all participants were equal in the research process and needed to be involved at every stage.

Nystedt and Magnusson (1982) find the strength of this participatory approach in its confrontation with a reality which can only be known through the medium of active experience and engagement:

"This means that knowledge is neither a copy nor a mirror of reality, but the forms and content of knowledge are constructed by the one who experiences it." (Nystedt and Magnusson, 1982, p.34)

This positive role actively engages teachers in curriculum development rather than making them recipients of training over which little change may result.

Action Research facilitates a process of engagement in self-evaluation which can provide the means to help teachers:

"open their eyes (so) they can see how to choose and fashion their own version of reality." (Diamond, 1985, p.34)
The use of a repertory grid workshop (see discussion on the following page) as a staff development strategy would involve the team in an exercise of self and collaborative reflection which may not be seen as a comfortable exercise. However, as Pope and Denicolo (1989) point out, strategies which do not challenge a person’s implicit theories will not lead to any deeper reappraisal of current theory or practice. But in order for this to be achieved, any workshop would benefit from including the shared core elements of Action Research and personal construct psychology listed by Pope (1982):

- the person is a responsible agent
- growth may occur through reflection on and in action
- understanding another’s perspective requires empathy and a ‘conversational approach’
- the participant’s and the researcher’s account of events may differ, and needs to be negotiated
- human beings are active, meaning seeking, potentially open to change, development, and capable of self direction

It is these shared elements which constitute the deeper meanings underpinning a successful active-constructive approach. The workshops incorporating this approach are described in Chapter 11, while the repertory grid-technique is discussed in the following section.

10.3 THE REPERTORY GRID TECHNIQUE

"So much of team success involves intangibles, qualities like attitudes and energies." (Larson and Lafasto, 1989, p.75)

Introduction

The repertory grid technique evolved from Kelly’s Personal Construct Theory (1955)
and derived from his understanding that it was essential to focus on an individual’s definition of his own problem (Pope, 1983).

The repertory grid was devised by Kelly as a means of looking at people’s construct systems by attempting to:

"Stand in others' shoes, to see their world as they see it, to understand their situation, their concerns."  
(Bannister and Fransella, 1986, p.5)

Kelly believed that people had their own view of the world, their own expectations of what would happen in a given situation, and that their behaviour was a continuous experimental process of checking constructs (Bannister and Fransella, 1986).

A clarification of members’ expectations would therefore be significant in understanding causes of conflict where perceptions can influence expectations and expectations can influence perceptions. (Stewart and Stewart, 1981).

The repertory grid would facilitate this process by enabling participants to react to issues in their own words and encourage them to test their own personal theories allowing them complete ownership of the process. It would also help them to understand the behaviour of other members by becoming aware of how they construed particular situations.

Such a person-centred approach was therefore consistent with the approach which this research was seeking to pursue, by encouraging teams to participate, collaborating in a process they could own.

10.3.1 The Flexibility Of The Grid Technique

One of the main advantages of the repertory grid technique lies in its flexibility as a methodology in that it can be used in a variety of situations. (Pope, 1980).
contributed immensely to its usefulness in terms of a data gathering device and a potential facilitatory tool for teams' continued use. Given the constraints under which much staff development takes place it seemed essential to adopt a form of grid which teams could use regardless of resources and of situation.

10.3.2 Reliability And Validity

The primary use of the repertory grid within this research was to introduce it as a technique which teams could adopt as a start point for diagnosing staff development needs. In addition, repertory grid workshops also provided me with further data. This came not only from the grid information, but also from the discussions which the grids initiated.

The underlying purpose of the grid was therefore to identify attitudes to teamwork and act as a catalyst to provoke team communication and exploration of perspectives.

However as a number of the identified issues were more tangible in the sense that these could change given certain circumstances, it seemed reasonable to expect that certain attitudes could, theoretically, also change from day to day if the components of the situation changed.

Issues of reliability, in the sense of looking for the grids to produce exactly the same results for the same person at different times, were therefore not relevant. The research needed a technique which would be sensitive to any changes and demonstrate them.

The possibility of exactly the same grid being used throughout this part of the research was contradictory to my aim of introducing, developing and adapting the grid technique. In order to ensure the grid's usefulness for the team it was important to
check that members were familiar with the focal topics known as elements (see following section for details), that they negotiated these elements together and that the negotiation stage formed an integral part of process. This ensured that the team clearly understood the process, owned it and were thus in a position to evaluate it effectively.

Validity in terms of usefulness was extremely important to this part of my research and I assessed that team members would find out "by direct experience, whether or not it was of value to them." (Fransella and Bannister, 1977, p.94)

The usefulness of the grid was subsequently investigated both from the comments made by team members during the workshops, and from evaluation forms which were completed by participants.

10.4 THE REPERTORY GRID WORKSHOP

10.4.1 The Aim Of The Grid

The purpose of the grid within a workshop situation was to explore the perceptions of individual team members. Individual differences could then be evaluated by the team in terms of their potential as areas of conflict or as creative sources for problem solving.

Through the process of completing a grid and the subsequent discussion that it created, teams could investigate areas of commonality and, where differences exist, this process has been shown to lead to sociality.

Bannister and Fransella described commonality as follows:

"To the extent that a person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, their processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person." (Bannister and Fransella, 1986, p.17)
Sociality is said to occur as follows:

"To the extent that one person construes the construction processes of another, they may play a role in a social process involving the other person."  
(Bannister and Fransella, 1986, p.18)

Kelly believed that if communication is to be effective there needs to be an understanding of other peoples' personal construct systems (sociality), although agreement with their constructs is not necessary.

In order to stimulate discussion, the grid would have its purpose defined in terms of exploring members' perceptions of the team goals.

Woodcock and Francis noted that:

"Simply acquiring a clear objective is only a small part of the story and that until objectives are agreed they have little value."  
(Woodcock and Francis, 1981, p.118)

Both the literature (see Chapter 2) and my own working observations had made it apparent that commonly agreed goals were vital to effective teamwork (Adair 1987).

The grid would explore how members perceived their team goals, whether they knew them and agreed with them and whether they were committed to carrying them out.

As Payne pointed out:

"A collaborative team has common goals, and its members while they retain personal and individual responsibility, divide up their work as to make the best of their activities and ensure that they achieve these goals."  
(Payne, 1981, p.6)

He also felt that teams needed a process for looking at their objectives; I thought that a repertory grid could facilitate this, and put the lecturer at the heart of the research process.
10.4.2 The Negotiation Of Grid Staff Development Workshops

At the end of the previous questionnaire I had asked if teams would be interested in helping further. Ten respondents agreed. I then wrote to all ten indicating that I should like their team to take part in a workshop exploring team perceptions as a means of identifying possible staff development needs. (See Appendix 20).

Of the ten, four replied that their team, would be willing to take part. Others wanted to, but were not in a position to do so at that moment.

One of the four respondents, a team leader, had written at the end of her questionnaire:

"Our college is in the process of reorganisation and this sort of development (teamwork) is in the "new philosophy" which is gaining some credence. The differences between team development philosophy and the "old culture" are causing interesting clashes."

As a result of a subsequent telephone conversation with the team leader, who in turn gained the agreement of her Vice Principal, it was arranged that I should work with the team for half a day.

This process was repeated with two other teams in different parts of the country. Unfortunately the fourth volunteer team subsequently had difficulty in finding a day when they would all be available again - a reflection of practical constraints in operation. These workshops took the form of an experiment so that what was learnt in one was used to inform the subsequent ones.
10.5 WORKSHOP OUTLINE

10.5.1 Explanation Of Technical Terms Used Within This Section

Constructs

A personal construct is a way in which an individual makes an identification of similarity and difference between sets of events, people etc; such constructs are built up and qualified from past experiences. They are linked together in a person’s mind in such a way that the pattern of relationships is what makes that person unique. Constructs have a bi-polar dimension bounded by the similarity and difference descriptions along which individuals rate the elements.

The Elements

Elements are those things which individuals are asked to discriminate between and represent the universe of discourse.

The Triadic Process

Constructs are elicited by presenting the elements three at a time, then asking the participant to say in what way two of the elements are similar to each other and different from the third.
The following matrix sets out the stages of the intended workshops and describes the rationale behind each stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE PROCESS</th>
<th>THE RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The purpose of the session would be negotiated with the team.</td>
<td>This would give the team a clear aim for the workshop and ensure that they owned the session rather than having it imposed on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) A rapport would be established with the team</td>
<td>This was important as individuals were going to be asked to share their personal perceptions with the rest of the team and an &quot;outsider&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The team would be given an explanation of the background to the grid, any terms which might be used and the process involved in completing the grid. For practice purposes a &quot;dummy&quot; grid would be used. The team could then experiment with the process and become familiar with it.</td>
<td>The focus of their thoughts would be on &quot;the team&quot; rather than trying to understand a new technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Elements would be negotiated with the team.</td>
<td>This would provide the opportunity for the team to highlight areas of commonality and discuss areas of personal interpretation with regard to what constituted the basis for possible subsections of the elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Team members would then elicit their own constructs through the triadic process. Each member would complete their own grid.</td>
<td>This would allow individuals to explore their own perceptions of the elements and attach their own verbal labels to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Some constructs would be provided once individuals had elicited their own.</td>
<td>This would help the team as a whole evaluate the areas of training needed for both individuals and the team. This entailed using the grid in such a way that comparisons between perceptions could also be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PROCESS

7) Completed grids would be shared with the whole team. This would take the form of a team discussion in which members would talk about their own constructs, explore other members alternative constructs and discuss what constructs and ratings individuals had in common.

THE RATIONALE

This would allow members to begin to explore the importance of any differing perceptions about team goals and would inform decisions about the effects of these differences of team performance.

10.6 A REFLECTIVE EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP PROCESS

10.6.1 A Clear Purpose

The workshop began with an emphasis on the purpose of the grid as being the most important preliminary consideration. (Pope 1983). In order for participants to understand the usefulness of the grid to their team, it was important to spend sufficient time in both clarifying the process and discussing the purposes for which the team might want to use the data. Teams needed to feel that they owned the purpose and the resulting data in order for them to be able to evaluate the grid's usefulness.

The background to the grid (i.e. a synopsis of the features of Personal Construct theory) and the aim were then explained as the previous section indicates. I was careful to stress that different perceptions have value and the aim was not to create absolute consensus of view. In Personal Construct terms, the first important aim was to help them achieve "sociality of construing" in this universe of discourse, i.e. ability to see things from different viewpoints, rather than commonality of construing. Members found this introduction helpful in giving context to the exercise.
10.6.2 Establishing A Rapport

Before each workshop I had informal discussions with each member in order to ascertain their roles within the team and to begin to build up a rapport. At the beginning of each workshop I also introduced an "ice-breaking" exercise so that the team would feel more relaxed about sharing information with each other and myself. While this worked well in two workshops, one team, who already had a lot of internal conflict, was somewhat suspicious of the leader’s motives for inviting me and was clearly not sure about my allegiances. Explanation and reassurances, therefore, took up a considerable amount of the beginning of this workshop. The team felt comfortable when the leader agreed only to be present at the end of the session as many of the team felt they would not be able to discuss things freely in his presence. This had implications for the totality of data about the team and for team coherence. However, it was one step forward in the process of development.

In another instance, while rapport was established, it was somewhat inhibited by working within a staff room visited by other staff at various times. However, this illustrates the difficult situations in which teams, and staff developers, have to work in practice in a non-ideal world.

10.6.3 Technical Terms And The Use Of A "Dummy Grid"

While I deliberately avoided introducing technical terms in the sessions to minimise confusion, many participants wanted to have more information as they felt they would be "more knowledgeable and in control". Participants found the dummy grid useful in understanding the process experientially and as it was done in a light hearted way it helped to increase rapport within the workshop.
10.6.4 Negotiating The Elements

Although participants completed their own grid, the elements needed to be common to the team in order to explore the nature and sharing of construing within a group. I asked each member to write down six perceived goals and these were all transferred onto a flipchart. The team then negotiated a final list of six elements. As Pope (1981, p.41) reminded us, the process had to take into account the fact that "whatever meanings words may have, they are assigned or ascribed to them by people." Therefore, when discussing the choice of element set, I took care that all members understood the meaning ascribed to their labels before the negotiation process began. I had deliberately restricted the number of elements to six in order to keep the process manageable within the time constraints and to encourage a focus on the main goals. However, even with core teams of six this resulted in a list of thirty or more seemingly different goals. Thus, the discussion involved in this negotiation proved to be extremely important, not only for understanding differing perceptions, but also to raise awareness of the fact that members were often talking about the same thing but attaching a different label to it. However, it was very time consuming. As a result of this, in subsequent workshops I asked each member to provide three goals. This reduced time considerably, but ideally more than three hours need to be given over to a grid workshop if the full benefits of the negotiation and discussion are to be realised. Also as Pope pointed out:

"Since the elements in a grid should be representative of the problem area to be explored, it is essential that adequate time is given to a discussion of this aspect of purpose."

(Pope,1980, p.3)

The first workshop revealed that the team found it difficult to arrive at concrete representative elements/goals which were not confused with team tasks. In order to
eliminate this confusion, I was more directive in the second workshop in that I asked the team to write down their three goals, one a problematic one, one a non-problematic one and a fairly neutral one. This proved to not only focus thinking and reduce time, but also ensured that the final list to be negotiated was far more representative. (see below for example of workshop 2 element list, Fig 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problematic</th>
<th>Slightly Problematic</th>
<th>Non-Problematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining resources</td>
<td>Prioritising</td>
<td>Co-operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the curriculum</td>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing relevant leadership styles</td>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>Students welfare as a common aim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding meetings</td>
<td>Standardising</td>
<td>Sharing objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising/marking</td>
<td>Sharing tasks</td>
<td>Agreeing discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardising procedures</td>
<td>Getting on with each other</td>
<td>Using all the team strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritising tasks</td>
<td>Realising the full potential of students</td>
<td>Achieving high standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students- ensuring full attendance and pass rate.</td>
<td>Having time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling part of the team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even before the teams started construct elicitation it was obvious from participants' comments that the brainstorming process in itself had given the teams a set of new understandings about teamwork. However, it was clear from the workshop with the team that was suffering from internal conflict, that the process needs very sensitive handling as suppressed anger can easily be triggered off unproductively when alternative perceptions are demonstrated. The discussions also needed to be managed carefully so that they did not degenerate into a "witch-hunt" to find the member who held different views from the rest of the
team. A preliminary "contract" with the team which reiterated the aims of the workshop and the positive nature of the process helped to avoid this situation.

10.6.5 The Elicitation Of Individual Constructs And The Sharing Of Completed Grids. Participants in the first workshop elicited their own constructs and decided on negotiating four common constructs. While they found the comparison of individual constructs thought provoking, they felt the process was time consuming. Thus, this might not be viable for teams who needed either a relatively quick diagnosis of team processes or who, in the present educational climate, did not have the time to engage the whole team in a fairly lengthy exercise. An example of a section of one grid produced can be seen below.

Fig.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Integrating the course</th>
<th>Developing the course</th>
<th>Developing a shared philosophy</th>
<th>Communicating within the team</th>
<th>Supporting students</th>
<th>Sharing responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everybody is committed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only some members are committed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is our main focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a peripheral focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody supports this and takes part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very few members participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is within our control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not within our control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the overlay process (explained below) was seen to be of more use in that it produced results more quickly. In addition, it gave instant feedback involving the whole team, thus providing a way of provoking team discussion within the same session. This process involved members completing the grids on overhead projector
transparencies replacing the tick-cross scale with a partial blocking out of each cell. In place of a tick the left half of the cell was filled, while the right side was used for a cross (see Appendix 21 for sample). The completed grids of the team were then laid over each other, so that it was easy to see areas of agreement or disagreement. Disagreement showed as a completely blocked cell. (Stewart and Stewart, 1981)

While it was agreed that a computer analysis of the grids (using the FOCUS computer programme, Shaw, 1990) might speed the process, the team saw a number of drawbacks:

a) access to the programme might be difficult for them;
b) the interpretation of the printouts might be just as lengthy, particularly as it would necessitate a second workshop to look at the analysis and discuss implications;
c) the initial spontaneous discussions and reactions might be lost by a time delay.

While the team acknowledged that the negotiated constructs had not produced as initially interesting information as had the individual ranges of constructs, they did have the advantage of providing a quick overview of the teams thinking and discussions of how people saw things and why.

As a result of this, and because of the even more limited time that the second team had available for the workshops, I decided to let them negotiate all their constructs through a brainstorming process centred around issues that they considered important for teamwork. The process was completed relatively quickly giving more time for the resulting group discussion.

In the third workshop, I tried to negotiate more time so that the benefits of both approaches could be accrued. The team felt it would like to undertake the negotiated
constructs first, enabling members quickly to draw up a programme of staff development - something they felt they badly needed. They negotiated a set of constructs based around those of the previous workshop. Considerable and heated discussions ensued when the team finally compared grids. As a result there was less time available to do another set of grids with individual constructs. The team was hopeful that they might have the time to do this at a later stage as they had become convinced of the value of the process.

In all three workshops the sharing of completed grids produced a lot of discussion which teams evidently found useful and which, in all three cases, led to decisions about the need for certain foci for staff development for both the team and individuals. While such a workshop could be facilitated by the team leader, it might be difficult in certain circumstances where teams might be tempted either to withhold how they really felt, (see discussion on page 215) or to vent their anger. The perceived neutrality of the facilitator can avoid this difficulty as long as a good rapport is established fairly quickly.

10.7 EVALUATION SHEETS AND GUIDANCE NOTES
At the end of each workshop, participants completed an evaluation sheet (see Appendix 23), the results of which enabled me to adapt or modify any parts of my presentation which had been unclear or unhelpful. The evaluation also indicated how useful participants considered the grids to have been to their particular team. In addition I also produced a brief set of grid guidance notes which I gave to participants. This would provide them with an aide-memoire should they wish to repeat the process for themselves.
10.7.1 Some Important Notes Regarding Workshop Presentation

1) Participants and presenters need to understand that the grids do not provide a solution to difficulties. The process of completing the grids should be highlighted as it is this which acts as a catalyst for discussion, enabling a team better to understand the perceptions of its members and address issues with more information and clarity.

2) Although there is a "recommended process" for the workshop, the facilitator should be sensitive to the team and the context and allow any flexibility which the situation may demand. The realities of each situation need to be acknowledged in that some sections may require more time than planned.

10.8 RESULTS FROM REPERTORY GRID WORKSHOPS

10.8.1 Pilot Workshop - Team 1

Team One from a college in the north of England, consisted of six core members and five support team members. This was a BTEC team who were very keen to take part in the workshop as they wanted to explore their own team development and identify any training needs (see page 227). Seven members, including one support team member, were able to take part in the workshop.

The team goals, (elements) appeared to be split between those concerned with the course and those concerned with teamwork. Less commonality of perception was discernable within the course goals which surprised the group as they had assumed they were a close-knit team.

The element set comprised the following:-

1) Integrating the course
2) Developing the course
3) Developing a shared philosophy
4) Communicating within the team
5) Supporting students
6) Sharing responsibility

The following constructs were negotiated by the team (see small grid Fig. 13).

Everybody is committed to... only some members are committed to
This is our main focus... this is a peripheral focus
Everybody supports this and takes part... very few members participate
This is within our control... this is not within our control

Issues arising from the grid results and subsequent discussion have been divided into team and individual perceptions. Unless otherwise stated, each individual perception represents that of one member. (See Appendix 24 for grid results for the whole team by frequency counts).

1. INTEGRATING THE COURSE

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) it was the main focus of their work;
2) integration was essential for team processes;
3) the team had a fair amount of control over this area;
4) not all the team were seen to have a shared philosophy regarding integration.

Individual perceptions

Integration and course development were independent and should involve students.

The team leader believed it was possible to carry out course integration without any real commitment to either the course or its students.
In subsequent discussions the team acknowledged that a lack of commitment would be possible even if a tutor was going through the process of seeming to involve students.

Integration involved effective communication and a sharing of responsibilities.

2. DEVELOPING THE COURSE

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) the whole team thought they were committed to course development;
2) they did not feel the whole team took part in this;
3) the majority of the team thought integration was less important than course developments.

Individual perceptions (including supporting students)

These needed more time spent on them than team goals.

These were the "nuts and bolts of the course the whole point of what we are about" as opposed to team goals which are "the method of operation -- the way we achieve the purpose!"

The leader believed course development needed a more collaborative team approach with effective communication as the outcome.

3. DEVELOPING A SHARED PHILOSOPHY

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) half the team thought this was not their main focus as some members were not committed to the course philosophy;
2) some members were not happy with the philosophy of BTEC even though they enjoyed being in the team itself;

Individual perceptions

The team needed to work on integration, shared philosophy and shared responsibilities, as they were the underlying mechanisms of the team.

A shared philosophy was a "weak team area", which needed exploring.

A common philosophy did not contribute to team success in the way effective communication and integration did.
4. COMMUNICATING WITHIN THE TEAM

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) all but one member saw team communication as effective;
2) not all members were seen to be sharing information;
3) communication processes needed to be clearer;
4) not everyone was aware of what information needed to be passed on;
5) the geographical proximity of some members facilitated communication.

Individual perceptions

Communication processes necessitated a more united approach.

Communication was crucial to effective teamwork.

It facilitated shared responsibility.

One member felt he was not informed about students by other team members.

5. SUPPORTING STUDENTS (see also 2.)

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) supporting students, together with integration, was seen to be central to the team’s work;
2) the foci of the team were more about the course than its own processes;
3) all but one member thought the team was committed to supporting students;
4) there were reservations about the time needed to carry this out effectively;
5) team members held differing perceptions of what constituted support.

6. SHARING RESPONSIBILITY

Team perceptions subsuming the following ideas:

1) only three members thought the team was committed to sharing responsibility;
2) some members assumed the leader did not want to share responsibilities;
3) it was felt that the team leader had more time to devote to the course as she received some remission;
4) roles needed to be explored in terms of sharing responsibilities.
Individual perceptions

This was not essential to effective teamwork.

This did not affect student progress.

This process was not as well developed as other team processes.

There was lots of personal involvement in the course and its students, but not in the team itself.

It was an area of teamwork which caused difficulty amongst members.

The leader believed members would feel more ownership of the course if it was shared. She felt she should not have to take on all the responsibility.

10.9 MAIN POINTS LEARNT BY THE TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS FROM THE NEGOTIATED CONSTRUCTS ON THE GRID.

It was agreed by the team that they had learnt:

1) that the members of the team held certain assumptions about the levels of commitment to certain aspects of the course and teamwork which did not appear to be the case in reality;

2) that not all members of the team felt as positively about the BTEC philosophy as others;

3) that while the team considered itself to be an effective one, it appeared from the grids to be generally more unified in its perceptions of goals concerning the course than of teamwork processes;

4) that some members held varying definitions of what supporting students meant in practice;

5) that assumptions about the effectiveness of communication within the team were not always valid;
6) that while the team leader felt strongly about sharing responsibility, several of the team did not appear so committed to the idea - there were some assumptions from team members that the leader should take on total responsibility.

10.10 HOW USEFUL DID THE TEAM FIND THE GRID?

Members saw the grid as having enabled them to have discussions about issues such as sharing responsibility, which they had not addressed before as a whole team, "It has certainly highlighted areas that need discussion." Another member said that she found the most useful part of the workshop to be, "Talking about individuals’ opinions on the aims of the team," while another reiterated the importance of the "final analysis and the discussion points arising from it, leading to areas that need to be investigated."

Most importantly, members felt they could identify with the results, and move towards taking action on various aspects of their practice. This is highlighted by Pope, who felt that:

"Action research approaches encourage teachers to ground their analysis of educational issues in the evidence they generate from reflection on their own context, rather than borrow from or rely on the 'grand' theories from psychology, sociology, philosophy etc., particularly those positivistic theories suggesting truth statements expressed nomothetic context-free generalisations." (Pope,1991,p.18)

10.11 RESULTS FROM TEAM 2

10.11.1 Introduction

This team delivered a BTEC course in a Surrey college. Fourteen members attended the grid workshop, eight of whom made up the core team, while the rest belonged to the support group. Five of those who attended had either just joined the team or were
about to become members. It was agreed that they might not have such clear perceptions of the team as those who had been members since it started two years ago but that joining the workshop would facilitate their integration.

The team negotiated the following set of elements as goals for their team:

1) Holding meetings
2) Achieving standardisation
3) Developing shared objectives
4) Decision making
5) Achieving integration
6) Using everyone's strengths.

