A Teacher's Perspective on Experiences of Educational Change: A Qualitative Self-Study

Melanie Clark

Department of Integrated Studies in Education

McGill University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December, 2019

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Educational Leadership

Abstract

This qualitative self-study explores three different educational change processes as experienced by a secondary school science teacher in an urban setting in the province of Quebec, Canada. Through reflecting on the teacher's own experiences in three different contexts of educational change, the teacher provides insight into how issues of agency, group size, collegial relationships, hierarchy and politics impacted the teacher's decision-making and affective domain as a participant and their perceptions of self-efficacy. High levels of agency, small group sizes, trusting pre-existing relationships, lack of hierarchy and low levels of political involvement in the change initiatives all increased the teacher's engagement and self-efficacy in the reforms. Suggestions are provided for participants and change leaders in designing future change initiatives to increase participant engagement and achieve more successful outcomes in educational reform.

Résumé

Cette auto-étude qualitative explore trois différents processus de changement pédagogique tel qu'expérimenté par un enseignant de science au niveau secondaire dans un milieu urbain au Québec au Canada. En se penchant sur les propres expériences de l'enseignant dans trois différents contextes de changement éducatif, l'enseignant nous éclaire comment les questions dans la façon d'agir, de la grosseur du groupe, de relations collégiales, de hiérarchie et de politique ont influencés la prise de décision et le domaine affectif de l'enseignant en tant que participant et leurs perceptions d'auto-efficacité. La facilité d'adaptation, de petits groupes, faire confiance aux relations préexistantes, le manque de hiérarchie et un bas niveau d'implication politique dans les initiatives de changement ont tous augmentés l'engagement et l'auto-efficacité

de l'enseignant dans les réformes. Des suggestions sont proposées aux participants et aux responsables du changement pédagogique dans la création d'initiatives de changements futures afin d'accroître l'engagement des participants et d'atteindre de meilleurs résultats dans la réforme de l'éducation.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to my supervisors, Dr. Caroline Riches and Dr. Lisa Starr. Thank you for asking the questions and sharing the insights that held a mirror to my ideas and allowed me to make this research my own.

I would like to acknowledge Katherine Davey of the Lester B. Pearson School Board as well as Dr. Anila Asghar and Ying-Syuan (Elaine) Huang of McGill, for their time and contributions to our PLC. I would also like to recognize Dr. Dale Boyle, Dr. Joseph Levitan and Dr. Blane Harvey from McGill for their feedback on early iterations of my research in their courses and for their literature suggestions, with particular thanks to Dale Boyle for introducing me to the concept of self-study. Thank you to my colleague Manon Rocan for her translation of the abstract.

I am deeply indebted to my beloved teaching colleagues from Montreal, many of whom were co-participants in these change processes. You taught me that being vulnerable to each other makes us better teachers; thank you for the learning, love, laughter and tears. I hope to foster that environment of cooperation and high standards of pedagogy during the rest of my teaching career. Thanks also to my administrators for their encouragement and support of my graduate studies.

Darren, thank you for believing in me, for your advice, your proofreading, and for helping me find quiet time to write. Nathalie, thank you for your encouragement and your example; every time I felt discouraged, I thought of the challenges you've taken on and decided I could keep going, too. Finally, thank you to Eli, Ben and Anna for your patience during the many weekends that you lost Mom to her computer.

I would like to dedicate this work to my parents, Brent and Nancy. I know you would have been proud.

Preface

I am the sole author of this thesis. All reflections upon which this self-study was based were also wholly my own. My supervisors provided feedback on draft versions.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Acknowledgements 4

Preface 5

Table of Contents 6

Chapter 1: Introduction 10

Background on My Study 15

How I Came to be a Teacher in Quebec 17

Relevance of My Study 19

Chapter 2: Literature Review 20

Self-Study and Critical Reflection through Autobiography 20

Use of Memory as Data Collection Tool 21

Educational Change 24

Gauging the Success of Educational Change Projects 26

Change: Reasons for Failures in the Past 28

Defining Politics in Educational Change Processes 28

Hierarchy in Educational Change 29

Teachers and Educational Change

30

What is the Role of Teachers in Educational Change 30

What Motivates a Teacher to Change 31

Teachers' Confidence, Inner Dialogue and Emotions: Connection to Change Processes 31