This process was seen to be extremely useful as it clarified a number of issues concerning the different language and verbal labels used to describe the same goal. As discussed in the "evaluation of negotiating constructs" (paragraph 10.6.5), this team decided to negotiate a set of constructs they would all feel comfortable with. This began with a brainstorming of issues important to team processes. After considerable discussion lasting about three quarters of an hour, the team arrived at a set of constructs which reflected their concerns about teamwork and which were very much in line with the literature on effective teamwork. The final list of constructs was put into a language with which each member of the team could identify.
The negotiated constructs were as follows:

The whole team participates... ...only some participate
The team is supportive... ...only some are supportive
Individuals roles are clear... ...roles are unclear
The team has autonomy... ...the team has little say in this
This is openly discussed... ...the team avoids this issue
This is effective... ...this is not effective

The following analysis represents those points raised by the grid results and the ensuing discussions. A bullet point mark notes the decisions on action taken. (See Appendix 25 for grid results for the whole team by frequency counts).

TEAM PERCEPTIONS

1. Meetings

The majority of the team thought these were poorly resourced.

Only some members participated in meetings - an issue which the team felt it needed to explore further.

Support team members felt isolated from the rest of the team as they were not able to attend meetings easily.

- The team felt timetabling meetings was within their control and that it should be done in negotiation with the whole team.

2. Achieving Standardisation

The team agreed that this particularly concerned marking and the production of assignments.

The whole team felt it was important to achieve standardisation.
The team needed more meeting time and remission to work on standardisation.

The majority of the team felt current standardisation of assignments was ineffective.

Subsequent discussion revealed that some members felt very unclear about their part in the standardisation process. This had not been recognised by the leader.

The majority of the team believed that discussion around standardisation had not been very constructive.

- The team decided to develop more time to achieving standardisation.

3. Shared Objectives

The team were united in their support of course goals; they were less sure about team goals.

Two new support team members were unsure about course objectives and uncertain about their roles in relation to them.

Six members of the team perceived a certain amount of destructive conflict when decisions had to be made.

Subsequent discussions revealed that this was due to the isolation and insecurity of some members.

- The team decided to spend more time ensuring all members were clear about team and course objectives.

4. Decision Making

The team had never really considered decision-making processes, having always assumed them to be effective.

Two thirds of the team believed decision making was not a collaborative activity although most members felt current outcomes were effective despite a lack of whole team involvement in the process.

It was unclear who was responsible for what types of decision.

The team felt it had little control over curriculum decisions as these were dictated by BTEC.

- Decision making was now viewed as a priority area for team development.
5. Integration

Integration was seen to be at the core of BTEC course delivery.

The whole team supported the philosophy of integration.

Some members (8) assumed integration was working well; the rest of the team thought it was ineffective.

Six members believed the whole team did not participate in integration.

Discussion revealed that some members did not participate fully because they felt insufficiently informed about it.

Support team members felt isolated and unclear about their part in the integration process. The core team had not realised their strength of feeling about this.

● The team decided to set aside time to look at integrated assignments and members contributions to them.

6. Using Everyone's Strengths

The team was very united in its perceptions of this goal and supported the idea of using members' strengths.

Minor differences in perception came from new members who attributed this to their lack of knowledge about other members' strengths.

● The team felt they therefore needed some form of induction process to overcome this.

10.12 MAIN POINTS LEARNT BY THE TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

It was agreed by the team that they had learnt:

1) that roles and responsibilities were unclear in a number of teamwork areas, particularly among support team members;

2) that core team were unaware of the feelings of isolation and lack of information being experienced by some support team members and some new members.
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an induction process was being considered, together with a reconsideration of meeting times;

3) that certain differing perceptions and assumptions made about team processes were often due to a lack of information about what was happening rather than a reluctance to participate in certain aspects of teamwork;

4) that some members had different definitions of effectiveness in that they were often using it to refer to course delivery rather than teamwork itself;

5) that the area of joint decision making may have been taken for granted in terms of whether or not the process was truly "joint".

10.13 HOW USEFUL DID MEMBERS CONSIDER THE GRID TO HAVE BEEN?

The team expressed a greater awareness of the different verbal labels used by different members to mean the same thing, an occurrence which had sometimes led to misunderstandings and potential conflict situations.

Comments from members regarding the most useful parts of the workshop centred around "The discussion that the grid produced" and "being able to use a method to establish the shortcomings of the team as well as its successes."

"It opened up areas for discussion and pointed to specific weaknesses rather than allowing general discomforts to grow unchecked."

In terms of benefits to the team, members saw it as important, "Because problem areas have been identified so that collective measures can be discussed."

When asked what they might do with the information gained from the grids, members replied,
"Consider ways of improving discussion as to the weaker areas of the course - and try to attend more meetings!" and "It was just what we needed, we'll now try to act on it." (course leader).

Members believe that their participation in the grid process as a team had brought them nearer to reflecting on their practice together. As Pope pointed out, it is the:

"Authentic contextual relevance and the empowering of participants both to contribute fully to such research, and to apply practically the ongoing results, are of paramount importance in such approaches to professional development." (Pope, 1991, p. 18)

10.14 RESULTS FROM TEAM 3

10.14.1 Introduction

There were thirteen members of team Three, five of whom were part of the support team and included two who had a greater responsibility for the administration of the team. This YTS, team which worked out of two geographical sites in North London, came together for the grid workshop, which they felt might enable them to explore the difficulties attached to working as a cohesive team.

After much discussion they negotiated six team goals as elements for their grid:

1) Communicating within the team
2) Ensuring equal opportunities within the team
3) Counselling for students
4) Ensuring effective administration
5) Ensuring effective resourcing
6) Developing their course offer

As the team wanted to draw up a staff development programme from the workshop they needed to negotiate the constructs so that they would all be working from the
same ones and could compare perceptions more easily. They also felt this was more practical because of time constraints.

We discussed some of the constructs of the previous workshop and, with this as a start point, the constructs which were finally negotiated reflected their concerns about teamwork and took into account the small amount of time they had at their disposal.

The whole workshop comprised two meetings in all, one for discussion and negotiation of the elements and constructs and one for the completion of the grid.

The following constructs were negotiated by the team:-

1. The team has control over . . . . The power behind this lies outside the team.
2. The team is effective in this . . . . The team has not come to terms with this.
3. The whole team participates in this . . . . Only some participate.
4. We seem to be clear about this . . . . There is some confusion about this.
5. The team supports this . . . . The team resists this.
6. Any conflict in this area is constructive . . . . Conflict is destructive.

(See Appendix 26 for grid results for the whole team by frequency counts).

Issues raised during team discussion of the grid results were as follows:-

(Decision areas are marked by bullet points).

TEAM PERSPECTIVES

1. Communicating Within The Team

The team felt it needed to look more closely at its communication processes.

Half the team thought communication was ineffective.

There was some perceived resistance to confronting this issue.

Communication was difficult for those separated geographically.
Members on the main site had not recognised the isolation of the rest of the team.

Members had assumed that those with administration responsibilities received all relevant information.

There was a lack of clarity about what needed to be communicated.

It was felt that some members deliberately withheld information.

- Communication processes needed to be viewed as a priority area for staff development for the whole team.

2. Ensuring Equal Opportunities Within The Team

There was surprise at the range of different perceptions of equal opportunities issues within the team.

There had been an assumption that equal opportunities operated in the team in the same way it did for students.

Less than half the team thought that equal opportunities were supported within the team.

It was not clear who was responsible for raising this issue within the team; as a result some members felt "oppressed".

Despite the control the team had in this area, it had never been confronted as a problem.

- The team decided to organise a staff development session to look at issues of equal opportunities within the team.

3. Counselling For Students

The team agreed this was a focus of their work.

Two support team members felt unsure about how they should support the counselling process.

- The team agreed that further help needed to be provided for support team workers.
4. Ensuring Effective Administration And Resourcing

This was a major area of concern because the team received outside funding.

Half the team thought it was ineffective in both its administration and resourcing.

Some of the team felt they had little control over this area of work and were powerless in the face of mounting obligatory paperwork from outside agencies.

Administrative roles were often unclear.

Three core team members felt they were not kept informed of the resourcing situation by the leader.

- It was agreed to minimise paperwork where possible and rationalise the process by which it was passed to support team members.

5. Developing the Course Offer

This was an area of immediate concern and had not been tackled before.

The team thought they were not very effective in this area.

The majority of the team felt everyone should get involved in exploring new course development.

- A coherent plan was needed to address this issue.

10.15 MAIN POINTS LEARNT BY THE TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

It was agreed by the team that they had learnt:

1) that roles were unclear in a number of important areas of work: communication processes, counselling, administration and equal opportunities;

2) that the issue of equal opportunities needed addressing within the team as there were assumptions about its implementation which were not perceived to be true in practice;

3) that a number of members felt isolated, especially in the support team - a situation exacerbated by the split site situation;
that there was a need to rationalise and examine current team processes such as paperwork;

that there was a need jointly to address the future of the course.

10.16 HOW THE TEAM SAW THE USEFULNESS OF THE PROCESS

Members were surprised at the number of assumptions held within the team which proved to be inaccurate. It was felt that the process had been particularly useful because "There was never enough time to sit and talk about the problems that arise on a day-to-day basis". The workshop had not only raised a number of issues but had given them the space to explore them, a point raised by Rudduck (1985) who believed teachers did not have the time to reflect on their practice or discuss basic philosophies.

The grid workshops had provided them with both the space and means to critically reflect on course delivery, and become the 'reflective practitioners' that Schon (1983) advocated as a professional role.

The leader saw this discussion as important because the team were now asking him for workshop space to explore specific issues more fully: "Usually they do not inform me of potential problems and accompany them with possible solutions." Other comments included: "Topics were opened up for the first time", "there were new ways of thinking". One member said he had benefitted because he felt "it had identified that they each had 'the same needs and problems' - which they were not really aware of." The whole team thought they had gained a better insight into the viewpoints of other members: "We are now able to identify the expectations and needs of different staff such as full-time and part-time."
10.17 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

While there were some issues specific to the individual teams, the analysis of the grids also indicated a number of areas common to either two or three of the teams:

1) The isolation of certain members, especially those in support teams, was not always recognised by the rest of the team.

2) Concerns around a lack of information and poor communication systems were present in all three teams to varying degrees. While assumptions about team communication processes and their effectiveness had also grown up in two of the teams, there had not been the space or time to monitor them. In one team certain members were seen as reluctant to communicate information, an indication that perhaps the degree of mutual support and trust needed for effective teamwork was lacking.

As Maddux emphasised:

"When communication is open, conflict is resolved positively and mutual support and trust have been achieved you are in sight of success." (Maddux, 1989, p. 65)

3) Uncertainty about roles and responsibilities was also common to all three teams with an additional emphasis in the first team on the need to take on more shared responsibilities.

As Adair pointed out:

"A lack of clarity and comfort in your role can cause insecurity, lack of confidence, irritation, anxiety and even anger among those around you." (Adair, 1987, p. 35)

This was evident in all three teams where there was both irritation and anxiety that certain processes and tasks were not effective because members were either unclear about their role or assumptions had been made about other members’
responsibilities. Discussions around certain assumptions, such as a perceived lack of commitment on the part of some members, revealed a lack of role clarity rather than a lack of willingness.

4) Grid data had revealed an emphasis of effort on tasks particularly concerned with the course itself, rather than on team processes. This issue was emphasised by Torrington and Weightman (1985) who discussed the problems of educational teams, with their lack of concern for their own needs and too heavy an emphasis on tasks. The grid results had pinpointed this issue clearly and presented members with the opportunity to discuss whether or not they should be more aware of team processes. Certainly the analysis showed that a number of the members held a variety of assumptions about their team, and this had provided them with the basis for some very useful discussion as to what lay behind these assumptions and how others saw the same situation.

10.18 THE VALUE OF THE REPERTORY GRID WORKSHOP - SOME CONCLUSIONS

Both the results from the grid analysis and the evaluation comments from participants indicated that there was considerable value for the teams in undertaking this process. The negotiation of the elements itself had produced fruitful discussion. This helped the teams focus on some of the differences and similarities between members, particularly in the use of verbal labels where the team had assumed a common understanding. As Adair (1987) pointed out, this in itself is vital to the team’s functioning, but in addition, the process of sharing grid results had also acted as a further catalyst for debate.
When such debate is facilitated sensitively, and carried out in an environment which is non-threatening and non-confrontational, it can allow for a productive and positive understanding of the way other team members perceive issues. This sensitivity to participants is a particularly important aspect of this method, whether it is used as a research tool or as a staff development procedure.

As Davies et al indicated:

"...a team is only as effective as its individual members in terms of their qualities and skills and their ability to use these in conjunction with others." (Davies et al, 1990, p. 81)

If sufficient time is allowed, a grid workshop can enable members to explore the perceptions and qualities of other members, enabling them to gather the important data that Hunt (1981, p.47) believed allowed people to "feel more competent in predicting subsequent behaviour" (of other members).

While it is possible, and sometimes advantageous, for the leader to facilitate the workshop, an outsider to the team "can bring a useful amount of objectivity and detachment into the proceedings and get the team to confront issues that left to itself, it would probably suppress." (Everard and Morris, 1988, p.135)

Indeed the grid workshops brought to the fore concerns which were not often considered in normal team processes because, for example, normal team meetings tend to be concerned primarily with course delivery and student progress.

These experimental repertory grid workshops demonstrated that similar formats could provide a flexible process acting as a catalyst for group discussion, allowing the team to look jointly at possible solutions to team concerns, expressed or covert.

As a result, clearer understandings of issues can be gained by the teams as a whole and strategies for dealing with specific areas can be constructively agreed on.
As Adair remarked:

"A crucial factor in group or team formation is the amount of time that has been spent together." (Adair, 1987, p.15)

The grid workshops had provided this very valuable start point for teams to spend time together in constructive discussions. Participants became 'lecturers as researchers', owning a process, which enabled them to produce relevant observable data on which they could build action. Such a process might go some way towards addressing Jones's criticism of academic research as well intentioned but lacking the truth grounded in the practice of participant research:

"Much research related to education had the cutting edge of a sponge. For a long time I questioned the honesty of much that I read about in some of the academic journals. Don't get me wrong, I'm not suggesting that their authors were anything but sincere and well intentioned. What I am trying to say is that their research did not speak the truth to me. These works seemed more concerned with statistics than sensitivities; rats rather than brats; research rather than the researched." (Jones, 1989, p.51)

10.19 A POSTSCRIPT

In addition to the personal satisfaction I gained from the telephone calls and "Thank you" notes I received subsequent to the workshops, I was also gratified to learn that two of the three teams at least had been so impressed by the process that they had used it to explore other issues together, eg. to come to joint agreements about "constructs" for student profiling and for agreeing individual profiles themselves. Teams expressed their intention to explore issues together in this way regularly, at least annually, as a team communication process.
Thus, although the initial workshop, which demands time to learn the process, may be expensive of time resource, teams can reap continuing benefit in terms of having access to a flexible technique for exploring issues in order to improve communication and understanding.
"Since it is the usual practice for programmes of study to be co-ordinated into courses, it is appropriate to consider the course team as being the primary agent for the activity of quality control." (Miller and Dower, 1989, p.10)

11.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter represents a watershed in the research. During the process of the research, through a variety of traditional naturalistic research techniques, much had been learnt about how team members deal with, or fail to, relevant aspects of their practice. Tentative conclusions had been reached, but a conviction had grown through the many discussions and interactions with teams that, since a major issue was ownership of process, recommendations should derive from the participants themselves. This led to the development and experimental trials of the repertory grid workshops. By combining the understanding which these produced with data from the prolonged and thorough explorations of the perceptions of those involved in the reality of practice and observation of the practice itself, a useful set of recommendations could be produced. These will be discussed in the next section.

However, the workshops were intended to serve two purposes, that is, confirmation and elaboration of previous data and experimentation with a different research approach - Action Research. This experimentation had two consequences. One was that it begged the further refinement of the grid workshop as a tool - this is discussed in sections 11.6 to the postscript of this chapter.
The second was that it alerted me to aspects of teamwork which had not been so obvious before - the definition of who constitute the team in this educational context. By this time, that context too had undergone changes and these would need to be incorporated into the refining procedure to ensure that salient current issues were addressed. These aspects are explored as 'The next stage' and 'The way forward', sections 11.4 and 11.5, as the final part of the journey is embarked on.

11.2 THE JOURNEY SO FAR

Before the final stage of a journey, it is helpful to review learning-to-date so that it is not overlooked as new vista are arrived at. Thus, these summary recommendations, drawn from various points and stages in the research process, are presented here. It is suggested that they might form a basis for efficient and effective course team practice. Their absence in the team-situations that I investigated, the tension between what team leaders and members regarded as important and the reality of structural, organisational and resourcing restraints, suggests that their application to practice may be by no means easy. Nonetheless, if the will is there on the part of administrators, team leader and team members, the evidence suggests that there will be benefits in terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of teams which may, in the end, outweigh likely short-term difficulties. However, those difficulties should be neither underestimated nor ignored.

The tension between the feelings, perceptions and priorities of team members and the various restraints indicated above might be expressed in another way, as an inter-play between two forms of what could be called, for want of a better term, competence, "managerial" and "intra-team", the tension arising in the uncertain and often vaguely
defined boundary between the two; it is this lack of competence-definition or a feeling
in the team that managerial competence is solely the province of those higher in the
hierarchy, who are either unheedful or who fail to understand team-needs, which lead
to much of the frustration and sense of helplessness that I experienced at team-level.
One main thrust of the recommendations below is the attempt to address this question
of competence by identifying three "spheres of competence", each responsible for
different areas of delivery, as follows:

A) Managerial competence: decision making and delivery which falls within the
normal province of "senior management", eg; Head of Department, Principal
Lecturers, Senior Lecturer;

B) Intra-team competence: the area of decision making and delivery which might
properly and realistically be the function of the course team or individuals or
groups within it;

C) Dual competence: where management and the team may be said to have a joint
responsibility for the making or carrying out of decisions or where delivery is the
culmination of complementary actions carried out within each independent
sphere of competence. It is this "mixed" sphere of competence which provides
the richest ground for misunderstanding and frustration and where the question
of role-definition is most acute; however, given the multiplicity and variety of
circumstances in different colleges, I can only stress here that it is an issue
which must be addressed and to which college must seek individual solutions.
11.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.

Sphere A: Managerial Competence

A1 If teams are to work effectively and to perceive management as committed to team work, managers will need to address the question of their responsibility to enable the provision of timetabled team meetings when at least the majority of the team can attend.

A2 The larger and more dispersed a team is, the less likely it is to work as an effective unit; attention to team size and location may pay dividends in terms of effective communication and integration.

A3 Where possible, teams should not contain members who are direct line managers, if conflict of interest and the disempowering of team leaders is to be avoided.

A4 Managers need to keep interference in day to day teamwork to a minimum thereby conveying to teams the sense that they own the course they are delivering and that they have a degree of autonomy in making decisions relating to it.

A5 Teams need to have the overt support of both their line managers and the wider college culture if they are to feel a real sense of competence and importance. This recommendation is bound up with the larger question of the status afforded to courses within that culture.

Sphere B: Intra-Team Competence

B1 Teams need to make sure that the roles of team members are clearly defined.

B2 Some team meeting time needs to be given over to reviewing not only course and student progress but also team-processes.
Sphere C: Dual Competence

C1 Allocation of new members to teams where neither the team nor the potential member feel they are being consulted can result in a lack of commitment and the breakdown of team collaboration and cohesion.

The taking-in of a new member therefore needs to be a positive "rite of passage", shared by current members and the new member. In selecting new members matters such as immediate availability or skill area should not be the sole criteria.

Even a clear link between recommendation and those most likely to be able to carry them out does not guarantee their implementation in the real situation of limited budgets and competition between priorities. It is therefore important also to focus on what can be achieved within and by teams themselves. My own research experience suggested that there might be ways of using the human resources available in teams in order to define objectives and to define also what might constitute the barriers to collaborative working and how these might be overcome. The means for achieving the empowerment of lecturers to develop a model they could use for themselves, could be the repertory grid workshop approach. This might, in my view, enable teams to investigate these factors with the aim of achieving a more united approach to effective teamwork.

The trialling and evaluation of the first series of workshops indicated that participants felt the grid technique to be of value and continued feedback had confirmed this. The workshops had therefore offered a bona fide staff development tool which was flexible in its implementation and provided an opportunity for teams to focus on constructive discussion about process rather than product. Further exploration of its flexibility was
in order, but it should incorporate new perspectives developed and an acknowledgement of the current milieu of teamwork practice.

11.4 THE NEXT STAGE

At this point in the research I had begun to sense that there was a strong analogy between the course team and the sports team who also have a common goal. This seemed an appropriate comparison as both contained players who had individual skills to contribute and needed a context in which every member knew and trusted other members capabilities enough to be able to relinquish or accept responsibility appropriately. Such a model also supported the need for, and value of, time and facilities being allocated for exploration and development "off the field of the match."

While I did not feel it appropriate to elaborate further on this analogy, I did begin to reflect on the place of the students within all this - were they perhaps seen as the ball or the opposing team?

Current rhetoric, theory and government edict (White Paper, 1991) would have the student playing a more active, participatory role - perhaps almost that of a junior team member. While participants in the research had talked much about the course and the team, there been little mention of the students, except as receivers of the product. While it was clear from the elements selected in the grid workshops that team members were concerned for the educational and developmental well-being of students, there did not seem to be any clear recognition that the student might have a contribution to make to the team and its processes other than in the guise of feedback on evaluation forms or by the presence, by no means universal, of a student representative on the course board.
This situation was not so surprising given that staff were struggling with the erosion of subject autonomy and increasing workloads, and often even found sharing with professional colleagues both conceptually and practically difficult. It would therefore take a considerable loosening of constructs vis-a-vis professional identity to encompass the student as an active colleague, rather than as a receiver of an integrated set of ideas and concepts. The situation tended to be rather that they were communicated to, within a given philosophical framework, and had a very circumscribed set of responsibilities.

This seemed somewhat paradoxical given that the grounding philosophy of this approach to course delivery was student-centred learning which aimed to produce autonomous learners. Indeed Denicolo and Pope (1990) in reviewing staff development models appropriate to the demands of the Enterprise Initiative, percolating through secondary and tertiary education, also noted that its intention is that students learned the skills necessary to become effective team members and to exhibit a range of interpersonal skills appropriate to the world of work.

A recent paper from the FEU (1990) also stressed the importance of promoting student centred strategies for teaching and learning, and reminded the reader of BTEC's general guidelines, one of which emphasised the use of projects and assignments where students can work in teams. Thus the goals for the course teams and for the students appeared to have a degree of commonality, so that students and lecturers became contemporaneous learners of the same process skills.
11.5 THE WAY FORWARD:

An opportunity for testing the workshop in a new way.

It was at this point in the research that the demand for quality assurance programmes in educational institutions began to gather momentum. The FEU report "Teaching and Learning Strategies" (1990) made a very relevant comment:

"Initiatives on quality assurance place the main focus on programme teams and their ability to plan and review processes while the NVQ emphasis on competence will progressively outlaw didactic methods and require greater collaboration with industry." (FEU, 1990, p.7)

In addition, a series of reports focusing on what formed quality provision for students arrived at Local Education Authorities and colleges (Miller and Dower, 1989). These became the focus for discussions about quality control for a number of institutions.

One institution which had previously been involved in the research and its staff development programme produced a quality-assurance document based on the Miller and Dower report. This recognised that quality provision had at its centre the efforts of the individual, while incorporating an understanding that each should take cognisance of the efforts and needs of others in a collaborative and co-ordinated way. The "others" in question included the core team, their support team, the students, other teams, the institution, employers and funders. While this document emphasised the need for continuous monitoring of the views and needs of all, many of the participants in the research felt that a model for sharing perspectives objectively had not been worked through in their institutions.

Student-centred learning is about putting the student at the centre of the learning process. A course team therefore needed to be aware of the most effective ways of ensuring this happened. However, if learning was to be truly student-centred, student
perspectives of how this could be achieved also needed to be understood. The important question would then be whether deliverer and recipient saw the application of student centredness in a similar way. While aware of the stated aims of a course, students may well come with a set of aims arising from both personal and academic needs (Houle 1961 in Knowles 1981). Tutors clearly have to be aware of this other layer of need and how it should be met.

The FEU (1988) project on 'Course evaluation through course team activities', emphasised the need for courses to meet the challenges posed by industry, and community needs, in a period of rapid change and pointed out that this required a suitable system of review and development which would involve the active participation of delivery staff. The project identified that while team members had a concept of efficiency, they seemed to have little awareness of the need to monitor effectiveness in terms of meeting the expressed needs of a particular client group.

Some colleges have been working on student contracts which have begun to address the stated expectations of students usually through a questionnaire/interview format. While a questionnaire-based contract appeared useful as a quick start point it did not seem to refine the process so that there was an objective overview about how the team and the students saw their roles within the course. Although the two groups were being addressed, they were, in a sense, still very separate, much as the staff had been working as individuals although part of a team. The intermeshing and overlapping of the goals of team and students needed to be explored.

The repertory grid workshop model had been effective in helping teams to identify their goals. It therefore seemed appropriate to build on this model so that it also embraced student perspectives.
As Lomax stressed:

"Good evaluation includes the learners' perspectives. Teachers are more powerful than students. They define what counts as a student. They write the formal contract. They manage the stage upon which the initial encounters occur. As actors upon this stage, students take the roles and the lines that are given, but the play that emerges is their unique construct. Because students are less powerful and less articulate than teachers, this construct is often lost. Positive discrimination is necessary in order to ensure that students' perspectives are fairly represented." (Lomax, 1985, p.255)

11.6 SETTING UP A GRID WORKSHOP

Negotiations were made with a course team leader who had been involved in the production of the quality assurance handbook to trial a team/student grid workshop. This aimed to carry out complementary workshops with both groups with a view to comparing their outcomes.

Results from this comparison would enable them to decide whether:

a) they needed to change or modify their approach to course delivery before the course began,

or whether, in certain circumstances:

b) differences in student/tutor perspectives might require an explanation to students as to why certain goals could not be met.

It was agreed that the first workshop should be undertaken with the course team as the students were not due to start the new term for two weeks. This team had come together for the first time to deliver a 'return to learning course' and although the core team knew each other, they had not worked together in this way before. It was decided that the workshop would be carried out with the core team because, although they only comprised four members, they had prepared the course submission together
and were undertaking the majority of the teaching. A wider support team of 'outside visiting' lecturers who were presenting individual one-off specialist teaching slots were not seen by the core team as really being full team members. In addition, the majority of them were not available to attend the workshop at the beginning of term and therefore it was decided that it would be repeated with the wider team at a later date.

11.7 THE GRID WORKSHOP - THE PROCESS

It is relevant to note that the developing model was moving away from a traditional psychotherapeutic grid application to a process which recognised the versatility of grids. It was not intended to be prescriptive or diagnostic but aimed to provoke discussion amongst participants, so as to raise awareness and provoke action plans.

Changes In The Grid Workshop

1) The Focus

As the aim of the model was to explore perceptions of student involvement, the focus of the grid changed to one which concerned itself primarily with student centredness.

2) The Purpose

As previously discussed in section 10.6.1 a clear purpose to the grid was essential to its effective outcome. The purpose of the grid for this team became to answer the question:

"What does the team need to do to ensure students get the most out of the course."

The complementary purpose for the students' grids was to gain information on:

"What did they think the tutors as a team should do to ensure student involvement in the course."
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11.8 THE COURSE TEAM WORKSHOP

The Process:

a) the team reflected on the aims of the course as presented in the course document. This enabled the team to focus on how it could ensure students achieved these aims;

b) the team brainstormed a list of elements arising from the purpose of the grid (given above);

c) the element list was discussed and a set of six elements was negotiated. Negotiation focused on:
   i) a set of words on which there was agreed meaning;
   ii) priority in terms of importance for the team.

While the team wanted to include more than six elements, they decided because of limited time, this would not be possible.

d) The following elements were negotiated:
   1) ensuring the students' comfort;
   2) co-ordinating joint planning;
   3) supporting students;
   4) involving students in activities;
   5) clarifying equal opportunities;
   6) communicating.

e) Team members made individual lists of ideas (constructs) about what they saw as the similarities and differences between the above activities (elements).
These were written onto the flipchart as a list of constructs.

f) There was ten minutes discussion in which the team negotiated which of these constructs they all shared. The team decided to have some negotiated constructs so that they could use the overlay process to produce a team development plan.

The negotiated constructs were:

I can do this on my own... ...this needs the support of my colleagues.
Central to our work... ...this is marginal.
I enjoy doing this... ...I don’t enjoy doing this.
This requires record-keeping... ...this doesn’t require record keeping.

g) The team then construed the negotiated constructs using the overlay process (see Appendix 21). They finally produced as many of their own constructs as the limited time would allow.

Both sets of constructs were rated on a scale of one to five;

h) The team compared the negotiated constructs by examining the overlays. The remaining time was spent discussing some of the similarities and differences in perceptions which the overlays demonstrated.

11.9 RESULTS FROM THE COURSE TEAM WORKSHOP

1) Ensuring the students’ comfort

Team perceptions

- Members saw students’ welfare central to the course, while the leader focused more on teamwork processes.
The team did not differentiate between team and student needs in the way the leader did.

Individual perceptions

- The team needed to work together to ensure this happened.
- There should be a sharing of information between the students and the team.
- Students who were comfortable both environmentally and emotionally would participate more fully on the course.
- There should be a focus on the needs of the students rather than those of planners.
- The team leader viewed this area of work as time consuming because it needed human resources rather than financial ones.

2) Co-ordinating Joint Planning

Team perceptions

- The whole team needed to support these processes as they were crucial to effective teamwork.
- There was a recognition that the support team needed to be involved more in these processes.
- The whole team felt communication needed to be recorded. The leader disagreed.
- Subsequent discussion clarified that the leader was referring to informal discussion.
The Team Felt

- There needed to be agreement on what should be recorded.

**Individual perceptions - co-ordinating joint planning**

- The leader saw these as needing individual negotiation and therefore as time consuming.
- It was a tutor-focused activity concerned with information sharing and developing common strategies
- It came from good practice and needed to take individual skills of members into account.
- It arose from an understanding of student needs.

**Individual perceptions- Communicating**

- This concerned open discussion between the team and students.
- It was essential for teamwork.
- It was central to the development of a coherent team strategy.
- Effective communication was essential for equal opportunities.
- The leader felt communication needed time to be worked at and required the commitment of all members.

3) **Supporting Students/Involving Students In Activities**

**Team perceptions**

- All the team, except the leader felt this was a main focus of their work.
- It needed some form of record keeping to be effective.
- The team felt it needed to explore what members meant by record keeping and
how it should be carried out.

- The team needed to look at what mutual support it required in order then to support students.

- There were differing perceptions of support; these needed to be clarified.

- There should be recognition that not everyone had the skills or felt comfortable supporting students. Some members acknowledged a division of labour might be needed.

- A clearer definition of monitoring student progress was needed by the team.

- The leader felt this should be dealt with on an individual tutor basis - the rest of the team thought it required a collaborative approach as it needed to include students' emotional as well as educational needs.

Individual perceptions - Supporting Students

- The leader viewed this on a practical level, perceiving it to be expensive in staff time.

- It was an emotional issue which required specific skills from team members.

- It involved a range of learning activities which would encourage student participation.

Individual perceptions - Involving Students In Activities

- The leader felt this also needed considerable resourcing.

- It was a very student-centred activity centring on encouraging discussions, information-sharing and a range of learning activities.

- Effective verbal communication essential to understanding student needs.
4) Clarifying Equal Opportunities

Team perceptions

- There was considerable unease about equal opportunities issues within the team.

- There should be a united approach.

- The team agreed it needed to explore this area further to ensure all members felt confident about equal opportunities issues.

Individual perceptions

- While this needed clarification it was an issue which could be sorted out quickly.

- It was central to student security.

- It needed empathy and an understanding of student needs.

- It was both a tutor and student centred activity.

- It should be shared with the students through a range of activities.

- One member felt particularly uncomfortable in dealing with equal opportunities issues.
The Process

The student workshop followed a complementary process to that of the course team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Process</th>
<th>The Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Students as a group were asked to brainstorm what they saw as their goals for the course.</td>
<td>Students had seen the aims of the course when they had enrolled. The brainstorming process was to enable them to focus on these aims as it related to each of them personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) There was about ten minutes of discussion in which they explored issues of overlap and duplication within these goals, particularly where different words had been used but the meaning behind them was similar.</td>
<td>This enabled students to both discuss their goals generally and to see where the views of other students varied or were the same. They felt that having a set of goals which they all owned as a group made it easier for them to ensure that these were achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The following goals were agreed: enjoyment; information about the subject; confidence; knowledge; opportunities for work; further study opportunities.</td>
<td>Although there was consensus over the set of group goals, it was clear that individual students' needs and perceptions about how these should be achieved would probably differ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Students were then asked to examine these goals and reflect on the following question: What do you expect the tutors as a team to do to ensure these are achieved?</td>
<td>This would provide a focus for the grid exercise which would be complimentary to that pursued by the delivery team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The students were asked to think of six ways in which these goals could be best supported by the team. Each student therefore provided their own elements. Students were asked to restrict the list of elements to six to lessen the amount of disruption to the teaching timetable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Students as a group then thought about their own elements and wrote down some of the ways in which they thought these were similar or different to each other. These constructs were then discussed and the students negotiated a set of joint constructs which proved to be similar to those of team. It was decided by myself and the team leader that some negotiated constructs would enable students to understand the process more easily and thus save time and ensure accuracy in grid completion. However, although this did save time, students still appeared to need a lot of support in the process.

7) The following areas were agreed on:

a) The course will be ineffective without this ... it would still be effective without this.

b) This needs to be central to the course ... this is not so important.

c) The tutors as a team need to do this ... individual tutors need to do this.

d) I feel I need support in this ... I won't need support with this.

8) The elements were discussed in detail in the group situation. Time constraints prevented the completion of negotiated constructs.

11.11 THE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT GRIDS

11.11.1 Comparison Of Student Elements

Eleven students took part in the grid workshop.

Initially it was important to explore the commonality between student elements to see how widely certain perceptions were held.

These were then analysed in terms of their commonality to the course team element set (student support, student involvement, a comfortable environment, communication, co-ordination and joint planning and clarification of equal opportunities). Although elements were expressed slightly differently from student to student, each member of the group provided an element set which contained something about:

a) student support/tutor understanding;

b) student involvement;
The former was the most frequently mentioned, which was not surprising as this was a group of mature students returning to study who felt they needed a lot of support and confidence building.

In addition, seven student elements had concerns about communication processes and six had elements which focused on course content such as writing skills, visits, materials and knowledge acquisition, while specific mention was also made by students about their involvement in the content in terms of shared experiences, group discussions and collective activities.

The final, much smaller area, concerned the class environment (physical and emotional): a relaxed atmosphere, making learning fun and providing consistency.

It therefore appeared that four goal areas were similar to those of the team even though the language used by the students to describe them was slightly different. It was interesting to note that while the teaching team were fairly preoccupied with equal opportunities issues, it was not mentioned by any of the students even though almost half of them were women and about a third were from different ethnic minority groups.
### 11.12 STUDENT ELEMENTS LISTED AND ANALYSED IN TERMS OF TEAM GOALS

**Element Sets** (some students did not provide six elements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To take time out of the class situation</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go over information more than once</td>
<td>- communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take time out for those who don't understand</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let us know if we're good for further study</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help us to understand</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide a friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>- environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put information across well</td>
<td>- communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have patience</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide materials</td>
<td>- content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give information</td>
<td>- communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective activities</td>
<td>- involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>- communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>- content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide speakers</td>
<td>- content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give support</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be approachable</td>
<td>- support/communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts and advice</td>
<td>- content/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share personal experiences</td>
<td>- involvement/communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to write</td>
<td>- involvement/content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stimulation</td>
<td>- content/emotional/environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts and figures</td>
<td>- content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>- support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared experiences</td>
<td>- involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor work</td>
<td>- content/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep us up to date</td>
<td>- content/support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Provide materials - support
   Support me - support
   Give me progress - support
   Have understanding - support
   Give me stability - support
   Give me satisfying course - content

7. Provide role play - involvement
   Materials - support
   Group discussions - involvement / communication
   Writing - content
   Visits - content
   Provide speakers - content

8. Make learning fun - environment
   Provide knowledge - content
   Support - support
   Speakers - content
   Visits - content

9. Provide information - communication
   Relaxed atmosphere - environment
   Information on work - communication
   Confidence - support
   Knowledgeable tutors - content
   Support - support

10. Provide counselling - support
    Confidence - support
    Knowledge - content
    Understanding - support
    Share experiences - involvement
    Communicate freely - communication

11. Provide consistency - support
    Be understandable - communication
    Be approachable - support
    Have knowledge - content
    Give ideas - content
    Give information on work - communication
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11.13 FEEDBACK FROM THE TEAM

The team had agreed to feedback any information arising from or related to both the grid workshops.

A) Report from first team meeting following the grid workshops.

They felt the grid workshop had been "very useful and informative and an interesting way of looking at the team and student perceptions."

They agreed that perhaps for the first time they had been able to work together to reflect on their practice through a process over which they had some autonomy. In this way they thought they might now be able to move forward on some of the issues raised by the workshop. As Lomax explains:

"This is because effective change seems to occur when individuals agree to the spirit as well as the letter of new initiatives: where teachers share in the ownership of new practices and procedures, and where they feel part of the action." (Lomax, 1991, p.103)

The following points came out of the discussions about the grid analysis:

1) Support

The team felt that it needed to define what it meant by "support". They decided that it was about caring, listening and pastoral support. The team felt this definition matched the perceptions of the students about how they wanted to be supported.

2) Communication

The whole area of communication came under review. The team felt it should be clearer about what information needed to be circulated, when and by whom and that this should include the support team. They would also ensure students received all the information they felt they needed and involve them more in group discussions.
3) Joint Planning And Co-ordination

The team agreed that joint planning and co-ordination needed to happen more effectively, and decided that they needed a process to achieve this. They decided to meet at the end of each term to plan for the next one, so that the second meeting of each term would be for review and consolidation. In addition, it was decided that members of the support team should be shown all student projects submitted so far, so that they would have a clearer overview of the students' standards and level of work. These measures were all designed to ensure that the team both communicated and co-ordinated their work more effectively and that support team members were not isolated.

4) Record Keeping

The team also discussed what record keeping should in fact take place as it was generally felt that it was only happening in some areas. The concept of sharing and co-ordination was again stressed as it was decided that student profiles should now be written jointly by the core team and that the students should be aware of this, so that they would feel more cared about and secure.

5) Skills Within The Team

The team then decided to explore the issue of their skills and felt that at the moment they were only acknowledging those skills that they felt positive about. Team members said that they did feel a lack of skills in certain areas (especially counselling skills) and that this lack would probable surface in a way detrimental to the course unless it was addressed. It was agreed that there should be further discussion on this and an investigation would take place on what could be provided in the way of training. This would ensure the degree of advice and support that students were asking for.
6) Team Tasks

It was decided that the team ought to spend more time prioritising its tasks and as a result of this discussion an extra meeting was planned to take place before each module. This would give the team time and space to prioritize more clearly what it should be doing for students. It was also agreed that the team would try to meet as often as possible informally.

7) Student Involvement/Student Centredness

As a result of the feedback from the students, the team felt it really needed to take all aspects of student-centred learning on board as a whole team issue.

There was general agreement that the team needed to review how students could be integrated more into classroom activities in the second half of the term, and how they could be provided with all the aspects of support they had asked for. It was decided that there should be a termly student evaluation to review whether the students felt this was happening. It was also felt that there needed to be more student negotiation within the course structure. On-going informal evaluation at the end of each lesson would enable the team to ascertain how the students were perceiving the course and their involvement in it.

8) Equal Opportunities

While the students had not focused at all on this issue, the team felt that the feedback from the grids had clearly indicated that this was an area in which at least one team member felt insecure. The team jointly decided that in order to alleviate this situation, they would facilitate a group discussion with the students on their perceptions of equal opportunities as it appertained to the course and its delivery. From this they would
formulate a student contract concerning equal opportunities and explore how it could be monitored and evaluated. All the team members including the support team would have a copy of the contract.

The team leader had also made a point of having as much contact as possible with the member who was generally feeling insecure. The team as a whole were trying to be as supportive as possible now that they recognised some of her insecurities.

11.14 STUDENT EVALUATION

As part of the end of term evaluation the students were asked three specific questions relating to the repertory grid workshop and the issues raised by them.

These questions were:

a) Do you feel you are being involved in decisions about the course?

b) Do you feel that the issues raised when we did the repertory grids earlier in the term are being recognised?

c) How do you feel the team could best support you during the spring term?

a) Involvement

Of the eight students who completed these questions, three thought it would be "good to involve the group more in decisions," two felt that the tutors did now discuss what they were going to do and that the students "could now disagree or agree when decisions were to be made."

One student thought that although the group were now involved more "I think it has been difficult because of people's irregular attendance", while another believed that they were consulted in some areas (project work) but not others.
b) Issues Raised By The Grids

All the students thought that the issues raised by the grids had been addressed. One student commented on the fact that she now had "a lot of the information that I asked for", while another mentioned that there had been a lot more interaction and awareness raising.

c) Support From The Team

Six of the eight students focused on areas of course content or project work and practical issues such as project work timetables in advance. One student felt there needed to be more support on progression issues while another asked that there should be "less rushing through the course and more individual support".

11.15 FEEDBACK FROM REVIEW MEETING

This meeting took place at the beginning of the second term following the students’ end of term evaluation.

The Equal Opportunities Contract

Member X, who had felt insecure about the course, thought the equal opportunities contract had given her a clearer framework within which to work.

The team leader, however, told me that she was doing her best to support X, but that she "was still feeling vulnerable and also acting in a rather dogmatic way about certain areas of the course delivery." The team leader believed that this was due to X's previous way of working and perceptions of how a course should be delivered - she preferred a more didactic approach and liked to work on her own as she felt a lessening of her authority when she worked collaboratively.
Student Evaluation/Teamwork

It was felt by the whole team that the student evaluation had been very useful as an end of module exercise and that the questions on it relating to the repertory grid responses had helped the team identify areas which still needed to be addressed.

In order to reinforce the students' perceptions of a delivery team, it was decided that at the beginning of each module (term), the whole core team would be there to greet students and welcome them back as a team in order to keep this concept clear in the students' minds.

Communication

The student evaluation had revealed that students wanted to be more involved in the course content. While this posed obvious difficulties given the syllabus and the accrediting body, it was decided that the students would be regularly informed about the course content and the team would try to allow flexibility where possible. The tutors would also try to ensure more student involvement during classwork.

It was generally felt by the team that the original grid workshop had given them an insight into a number of issues which the team were either only partly aware of or not aware of at all. This had led to discussions of those identified issues and a firm commitment to monitor teamwork processes and ensure continuous evaluation of student involvement.

11.16 REFLECTION AND CONCLUSION

11.16.1 The Value Of The Workshops

Team members who had at first been slightly hesitant and, in one instance quite sceptical, about the value of the repertory grid workshop given the time it took and the
potential disruption it could cause to the teaching timetable, were very enthusiastic about the outcomes. Members felt that it had been valuable to explore some of the differences within the team which they had been vaguely aware of but had not addressed directly. They believed that they were now better able to acknowledge that they were a team and needed to work together for the sake of themselves as individuals, the course, and the students. In action research terms, they had observed the data themselves, in the light of criteria for practical significance, and it is this which had given them the basis for deciding whether or not a significant result had been obtained (Fox, 1969).

The team felt that it had been very useful to see the students' goals and perceived needs and to note the differences in emphasis to those of the course team. They were particularly interested in the fact that while there were a lot of areas of similarity, although perhaps expressed differently, the team had emphasised the issue of equal opportunities and team processes while the students had focused predominantly on their own personal expectations, stressing the importance of course content and its delivery by team members.

The perceived benefits of the student grid workshops were of two types, factual and structural, both providing a basis for further positive action by the team, for meaningful interaction between the team and the students, and also in the longer term between the team and other types of client.

A Factual Benefits:

A1 a comparison of staff team and student group perceptions rather than just an overview of the expectation of individual students;
A2 a set of student responses derived from an objective model of investigation which avoids much of the bias inherent in student interviews conducted by tutors.

B **Structural Benefits:**

B1 a basis for on-going course evaluation;

B2 a channel of communication with students through which the team could discuss the difficulties and constraints in meeting certain student expectations;

B3 a process which is owned jointly by lecturers and students;

B4 a structured means of defining other client needs and expectations such as those of employers and funding bodies which could serve as a useful and effective marketing tool.

**POSTSCRIPT**

The team piloting this model, both staff and students, intend to use the modified grid technique as part of their on-going development process and I will work with them to improve on its design and procedures. The facilitation of an action research approach had proved to be the answer to on-going team evaluation after my research was completed. It had ensured a collaborative investigation into shared practice (Lomax, 1990), with the members as practitioners playing:

"...a central role in the research as the main informant, and the one best able to set standards against which to judge success." (Lomax, 1986, p.43)

The validity of this process was demonstrated by its power to inform and start debate, which led to an intention to improve practice, particularly at the tutor/student interface.

The grid model had ensured that this was central to guiding successful course delivery,
by involving both tutors and students in individual and joint course evaluations, the importance of which is stressed by Lomax:

"Programme evaluation must be shared because programmes are shared realities. All the participants have a stake in the programme, whether they are programme leaders, other tutors or students." (Lomax, 1989, p.102)

Other groups have also begun to show an interest in similar procedures to improve their practice. Evidently this is just a beginning - though the report in the thesis must stop somewhere. In the next chapter I will briefly summarise the main findings in terms of the research process and recommendations.
"Man looks at this world through transparent patterns or templates which he creates, and then attempts to fit over the realities of which the world is composed. The fit is not always very good. Yet without such patterns the world appears to be such an undifferentiated homogeneity, that man is unable to make any sense." (Kelly, 1963, p.9)

12.1 INTRODUCTION

It has been a long research journey from the informal observations of teams at work, and the almost casual conversations with team members with which I had begun. It is worth noting how, from very early in that journey, certain key themes were identified, notably the "three C's" - collaboration, commitment and communication, and the need for teams to have the support of management, and how these were then gradually refined and related to the other major themes of quality and client satisfaction, which will be key features of Further Education in the 1990's.

At this stage it is worth reiterating the point about my research direction stated in Chapter 1. It would have been possible to undertake a comparative study between different types of course team, however, I decided to focus particularly on the human resource element of teamwork. This arose out of my initial contact with teams (see Chapter 1) and the experience of working with two teams both delivering the same kind of course within the same college, but operating at very different levels of effectiveness.
Even with these teams at apparently very different stages, it became clear that there were generic issues which applied to both, and which might provide a more fruitful way forward for the research. While there would be undoubted value in a comparative approach, I was concerned that such a way forward might lead me to concentrate on particular and specific course issues at the expense of a clear research direction. Context was clearly important and, though it would not be lost sight of at any point, an excessive concentration on the particularities of the nature of courses risked a loss of ultimate usefulness to course teams in general.

12.2 REFLECTING ON A METHODOLOGICAL JOURNEY

One later theme - quality - had been implicit from the beginning, in the sorts of concerns that tutors expressed about the effectiveness or otherwise of their team process. But that is to get too far ahead to start with in reviewing a quest which began with a search for insights into teamwork.

To achieve these, my main approach had been in a qualitative paradigm in order to suit the nature of the research. A person-centred approach had indeed been the most appropriate method for my needs, and had furthermore provided those insights into teamwork which, I believe, a more purely quantitative approach would not have achieved.

The adoption of an iterative mode had also proved vital in suggesting those areas which might most profitably be investigated further, and had ensured that in-depth interviews would re-inforce and explore more fully the data resulting from more macro-approaches.
The literature review which followed my first contacts with teams confirmed, extended and refined my early working assumptions, particularly those relating to my four themes of collaboration, commitment, communication and management support. This elaborating process followed Marshall and Rossman’s suggestion (1989) that one should begin by intuitively locating the research problem in a body of theory about teams and group work, and then - as I did - explore the literature until the assumptions initially made about the theory can be identified.

I began with the problem, discussed in Chapter 2 page 16, that little had been written specifically about course teams in education, but interest - as demonstrated by published reports - increased as the research progressed, particularly in relation to student-centred approaches to teaching and the issues surrounding quality delivery (FEU 1990, Miller and Dower, 1989). Later I was able to link the conclusions and recommendations derived from my own work to these emerging priorities. Meanwhile, although not always directly relevant to an educational setting, the management literature (see pages 19-43, eg. Belbin, 1981, Hunt, 1981, Maddux, 1989, etc) had provided me with a framework for understanding and exploring further those characteristics of teamwork which might add to or detract from its effectiveness.

Thus I was able to return to the field with a mental checklist of areas which I felt I needed to pursue, and which formed a basis for the initial questionnaire (see Chapter 4). The role of the latter was therefore to gauge to what extent the views of team members would re-inforce my initial experiences and my review of the literature. Its major success lay in revealing those groupings of lesser themes or issues which formed the "components" of my major themes, e.g. team size, member proximity...
and team leadership were associated with communication.

The purpose of the interviews that followed was to build on the solid foundation of the first questionnaire by exploring in more depth the areas I had identified at the start and which had been developed through the views of respondents. These interviews proved to be the most appropriate tool for obtaining a clearer and deeper understanding of those issues, only touched on briefly in the questionnaire by respondents.

One working assumption derivable from the interviews was that the climate, supportive or otherwise, in which the team operated and the team’s real or perceived status would (cf. Access courses) both have an effect on the commitment of members. Commitment appeared to manifest itself in different ways: members needed to feel committed to both the course and the team, and lack of commitment was demonstrated by such actions as non-attendance at meetings, and lack of communication within the team.

This linked directly with another of my themes: management support. It was clear that managers needed to pay more than lip service to supporting teamwork. They had to be truly convinced of its benefits, and to demonstrate that by facilitating meetings and giving careful consideration to membership of a team.