Resistance of Teachers to Change 32

Teacher Engagement in Change Processes 33

Staff Development and Leadership 35

Impact of Agency on Teachers in Educational Change 36

Chapter 3: Research Methodology 39

Introduction 39

Purpose of My Study 40

Research Design 40

Ethical Considerations 47

Trustworthiness and Quality in Qualitative Research 47

Chapter 4: Discussion 52

Change Process 1: Professional Learning Community 56

High Level of Agency, High Self-Efficacy 59

Relationships and Group Size 61

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications 66

Change Process 2: Induction into an IB School 71

Moderate Agency, Varying Levels of Self-Efficacy 73

Relationships and Group Size 82

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications 89

Change Process 3: School Reform Movement 96

Low Agency, Low Self-Efficacy 97

Relationships and Group Size 102

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications 106

Chapter 5: Analysis and Conclusions 111

Connections to Educational Change 111

Summary of Factors Affecting the Success of Change Processes 112

Agency and Self-Efficacy 112

Group Size and Relationships 114

Hierarchy 120

Political Motivations and Implications 124

Analysis of Methodology 125

Self-study and Autobiographical Inquiry 125

Memories and Emotions during Reflection Writing 125

Critical Friends 126

Conclusions 126

Take-aways for Future Designers and Leaders of Change Processes 126

Take-aways for Future Participants in Change Processes 129

Impact on My Future Practice 131

References 134

Appendix 1: Framework for Analysis 144

Chapter 1: Introduction

Attempts to create change within the education system usually create polarity; simultaneously welcomed and desired by some while feared and opposed or avoided by others. Whether embraced or abhorred, change processes require many resources. This investment may lead to end results that exceed expectations, results that differ from the intended objectives, or that produce no change at all. Through my ten years of high school teaching experience, I have been asked to be a part of changes that have affected nearly every aspect of my day-to-day teaching life. These have included implementing a new provincial curriculum, joining and integrating into an International Baccalaureate (IB) school, creating and leading a professional learning community (PLC), and being part of a team tasked with designing a new secondary school model. There has been a wide range of challenges, obstacles, successes and stressors in implementing these changes. Some change processes have progressed smoothly and shown positive results, while others have seemed unnecessary, ineffective and frustrating.

In 2007, I was a new teacher at an English public secondary school in Quebec at a time when the new Quebec provincial curriculum, known as the Quebec Education Program (QEP), was being implemented at the secondary science level. The messages and tone I received from people directing the change were not in tune with the mood and messages I was getting from my teaching colleagues. What I heard from the school board consultants and administrators during that time was a message that change was necessary, that their new program and all that it entailed must happen as a complete package, and that all teachers needed to get on-board. This was in conflict with what I heard from teachers, who were feeling unconvinced, unprepared and

unsupported. As a new teacher, it was a challenging time to join a school staff; veterans within the staff, who in less tumultuous times would have been confident support systems for new teachers like me, were being pushed out of their comfort zones, being asked to learn new teaching techniques, new terminology, and to think about instruction and assessment in ways they never had before. I was trained as a Science teacher, prepared for teaching courses such as Biology, Chemistry and Physics. There was a new expectation in Quebec, as part of the introduction of their new curriculum that Science classes were now labelled as "Science and Technology" and incorporated the use of power tools and many building techniques that had previously been the domain of workshop or woodworking classes. I witnessed delays in preparing and equipping teachers for the new curriculum they were expected to deliver; textbooks were late, sometimes by months or years; workshops on instruction and assessment methods were provided after the courses had already begun; equipment (workshop power tools) intended to be used to support the new curriculum in schools were delivered months or years after initial implementation, and teachers in my school were provided with no instruction on the tools' proper and safe use. Many conversations around the staffroom lunch table centered on our views vis-a-vis the implementation of the new curriculum, our collective frustrations, and how it could have been done differently.

More recently, I joined a team of educators and community members that met once a month for about six months and was tasked with designing a school centered on a project-based learning model. The project, which I will refer to as the School Reform Movement (SRM), had the goal of piloting this new school model in the province of Quebec. At the time I joined this project, I was also trying to decide on a topic of study for my Master's thesis. As I was

discussing my joys and frustrations as a participant in the School Reform Movement's development with my thesis supervisors they pointed out that it sounded like I was passionate about change processes in general and that this would be a good direction for my research. This moment of realization provided clarity of purpose. I could easily recall the strong feelings of my positive and negative emotions elicited by my participation and leadership of change processes during my teaching career.

I was unsure of how to approach a study on the topic of change processes; I am no expert in the field of designing such processes. What did I have to contribute to the field of research in this area when universities like Harvard and Yale devote years and teams of people to developing change process methods? While participating in a graduate class at McGill, I was sharing this with my instructor before class one night and the instructor introduced me to the methodology of self-study. "Your experience as a teacher in these change processes is the study," the instructor suggested. "Share it, examine it, and let others use it to inform how people design future change processes and how teachers participate in them." This comment illuminated my lived experience as having value to others and gave me a reason to examine and share it. I now had a thesis project.