I decided to devote a second questionnaire entirely to the development of this emergent issue of membership; itself a foundation component of the major theme of commitment. The data from this second questionnaire raised concerns about the whole process of selection of team members, which in many instances tended to be one of allocation rather than direct member choice. It also pinpointed the criteria and methods used for selecting team membership, some of which ran contrary to those
recommended for effective teamwork within the literature. For instance, a team needed to recruit not only those with a wide variety of skills, but those who were also disposed towards teamwork (Seaman 1981). The desires of the individual should also be taken into account during the selection process (Torrington and Weightman, 1985).

The data gained from the second questionnaire had revealed a number of specific issues relating to team membership. In line with my research process so far, which followed a clear traditional pattern in which micro-developments followed earlier macro-approaches, these too needed to be investigated in more depth. A second set of interviews was therefore carried out with a number of those people who had responded to the questionnaire on membership. In these, respondents gave examples of what they saw as good and bad practice in the handling of membership processes, both in terms of the ideal, and what was actually happening in their own institutions. This more in-depth insight proved extremely useful, firming my understanding of some of the issues affecting institutional situations, and confirming the point derived from literature, that selection needed to be a positive process in which the individual, the team and the task are taken into consideration.

The generic issues which were emerging from the data now needed to be investigated in the real context of working teams, their activities and their interactions. It was therefore fortunate that at this key developmental stage in the research I was able to investigate three individual teams in depth. This enabled me to observe the human theatre in which the drama of my four themes, and the concerns which surrounded them, were acted out. Allocation to teams, rather than choice, could be seen as the trigger for passionate debate and even conflict, and negative feelings about autonomy.
and status were articulated as helplessness and lack of self worth.

Up to this point I had collected data from a variety of teams using three different types of research tools. This had led to a cumulative identification of a number of factors which might affect teams to varying degrees, depending on their individual situation. Before making any tentative recommendations on teamwork it was important to verify the significance of those factors through an investigation of good practice within teams which were perceived as successful. This formed the rationale for the final questionnaire which took the opposite perspective, generally focusing on their positive rather than their negative aspects.

It was interesting that even within these "successful" teams the factors previously identified still proved to be sources of difficulty. However, by this stage I had a much clearer notion of how the responsibility for decisions affecting teams might most usefully be distributed, if successful teamworking were to be facilitated. This was summarised in my identification of three "spheres of competence", the Managerial, the Intra-team and the Dual, which sought to allot aspects of the decision-making process regarding teams to appropriate groups or combinations of groups in the organisation (see Chapter 11).

These recommendations recognised the need for support from middle or senior management, and a culture which encouraged teamwork. While it was also acknowledged that many of these changes might be slow to be implemented, it was also affirmed that where colleges had a stated commitment to course delivery through teamwork, that commitment should be translated into prioritising resources to enable teamwork to happen, even if overall funding was not increased. In addition it was also
important to stress that management, by careful planning, could more effectively support collaborative working, eg. via time-tabling appropriately.

However, it was also recognised that, in a volatile situation of financial and political change, these changes might not be easy.

Given this acknowledgement, it seemed important to explore other practical ways of facilitating teamwork that could ensure more collaborative working, without necessarily having immediate resource implications. The data had indicated that allocation to a team was very often the most common form of membership process, and that members could either be allocated for negative reasons such as being short on hours, or because they were subject specialists and in demand for a particular course.

While such allocation was far from being what the literature on team selection advocated, it was clearly a reality. Certainly the allocation process was not always conducive to engendering commitment in a team member. These people, however, had to work together to deliver a course, and therefore it seemed crucial that they be helped to understand the perceptions of other members, so that issues could be brought out into the open, and members expectations and needs clarified through discussion and supported by staff development, thus avoiding unnecessary conflict.

It then seemed appropriate for team members to become more involved in the search for a way forward. Involving them as action researchers in a process which facilitated collaborative working and problem solving was indicated if the research was to arrive at a model which could indeed assist teamworking.

Building on Adair's (1987) suggestions, an adapted personal construct psychology approach using grid workshops was designed to involve members in an examination of their perceptions regarding the goals of the team. This, in turn, allowed identification
of individual and team needs and perceptions about the course, the team and the students.

This stage of my research coincided with the appearance of workbooks and a handbook by Hill and Webber (1991), which provided a set of team exercises designed to perform a similar task. The premise of these exercises was very similar to that of the grid workshop - that for a team to be effective and develop, it needed to understand the perceptions of other/new members. However, the initial brainstorming exercise offered did not appear to use a process which facilitated in-depth exploration of constructs, and could be in danger of providing fairly superficial or "socially acceptable" information. Further, although the idea itself of involving students in decision making is not new, the modus operandi may differ. For instance, a final search of the literature just prior to writing these conclusions revealed an FEU study "Leadership in Learning" (1981). This project focused on the personal and social development of students, and proposed a model in which the consultant from the staff team attended student group meetings, while the staff team itself benefitted from the services of an appointed external consultant.

Although there are merits to this idea, it is a product of its time. The level of staff/student interaction was limited, and resources for consultancy work were more readily available, although not prolific even then.

In the nineties, as resources have become more scarce, the focus on student-as-client has become more widespread. Thus, the main benefits of my model of action over that given in the FEU study is that it recognises both financial restraints and the growing need for an interactive, responsive relationship between staff and students.

My own grid workshops had provided the catalyst for team members to discuss how
they saw the team, to compare perceptions, to identify important differing perceptions and to decide on individual or team training needs where appropriate. These teams, however, had focused very much on the problems of the team both in domestic and curriculum terms. While students were mentioned, they were not by and large at the forefront of discussions and their involvement with the team was confined for the most part to having a student representative at course team meetings and providing end of course evaluation. In addition, some tutors, like those in the FEU report (1990), were clearly finding a student-centred approach difficult to put wholly into practice.

Furthermore, although the research had begun by focusing on the team and then on its members, at this stage it acknowledged that, effective or not, a team did not operate in isolation in delivering a course but was part of a much wider team composed of all those groups who had an interest in the course such as students, employers and funding bodies.

The involvement of this wider team was secured through the adaption of the initial grid workshop model in order to facilitate the comparing of perceptions of students and team members. The involvement of team members as action researchers collaboratively examining both their work as a team and as course deliverers proved to be vital in providing a team with a student expectations checklist which could later be used in further development work with all those other groups involved in the course. This process culminated in the developmental model produced as a result of the research.
12.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF TEAM/CLIENT WORKSHOP IN THE LIGHT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE - THE BALANCE TIPS

The place of the course team

During the course of this research, considerations about quality assurance were becoming more and more important in the educational context. Documents such as Miller and Dower (1989) and Miller and Innis (1990) had emphasised the need for some form of quality management, with the course team playing a central role in this process. This role had long been recognised in industry, particularly in the area of projects teams (Peters, 1989) and quality circles (Mullins, 1989), and was highlighted as one of the benefits for any organisation committed to collaborative working (Kanter, 1985). Some of these models are not particularly new, but in a climate in which quality measures were being sought by colleges and demanded by outside agencies, Further Education was beginning to take more note of industrially and commercially developed approaches. I will therefore briefly review some of the more relevant for my purposes.

The language of industry and commerce will be translated into educational terms. This should not be seen to be an agreement with the political ethos which has resulted in the application of a commercial basis to education, but rather is a recognition of the pervading influences impinging on it. It also acknowledges that quality provision to students is paramount, no matter what the motivation behind its dominance in current educational discourse.

The place of the "client"

The main focus of any quality approach is about putting the client at the centre of the process (Meed, Rossetti and Holloway, 1991) and providing that which the client expects to receive; within a course delivery situation this focus clearly equates with the
philosophy of student-centredness.

In the approach emphasised by Meed et al (1991), four steps are required if the process is to be effective:

a) Identifying the client(s)

b) Identifying the client's needs/wants

c) Meeting these needs

d) Regular review of the process

Collard (1991) stressed the importance of this whole process in relation to a quality service and went on to emphasise the very significant costs in relation to the reputation of the organisation and possible market losses if consideration was not paid to this area.

While he was referring to an industrial situation, educational institutions are still a "service industry" and, as such, may suffer in much the same way when market losses are translated in terms of students retention and recruitment.

In the current financial climate with a background of local management of colleges and the White Paper on Education and Training (1991), it would seem that post-sixteen institutions cannot afford to ignore the quality aspect of course delivery as it relates to the individual requirements of students and other interested bodies.

If it is accepted in a quality assurance programme that everyone within the organisation will contribute to the service to the client, in an educational context this means that all those people involved in a college are important links in the quality chain.

In a total quality process the stakeholders (to use an industrial term) are seen as the focus of a total quality programme which itself needs to be part of the overall culture of the institution. However, having said that, in terms of an individual student on a
particular course, only a few people will regularly come face-to-face with the client/stakeholder (i.e. the student) and therefore the course team is clearly a crucial part of this quality chain.

As a recent FEU report (1990) pointed out,

"Initiatives on quality assurance place the main focus on programme teams and their ability to plan and review processes." (FEU, 1990, p. 7)

**Identifying the client**

The notion of "client" in an educational course situation is by no means straightforward. It is clear that there may be a number of clients or stakeholders in a course: the students themselves, funding bodies, team members, governors and employers. While examples will, of course, depend on the course, the institution and the situation, it is unlikely that there will be less than two or three client groups or customers. However, the identification of these will not necessarily be a straightforward process and will need to be thought through carefully by the delivery team. As Collard (1991) pointed out, singling out one client/customer could result in not taking into account the expectations of any others who may be affected.

Thomas also stressed that the needs of the first client (in this case the students):

"cannot be considered in isolation from the needs of the second group of customers who are not present at the event, these are the people who are affected by customer one in the situation in which they must be functional." (Thomas, 1992, p. 76)

If one accepts Thomas's view that,

"A quality product or service is one that fully meets the expectations of those who purchase it". (Thomas, 1992, p. 3)
it seems essential that course teams should consider carefully all those people who form the wider 'team' rather than deciding in isolation on course objectives and their delivery. As Collard (1992) acknowledged, the process of defining the expectations and requirements of members of the wider team will not be easy, but:

"A lack of emphasis on this particular stage can undermine a total quality programme, however, well organised". (Collard, 1992, p. 66)

However, it has to be acknowledged that course teams will have a differentiated client base with a range of needs to satisfy and respond to and will therefore need to recognise that people attach different priorities to various aspects of the product.

Adapting the model put forward by Deming in Collard (1991):

Fig. 14

THE QUALITY PROCESS

Improved Quality
(i.e. in terms of meeting expectations)

\[ \rightarrow \]

Leading to

\[ \rightarrow \]

Increased motivation of teams and students
and continued funding where relevant

\[ \rightarrow \]

Leading to

\[ \rightarrow \]

Increased retention and progression/
and possibly lower unit costs

\[ \rightarrow \]

Leading to

\[ \rightarrow \]

Retaining an influential role
in education
12.4 QUALITY AND THE TEAM - ACTION APPROACH

My experience of introducing teacher and student team based grid workshops has convinced me that this is the means by which Deming's quality model and its implications can best be addressed in an educational setting. It provides the means by which teams can improve their own practice in the "marshy ground" where practical constraints can prevent the implementation of theoretical models, however desirable. Furthermore, it enables teams to work on the basis of a clear perception of client priorities in a climate where the role of clients' articulated needs in delivering a quality service is increasingly acknowledged.

Moreover, the extension of the workshop approach from facilitator/consultant leadership to a team operated action-research model both allows for team autonomy and ownership, and enables this quality process to be carried out successfully without extra expense at a time of financial restraint.

Figure 15 (overleaf) illustrates this process.
REPERTORY GRID WORKSHOP DEVELOPMENT MODEL

STAGE 1 - FACILITATOR / CONSULTANT-LED MODEL

Consultant support for identification / clarification  Consultant-led (grid workshop leader)  Consultant and tutor / student team

Learning theory  Tutor/team aims and experiences  Validating / accreditating body requirements  Determining  Developed via  Resulting in  Modified aims and objectives  Reflected on during

COURSE STRUCTURE

GRID PROCESS

STAGE 2 - TEAM ACTION MODEL

Team and tutor training  Tutor-led participation by teachers and students  Team leader / team members  Drawn up by e.g. team leader  Student/team consultation

WIDER TEAM DISCUSSIONS  Leading to...  Actions and Evaluation of actions
Here, the consultant-led preliminary process, serving also as the training stage, is followed by later quality processes in which course leader, teachers and students assume the role of action researchers. These participants actively and co-operatively keep the course under review, consider outside factors such as changes in accreditation requirements, and together operate a sensitive instrument by which the course can retain its relevance, and continue in its practice to meet the needs of its principal stakeholders. This action-reflection-learning process may be likened to that described by Kolb and Fry (1975). It also has distinct similarities to the model of NVQ project support developed by the University of Surrey, a "velvet glove" consultancy model which sought to "encourage and facilitate change at the local level through workshop or discussions" (Haffenden, Blackman and Brown, 1992, p.32).

If quality is to be maintained, such a process will need to be continuous and cyclical, as Figure 16 illustrates.
GRID ACTION RESEARCH MODEL

IN THE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT STAGE
THE FACILITATOR AS LEADER / CATALYST
FOR.....

REFINED COURSE MODEL

STUDENT AND TEACHING
TEAM INTERACTION

PRELIMINARY MODIFICATION
TO COURSE

(COLLABORATIVE WORKING )

ACTION RESEARCH GRID
WORKSHOPS

(In stage 2 of the cycle and beyond, the outside facilitator's role is assumed
by team member(s) or team leader.)

(after Kolb D. and Fry F. [1975] "Towards an applied theory of experiential
learning" from "Theories of Group Processes")
12.5 FUTURE POTENTIAL: TOWARDS A BROADER QUALITY MODEL

My own developmental practice had, because of time and other constraints, focused on a sub-set of the wider team I referred to on page 250, but the nonetheless crucial one of teachers and students. It will be for others to explore the potential of this model for the development of further quality procedures through the participation of a wider constituency of client groups such as employers, funding body representatives and receiving institutions. Within institutions, this broader constituency might take in support staff and management representatives.

The potential is there to refine the model and thereby also involve this wider group as action researchers engaged co-operatively in the search for quality outcomes. Only in this way will they be able to come to terms with Moss Kanter's "new turbulent operating environment" through a practice and a process which will:

"...generate involvement, commitment, pride in work among people, develop people and harness their full potential for organisational and self-development."

(Moss Kanter, 1991,b, p.21)

POSTSCRIPT

In advocating Action Research for teachers and students as a way of addressing their work problems, and in encouraging teachers to be sensitive to their client groups, I am not insensitive myself to the difficulties they will face. After all, through the process of this project, my route has been a similar one to that which they will face.

As I began my journey I adhered to well tried methods, supported by tradition. Although not easy in themselves, they provided me with an initial sense of security.
It also produced a sound basis of data on which to build more adventurous forays, in terms of methodology, when I was confronted with the frustration of trying to suggest ways of implementing good practice in a less than ideal, less than tidy and a less than traditional situation. Conviction had to be joined by courage to face uncertainty, and much of this courage came from the discovery of others embarking on Action Research approaches throughout education - my 'wider team'. It also came from the teachers and students that I worked with, whose willingness to join me as co-researchers was a source of inspiration.
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Dear

I am carrying out a research project for a Phd. at Surrey University under the supervision of Dr. P. Denicolo and Dr. M. Pope.

The aim of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of educational course teams in Further and Adult Education with a view to helping teams make the most effective use of the time and resources available to them.

I have worked in both Adult and Further Education for the past twelve years, and have been involved in various educational teams.

The initial research is in the form of the enclosed questionnaire, which will be followed up in some instances by interviews and case studies.

I should be very grateful if you could pass this questionnaire to a course team member to complete, as his/her experiences of working on a course would be greatly appreciated. The information gathered will be treated in the strictest confidence.

It would be helpful if the questionnaire is returned within three weeks of receipt.

Thank you for your help.

Yours faithfully

KATE BAKER
Dear

I am carrying out a research project for a Phd. at Surrey University under the supervision of Dr. P. Denicolo and Dr. M. Pope.

The aim of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of educational course teams in Further and Adult Education with a view to helping teams make the most effective use of the time and resources available to them.

I have worked in both Adult and Further Education for the past twelve years, and have been involved in various educational teams.

The initial research is in the form of the enclosed questionnaire, which will be followed up in some instances by interviews and case studies.

I should be very grateful if you could complete the questionnaire, as your experiences of working on a course will be greatly appreciated. As you may be aware, I am also a member of the Curriculum Development Project working directly to Dr. Hilton. I should therefore like to assure you that there is no connection between my research and my work for the ILEA, and any information supplied by you will be treated in the strictest confidence.

It would be helpful if the questionnaire is returned within three weeks of receipt.

Thank you for your help.

Yours faithfully

KATE BAKER
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to investigate the perception and attitudes of members of educational course teams of varying types, in both Further and Adult education, towards the effectiveness of the team to which they belong. A course team is used here to mean a group of staff working together to deliver a specified course, scheme or programme.

Most of the questions require either a yes/no answer using a tick in the relevant box. However, a few questions may request additional information or you may feel you would like to elaborate on your answers. I would find it very useful if you would supply this information wherever possible, and any other comments relating to your experience of working as a member of a course team would be welcomed.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF RECEIPT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.

* * * * * * * * *

1. Please indicate what course team you belong to. (Please answer for one team if you belong to several).

- Access □
- CPVE □
- GCSE □
- BTEC □
- TVEI □
- Return To Study □
- YTS □
- Other (please specify)...........................................
2. Please describe your area of responsibility within the course.

3. Is this course organised by a course team? YES/NO

If no, please go to question 22.

4. Are you a member of this particular course team? YES/NO

5. How is the course planned and organised?

6. In this work, do you feel an integral part of the team? YES/NO

7. Please use the space below to elaborate on your answer to question 6.

8. How often do the course team members meet as a team?

   Weekly
   Fortnightly
   Monthly
   Termly
   Annually
   Never
   Other (please specify) ..........................................

9. Do you have remission for attending these meetings? YES/NO
10. Who attends the meetings (please tick as many as appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time tutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course tutor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student counsellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Who is responsible for arranging the team meetings?

12. Who has responsibility for leading the team meetings?

13. Do the meetings have an agenda? YES/NO

14. Is the agenda sent out in advance? YES/NO/SOMETIMES

15. Please give a brief description of what you think an EFFECTIVE course team should be.

16. Do you feel your team fits this definition? YES/NO

17. Would you please briefly explain the reasons for your answer.

18. Did you choose to be a member of this team? YES/NO
   (If YES go to question 20)
19. How did you come to be a member of this team?

20. Has this team had any in-service training, or induction courses on team building? YES/NO

21. Have you had any previous training for teamwork? YES/NO

22. Do you belong to/have responsibility for any other course teams? YES/NO

23. Please specify which (if applicable).

24. Do you feel membership of more than one team creates difficulties for you? YES/NO

25. If YES please indicate the nature of these difficulties.

26. Does your team evaluate its effectiveness? YES/NO

27. If YES please give a brief description of the ways in which this is done.
28. How often does the evaluation take place?

Continuous  □
Weekly  □
Monthly  □
Termly  □
Yearly  □
Other (please specify) ...........................................

Thank you for your co-operation.

The time you have taken to complete this questionnaire is very much appreciated.

I would like to help further with this research.

Name................................................
Address............................................
Tel No..............................................
DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRE ONE ON TEAMWORK

1) COURSES TO WHICH RESPONDENTS BELONGED............

Access................................................................................. 16
RTI ................................................................................... 3
BTEC ................................................................................. 5
Restart ................................................................................ 7
GCSE ................................................................................. 3
YTS ................................................................................. 1
CPVE ................................................................................. 2
TOTAL ............................................................................ 37

2) AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN THE COURSE TEAM

Team member.................................................................. 16
Part-time tutor .................................................................. 1
Course team leader ......................................................... 18
Head of Department ........................................................ 2
TOTAL ............................................................................ 37

3) IS THIS COURSE ORGANISED BY A COURSE TEAM?

YES.................................................................................... 37
NO...................................................................................... 0
TOTAL ............................................................................ 37

4) ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THIS PARTICULAR COURSE TEAM?

YES.................................................................................... 35
NO...................................................................................... 2
TOTAL ............................................................................ 37

5) HOW THE COURSE IS PLANNED AND ORGANISED

The team as focus

1. By the Access course team
2. The final responsibility lies with the course team leader, but a strong team is building up and courses are being co-ordinated.
3. Course tutor and team in conjunction with the "linked"
   Higher Ed. colleges.
4. The course team.
5. CPVE is planned and taught as a team
6. By the course team
7. Planned submission to the MSC and then run by the team.
8. Small team of staff plan the course, based on the syllabus of the college nearby. The course is organised by the same people and more or less full-time.
9. My approach is to involve, acknowledge and evaluate the team members ideas (even though I could do it in a fraction of the time myself) by team evolving the specific objectives, methods and materials. In both courses we had global objectives from the previous year. I will give overall approval and I look for coherence across the course, not just in an activity.

The meeting as the focus
10. Through regular team meetings
11. Each course has a different course team - teams meet formally twice a term - informally more often.
12. At a weekly meeting where ideas are pooled, and each person in the team adds ideas for assignments based on his or her skill area.
13. Regular meetings, included in the timetable.
14. By discussion and constraints of the timetable.

External focus
15. The course director initiates and does most, if not all the work.
16. The four courses are planned by the departmental tutor and incorporated my own input which included the introductory and closure weeks.
17. Via two co-ordinators and one SL/Head of Department who has special responsibility for GCSE. There is a course team, but their teaching and tutorial roles go across a number of course teams, and the teaching group does not at present operate as a team.
18. Planned by the Head of Humanities and one sociology teacher. I slotted in and teach the subject I know best. Team meetings of five people occur approximately once a month and a student rep. attends.

Student focus
19. We have a workable schedule for the week, which is continually reassessed and changed (sometimes spontaneously) according to the needs of the students.
20. Came from the needs of the students. Tutors changed sessions in order to accommodate various groups each week.
21. Originally evolved from the needs of the students, though used particularly the strengths of the teachers.

6) DO YOU FEEL AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE TEAM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) ANALYSIS OF WHY PEOPLE MAY OR MAY NOT FEEL AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE TEAM

A) Why they felt they were part of the team

Mutual support

1. There is support and expertise
2. Team support is crucial when the team is dealing with the kind of material so often thrown up by communications. I felt supported by them, and I supported others. We were equally involved in planning and carrying out the course.
3. I feel each individual member has a commitment to the overall course, and we share ideas, concerns and information generally.
4. The sessions overlap and the feedback from fellow lecturers is helpful and supportive.

Meetings
5. There are regular team meetings. Informal discussion on a very regular basis with individual members.
6. I facilitate all team meetings and attend all team meetings. The course discusses all aspects of operating the course at meetings, integrating content etc.
7. Because decisions taken at tutors meetings directly govern development and implementation of course tutorials and residential sessions.
8. We meet regularly and team teach (double staffing) for part of the time.
9. I attend all meetings and my views are taken into account. I am valued for my counselling role.

Involvement and decision making
10. There is a great deal of discussion and planning. Every member participates fully and is helped by being given responsibility for specific tasks and duties.
11. I am involved in entry and selection procedures, internal assessment and liaison with external moderator, also member of examination committee.
12. We attempt to discuss one another’s work to facilitate the four integrated assignments.
13. Very democratic course leader.
14. Decisions and policies are decided democratically.
15. Everything is discussed and each person is encouraged to add ideas.

Roles
16. I have been course convener and a member of the team as well, and have enjoyed both roles, but view them very differently.
17. I have a central role.
B) Why respondents did not feel they were part of the team

Commitment
18. Not really, although it is quite possible to put in a lot more input if I wanted to.

Involvement
19. I feel that the course has mainly been organised without my assistance and that I have little say in it.
20. General and Communication studies tends to be somewhat peripheral to BTEC. I am more a part of the team for Access.
21. Because I teach the rest of the time in a different building and therefore have little contact with the Access course staff and students.
22. I have been unable to go to meetings recently because of timetable clashes.

Roles
23. As co-ordinator I feel involved but separate too, as I have a quasi management role to play.
24. As team leader I feel responsible for the team, perceived by them as the "expert", and paid more. This is an issue for the team.
25. Sometimes I feel an integral part of the team, but all too often due to inadequate planning, I feel I am merely 'reporting back' with inadequate feedback.
26. Team has 10 members from 3 departments and the Poly, ranging from part-time to full-time, from section heads to lecturers, consequently you tend to do all the work.

8) HOW OFTEN DOES THE COURSE TEAM MEET?

Weekly................................................................. 5
Fortnightly........................................................... 5
Monthly................................................................. 10
Termly................................................................. 10
Annually............................................................... 1
Never................................................................. 3
Other................................................................. 3
TOTAL......................................................... 35

OTHER
a) Weekly on an informal basis.
b) Whenever we can make it.

9) DO YOU HAVE REMISSION FOR ATTENDING MEETINGS?

YES................................................................. 4
NO................................................................. 31
TOTAL....................................................... 35
10) WHO ATTENDS THE TEAM MEETINGS

Part-time tutors ................................................................. 23
Lecturer one ..................................................................... 24
Lecturer two ..................................................................... 22
Senior Lecturer ................................................................. 18
Course tutor ...................................................................... 24
Head of Dept ..................................................................... 3
Vice Principal ................................................................... 1
Student Counsellor .......................................................... 4
Librarians ......................................................................... 2
Student reps ...................................................................... 5
Higher Ed. reps (for Access) .................................................. 3
Staff/Curriculum Development officer ................................. 1

11) WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ARRANGING THE TEAM MEETINGS

Course tutor/leader ............................................................ 30
The team (all from same team) .............................................. 4
Senior Lecturer ................................................................. 3
TOTAL ........................................................................... 37

12) WHO HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADING THE TEAM MEETINGS

Course tutor/leader ............................................................. 30
Shared, rotating responsibilities (same team) ....................... 4
Varies ............................................................................... 3
TOTAL ........................................................................... 37

13) DO THE MEETINGS HAVE AN AGENDA?

YES .................................................................................. 33
NO .................................................................................... 2
SOMETIMES .................................................................... 2
TOTAL ............................................................................... 37
14) IS THE AGENDA SENT OUT IN ADVANCE?

YES................................................................. 17
NO............................................................... 7
SOMETIMES.................................................... 13
TOTAL ......................................................... 37

15) RESPONDENTS DESCRIPTION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES AN EFFECTIVE TEAM (additional quotes to main text)

Commitment to team work and the course
20. Good tutors who work together for the benefit of the course.

Sharing goals and objectives
21. Integrated, well known to each other, agreed on common aims and objectives and on course philosophy.
22. Who are clear about the objective of their course.
24. One with clear objectives which it reaches with minimum of time wasting.

Supporting and sharing
25. Exchange of ideas, information, concerns, and current issues, and support for work undertaken.
26. An effective course team should have enough intercommunication/support/expertise/positive attitudes from colleagues, though not too much either.
27. A group of people who willingly come together to run a course and where there are minimal considerations of power and status, i.e. someone needs to be in charge but equality if desirable.
28. A team in which all members are equally involved, and who are clear about the objectives of their course.
29. Joint responsibility for implementation, planning, prioritisation, support and evaluation, administrative arrangements should be taken on by one person - possibly slightly detached.
30. A team like ours, except that sometimes we were so into being equal and non-hierarchical that we spent too long contemplating our navels, often one of us managed to win, no awards though, ( sorry,don't think this is a helpful answer).
31. Teachers exchanging ideas and sharing experiences. Giving support to one another.

Meetings
32. Meetings regularly attended by all course team members. Effectively chaired by course tutor who is best informed as to the context in which the course is operating. Plans future developments, e.g. integration of content etc.
33. It should be able to meet regularly with remission.
34. Meetings minuted - to provide continuity and a record of decisions. Regular agenda items, e.g. final meeting for the year should include external exam. reports etc, interim meetings should include students' progress. Opportunity for members to submit items
for agenda. Not too bureaucratic to discourage discussion but firmly chaired to keep order.
35. Meeting regularly once a week.
36. Have an agenda, meet as necessary (not necessarily regularly), consist of appropriate members of staff.

Communication and co-ordination
37. Being very clear about the needs of individual students - that is all members of the team - to provide adequate communication and information to all concerned.

Team reviews
(No additional quotes)

Team composition
39. Should contain at least one representative from each discipline and should be fairly flexible in approach.

Roles
(No additional quotes)

The importance of a team approach
(no additional quotes)

16) DOES YOUR TEAM FIT THIS DEFINITION?

YES.................................................................................... 17
NO..................................................................................... 5
SOMETIMES................................................................. 15
TOTAL............................................................................. 37

17) EXPLANATIONS AS TO WHY RESPONDENTS FELT THAT THE TEAM DID OR DID NOT FIT THEIR DESCRIPTION OF AN EFFECTIVE TEAM

Meetings (negative statements)
1. Without remission, liaison is sometimes difficult.
2. Meetings are cursory, and sometimes little more than required courtesy.
3. Some of the meetings are particularly useful, others are purely filling in timetable space.
4. Doesn’t meet once a week. Exchange and support is informal and to some extent effective, but not rigorous - could be a lot better.
5. Feel I have lost touch since missing meetings.
6. I don’t really know what any of the others are doing.
7. It isn’t possible to be effective without time being made available.

Meetings (positive statements)
8. All course team meetings are consistently attended by the majority of members who are given remission, and who by and large are committed to the ideology of the course.
9. Meetings are detailed and productive.
Sharing and co-operation (negative statements)
10. Individualism and a lack of resources.
11. Generally we have the same goals and work quite well together, but I don't think we always work well together and I don't think we are as efficient and thorough as we should be.

Sharing and co-operation (positive statements)
12. The members co-operated with each other and aim to help the students.
13. Shared experience, knowledge, expertise.
14. On this type of course there are different people with different types of expertise. It is essential to share this.
15. Before the course began, we as a team committed ourselves to working collectively and for the good and support of the team of tutors.
16. They know what it is all about.
17. Because the team is well co-ordinated.
18. A multi-exit course and large disparate course team - too much emphasis on the course director who teaches on five other courses.
19. A reluctance to work in a team that's changing personnel all the time.
20. As maths is often a "non socially" accepted asset, one is often in isolation.

Ownership
21. Although team fits definition ownership can feel burdensome.
22. Because I feel the course has been organised without my assistance, and that I have little say in it.
23. In some BTEC courses the course tutor has a bigger stake in the course than other team members who may have other more pressing commitments.

Resources
24. A lack of resources.
25. Personally I feel very supported by our group. We do work well together in the interests of the students and ourselves. Mostly we are handicapped by lack of money.
26. I can't answer this briefly.
27. Working with external constraints.

Conflict
28. There have been occasions when views have been strongly expressed to create harmful divisions and conflict. One viewpoint or the viewpoints of a small powerful group can be disruptive.

18) DID YOU CHOOSE TO BE A MEMBER OF THIS TEAM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19) HOW RESPONDENTS CAME TO BE A MEMBER OF THIS PARTICULAR TEAM.

1. It is an inherent feature of these courses, choice does not come with it. If you don’t wish to be a member of the team you don’t teach on the course.
2. They wanted someone with my particular expertise to teach on this aspect of the course and I was asked to do it, because I was likely to have more "free" time on my timetable than other tutors.
3. It is the demands of the timetable.
4. I was asked, but said yes.
5. I was asked by the course tutor.
6. I was invited after the resignation of another lecturer.
7. I was recruited by the senior lecturer who initiated Restart.
8. I applied for the job.

20) HAS THIS TEAM HAD ANY IN SERVICE TRAINING ON TEAMBUILDING?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21) HAVE YOU HAD ANY STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN TEAMWORK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22) DO YOU BELONG OR HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY OTHER COURSE TEAMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23) RESPONSIBILITIES THAT RESPONDENTS HAVE FOR OTHER COURSE TEAMS

- City and Guilds Communication Skills (on two sites of the college)
- GCSE
- B.ED Science Access
- CPVE, GCSE, BTEC, ESL Foundation
- English Language mode 3 and GCSE
- Social work courses
- City and Guilds servicing team for vocational courses
- Occupational therapy courses and computing Access.
BTEC
YTS
A Level course team
ESL, Special needs, CPVE and Open Access
Science Access
BTEC, CPVE, YTS
A Level and GCSE
GCSE
YTS and GCSE
CPVE AND GCSE
BTEC, Communications support team

24) DO YOU FEEL THAT MEMBERSHIP OF MORE THAN ONE TEAM CREATES DIFFICULTIES FOR YOU?

YES................................................................. 18
NO................................................................. 16
TOTAL 34

25) MEMBERSHIP OF SEVERAL TEAMS - WHAT ARE THE NATURE OF THE DIFFICULTIES

Time
1. Having too little time to dedicate to a proper job of co-ordinating staff input.
2. Lack of time.
3. Takes too much time, difficult to diversify.
4. Amount of co-ordination involved, logistic problems, excessive bureaucracy at times.
5. I'm always desperately short of time, as are all teachers, but I don't think that this is particularly connected with membership of two course teams.

Meetings - overlap of meetings and other difficulties
6. Time spent in meetings.
7. Attending all the meetings.
8. Getting to the meetings at a time when other people are also free.
9. It reduces opportunities to meet, conflicting approaches of delivery.
10. Occasional overlap of meetings and duties.
11. At meetings we seem to waste time by talking about the same issues repeatedly and not moving forward.

Pressure and stress
12. Spread too thinly, therefore tendency to prioritise my importance with respect to the course. This is dependent on personal interest, time allocated on course, i.e. teaching hours and time allocated for team meetings.
14. Too much time spent in lunchtime when I need a rest. Clashes of team times - I can't make them all.
15. I feel under pressure.
16. Extra pressure on free time, therefore less planning time. Difficulty in finding an hour when everyone is free.

DIFFERING PERCEPTIONS
17. I have ideals and push hard - I want one team to be as good as another. Different perceptions of my role/ capabilities/ style.
18. If one team is working particularly well, occasionally I feel that that one is "better" than the others.

26) DOES YOUR TEAM EVALUATE ITS EFFECTIVENESS?

YES................................................................................. 20
NO................................................................................. 17
TOTAL 37

27) HOW OFTEN DOES THE EVALUATION TAKE PLACE?

CONTINUOUSLY........................................................ 11
WEEKLY................................................................. 2
MONTHLY................................................................. 0
TERMLY............................................................... 1
YEARLY............................................................. 6
TOTAL 20

28) DESCRIPTIONS OF THE WAY IN WHICH TEAM EVALUATION IS CARRIED OUT

Course content and course evaluation
1. Discussions related to style/content of course and student response.
2. Annual course evaluation to include student evaluation in all respects, e.g. servicing, environment, foundation.
3. Post course meetings and course evaluation sheets from each session.
4. Evaluation of course by participants throughout, and evaluation of the course by the team in last meeting as part of the team’s structured meetings plan.
5. We had a long session evaluating the course in relation to its aims. Every session with students is evaluated by the team both verbally in the group, and by written and pictorial reflections.

Student progress
6. Through weekly evaluation by the students.
7. Feedback from students.
8. Regular meetings on student progress.
9. Assessment of participants.

General
11. Constant monitoring at weekly meetings.
12. By discussion.
13. Discussion between ourselves.
14. Self assessment as individuals and as a group as to our effectiveness as tutors, and evaluation with participants of the course.
Dear

You very kindly completed a questionnaire on course team processes, and indicated that you would be willing to help further with this research.

As a follow-up to the questionnaire I shall be conducting some in-depth interviews, and I should be grateful if you would be willing to take part.

If you are available to be interviewed, please can you complete and return the tear-off slip below.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

KATE BAKER

I am willing/unwilling to be interviewed.
Possible dates would be..............................................
Name...........................................................................
College...................................................... Course........
Tel.No..............................................
QUOTES FROM TEAM MEMBERS AND LEADERS INTERVIEWED ON
ISSUES CONCERNING TEAMWORK

(Quotes used in the main text)

THE IMPORTANCE OF MEETINGS AND THE DIFFICULTIES ATTACHED TO THEM

a) Timetabling difficulties

1. "Yes, it is very difficult for every one to attend at any one time. We try to meet once or twice a term, but we have to get timetable together. Working across departments is a problem, as the course is serviced by different departments."
2. "Meetings are time-tabled at the beginning of the previous summer and the four members of the core team can always meet".

b) Timing of Meetings

3. "I feel meetings are important, but we don’t get a lot of them. Fridays is a bad time for meetings".
4. "Not being able to meet regularly means we haven’t got a focus (to integration)".
5. "I think the team is effective because we meet regularly to discuss student progress and on the whole the work is well co-ordinated".

c) Siting and proximity

6. "It becomes more difficult to co-ordinate support subjects, especially if the tutors are based at another site".
7. "All those on the course had desks in the same work room provided for the course, communications were therefore a lot easier".

d) Regular Meetings

8. "I think an effective team should have regular meetings at a time when the majority of staff can go and minutes should be circulated to absentees with an agenda in advance. This doesn’t happen so I feel very out of touch".
e) Membership of more than one team

9. "Meetings are a problem. College general meeting time is between 9 and 10 a.m. on a Thursday for all staff and I, for example am in seven teams. I actually managed to get two out of three meetings last term. Out of ten tutors I have never got more than six at a meeting and part-timers are always a problem".

f) Remission

10. "There is no remission for these, people come out of goodwill. However they do come because it's important to know what they are taking on".
11. "Without remission liaison is sometimes difficult".
12. "The majority get it(remission). It was structured into the course when it was set up. It was set up under the influence of the Open College. Access was new so they managed to impose a model of good Access practice on the college."
13. "Tutors who are part-time are paid to come to meetings and full time staff are given remission".
14. (In reply to whether or not part-timers could attend meetings and be paid)"It is difficult, but I work it. They need to be there because they teach half the course. This an historic situation and they will slowly be replaced by full-timers."

g) Dissatisfied Members

15. "Those who were not keen on teaching on the course don't come to the meetings"

h) Cost of meetings

16. "We met in the lunchtimes, but since then we only meet if there is a crisis and have only met once and that was in a lunchtime. The VTs come in their own time and are not paid. Six people come - 3VTS, 0.5, the SL and myself. Otherwise we discuss the students informally in the staff-room. I don't feel this is right, but it is the way we pass information on through the week.................although it is said that the course is making money there are still no paid meeting times. The MSC has never been asked for any money for meeting time and it is expensive to have meetings."

MEMBERSHIP OF OTHER TEAMS - DIFFERING EXPERIENCE

a) Lack of ownership

17. "Membership of other teams was sometimes a problem in that people had to fit in with criteria in which they felt they hadn't had much of a hand in".

b) Time

18. "I have too little time to dedicate to a proper job co-ordinating staff in-put. However some good practice is often brought in from other teams. For example the maths tutor said that the induction course wouldn't work in his experience of another course. He explained why a different approach would be preferable."
c) **Overload**

19. (Team member talking about leader’s membership of several teams) "One problem is that she is overloaded and her energies are split in different directions."

**TEAM REVIEWS AND PLANNING**

a) **Inappropriate time**

20. "We could use the reading week for staff development, but it’s probably not possible. There is no staff planning time only at the end of the year when it is no good. Basically it is reactive management to the team."
21. "Remission was given for staff and curriculum development in two day blocks as they found it easier to created time in this way."

b) **No time allocated**

22. "There is no staff development and certainly no preplanning time for the next year that I know about. In fact quite a lot of things have been allowed to stew like the issue about students."
23. "Team monitoring was done constantly on an informal basis and formally at certain meetings when we looked at how the team was operating and other things such as the sharing of responsibilities over pastoral care."

c) **Pressure**

24. "At the moment I am doing some forward planning with the course tutor, but is is very ad hoc. We are under tremendous pressure and have no time off for part-timers to join in."
25. "On the new course now we tell the tutors that we will review their work to see if they can stay or not and one has actually been taken off."

**DIFFICULTIES OF INTEGRATION**

a) **Lack of experience**

26. "I feel Access needs a team approach because of the integration of the course and its ethos. If a tutor is on the course who hasn’t had that integration experience it is very difficult."

b) **Planning**

27. "Liaison and integration are essential, but because it is a student centred course, the nature of the work only allows us to plan a few weeks ahead. We therefore have to meet on an ad hoc basis."
c) Subject specialists

28. "We tried to integrate, but the team didn't fancy the idea of teaching other subjects and retreated into their own subject area. It got so theory based that they were doing everything and not doing anything properly - our meetings are now mainly admin."

d) Lack of meeting time

29. (Talking about whether or not the team integrates) "Sometimes in pairs - two on every subject area and I provide a focus for cross course projects. Not being able to meet regularly means we haven't got a focus."

THE NEED FOR A COMMITMENT TO THE TEAM AND THE COURSE PHILOSOPHY

Lack of commitment

a) To the course

30. "Last year one team member said that teaching on the course was dead easy. He has asked for work since, but the team members were so hurt by his comments that he has not been taken on again. It was felt that he didn't support the team and although it isn't a really effective team, they did rally round to block him out."
31. "I did need to remove one tutor, Mr. X, who was very indifferent to the students and to the course and therefore his delivery became problematic. He made no attempt to integrate despite attempts by me to integrate with him."
32. "I feel I have a commitment to some individuals within the team, although maybe not to the whole team. I hardly ever see or talk to X, she's moving on soon."

Positive commitment

a) To the course philosophy

33. "They all chose to work on Access and are committed to its philosophy."

b) To teamwork

34. "There was a real commitment to the concept of a team. Our team was very much an egalitarian creature which had a common understanding of the concept of a team that needed a leader and that needed to iron out definitions."

c) To the course

35. "Yes, they co-operate well and are a small cohesive group. This is a small college and tutors have a lot of values in common....One of the team's strengths is that we are all from a sociological background - only the woman Vice Principal team member is not and she has done sociology and has a sensitive interest in adult education. She also doesn't pull her office in meetings."
36. "We all work on the course because we wanted to and we gave up more of our free time."

ISSUES CONCERNING TEAM MEMBERSHIP AND SELECTION

a) The timetable

37. "There has been a different tutor for the past 3 years, this is something to do with the timetabling - it was whoever was free - the team didn't choose."

b) Status of the course

38. "Well, membership can vary. The problem is this course is timetabled last for full-timers, because I think it has a low priority in the college."
39. "Well, because the course had high status, there was an emphasis on the team to add to this status. The Head of Department was in charge of selection although the team was actually self selecting in that the key person from the science department was chosen along with the key person from continuing ed. who was to do the social sciences and the whole course was built around the Gen. Ed. department. It was a very prestigious course and had guaranteed progression on to the Poly."

c) Head of Department decision

40. "The team is made up of ten people and I had the flexibility to choose the other 5. I wanted the team to be as small as possible and to have black people teaching on it.....I am well aware of the weak spots (in the course), last year it was maths and I realised what needed to be done so I earmarked someone. The Head of Department agreed in principle, but in actual fact it was a fait accompli. The person was actually reasonable ".

d) Subject specialism

41. "Expertise in subject area, but also knowing the person was keen to do it and had not just chosen it as a soft option. "

e) Availability

42."I was able to choose 4 our of the 7 team members and the other three were on the team either because of their subject area or their availability......Selection was carried out right at the end of the summer term and this wasn't very satisfactory as there had not been any time before September for team planning."

f) Low on hours

43. "The Head of Department said that I had a say in the timetabling of the people I wanted, he said it was OK, but I also had to take people if they were short on hours".
g) People who demand to be on a course

44. "Theoretically I have no say as course co-ordinator. I can approach some members of staff before timetabling happens, but this leads to problems and so I am left with those people who are not wanted very often, or those with very strong personalities who demand what they want."

h) Sympathetic to the course philosophy

45. "I looked for people who were sympathetic to the ideals of Access. I have a choice in most of the subject tutors, but there was less choice in the supporting subject areas."

i) Commitment and experience

46. "I was selected as far as I can tell for two reasons - interest, commitment and experiences with adults and being the only one to be able to offer numeracy."

j) Recruited for the team

47. "The team were recruited specifically for YTS and they were recruited with team cohesion in mind in that they were selected as much for their course philosophy and personality as they were for their subject areas."

k) Financial constraints

48. "None of us were selected and their hands are partly tied by redeployment and the financial situation."

l) Leader recommendation

49. "Well, we don't get people foisted on to us. The timetabling is done by the principal lecturer and sometimes I have to take someone because I am asked, but usually I approach people I want or they approach me."

m) Preference

50. "Well, selection has never been a real issue, but it will be as there are less and less staff and more courses next year. I have sent out a preference sheet to all my staff for next year. As the course tutor I am involved in discussion at SL and PL level and management have so much to do that they allow me far more autonomy than usual for an L2 and I have played the system. I have kept the team the same and small and buy in people who want to teach on it and have good reasons. It's a bit manipulative but it works."
n) Volunteers

51. "I think selection needs to be voluntary rather than conscription. For example the BTEC people are asked what kind of courses they want to have on their timetable and this is how a team is composed."

INFLUENCES ON OWNERSHIP AND AUTONOMY

a) Head of Department

52. (Talking about autonomy) "Well the Head of Department gets the minutes, but we have total freedom to do what we like.......The Head of Department views Access very supportively as it's been successful".
53. "We are not in a position to say that this is our course. Roles are not shared out and it's all on my shoulders. I try to use their expertise but they are all overloaded with other courses".

b) Team leader

54. "The team has very little control over decisions because basically I don't let them have much."

c) The Principal

55. "The Principal probably didn't consider how people would work together as a team, but he's supportive to team work."
EXTRACT FROM AN INTERVIEW WITH TEAM LEADER FOR
GCSE COURSE TEAM
AT Z COLLEGE IN AN OUTER LONDON BOROUGH

INT. = Interviewer
A. = Course team leader

INT: Can you tell me how the course is planned and organised?

A: It's planned via the two co-ordinators - science and humanities - and one SL who is also the HOD who has special responsibility for GCSE. There is a course team, but their teaching and tutorial roles go across a number of course teams, and the teaching group doesn't at the moment operate as a team. We have a matrix system and the timetable is organised in courses and not subjects.

INT: What is your role in the team?

A: I am the co-ordinator of the GCSE humanities - the team leader running the course - but in the case of the GCSE it is a group of subjects.

INT: How many people in the team?

A: The team has approximately thirteen people in it; 8 English tutors, 1 sociologist, 1 accountant, 1 Business Studies, 2 Law and 1 English Literature, as these have been the subjects which have been traditionally taught in the past.

INT: How often do they meet as a team?

A: There is usually a meeting once a term, sometimes twice if the SL calls a GCSE general meeting of science and the humanities. I usually call the meetings and we have them on a Friday. Friday between 3 and 5pm. is meeting time for subject, departmental and course meetings, so there are enormous overlaps. The subject teams do tend to operate independently developing their subject areas, but we are not all finding the time to teach as well as we should do, as there is so much more administration.

INT: Does everyone in your team attend the meetings?

A: No, they are badly attended, not just because they are in other teams, but they are voting with their feet about the new system (matrix). It's impossible to have a proper meeting. At the last meeting only the English Language tutors came, so I am more in touch with them. I do try to get together with the other tutors and minimise the clash. The subject teams are much better attended because the time-table is coming up, and they can get what they want.
INT: What grade are the team members?

A: They are all Lecturer One or progressed Lecturer Two, apart from one member who is an SL.

INT: Does having a Senior Lecturer grade member cause any difficulties?

A: No, there are no problems with having the SL in the team, and he either attends meetings or sends apologies. I feel meetings are important, but we don't get a lot of them. Fridays is a bad time for meetings. We do have the English Language standardisation meetings once or twice a term on a Wednesday afternoon. There is no remission for these, people come out of goodwill. However, they do come because it's so important to know what they are taking on.

INT: Do you feel the members of your team are committed to the team?

A: Well, the two Law lecturers don't attend, it's historic and to do with their personality, they are just put up with by the others. They cut themselves off. The Business Studies tutor is off ill, and the work has been taken over by two part-timers. The HOD just doesn't consult with me over selection. I feel I should have been called inasmuch I can never get them to meetings.

INT: Is the HOD supportive?

A: There are two HODs, one new and one not. Both don't understand subject teams, and there is a complete lack of consultation. The subject team faculties get a list of hours from the HOD, and these are divided into subject areas, and then the hours are made available to the subject team members who put bids in for them. But you have to be full-time, the part-timers get what's left.

INT: Who selects the team members?

A: Well, theoretically I have no say as course co-ordinator. I can approach some members of staff before the time-tabling happens, but this leads to problems, and so I am left with those people who are not wanted very often, or those with the strong personalities who demand what they want. Last year one strong personality got exactly what she wanted. Another tutor claimed high level work and the students complained about her, but the HOD did nothing - he's just 'nice and supportive'. I feel I have got support for GCSE from the HOD, but he doesn't understand the system.

INT: What criteria do you use, or would you use, if you could select team members?

A: The main criteria would be expertise in the subject area, but also knowing that a person was keen to do it, and had not just chosen it as a soft option.
INT: Do you think the team has much autonomy?

A: Last year the team sorted things out for themselves and then notified the HOD, he then went and did something completely different, so I don’t think there is much autonomy. The HOD is a very bad delegator. I had an exam entry system all worked out, and the HOD did it totally differently and in an ineffective way. At least he's retiring!
Dear

I am undertaking research on course team effectiveness, and I am particularly interested in looking at selection criteria and processes for team membership.

I should therefore be very grateful if you could pass the enclosed questionnaire to a team leader to complete. It should be returned in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope within three weeks of receipt.

Thank you for your help, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

KATE BAKER
QUESTIONNAIRE ON COURSE TEAM MEMBER SELECTION

This questionnaire aims to investigate the methods and criteria used in the selection of course team members in both Further and Adult Education.

A course team is used here to mean a group of staff working together to deliver a specified course or programme. Selection is used here to mean whatever way tutors become team members.

Most of the questions require either a YES/NO answer using a tick in the relevant box. However, a few questions may request additional information, or you may feel you would like to elaborate on your answers.

I should find it very useful if you could supply this information wherever possible, and any other comments relating to your experience of selection methods for course teams.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF RECEIPT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.

* * * * * * * * * *

1. Which of these courses is your team delivering?  
   (please tick one, and answer the questionnaire in respect to that course).

   Access □
   CPVE □
   BTEC □
   YTS □
   Other (please specify)..........................................

2. What is your role within the team?

3. What grade are you?
4. How long has the present team been together?

5. How long has this course been running?

6. How many people are in the team? (Core team if there is also a wider or support team)

7. When was this team chosen?
   - In the summer term before the course started  
   - In the September the course started  
   - Other (please specify) ..........................................

8. How many of the team were recruited through the following?
   - Internal advertisement  
   - External advertisement  
   - Head of Department recommendation  
   - Team member recommendation  
   - College "grapevine"  
   - Volunteering  
   - Other (please specify) ..........................................

9. What criteria were used for the selection of team members? (please tick more than one if applicable)
   - The tutor(s) was low on teaching hours  
   - Commitment to team work  
   - Commitment to the course philosophy  
   - The tutor(s) was a subject specialist  
   - Commitment to an integrated approach to the curriculum  
   - The tutor(s) happened to be available  
   - The tutor(s) matched the current team profile  
   - Other (please specify) ..........................................

10. Are the same criteria applied if a team member leaves mid-year?
    - YES  
    - NO  
    - SOMETIMES
11. If NO, what criteria are used?

12. What do you consider are the main difficulties in selecting and recruiting team members?

13. What is the procedure if a team member proves to be unsuitable?

14. Please give a brief description of what you consider to be a practical, rational and effective method of recruiting course team members?

Thank you for your co-operation.

The time you have taken to complete this questionnaire is very much appreciated.

I would like to help further with this research.

Name................................................
Address.............................................
Tel No.............................................
### DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRE ON SELECTION IN COURSE TEAMS

Total number of respondents = 24

1. COURSES DELIVERED BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.TEC.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPVE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RESPONDENTS ROLE WITHIN THE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course team leaders</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section head/PL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. RESPONDENTS' GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer one</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer two</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. LENGTH OF TIME PRESENT TEAM HAS BEEN TOGETHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under one year</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to four years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to nine years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years or over</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. LENGTH OF TIME THE COURSE HAS BEEN RUNNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under one year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to four years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to nine years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years or over</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN CORE TEAM (if there is also a wider or support team)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five members or under</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten members or under</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen members or under</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over fifteen members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. WHEN WAS THE TEAM CHOSEN?

1) In the summer term before the course started ...................... 12
2) In the September the course started .................................. 4
3) One month before the start date
4) Progressively
5) Various times
6) Halfway through the course - due to resignations
7) Original team chosen term before start date - in theory carefully rechosen each year, but in practice is almost the same because of timetabling and preferences.
8) Across team years - all full-time posts in core team are supplemented by ten part-time tutors.
9) The course was already running when the present team was chosen.
10) A combination of summer term before and September the course started.

8. WAYS IN WHICH MEMBERS WERE RECRUITED TO THE TEAM

(Numbers given do not represent the numbers of respondents or teams, but the numbers of team members within their teams recruited in a particular way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal advertisement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External advertisement</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department recommendation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team member recommendation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leader recommendation</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &quot;grapevine&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER

1. We all volunteered to work together as the most suitable means of achieving our goals.
2. Timetabling constraints.
3. If a vacancy arises then I, as course leader, make a bid for a replacement who I believe to be enthusiastic, motivated to adults.
4. Three members through senior lecturer recommendation (not team member).
5. Through senior lecturer recommendation.
6. Several through team leader recommendation and several through volunteering. One told to do it.
7. Light on timetable.
8. One transferred from another section of the college.
9. Five specialist staff with relevant expertise.

9. CRITERIA USED FOR THE SELECTION OF TEAM MEMBERS
(numbers shown equal numbers of team members chosen by each criteria -more than one
criteria could be used for a team member's selection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor was low on hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to team work</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to course philosophy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor was subject specialist</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to integration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor happened to be available</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor matched the current team profile</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER
1. We all self selected on the basis of commitment to the course philosophy.
2. Any of these criteria may come into play, but the workings of the timetable determined
many changes.
3. Specialist member left post for other job and no full-time staff available - had to get
part-timer.
4. Reputation as excellent teachers.
5. Tutors matched the course profile.
6. Tutor responsible for that area of work and tutor contracted to work in that area
through job description.
7. Looked at what the prospective team member had to offer the team not the
institution.
8. Some staff recruited by course team members.

10. ARE THE SAME CRITERIA APPLIED IF A TEAM MEMBER LEAVES MID-YEAR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS
1) If possible.
2) Never happened.
3) Yes in theory, in practiced availability only.
4) Not in the Authority's present climate.
5) Yes, in terms of availability only.
11. IF NO, WHAT CRITERIA ARE USED?

1) Availability only
2) Whoever is available and is a good teacher
3) Availability - low on hours or able to teach at appropriate times.
4) Anybody under hours, any available part-timer, nothing done at all.
5) Same criteria are applied, only it becomes more desperate - especially tutors low on teaching hours.
6) There is a rationalisation of college/department resources in terms of numbers of teachers timetabled hours, and class contact.

12. WHAT RESPONDENTS SEE AS THE MAIN DIFFICULTIES IN SELECTING AND RECRUITING TEAM MEMBERS

A) Issues concerned with timetabling and availability.
1. The difficulty of timetabling for suitable staff and selecting people not known to the team.
2. Obtaining staff in widely differing areas.
3. The staff are already teaching more than they can take on.
4. The timetabling conflicts with the needs of other courses requiring the same people.
5. Selection is dependent on the uncertainty of staffing generally.
6. Being able to develop appropriate teams when the Head of Department and timetabling requirements take priority - rather than the philosophy.
7. Availability.
8. Finding a short term member to replace someone on maternity leave.
9. As this is an outside funded course and the contract comes at the last minute, the team gets what is left over. This is characteristic of full cost work in the college. The implications of a late contract for staffing are that it is difficult to commit full-time team members if the contract falls so part-timers are used which makes it difficult for teamwork and integration. The solution is averaging, but the union is not keen on this.

B) Issues around experienced members and specialist members.
1. Reliability, getting specialist knowledge and good full-timers who are not already committed.
2. A shortage of well trained, well qualified staff with experience in adult education and who have worked in full-time Access work.
3. Matching the staff available to the specialisms and philosophy of the course.
4. Some inflexibility due to specialism of qualifications and experienced needed.
5. Using staff from more traditional areas e.g. engineering on an integrated course approach - ensuring that the person will fit in with the team.
6. The cost of eternal recruiting in terms of the low salaries for the specialists needed.
C) The effects of course status
7) There are no problems as it is a very popular course to teach on and we have more staff than are needed.
8) The course is seen as low level and not worthy of value.
9) The work is seen in the college as being very low level.

D) Commitment to course and teamwork
10) Need to share same philosophy and abide by team decisions.
11) Finding those committed to the course philosophy.
12) The need to develop a consistent team profile by recruiting appropriate personnel - the course philosophy is not widely understood in the college.
13) A lack of interest.
14) Ensuring that new team members will meet the needs of the team, personally and professionally.

13. WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE IF A TEAM MEMBER PROVES TO BE UNSUITABLE?

Where this was hypothetical
1) Counselling out, but it hasn’t happened yet.
2) Counselling and change
3) Informal support to attempt change - failing that removal.
4) Staff development

Where a member had proved unsuitable
5) They would be moved to a different area of work.
6) A switch with another staff member.
7) Dropped and replaced as soon as possible.
8) They would be offered something else as we are a matrix.
9) No clear procedure, the team leader would liaise with the Head of Department to counsel/remove member.
10) Manipulation and reselection of team member at the end of academic year.
11) No action taken over full-time staff who are unsuitable - more’s the pity.
12) At present this notion would have no bearing on teamwork, only in terms of discipline or poor teaching. Inasmuch as anyone cares, that member would be switched for another.
13) I suppose it would depend on course tutor’s influence.
14) Very difficult - counselled off only if the employer complains (outside funded course).
15) Vast difficulties - staff development and training if eventually hierarchy can be persuaded that they are no good they they get passed on to another team.
16) Has happened - were counselled off.
17) This happened about two years ago and I spoke to the member of staff and he himself realised there was a mismatch as he felt uncomfortable with our style and ethos. If this happened again I would therefore talk to the person and hopefully ask timetablers to take them off the team. I don’t offer them the option.
18) I credit the course tutor with being a slick operator - she's made the odd change without giving offence.
19) Course team evolved strategies for developing unsuitable members to improve the situation and minimising the harmful effects.

14. DESCRIPTIONS OF WHAT THE RESPONDENTS CONSIDERED WAS A PRACTICAL, RATIONAL AND EFFECTIVE METHOD FOR RECRUITING COURSE TEAM MEMBER

1. The Grapevine
   1) The grapevine
   2) The grapevine to provide information about suitability. Then an informal approach by team leader who liaises with the Head of Department to arrange release of team member from conflicting duties.

2. Selection as part of staff development and planning
   3) In an ideal world, present the course to the people in the structure beforehand to allow them to choose rather than be "enlisted". That courses need to be included in departmental staff development for people to make informed choices.
   4) Staff should not chop and change, and tutors should be given the chance to become part of a team through the planning, delivery and evaluation phases of a core.
   5) Part of a staff development exercise.

3. Internal advertising
   6) Advertising the need for teachers within the college - by way of informal memo and date for a meeting for interested teachers. We use this system.

4. Identification of potential members
   7) I am constantly on the look-out for good teachers of the right sort for the team and I keep a record of them and contact them. Also other team members do the same (and students). Having a core and periphery also gives a reservoir to draw from. Having a team with multiple skills and commitment also helps. Flexibility in adapting the course to the real qualities of new teachers as well as vice versa and finding people who fit. Keeping an open mind as to community and higher education requirements and student feedback.

5. Leadership decisions
   8) I suppose if one is to give equal opps. to membership of the team, there should be awareness across the college, but in practice I've decided the needs of the students come first so I've taken a much more leadership decision making role in selection.
   9) What happens is that usually the Head of Department asks the person who has shown an interest in an area to be the team leader and then leaves it to the leader to recruit staff. This is good for cohesion, but often time consuming if no members are suggested - if no appropriate staff are available and no money is available for part-time staff, real worries ensure. The Head of Department tends to rely too much on the leader to sort everything out and to try to negotiate for part-timers to be paid to attend in their own time.
6. Commitment
10) Identify educational philosophy and a willingness to work as a team. Put personal preferences second.
11) Appoint an enthusiastic team/course manager whose responsibility it would be to ensure that the course philosophy was known by all team members. Recruit as many members as possible on the basis of commitment. These members would possibly remain together for three years. Subject specialisation would not necessarily be a priority.
Also make teams and team meetings a priority for timetabling purposes.
12) Identify commitment to client group and to the course philosophy.
13) Commitment to team, to course philosophy and to an integrated approach to the curriculum and volunteer.

7. Team recommendations
14) That the team leader ensures that recommendations for team membership are aware of course philosophy and agree with it.
15) The existing team must have involvement - a team approach is essential.
16) Assuming course share common philosophy, then recommendations of members in discussion in open team meeting - approach to a "new" member (interest and willingness a pre-requisite) - careful and supportive induction. The only was to recruit an effective member for a team is by means of that team.
17) The course team is fully involved in shortlisting candidates for posts in the course team.

8. Flexibility
18) Have requisite skills, work independently with minimum supervision i.e. reliable, trustworthy and competent, willing to take on board new ideas, methods and materials i.e. flexible and creative, enthusiastic and are enjoyable to be with i.e. have a sense of humour.
19) A member of staff in the college is considered to be a college resource and not departmentally bound.

9. Subject specialisms
20) Identify subject specialisms required, identify teaching approaches/teacher personality requirement, identify staff with the appropriate attributes or those who can, within the time limitation, be developed as required, sell the project to the staff identified, facilitate the operation of the team through appropriate timetabling, resourcing, encouragement etc.

10. Identification of volunteers
21) Volunteers who know the subject and who are keen to develop new curricula and committed teamwork.

11. Allocation on the basis of departmental philosophy
22) A clearly thought out department philosophy and policy which aims to meet the needs of the staff and courses. Allocation of staff to courses to be based on this, to be reviewed in the light of individual staff development and whatever
modifications to the course take place. This is a management issue for Heads of Department, the relevant senior lecturer and course team leaders.

12. Recruitment of part-timers
23) By recruiting staff part-time, and giving them experience of teaching a full-time Access course and by advertising in the national press.

13. Advertising in the national press
23) By recruiting staff part-time, and giving them experience of teaching a full-time Access course and by advertising in the national press.

14. Averaging
24) That can average - be able to have part-timers who can also average - the 12 hour rule prevents this. This makes better use of part-timers.

15. Identification of team needs
25) Looking at the needs of the team, and then asking prospective team members to spend some time with the team working in the environment and with the students.

16. Identification of qualifications and experience
26) Relevant vocational qualification, recent experience in the field of vocational expertise, experience of teaching this age group, ability to work as a member of a team.

17. Other
27) Is there one?
28) The main obstacle is that so few staff have any interest in teamwork. In addition, it is well nigh impossible to get staff to read BTEC guidelines.
LIST OF COMMENTS DERIVED FROM INTERVIEWS
FOCUSING ON MEMBERSHIP (See Chapter 7)

1) WHY TUTORS BECAME MEMBERS OF A PARTICULAR TEAM
(Criteria for someone becoming a team member)

Teamwork
1. "At the end of the term the course tutor said, I hope you want to do it. I think that people are chosen on whether they are going to get on with other members and contribute".

Availability
2. "Various people were approached, and as it was so late in the year and having to organise a timetable, it was a case of who could do it. In fact two tutors were on overtime and I did it because I was free because another course I was teaching had folded, but I had a strong feeling that it was lined up for me".
3. "It's allocation through expressed preference or expertise, but it's a bit tricky as there will be some unpopular areas and for unpopular areas people are just timetabled in".
4. "When it first started you just got given a timetable and told what to do by the head of department. The engineering team still do this, but gradually it changed when the head of department changed. The change really came when he lost the timetable he had done".
5. "He was the clearest option in course terms as he had already worked with them. He was light on him timetable and had geography experience".

Recommendation
6. "The co-ordinator has asked me if I know of anyone else I can recommend in communications to fill the slot and who is available".

SKILLS RELEVANT TO THE COURSE
7. "People were actively sought out for this course and every member was selected particularly (Talking about the head of department). He translated all our ideas into looking at staff for YTS modes A and B, placing an emphasis on the young people and on the skills. He didn't want to inherit "excellent" teachers just because they were light on hours. Some tutors wanted to be responsible for Mode B kids where they were responsible for them totally rather than fitting in with a managing agent as in Mode A. So we looked for those with the strengths for Mode B kids who were on a taster programme."

EXPERIENCE
8. "Team leaders were pre-selected and the criteria was that they had had lots of experience, were familiar with the college and were good administrators".
9. "They mostly came through external ads, but they need experience of working with unemployed students".
unemployed students".
10. "Well he was the nearest in expertise. He had industrial and educational experience. As a person, I thought that if the team fell apart he would still deliver as he was personally loyal to me. I chose him because I thought he wanted to do it, but he wasn’t any good".

WANTED TO TEACH ON THE COURSE
11. "People who end up on the team are the people who have always done that work, want to do that work and have some expertise in that sort of work. Only in the last two years has there been an attempt to allocate people to particular areas and keep them there for 3 years. They then develop some expertise and perhaps some recognition".
12. "It’s allocation through expressed preference or expertise."

COMMITMENT TO THE COURSE AND ITS PHILOSOPHY
13. "Basically we were looking for people who could empathise with the course and its philosophy".
14. "Selection will not be formal, but I will choose people who are sympathetic to adult students, keen to teach in a non-directed way and I will select on the basis of what I know about them. I have been here for years, so I know people well and know their ability for different subjects".
15. "They should have minimum levels of commitment and a readiness to work with others and make an effort to share and integrate".

RECOMMENDATION/FRIENDSHIP
16. "The team leader recommended some members as she know them but this led to a lot of problems as people felt they had different status. It also resulted in uneven treatment".
17. "When they produced the submission, the team leader started approaching who he wanted on a friendship basis".

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
18. "I picked someone else with BTEC first experience and wanted to give him BTEC National as staff development. However, he decided he didn’t want it, but offered it to X instead".

APPOINTED TO THE JOB
19. "People although they were actually appointed to teach general studies a few years ago, will say they’ve got no expertise in this area and that they teach ‘A’ level sociology. There’s a flight from some areas".

2) MEMBERSHIP - CONTROL/ THE AMOUNT OF CONTROL

No control
20. "One team member was a student counsellor, and the Principal just pulled her out of the team, but luckily I was able to choose her replacement through my informal networks. This tutor works through groupwork, and as she is black, I was able to play the political game and have her".
21. "For the statistics input there is an ideal person in the maths department, but this department and myself don't see eye to eye over maths servicing so I am given a 'slack'teacher."

22. "I'm the senior lecturer responsible for the co-ordination of the team, it's a bit of a non-job. I couldn't decide who I had, they were imposed on me".

23. "I feel that it would be better to have complete control over selection at the beginning. I've got a tutor now that I had a row with before. I was lent on to have her because of her availability."

24. "I wanted to do communications and I was a bit sulky as I wanted to do this, but the team leader was so very committed that it was an inspiration, so that eventually it seemed like a good idea."

Some control
25. "I get some people I want and some I don't want and I have to take them because of departmental politics."

26. (On member selection) "This will be set out by the steering committee who will look at it, but it is fairly easy to get the people I want. As far as teamwork goes, most people want to work in course teams in different subjects, but there is no time for meetings so there is a low level of integration."

27. "The team leader seems to be able to short circuit and go to the Vice Principal".

Have a lot of control/should have a lot of control
28. "There is a laissez-faire attitude and the new Head of Department has played it quite well, and won't foist things on to people but can be manipulative. Anyone can recommend someone for the team, the trouble is I can't always find a place for them. I am always on the look out and I have a pool of people."

29. "I feel that it would be better to have complete control over selection at the beginning."

30. "You need control over who is in the team as you have got the core and support team and the support team is not committed, only to the department. You really need to sort the different HOD perceptions out. There's either no autonomy or too much. You need a clearly defined structure to the team."

COMMITMENT/LACK OF COMMITMENT FROM MEMBERS

Lack of commitment
31. "The personalities of members, enthusiasm and the commitment of the leader, I feel that this sets the tone, although I must say there is no hanger on who is not so committed. However because of the leadership and the general professionalism of other members she is shamed into working."

32. "One tutor had to be removed as she was not up to it. Her heart wasn't in it. There was a meeting at which her Head of Department spoke up for her and said that she couldn't work any longer in that particular teaching room, but the students had complained about her and I think she left by mutual agreement. She certainly would never have volunteered for the course."

33. "Another male tutor was very anti the idea of the course. He was a very embittered old hand who had had no promotion - he just refused to find work experience for the course."
34. "There is one member I would have preferred not to work with, but he was timetabled for it and this is one of the constraints."
35. "I can get rid of bad people quite quickly as they are part-time. By and large I don’t have the problem as I get them to teach what they are actually interested in."
36. "The team leader made it obvious that he wanted him to go. He didn’t like being moved, I think it lowered his self esteem. He didn’t try to be part of the team and he didn’t tell anyone what he was doing. He left at the end of term."
37. "We managed to change someone for someone better without causing offence. The Head of Department was not obstructive. It was a change to good effect, she was reliable and committed."

Commitment
38. "I feel that this amount of time (on planning) and the selection of the team made them a team with a lot of shared understandings and they were very supportive. For example one tutor volunteered to help a tutor in a difficult class and arranged the timetable to do so."
39. (Your team has been together for five years, they must be very committed? ). "It is not so much that as the fact that there is nowhere else to go. It is a good thing for the course, but people do get stale so I do try to change things."
EXTRACTS FROM AN INTERVIEW WITH TEAM MEMBER OF AN EXTERNALLY FUNDED COURSE AT Y COLLEGE

INT. = Interviewer
L. = Team member

INT: Can you tell me who's in the team?

L: Well membership can vary each year, but in actual fact it has stayed more or less the same. The problem is that this course is timetabled last for full timers.

INT: Why?

L: Because I think that it has a low priority. 16 - 19 work has always been considered more important before - adult work has not been seen as so important, but now it is more important because of falling 16 -19 numbers.

INT: Who is currently in the team?

L: A full-time computer lecturer one who does three hours, a 0.5 tutor for science, a 0.5 communications tutor, myself, and a maths. lecturer. I teach half a day and there is also a careers lecturer.

INT: How was the team chosen?

L: Well there were rows to start with over who would run it. The then Head of Department wanted a particular part-time tutor, but as the lecturer one Careers with the most experience I wanted to have that responsibility, so I pulled out and then was given the responsibility to set the course up. However the part-time tutor is still seen as the course tutor, as she was the first there and was time-tabled first and does the first slot on the timetable. Now with the arrival of Employment Training, which I am heavily involved in, the part-time tutor is tutor for Restart and takes the responsibility and I only do a half day a week. The other tutors also do more on Open Access and I take responsibility for the adult literacy.

INT: Can we just go back to how the members were actually chosen for the team?

L: The science tutor was an external appointment for MSC work, but was taken off this by his Head of Department, and this caused a lot of anger in the team as he was creamed off for other departments. The SL asked me to set the course up originally as I was the careers person and it was felt that it should be a careers orientated course with lots of group work. Then an ad. was put in the paper and people were interviewed. Two turned up and I was allowed to say what I felt was needed in the way of people. The SL chose the 0.5 lecturer because he thought she would want
the work. He also thought she was all right personality-wise. After a few months it was realised that the students needed more computing. Unfortunately the computing tutor is now on overtime and there's been a different computing tutor for the last three years, this is something to do with the timetabling - it was whoever was free - the team didn’t get to choose.

INT: What if these people turned out not to be suitable?

L: Well I could have been prepared to say if I thought someone was not suitable. I tended to paint a very bleak picture of the course in order to put people off so that we would get the right people. As far as the main part-time tutor went, the HOD through the deputy chose him as he thought he would be great, but he didn't have the right experience. He had had similar experiences to the students, but was not all that good with groups. In the end we had to compromise with the HOD and whittle down his timetable and give him what we thought he could cope with and he did well. I chose the other part-time tutor and although the HOD didn't like me as an lecturer one making the choice, he agreed that she was very good.

INT: Can I ask how often you meet as a team?

L: At first there were weekly meetings for about a month, that was when there was only four people involved, myself, the senior lecturer in charge overall, the 0.5 and the part-time tutor. We met in the lunchtimes, but since then we only meet if there is a crisis and have only met once and that was in a lunchtime. The part-time tutors come in their own time and are not paid. Six people come: three part-timers, the 0.5, the senior lecturer and myself. Otherwise we discuss the students informally in the staffroom. I don't feel this is right, but it is the way we pass the information on through the week. It has now been agreed that there should be two hours admin. for the course tutor, but as it is said that the course is not making any money there are still no paid meeting times. The MSC has never been asked for any money for meeting time and it is expensive to have meetings.

INT: Do you feel you make a team?

L: Well it is a team in the sense that four of us are a team and make a core, but one of the part-time tutors is in and out and we never see the computer guy of the lecturer for science - only at the dinner table. We are a core team because we always talking about our students and the careers part is the binding bit and we are also in the same room. I think this is the prime factor.

INT: I understand you are also in the CPVE team, how does membership of this team compare with your membership of the CPVE team?

L: We do have weekly timetabled in meetings. This course is not a whole year’s programme like CPVE, as it is repeated, but it does need more pastoral work for both tutors and students and so it would be good to have meetings regularly. The CPVE team was very supportive in the first year and together we created a work
experience booklet. The core team was to meet about integration, but somehow integration didn’t happen. We did our own thing as it was not happening properly. We tried to integrate, but the team didn’t fancy the idea of teaching other subjects and retreated into their own subject area. It got so theory based that people were doing everything and not doing anything properly - the students respond better to subject based classes. Our meetings are now mainly administration.

INT: How do you feel about this team at the moment?

L: Well. I like to keep my slot on the course. We are under tremendous pressure and have no time off for part-timers to join in. It has been arranged finally that the team takes turns in doing the Monday slot and the course tutor will be taking over the timetabling. We are still given subject tutors by the various departments, but the SL will only accept them the first time round and not keep them for the second time if they do not fit in. On all the new courses we now tell the tutors that we will review their work to see if they can stay or not and one has actually been taken off. Last summer one part-time member said that teaching on the course was "dead easy". He has asked for work on it since, but the team members were so hurt by his comments that he has not been taken on again. It was felt that he didn’t support the team and although it is not a real team, they did rally round to block him out.
Dear

I am undertaking research for a doctorate on course teams in Further Education.

It has been suggested that teamwork should be an integral part of courses such as BTEC, CPVE etc., but obviously, in practice difficulties arise. The focus of this research therefore, will be on how teams can be helped to be more effective through an evaluation of tutor attitudes to teamwork.

I should be extremely grateful if one of your teams was willing to help in this research by completing the enclosed questionnaires. There is one for the course team leader, and four others to be completed by team members chosen by the course team leader to be representative of the team. In addition, these will be followed up by a staff development workshop on attitudes to teamwork, and if the team would like to participate in this exercise, I should be extremely pleased to work with them.

Please note that the questionnaire is designed to take only ten minutes to complete, and that the information will be treated in the strictest confidence. I should be very grateful if the questionnaires could be given to each person with a replied paid envelope, so that they can return them directly to me within three weeks of receipt.

Thank you for your help, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

KATE BAKER
Dear

I recently sent a set of questionnaires concerning staff development and course teams in Further Education.

I should be very grateful if any outstanding questionnaires could be returned within the next ten days to ensure they are included in the project.

Teams interested in participating in the staff development workshop previously outlined, should contact me as soon as possible at the above address.

Thank you for your help and co-operation.

Yours faithfully

KATE BAKER
Ms C. Baker  
Researcher  
Dept. of Educational Studies  
Block AA  
University of Surrey  
GUILDFORD  
Surrey GU2 5XH

Dear Ms Baker

Thank you for the letter addressed to Mr Ball in which you ask our co-operation in developing research into the area of course teams in further education.

This is a subject which is of strategic importance to us and we are most interested in it as a project, but we feel that we are at too early a stage of development to be of much use to you, and I am therefore returning the material.

However, we would be most interested to hear of any outcomes of your research in due course.

Yours sincerely

R.A. MOORE  
Assistant Principal  
Staff & Student Services

Enc.
NOTES FOR RESPONDENTS

This questionnaire is designed to take approximately ten minutes to complete.

Most of the questions only require a tick in the relevant box(es). However a few questions may request additional information, or you may feel you would like to elaborate on your answers. It would be very useful if you could supply this information wherever possible, and any other comments relating to your experience of teamwork.

Please check you have answered all the questions.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF RECEIPT.

Any queries or comments about the questionnaire should be addressed to Kate Baker, Educational Studies Department, Surrey University, Guildford, Surrey.

PLEASE NOTE

A team is used here to mean a group of staff working together to deliver a specified course or programme.

TEAM MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer in respect of one team.

Please tick the appropriate box(es).

1. What course does your team deliver?
   1. Access ☐
   2. CPVE ☐
   3. BTec ☐
   4. YTS ☐
   5. TVEI ☐
   6. Return to study ☐
   7. Other (please specify) ..............................................

2. How many members in the core team (if applicable)?
(Please note - core team here means those members of the team teaching core/compulsory subjects only).

3. How many members in the support team (if applicable)?

4. Is this an integrated course?
   1. YES ☐
   2. PARTIALLY ☐
   3. NO ☐
5. What is your role within the team?

1. Team member (core team) ☐
2. Team member (support team) ☐
3. Other (please specify) ...........................................

6. Approximately how many hours each week do you teach on the course?

.................................................................

7. What do you teach on the course?

.................................................................

8. What grade are you?

1. Part-time ☐
2. Lecturer ☐
3. Senior Lecturer ☐
4. Principal Lecturer ☐
5. Head of Department ☐
6. Other (please specify) ...........................................

.................................................................

9. How long have you been in the team?

.................................................................

10. How strongly did you feel about joining the team?

1. Joined eagerly ☐
2. Joined fairly eagerly ☐
3. Didn't mind ☐
4. Didn't really want to join ☐
5. Compelled against my will to join ☐

11. What do you see as positive aspects of joining the team?
(Only answer this question if you replied 1, 2, or 3 of question 10).

1. Committed to course philosophy ☐
2. Short on teaching hours ☐
3. Enjoy working in a team ☐
4. It was a convenient time-table slot ☐
5. Committed to an integrated approach ☐
6. Other (please specify) ...........................................

.................................................................

12. If you answered 4 or 5 to question 10, what reservations did you have about joining the team?

1. Do not like working in a team ☐
2. Do not like course philosophy ☐
3. Do not like an integrated approach ☐
4. Do not like this particular team ☐
5. Other (please specify) ...........................................

.................................................................

13. Do you still want to be a member of the team?

1. Definitely yes ☐
2. Definitely no ☐
3. Uncertain ☐
4. Probably not ☐
5. Definitely not ☐
14. How did you become a member of the team?
1. Volunteered □
2. Asked by team leader □
3. Asked by team member □
4. Time-tabled in by HOD □
5. Appointed directly to the team □
6. Other (please specify) ........................................

15. How much does the team (as a group) participate in the selection of team members?
1. In every case □
2. In most cases □
3. Occasionally □
4. Very occasionally □
5. Never □

16. How much have you personally participated in the selection of team members?
1. In every case □
2. In most cases □
3. Occasionally □
4. Very occasionally □
5. Never □

17. How much do you feel the team should participate in team member selection?
1. In every case □
2. In most cases □
3. Occasionally □
4. Very occasionally □
5. Never □

18. If you feel that the team should have at least some degree of participation, why do you feel this?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

19. How often does the team meet formally?
1. Once a week □
2. Once a fortnight □
3. Once a month □
4. Once a term □
5. Once a year □
6. Other (please specify) ........................................

20. How often do you think the team should meet?
1. At least once a week □
2. At least once a fortnight □
3. At least once a month □
4. At least once a term □
5. At least twice a term □
6. At least once a year □

21. Do you get remission for attending team meetings?
1. YES □
2. NO □
3. SOMETIMES □
22. How often do you meet other team members informally?
1. Regularly □
2. Fairly regularly □
3. Occasionally □
4. Very occasionally □
5. Hardly ever □

23. How worthwhile do you feel it is for the team to meet?
1. Vital □
2. Very worthwhile □
3. Worthwhile □
4. Not worthwhile □
5. Waste of time □

24. How willing are you to spend time meeting the team?
1. Very willing □
2. Willing □
3. Prepared to go □
4. Unwilling □
5. Very unwilling □

25. How much do you enjoy being a member of this team?
1. Love it □
2. Quite like it □
3. Don't mind it □
4. Dislike it □
5. Detest it □

26. How much do you feel part of the team?
1. Completely □
2. Almost completely □
3. Partially □
4. Hardly at all □
5. Not at all □

27. How committed are you to the idea of teamwork?
1. Totally □
2. Almost totally □
3. Partly □
4. Not very much □
5. Not at all □

28. How much common philosophy do you feel is needed to work as a team?
1. A lot □
2. A considerable amount □
3. Some □
4. Not much □
5. None □

29. How effective do you feel your team is in working together?
1. Very effective □
2. Fairly effective □
3. Quite effective □
4. Not very effective □
5. Not at all effective □

30. How much do you feel the team's leadership affects the team's effectiveness?
1. Totally □
2. A lot □
3. A certain amount □
4. Hardly at all □
5. Not at all □

31. How much do you feel the Head of Department/Head of Faculty/Vice Principal affect the team's effectiveness?
1. Not at all □
2. Hardly at all □
3. A certain amount □
4. A lot □
5. Totally □
32. Do you feel this course benefits from having a team to deliver it?

1. YES  □
2. NO   □
3. NOT SURE □

33. If YES to question 32, how does it benefit? Please give a brief description.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

34. If NO, please elaborate on your reasons.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

35. Which of the following describes your team?

1. It shares objectives □
2. It does not work well together □
3. Assignments are integrated □
4. Members are not supportive of each other □
5. It does not take decisions together □
6. All members attend team meetings regularly □
7. It does not take collective responsibility for the course □
8. Other (please add any description you feel appropriate)........

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

36. Have you been involved in any staff development for teamwork?

1. YES  □
2. NO   □

37. If YES, what areas were covered?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

38. How many other teams do you belong to?

........................................................................................................................................

39. How many of these did you want to be a member of?

........................................................................................................................................

40. Please list what you see as being the benefits of being in a team.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
41. What do you see as the difficulties of being in a team?


THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

I am willing/unwilling to help with this research.

Name  
Address  

NOTES FOR RESPONDENTS

This questionnaire is designed to take approximately ten minutes to complete.

Most of the questions only require a tick in the relevant box(es). However a few questions may request additional information, or you may feel you would like to elaborate on your answers. It would be very useful if you could supply this information wherever possible, and any other comments relating to your experience of teamwork.

Please check you have answered all the questions.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF RECEIPT.

Any queries or comments about the questionnaire should be addressed to Kate Baker, Educational Studies Department, Surrey University, Guildford, Surrey.

PLEASE NOTE

A team is used here to mean a group of staff working together to deliver a specified course or programme.
5. What do you teach on the course?

6. Approximately how many hours each week do you teach on the course?

7. What grade are you?

1. Part-time
2. Lecturer
3. Senior Lecturer
4. Principal Lecturer
5. Head of Department
6. Other (please specify)

8. How long have you been course team leader?

9. How strongly did you feel about being course team leader?

10. What do you see as positive aspects of being team leader?
    (Only answer this question if you replied 1, 2 or 3 to question 10.

    1. Committed to course philosophy
    2. Enjoy leading others
    3. Time-table short on hours
    4. Committed to an integrated approach
    5. Enjoy team work
    6. Time-tableing was convenient
    7. Wanted to broaden experience
    8. Other (please specify)

11. If you answered 4 or 5 to question 10, what do you see as the negative aspects of being team leader?

    1. Do not like leading people
    2. Do not like this particular team
    3. Do not like an integrated approach
    4. Do not like course philosophy
    5. Do not like working in a team
    6. Do not want the responsibility
    7. Other (please specify)

12. Are you still eager to be course team leader?

    1. Definitely yes
    2. Definitely no
    3. Uncertain
    4. Probably not
    5. Definitely not
13. How did you become course team leader?

1. Volunteered  
2. Asked by team members  
3. Asked by Head of Department  
4. Asked by Vice Principal  
5. Appointed directly to the team  
6. Other (please specify)  


14. How much did you participate in the selection of team members?

1. In every case  
2. In most cases  
3. Occasionally  
4. Very occasionally  
5. Never  


15. How many of the current team (core and support) were chosen by you?


16. How many of the current team were allocated to the team, rather than chose to be in it?


17. How much can you participate in the selection of new members of the team?

1. In every case  
2. In most cases  
3. Occasionally  
4. Very occasionally  
5. Never  


18. How much participation do you think you should have in team member selection?

1. In every case  
2. In most cases  
3. Occasionally  
4. Very occasionally  
5. Never  

19. If you feel that the team leader should have at least some degree of participation, why do you feel this?


20. What criteria are used for the selection/allocation of new team members?

1. Commitment to teamwork  
2. Members are subject specialists  
3. Commitment to an integrated approach  
4. Happened to be available  
5. Low on teaching hours  
6. Commitment to course philosophy  
7. Matches current team profile  
8. Other (please specify)  


21. What do you consider are the main difficulties in selecting/allocation team members?


22. How worthwhile do you feel it is for the team to meet?

1. Vital
2. Very worthwhile
3. Worthwhile
4. Not worthwhile
5. Waste of time

23. How often do you meet team members informally?

1. Regularly
2. Fairly regularly
3. Occasionally
4. Very occasionally
5. Hardly ever

24. How willing are you to spend time meeting the team?

1. Very willing
2. Willing
3. Prepared to meet them
4. Unwilling
5. Very unwilling

25. How much do you enjoy being team leader?

1. Love it
2. Quite like it
3. Don't mind it
4. Dislike it
5. Detest it

26. How much do you feel part of the team?

1. Completely
2. Almost completely
3. Partially
4. Hardly at all
5. Not at all

27. How committed are you to the idea of teamwork?

1. Totally
2. Almost totally
3. Partly
4. Not very much
5. Not at all

28. How much common philosophy do you feel is needed to work as a team?

1. A lot
2. A considerable amount
3. Some
4. Not much
5. None

29. How effective do you feel your team is in working together?

1. Very effective
2. Fairly effective
3. Quite effective
4. Not very effective
5. Not at all effective

30. How much do you feel leadership affects the team's effectiveness?

1. Totally
2. A lot
3. A certain amount
4. Hardly at all
5. Not at all

31. How much do you feel the Head of Department/Head of Faculty/Vice Principal affect the team's effectiveness?

1. Not at all
2. Hardly at all
3. A certain amount
4. A lot
5. Totally
32. Do you feel this course benefits from having a team to deliver it?

1. YES
2. NO
3. NOT SURE

33. If YES to question 32, how does it benefit? Please give a brief description.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

34. If NO, please elaborate on your reasons.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

35. Which of the following describes your team?

1. It shares objectives mostly
2. It does not work well together
3. Assignments are integrated
4. Members are not supportive of each other
5. It does not take decisions together
6. All members attend team meetings regularly
7. It does not take collective responsibility for the course
8. Other (please add any description you feel appropriate)...........

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

36. Have you been involved in any staff development for teamwork?

1. YES
2. NO

37. If YES, what areas were covered?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

38. Do you lead any other course teams?

1. YES
2. NO

39. How many other teams do you belong to?

........................................................................................................................................

40. How many of these did you want to be a member of?

........................................................................................................................................

41. Please list what you see as being the benefits of being in a team.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
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42. What do you see as the difficulties of being in a team?

........................................................................
........................................................................
........................................................................

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

I am willing/unwilling to help with this research.

Name  ..................................................................

Address  ..................................................................
..................................................................
..................................................................
..................................................................
DATA FROM FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE 3 ON TEAMWORK ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. COURSES DELIVERED BY THE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Team member</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER
1. City and Guilds.
2. City and Guilds.
3. Special needs link courses.
4. Skills for life courses.

2. SIZE OF THE CORE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Team member</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. SIZE OF THE SUPPORT TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Team member</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. IS THE COURSE INTEGRATED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Team member</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Categories of Data | Team member response | Course tutor/leader

5. RESPONDENT'S ROLE WITHIN THE TEAM (team members)
Team member (core team) 56
Team member (support team) 8
Total 64

6. HOURS PER WEEK TEACHING ON THE COURSE
1-5 25 3
6-8 14 4
9-10 7 2
11-15 7 3
16-21 7 4
Total 60 16

7. WHAT IS TAUGHT ON THE COURSE (team members and leaders)
1. Information Processing / People and Organisation
2. Planning & Control / Role of the Manager
3. Sociology / Social Policy and Administration
4. Beauty Therapy
5. Banking and Investment
6. Communication / Social and Environmental Studies
7. Nutrition, Diet and Biochemistry of Food
8. B. Tec and City and Guilds Practical
9. Physics
10. English Literature
11. The Organisation in its Environment
12. Computer Programming
13. Multiskills, Science, Safety
14. People in Organisations
15. Economics / Marketing
16. Business Studies
17. Child Development / Special Needs / Learning Activities
18. Manufacturing Technology and Material
19. Physical World and Environmental Studies (=Geography!)
20. Technical and General Drawing / Colour / 3D work
21. Television Production
22. Industrial relations
23. Photography.
24. Finance / Travel and Tourism
25. Politics / Study Skills
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. GRADE OF RESPONDENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER**
1. Associate lecturers

**9. LENGTH OF TIME ON THE TEAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10. RESPONDENT’S EAGERNESS TO JOIN THE TEAM/BECOME LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eagerness</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very eager</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly eager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t mind</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t really want to join</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. POSITIVE ASPECTS OF JOINING THE TEAM/BEING LEADER**
(respondents could reply more than once)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed to course philosophy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy working in a team</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy leading others (leaders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short on hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to integration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabling was convenient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to broaden experience (leaders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER**
1. An interesting course.
2. I enjoy teaching on caring courses at this level.
3. Other peoples’ skills can be integrated.
4. The expansion of the department’s provision, also responding to the needs of 16-19 year olds, and devising a new and unique course.
5. I like the theory of integration. Practice is another matter!
6. It’s a challenge

12. RESERVATIONS ABOUT WORKING IN A TEAM/BEING TEAM LEADER
(respondents could give more than one reason)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like working in a team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like course philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like an integrated approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like this particular team</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not like leading people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want the responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Members:-
1. Lack of time for meetings/ general administrative duties.
2. Lack of time.
   Leaders:-
3. It’s very hard work
4. Administration
5. The paperwork
6. Trying to get everyone together

13. WANT TO CONTINUE AS A TEAM MEMBER/TEAM LEADER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. MEANS OF BECOMING A TEAM MEMBER/LEADER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volunteered</th>
<th>Asked by team leader</th>
<th>Asked by head of Dept</th>
<th>Asked by team member</th>
<th>Timetabled by H.o.D</th>
<th>Appointed directly to team</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
OTHER/ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
1. Through my teaching commitment.
2. I helped create the course
3. It is part of the course co-ordinator's responsibility
4. The obvious person - subject area set it off.
5. Assumed by all as I was in from the start.
6. Asked by BTEC co-ordinator.
7. Asked by Vice-Principal

QUESTIONS ON SELECTION ISSUES FOR MEMBER RESPONDENTS

15. HOW MUCH DOES THE TEAM PARTICIPATE IN SELECTING TEAM MEMBERS?
   In every case 3
   In most cases 6
   Occasionally 17
   Very occasionally 12
   Never 23
   Total 61

16. HOW MUCH DO RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATE IN SELECTING TEAM MEMBERS?
   In every case 3
   In most cases 10
   Occasionally 11
   Very occasionally 6
   Never 34
   Total 64

17. HOW MUCH SHOULD THE TEAM PARTICIPATE IN SELECTING NEW MEMBERS?
   In every case 16
   In most cases 20
   Occasionally 20
   Very occasionally 2
   Never 3
   Total 61

18. WHY SHOULD THE TEAM PARTICIPATE IN TEAM MEMBER SELECTION?

   Continuity and integration
   1. It would help to keep continuity within the team.
   2. In order to integrate fully.
   3. One cannot expect a high degree of integration/co-operation otherwise.
   4. The team members had to work well together to deliver an integrated course.
Team spirit and cohesion
5. A team is strengthened by mutual respect, and a wish to work together.
6. The 'team' should mean the group as a whole having their views put forward for discussion, and therefore any decisions made.
7. There is a need to be able to work together, otherwise the students feel that that the course has no coherent philosophy.
8. Because they all have to work together, and should know/like/agree with each other to some extent.
9. To build the team spirit.
10. Because there is a need to work as a willing team.
11. The success is dependent on "team work".
12. It is important that there is complete goal congruence.
13. Team cohesion, motivation and commitment.
14. It is very important that the team can work together.
15. If you are working on courses that are inter-related, then there must also be co-operation and participation.
16. Because it is democratic(teamwork)
17. Collaboration leads to co-operation.
18. It makes for a greater degree of cohesion and efficiency within the group. A better change of team members co-operating.
19. More views means the best can be obtained.
20. Confidence in support of design making policies etc.
21. Makes a better team.
22. Is it a team otherwise?
23. To pool resources.
24. Because it maintains the team's sense of identity.

The need to select suitable members who are committed and fit in with the team profile
25. Experience! Unsuitable appointments have been apparent from the start, and could have been avoided if there had been team involvement.
26. It creates a balance of expertise and personality.
27. Because the new member should fit in, and therefore should have a chance to meet and be met by other members before joining.
28. Because sometimes only certain people can fit into a team.
29. The team will work as a better unit if members get on well together.
30. We are conscripts who have to produce the goods. Committed volunteers and real management by the team would be great. (But democracy in Education? Don't be silly!!).
31. Because staff "chemistry" is important.
32. Because the philosophical underpinning of the course depends upon a fully collective teaching strategy.
33. In order to recruit staff that can benefit the team.
34. It can be a disaster if you end up working with someone who doesn't fit or doesn't pull their weight properly.
35. The avoidance of personality clashes and severe conflict of ideas.
36. It is important to work well together and have the right mix of personalities.
37. To exclude lecturers who show clearly they do not want to teach on the course.
38. Helps generate identification with teams, and it's easier to work with people you wanted!
39. Teams that function well usually involve staff who are happy working together.
40. Team members often know best what skills/specialisms/personality types are required to balance the team.
41. To ensure lecturers are committed to the team.

QUESTIONS ON SELECTION ISSUES FOR TEAM LEADERS
(Questions 14 - 21 in leader questionnaire)

HOW MUCH DID LEADERS PARTICIPATE IN MEMBER SELECTION?
1. In every case 2
2. In most cases 3
3. Occasionally 4
4. Very occasionally 2
5. Never 2
Total 16

HOW MANY OF THE CURRENT TEAM (CORE AND SUPPORT) WERE CHOSEN BY THE LEADER?
1. None 6
2. 1 - 3 4
3. 4 - 5 3
4. All (with HOD) 3
Total 16

HOW MANY OF THE CURRENT TEAM WERE ALLOCATED TO THE TEAM RATHER THAN CHOSE TO BE IN IT?
1. None 4
2. 1 - 4 2
3. 5 - 10 5
4. All the team 5
Total 16

HOW MUCH CAN THE LEADER PARTICIPATE IN THE SELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS?
1. In every case 1
2. In most cases 4
3. Occasionally 7
4. Very occasionally 4
5. Never 8
Total 16
HOW MUCH DOES THE LEADER THINK THEY SHOULD PARTICIPATE?

1. In every case 8
2. In most cases 7
3. Occasionally 1
4. Very occasionally 0
5. Never 0
Total 16

WHY DO LEADERS FEEL THEY SHOULD HAVE A DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION?

Importance of integration
1. The course is highly integrated and can be ruined by the poor performance of one member.

Commitment/team profile
2. Select appropriate and committed staff.
3. I’m aware of the existing team and new members have to work with them. I also know the work and commitment involved for team members.
4. Because as leader I represent the views of the team and I know who is likely to fit in with existing members.
5. Because it is very important that new team members have support of the team and I want people who are committed to BTEC.
6. Because I would prefer to be sure that team members were fully committed to the philosophy of the course.
7. Some lecturers are anti the BTEC philosophy and therefore difficult to enthuse.
8. Important to ensure quality and commitment of staff and to find someone you can work with.
9. In consultation with the rest of team one should know whether proposed new member will fit in, wider experience of specialist areas contained within team will help with this assessment.
10) Because it makes the working with the team easier if you have committed people on it. You have to work with them!
11) Experience of BTEC, quality and temperament of staff all need discussion.

Leader accountability
12. Because as leader I am accountable for the course and its students
13. As team members all lecture on the course I co-ordinate, I feel I should have some participation in the selection of teaching staff.

Team effectiveness
14. Because the importance of actually forming a team is an essential and important dynamic influencing future effectiveness of that team.
15. Weak links in the team is reflected in the course in general.
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WHAT CRITERIA ARE USED FOR SELECTION/ALLOCATION OF MEMBERS?
(respondents could give more than one answer)
1. Commitment to teamwork 4
2. Members are subject specialists 16
3. Commitment to integration 4
4. Happened to be available 9
5. Low on teaching hours 8
6. Commitment to course philosophy 4
7. Matched current team profile 4
8. Other 0
Total 49

WHAT LEADERS CONSIDER AS THE MAIN DIFFICULTIES IN THE
SELECTION/ALLOCATION OF TEAM MEMBERS

Timetabling constraints/lack of suitable members
1. Resource constraints - members teach on other courses too, this has advantages but good lecturers tend to be in demand.
2. Being a small college all staff recruited to the section tend to end up being a team member.
3. Constraints imposed by such demands as people being low on hours and generally off loaded into positions they are not necessarily suited to.
4. Matching timetable needs of individuals to course as a whole.
5. Timetable constraints i.e. teaching on other courses -
6. Other constraints and teaching commitments.
7. Reconciling timetabling pressures with appropriate staff.
8. Availability.
9. Subjects that people teach are demanded by several areas and there is competition for those teachers with appropriate areas of interest.
10. Matching up specialisms with commitment with time available.
11. Recruiting specialist staff.
12. Difficulty if no previous knowledge of candidate.

Part-time staff
13. Part-time team members have difficulty in attending meetings, tend to work in isolation.
Part-time staff can also cause a few problems.

19. HOW OFTEN DOES THE TEAM MEET FORMALLY? (members response only)
Weekly 9
Fortnightly 3
Monthly 27
Termly 15
Yearly 2
Other 6
Total 62
OTHER
1. Less than once a year.
2. Twice a term.
3. Twice per term.

20. HOW OFTEN SHOULD THE TEAM MEET (members' response only)
Weekly 11
Fortnightly 8
Monthly 29
Termly 8
Twice termly 6
Yearly 1
Total 63

21. DOES TEAM MEMBER RESPONDENT GET REMISSION FOR TEAM MEETINGS?
Yes 10
No 51
Sometimes 2
Total 63

22. HOW OFTEN RESPONDENT MEETS OTHER TEAM MEMBERS INFORMALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly regularly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. HOW WORTHWHILE IS IT FOR THE TEAM TO MEET INFORMALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vital</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very worthwhile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not worthwhile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A waste of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of Data</td>
<td>Team member response</td>
<td>Course tutor/leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. RESPONDENTS' WILLINGNESS TO MEET TEAM MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very willing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared to go</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unwilling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. RESPONDENT'S ENJOYMENT IN BEING A TEAM MEMBER/LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love it</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite like it</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't mind it</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike it</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detest it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. HOW MUCH RESPONDENT FEELS PART OF THE TEAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost completely</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. RESPONDENT'S COMMITMENT TO THE IDEA OF TEAMWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost totally</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. HOW MUCH IS A COMMON PHILOSOPHY NEEDED TO WORK AS A TEAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A considerable amount</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. HOW EFFECTIVE IS IN THE TEAM IN WORKING TOGETHER?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. HOW MUCH DOES TEAM LEADERSHIP AFFECT THE TEAM'S EFFECTIVENESS?

| Not at all | 0 | 0 |
| Hardly at all | 1 | 0 |
| A certain amount | 8 | 5 |
| A lot | 41 | 10 |
| Totally | 14 | 1 |
| Total | 64 | 16 |

31. HOW MUCH DOES HOD/HEAD OF FACULTY/VICE PRINCIPAL AFFECT THE TEAM'S EFFECTIVENESS

| Not at all | 17 | 3 |
| Hardly at all | 14 | 6 |
| Certain amount | 21 | 5 |
| A lot | 11 | 2 |
| Totally | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 64 | 16 |

32. DOES THE COURSE BENEFIT FROM HAVING A TEAM DELIVER IT

| Yes | 60 | 15 |
| No | 0 | 0 |
| Not sure | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 64 |

33. IF YES, HOW DOES IT BENEFIT

Variety of skills and specialisms
1. Different areas of work are taught by specialists.
2. A range of people bring a number of different skills and perspectives to students.
3. To give a broader spectrum of each subject area to the students.
4. It provides a range of teaching skills committed to a common purpose.
5. It provides more specialist knowledge.
6. The team represents a variety of backgrounds, expertise and differing personalities.

7. It benefits from a variety of approaches, interpretations, personalities and talents. This has its dangers if the members of the team do not know what the others are doing.

8. You experience a variety of teaching techniques and viewpoints.

9. Specialisms covered within the course structure by individual's tutors.

10. The benefit of specialists able to contribute to input, the possibility of integration.

Integration

11. It ensures the course is integrated. Lecturers know what other people can deliver, and can adjust their input accordingly.

12. It gives it an integrated approach, and helps keep track of the student's progress.

13. It helps towards an integrated approach.

14. Integration of learning experiences is possible. People learn from each other's experiences with the student.

15. Improved continuity and integration

16. Improved integration

17. Because the course is inherently broad in it's range, everyone has to communicate and integrate, also it benefits from students monitoring and feedback. The quality and range of assignments benefit from team input.

18. In order to achieve an integrated course.

19. Improved integration

20. It provides the integration absent from the course material.


22. Integration without a team is impossible.

23. More integrated. The best or better solutions to problems are found. Continual improvement.


25. Good integrated assignments which are both good learning vehicles for assessment have been developed - more realistic, more thought provoking, if done properly - skills more applicable to jobs - won't work well if unit lecturers are not co-ordinating input.

26. We bounce ideas of each other and all help with integrated assignments.

Mutual support and sharing

27. Members help each other with course progress.

28. It is a shared experience with individual students.

29. People teaching a course for the first time can give mutual support, and help one another with the evaluation of the course.

30. We bounce ideas off each other, and all help with integrated assignments.

31. The team shares problems and ideas.

32. It creates a common awareness of team members' problems.

33. We all contribute to improving course work and assignments, with many fresh ideas and approaches.

34. We share ideas and work out a plan for team teaching.

35. A team is much more dynamic and supportive. "Two heads are better than one".

36. Problems can be discussed from several viewpoints. A fuller picture of the abilities of each student is gained.
37. Diversification and division of labour

38. You are able to share ideas - discuss progress of students- derive support should it be needed when tackling recalcitrant students.

39. The sharing of ideas for coursework and assignments.

40. The pooling of ideas.

**Coherence and co-ordination**

41. We produce a common policy on discipline and other problems.

42. You create a co-ordinated and planned course, with multi expertise built in.

43. Agreeing common objectives.

44. You know what other people area doing. You are all moving in the same direction, and interpreting the same work.

45. Common philosophy, united front, integrated activities and teaching.

46. It creates a coherent philosophy and a commitment by those teaching.

47. The integration of goals.

48. Co-ordination, presenting ourselves as a unit. Students see us as a team.

49. There are more co-ordinated assessments issued at staggered intervals, with not too much overlap.

50. Better control and overall continuity.

51. Coherence; a variety of specialisms, approaches and modes of delivery.

52. Students needs are better understood. It is necessary to co-ordinate marks for examination boards.

53. We at least attempt, albeit unsuccessfully, to have a united approach.

54. A united approach to student development and problems.

55. Any team is an amalgam of individual strengths. To amalgamate they must of necessity share essential common characteristics. These values will be imparted to students from successful team approaches.

56. Working towards the same goal.

A good leader, a common approach, a common commitment.

57. It improves continuity and relates our activity.

**More effective course**

58. Team effort means an effective delivery to the students.

59. Better results/courses.

34. IF NO, PLEASE ELABORATE ON YOUR REASONS.

No responses.
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35. RESPONDENT'S DESCRIPTION OF TEAM
/respondents could give more than one answer/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It shares objectives</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't work well together</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments are integrated</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members are not supportive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not take decisions together</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members attend meetings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't take collective responsibility for course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER (members) - including additional comments

Positive comments
1. Some of the team members are very supportive of each other in pockets. It is a large team, and this represents challenges which we don't always overcome.
2. Members are supportive of one another. The team is trying hard to establish a new course in difficult circumstances.
3. It takes collective responsibility for the course.
4. It shares opinions on what is expected of students and aspects of discipline that are necessary.
5. We work well together and complement each other’s skills.
6. Course assignments are integrated.

Negative comments
7. There is poor team leadership.
8. Members boycott team meetings due to appalling leadership.
9. Some members work harder than others.

OTHER (leaders)

Positive comments
1. It shares objectives up to a point.
2. We integrate where feasible but also do our own assignments if we see fit. No one is forced to integrated work.
3. We are supportive of each other and work willingly together.
4. They are mostly committed.
5. A committed team working under a load of administration with little clerical support.

Negative comments
6. Some members attend meetings, but certainly not all
36. RESPONDENT’S INVOLVEMENT IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR TEAMWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Data</th>
<th>Team member response</th>
<th>Course tutor/leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. IF YES, WHAT AREAS WERE COVERED (for members)

1. Training in teamwork skills (i.e. working together, leadership, team building)
   - 6 respondents
2. Training in course delivery and curriculum areas (i.e. integration, assignment writing)
   - 9 respondents

FOR LEADERS
1. Decision-making and I’ve forgotten most of it.
2. Assessment
3. Team objectives and criteria for good teamwork

38/39. HOW MANY OTHER TEAMS DOES RESPONDENT WORK WITH / HOW MANY DID RESPONDENT WISH TO BE A MEMBER OF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In no other teams</th>
<th>- want to be in it</th>
<th>- want to be in them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In one other team</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in it</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In two other teams</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in one</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In three other teams</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in one</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In four other teams</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in two</td>
<td>- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In five other teams</td>
<td>- don’t want to be in three</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In six other teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEADERS - DO YOU LEAD ANY OTHER TEAMS?

| YES | 6 |
| NO  | 10 |
| TOTAL | 16 |
LEADERS - HOW MANY OTHER TEAMS DO YOU BELONG TO AND HOW MANY OF THESE DID YOU WANT TO BELONG TO?

1. In no other teams
2. In one other team - want to be in it
3. In two other teams - want to be in them
4. In three other teams - want to be in them
5. In four other teams - want to be in them
6. In six other teams - want to be in them all
7. In many teams - want to be in them all

1. In one team - don’t want to be in it

Total

40. THE BENEFITS OF BEING IN A TEAM
(From both a member and leader point of view)

a) Benefits to members/leaders in terms of Mutual Sharing and Support
1. You work together for a common goal.
2. A team creates a sharper focus on students, and mutual support for staff.
3. You are able to bounce ideas off others.
4. The collective output is greater than the sum of the individual inputs.
5. It is a supportive environment.
6. Discussion, advice and support.
7. All working to a common aim, and seeing students pass on to good careers.
8. It is a means of getting to know other staff very well in a very large organisation.
9. You gain help and support from each member of the team.
10. You share your knowledge and abilities.
11. The students benefit from several caring staff.
12. Corporate decision making and mutual support.
13. The avoidance of feeling that you’re teaching in isolation.
14. The back-up and support, also scope for for consultation when team members are willing.
15. Synergy. Expressing different ideas and being aware of what others are doing.
17. The pooling of information and ideas.
18. Shared opinions and experiences of student profiles. The ability to link different teaching subjects to a common cause.
19. Mutual support and a common or shared approach to problem areas.
20. Producing a variety of ideas and having a common policy.
21. Sharing the work and approach, with flexibility and multi-disciplined skills.
22. We share ideas and resources, and help each other.
24. Better overall standards, as the courses are planned more effectively.
25. The sharing of ideas and experiences, and support from other staff.
26. You gain from other members’ ideas, strengths and opinions.
27. Support from colleagues, improved course management, and improved course monitoring.
28. Mutual support and the sharing of ideas.
29. Motivational and supportive aspects.
30. The ability to discuss and develop ideas.
31. Shared experiences of students' difficulties.
32. Support, motivation and direction.
33. Occasionally the sharing of humdrum administration, and the sharing of work experience monitoring.
34. Motivation and support.
35. Sharing ideas and supporting each other. You feel less isolated in your work.
36. Sharing experiences and helping one another.
37. Creating friendly working relationships.
38. Support; cohesion; unity of objectives; unity of standards; improved education for students.
39. Shared workload, shared responsibility.
40. As a newcomer to BTEC, team meetings are a great help and support in learning the ropes.
41. Ideas can be positively developed through debate.
42. Sharing of ideas. Mutually supportive.
43. Sharing ideas, knowing the students better, able to back each other.
44. Mutual support.
45. To share objectives and the ownership of the course.
46. Helps develop ideas, gives support, gets through work quicker.
47. Support! Brainstorms!
48. Working out difficulties.
49. Mutual support and specialisation in areas like skills development. Greater likelihood of "brainstorming" and of different people developing the programming over a period of years.
51. Supportive/cross fertilisation of ideas/more effective monitoring of student progress.
52. Co-operative working.
53. When producing assignments the team comes up with ideas that wouldn't be generated if individuals worked in isolation.
54. Shared problems and shared information.
55. Support of being able to discuss matters and generate ideas.
56. Discuss problems and share work load.
57. Sharing ideas and experience.
58. Support and others to bounce ideas off, enjoy working with others.
59. Cohesive group, form support group, shared expertise.
60. Share common objectives and can belong to a unit which is friendly.

b) Benefits to the students and the course in terms of delivery, integration etc.
Integration
1. It helps business to be taught as a whole rather than as separate units.
2. It gives you a breadth of experience for students, and integrated assignments.
3. It is easier to implement an integrative approach.
4. Improved integration and teamwork.
5. The formation of a whole approach.
6. The quality of integrated assignments set, and a more objective view of student progress.
7. Close co-operation between staff creates a more integrated approach.
8. Integration between people helps to produce better results for students and staff.
10. Interaction between subjects and topic areas.
11. Better delivery of integrated course
12. Coherence of course delivery and shared assignments
13. Co-ordinated course objectives and delivery.

Improved delivery of course - particularly through sharing of materials, ideas and goals
15. Improved quality of teaching
16. Maintains and improves standards
17. Better overall standards, as the courses are planned more effectively.
18. A more rounded view of the purpose of the course.
19. The cross fertilisation of ideas.
20. Where it overlaps, material can be pooled.
21. There are different viewpoints and approaches.
22. The exchange of ideas, and the development of common purpose "cabinet" responsibility.
23. Problems are sorted out more quickly, and the delivery of work to the students is better.
25. Own ideas tested rigorously, students benefit and education is improved.

41. THE DIFFICULTIES OF BEING IN A TEAM

A) Difficulties attached to team communication
I) Geographical problems
1. Members scattered on different parts of the campus.
2. Co-ordinating activities is difficult when team members are dispersed between different divisions.

II) Time for Meetings
1. The time restrictions of meetings.
2. Getting together for meetings.
3. Finding the time to meet.
4. Having all members free at the same time for meetings.
5. It is difficult to timetable meetings.
6. It is difficult to get everyone together for a meeting.
7. Getting all the team members together for a meeting.
8. Arranging meeting times.
9. Time consuming, time consuming, and time consuming.
10. The shortage of time to meet and discuss matters thoroughly.
11. Finding the time to meet.
12. Making the time to meet.
13. The difficulty of arranging meetings at a convenient time.
14. The co-ordination of meetings.
15. Finding time to get things done.
17. Finding a time when everyone can meet. No time is allowed on the timetable.
18. Lack of time to meet formally.
19. Finding the time to meet.
20. Time!! The danger of having a nervous breakdown. Time!! With no remission.
22. It is difficult to all meet together. Some have commitments to other teams.
23. It is difficult to meet formally because part-timers are not paid for meetings.
24. Arranging meetings with sessional staff.
25. Problems of meeting when significant parts covered by sessionals, especially if done at times when other team members are not in college.
26. Time and ability to meet, i.e. logistics.
27. Being able to meet and discuss ideas enough times is a problem. (Both time and resources).
28. Time and red tape.
29. There is a lack of communication due to the size of the team - it's too big, but it's nobody's fault on the team.
30. More members, slower inter-communication.
31. Losing contact with individuals.
32. Communication!

III) Team processes - time consuming
33. It's very long winded
34. Discussion does not always make for rapid decisions
35. Too much talking!
36. There are too many ideas and we have a weak leader.

B) The individual versus the team
1. The difficulty of appreciating other topics and viewpoints, even with discussion.
2. Not being able always to implement one's own objectives, and not always fully understanding the ethos of other modules.
3. The requirement to compromise on pet projects to satisfy course unity.
4. The differences of views and opinions.
5. Feeling you are totally different and on a different wavelength.
6. There are variations on emphasis on how the course should be assessed, and how stringent the standards should be. It is difficult to combine this with a supporting and encourage overall philosophy.
7. Possible conflict, and duplication of effort.
8. Keeping the main objectives in sight.
9. Interdependence - people relying on you and the fear of letting them down.
10. Proper co-ordination of ideas.
11. Integrating the work means watering down the content of core unity. Extra work
is seen by the students as pointless.

C) Team Membership
1. Un-co-operative team members.
2. Members who don’t want to share and don’t want to be on the team i.e. time-table fillers.
3. Un-committed members.
4. You don’t always get total team support and equal effort.
5. The problem with staff on a team that you dislike or can’t work with.
6. Sometimes obstructiveness by a single member.
7. Not all the team members are committed.
8. Dead wood, members not pulling their weight.
9. Team members who do not pull their weight.
10. Working with others.
11. Occasional personality clashes.
12. Clashes of personality.
13. Personality clashes and a general lack of co-operation.
15. The personalities of some members.
16. The possibility of personality clashes within the team.
17. Conflict of personalities.
18. May not view some team members as good team members, i.e. bias.
19. Might not get on with everyone.
20. Lack of commitment (when it occurs).
21. Establishing effective and close working relationships where decision making is collegial.
22. Having responsibility without authority.
23. We have a weak team leader

DIFFICULTIES OF TEAMWORK AS PERCEIVED BY LEADERS

a) Communication/meeting time
1. Time to meet and the communication between departments
2. Making enough time available for regular meetings
3. Getting everyone together for meetings.
4. Meeting time and just TIME
5. Co-ordinating everyone in the small amounts of time allowed.
6. Everyone being free at the same time.
7. Time-tabling problems and availability of staff at the precise time.
8. A large team has difficulty in meeting regularly.
9. Getting the whole team together.
10. Time constraints and too much work.
11. Co-ordinating projects, staff timetables, assessments, information and meetings - all the administrative problems of 12 staff in two year groups with only 5 days a week.

Team members
1. Getting the right people on the team
2. Conflict from time to time.
3. Agreement on areas of conflict.
4. Not all the team members work as enthusiastically as they might, and a team is only as strong as its weakest link.
5. There is a real lack of opportunity for out of class co-operation.
### NUMBER OF HOURS TAUGHT/HOW COMMITTED RESPONDENTS ARE TO A TEAM APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Almost totally</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Not much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than five</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than eight</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than ten</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than fifteen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than twenty one</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER OF HOURS TAUGHT/HOW MUCH RESPONDENT ENJOYS BEING IN TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Quite like</th>
<th>Don't mind</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than five</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than eight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than ten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than fifteen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than twenty one</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEETINGS ARE WORTHWHILE/GRADE OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Vital</th>
<th>Very worthwhile</th>
<th>Worthwhile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WILLING TO TAKE PART IN MEETINGS/GRADE OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Prepared to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NUMBER OF HOURS TAUGHT/FEELING PART OF A TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Almost completely</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than five</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than eight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than ten</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than fifteen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than twenty one</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BENEFITS FROM HAVING A TEAM APPROACH/EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Yes-there are benefits</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly effective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear 

Thank you for returning the questionnaire on issues relating to the staff development of course teams in Further Education.

You indicated that you would be willing to help further with this research. This would take the form of a staff development workshop with as many members of your team who are available, and who would like to take part. The aim of the workshop is to help the team identify differing perceptions within the team with a view to using this diagnosis as a basis for any possible future staff development.

If your team would like to take part in a workshop, I shall be glad to facilitate one at a time to suit your team.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

KATE BAKER

The team would like to participate in a workshop.

Possible dates next term would be.................................................................

Name of contact........................................... Course...........................................
College............................................................
Tel No.............................................................

PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED FREEPPOST ENVELOPE
EXAMPLE OF OVERLAY PROCESS

GRID 1

GRID 2

GRID 1 OVERLAID ON GRID 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING THE REPERTORY GRID WITH COURSE TEAMS AS A DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

KATE BAKER
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY
INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF GRIDS WITH TEAMWORK

Introduction

The grid is used here as a tool to help identify future staff development needs within teams.

The process of working on grids as individual team members, within a team situation, will allow members to identify their own attitudes to, and viewpoints on, various aspects of teamwork, as well as those of other members of the team. This can then form the basis for discussion about whether any differences in attitude or viewpoint within the team are important in terms of the negative or positive effects they may have on effective teamworking.

Individual and group training needs can also be identified in the light of the discussion, so that staff development can be a team-led exercise, rather than one imposed on the team by people outside the team.

Before starting on the grids it is important for the team to remember that:-

IT IS THE TEAM WHO OWNS THE FINAL DATA, AND SHOULD DECIDE WHAT THE OUTCOMES ARE.

It is also important that the whole team agree that:-

a) It is useful to explore differences of perspective.

b) That differences are viewed as constructive information and not as an opportunity to apportion blame or disapprobation.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that some differences of perception are to be expected. It is recommended that an ice breaking exercise is used with groups who normally meet infrequently.

STEPS IN USING THE GRID WITH THE TEAM

1. In order to begin to compare the viewpoints of individual team members, the team needs to start by identifying approximately six goals of the team (there can be more if enough time is allowed), as they are individual members, see them. Each team member therefore, lists what he/she regards as the six most important goals of the team. (An example might be "...to support the students").

2. When members have had sufficient time to complete this process, each member shares his/her six goals with the rest of the team. They are written on to a flipchart by the team leader or facilitator, and no comments or elaborations should be given or asked for at this stage.
3. When all team members have read out their lists, the facilitator leads a negotiation process whereby the team arrives at six* agreed goals out of the total list provided. This will require the team to spend some time explaining what each goal is, and in so doing, identifying what they see as duplication, in order to arrive at a common language and understanding of the teams jointly considered six most important goals.

* Note: The attached numbering sheet is for six stated goals, as this is felt to be the maximum number which can be effectively examined in a three hour staff development session.

4. Each member of the team then writes the six negotiated goals across the top of the grid, one for each column.

5. Working according to the attached numbering sheet (see page vi), each team member compares the agreed goals in threes (eg. 123, 345).

6. Taking three goals at a time, each team member considers from his or her own point of view:-

a) Which two have something in common and why.

b) Which one is different and why.

(eg. two goals are seen to be "difficult to carry out" and one is seen to be "easy to carry out".

7. A tick is placed in each of the boxes for the similar pair, and a cross is placed in the box of the one that is different. (See dummy grid on page v).

8. The similarities and differences (known as constructs), are recorded in the appropriate left and right hand columns.

9. Ticks and crosses are then given to the remaining goals along that horizontal line, according to whether it is felt that they fit with the comments made for the pair or the single.

10. This process is repeated until all the combinations of numbers on the attached sheet have been considered.

11. Individual team members then read out their perceptions (constructs) of the given goals, and these are noted on the flipchart by the facilitator.
12. At the end of each set of compared goals, the team can discuss the similarities and differences in perceptions and attitudes.

The discussion can cover such issues as:

a) Whether any apparent differences are important to the effective running of the team.

b) The implications for future team and individual staff development.

NOTE

In addition or as a variation

Provided Constructs

Instead of asking team members to think about their own reasons for similarities or differences (constructs) about the agreed goals of the team, a prepared list can be given to the team by the team leader or facilitator, or can be added after individuals have provided their own personal ones. In this way it is easier to examine group views on certain given attributes. (Eg. all the team joins in/few join in; few are committed/all are committed).

The grid is carried out in the same way, except that all members think about the same given similarities and differences. Ticks and crosses can then be compared at the end to see how far the teams are in agreement over certain issues.

Overlay Method

To facilitate comparisons, the information on the paper sheets can be transferred to pre-prepared grids on overhead transparency sheets, with ticks being represented as top left triangles in one colour, and crosses as bottom right triangle in another colour. When one sheet is laid on another, areas of agreement show as a dark triangle in either corner, and areas of disagreement show as a totally coloured-in square.
"DUMMY GRID"

Purpose of Grid - To help me decide what biscuits I should buy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Digestive</th>
<th>Shortcake</th>
<th>Chocolate</th>
<th>Wholemeal</th>
<th>Sweetbread</th>
<th>Bourbon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like a lot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain and</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single layer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Two tiered with cream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRID SEQUENCE FOR SIX ELEMENTS

123
456
146
256
365
156
264
346

This does not exhaust all the possibilities, but provides an adequate start point for the time available.
TEAMWORK REPERTORY GRID EVALUATION SHEET

1. Were the instructions for using the grid clear and understandable?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐

2. If NO, which parts could be made clearer?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

3. What did you personally find the most useful part of the session?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

4. What did you personally find the least useful part of the session?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

5. Do you feel the team has benefitted from this exercise?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐

6. If YES, in what ways do you feel it has benefitted?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
7. Do you personally feel you have gained a greater understanding of the viewpoints of the other team members.

YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐

8. Would you recommend this staff development exercise to other teams?

YES ☐ NO ☐

9. What will you do with the information the grids have provided?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

10. Any further comments.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for completing this evaluation form.

PLEASE RETURN TO KATE BAKER, EDUCATIONAL STUDIES, SURREY UNIVERSITY, GUILDFORD, SURREY.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Team Constructs</th>
<th>Integrating the Course</th>
<th>Developing the Course</th>
<th>Developing a shared Philosophy</th>
<th>Communicating Within The Team</th>
<th>Supporting Students</th>
<th>Sharing Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everybody is Committed to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Is Our Main Focus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone Supports This and Takes Part</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Within Our Control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS FROM GRID WORKSHOP - TEAM 2 (14 members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Team Constructs</th>
<th>Team Goals (elements)</th>
<th>Using Everyone's Strengths</th>
<th>Advancing Integration</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Whole Team Participates
- The Team Is Supportive
- Individual Roles Are Clear
- The Team Has Autonomy
- This Is Openly Discussed
- This Is Effective
# RESULTS FROM GRID WORKSHOP - TEAM 3 (13 members)

## Team Goals (elements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Team Constructs</th>
<th>Communicating Within The Team</th>
<th>Ensuring Equal Opportunity Within The Team</th>
<th>Counselling For Students</th>
<th>Ensuring Effective Administration</th>
<th>Ensuring Effective Resourcing</th>
<th>Developing the Course Offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Team Has Control Over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Team Is Effective In This</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Whole Team Participates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Seem To Be Clear About This</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Team Supports This</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Conflict In This Area Is Constructive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>