I had been coming at the idea of research through the lens of scientific method and a quantitative perspective before this moment. In my classes on research methods, my background in science and scientific research let me to initially balk at the idea that there could be value in qualitative methods. "Isn't qualitative research just storytelling?" I remember asking. "What is the difference between qualitative research and journalism?" I felt like working in qualitative research would be less respected, provide less truth somehow, than doing work that was

quantitative in nature. I worried that colleagues and personal friends would have less respect for my work and for me as a researcher. In spite of my professors extolling the virtues of stories as research in the early classes of my graduate studies in methodology, I had remained unconvinced until I recognized a gap in the literature, the absence of teachers' own voices in their experiences of educational change. As I read, trying to connect my own experiences to what had been done and written about by others in this field, I found people describing and dissecting these change processes as outside observers or as third parties interviewing teachers, sharing pieces of what those teachers said they experienced and making their own assumptions about its meaning. I wanted to hear from the teachers themselves, to compare and contrast my experience with that of others. As a teacher who had been through such experiences, I wanted to know what other teachers had thought and felt as they had gone through these change initiatives. What had informed their decisions and actions? What had been going through their minds? Did they get angry, sad, encouraged, or frustrated? Did they disengage? I knew what these thoughts and feelings had been in my own professional dealings with educational change initiatives and I decided that this was an area in which my own story could add to the body of academic literature on the topic. Recognizing that I had experiences to share and that scholars such as Fullan (2007) and Hargreaves (1998) acknowledged the value, and absence, of teacher voice on the topic of educational change gave my intention to write a self-study based on my own experiences in educational change value and worth.

Through pondering the value of sharing my perspective with the broader educational world, I have determined that what goes on in the mind of the person participating in the change process is both what determines a person's decision to engage with the process and then steers

their course of action as a result; the combined result of choosing to engage and then deciding on the form or actions that engagement takes have a large part to play in whether the change process is successful or not. If the goal is to change people's beliefs and actions, wouldn't it be valuable to explore the effect different aspects of the implementation process are having on what the participant thinks and feels? It is that internal dialogue within the mind of the participant that determines their actions, afterall. This is the value that sharing my experiences provides. I recognize that my story doesn't provide the perspective of all teachers in processes of change. I have my own knowledge, prior experiences, personality, self-concept and biases that I bring to every new experience I encounter. But my story is a piece of the puzzle; to understand the thoughts and feelings of all teachers in such circumstances is impossible, but to work toward that understanding you have to start with one.

My purpose in this research is to openly share and examine my experiences of educational change from my perspective as a teacher in order to help myself and others learn lessons that may influence the design of, and participation in, successful educational change processes of the future. I believe sharing my perspective is beneficial in that it allows others who are stakeholders in educational change processes (administrators, fellow teachers, school board officials, policy writers, students and parents) to know what a teacher thought and felt as they experienced these processes and how these thoughts and feelings shaped their past and future participation. In "The New Meaning of Educational Change" (2007, p. viii), Michael Fullan stated that to understand the workings of educational change processes requires knowing, at a small scale, "what change feels like from the point of view of the teacher, student, parent, and administrator" and how these interact with larger scale organizational and institutional factors. I

hope to provide this insight. According to Tran (2018), "teachers' attitudes and feelings can influence their engagement or their responses to the change"(para.8). Hargreaves (2005) cited teacher emotion as one of the most understudied aspects of educational change. I will do my best to include my own assessment of my attitudes, emotions and their effect on my decisions and actions in these processes of change. I do not imply that my views represent those of all teachers, but will share and provide analysis on my own reflections in hopes that they will add to the conversation as representative of what one teacher experienced.

Writing about these experiences gives me the opportunity to look back and ask questions:

- What were my perceptions of the social and political forces acting on each process, and how did I see these influencing the way the process was designed and run?
- What were my motivations for participating?
- What was the goal of each process? Did the goal as stated by the leaders of the process match with my perception of the goal? If their stated goal didn't match my perception, how did this affect my participation?
- How did I see my own agency and self-efficacy in the context of these processes?
- What recommendations would I make to future change participants and future change leaders?
- What were the impacts of my past participation on my future practice?

Through these questions I will analyze my past experiences in educational change.

Background on My Study

I did not begin my graduate work with the intention of examining educational change processes. When I first considered a topic for my thesis, I was thinking of addressing pedagogy

in the field of gifted learning. After completing a reading course on gifted learning and discovering models and programs designed to support these students in primary and secondary school, I considered how gifted learners fit into my own school context. As a teacher, I recognized the need to better support gifted students in my classes and, through my reading, I discovered an abundance of methods and models for this purpose. I asked myself why these supports for gifted learners existed but were not being implemented. As I discussed this need with colleagues and administrators, I found some teachers were in agreement that more attention and support for gifted students was needed, while in other cases I discovered opposition and faced questions such as "why do they need special support?" and "don't you think we should focus our resources elsewhere since the gifted learners will be successful without any extra effort on our part?". Some saw the need for moving beyond the status quo to support gifted learners but felt limited by the time required to create the necessary differentiation.

I could create changes within my own classroom teaching practice to better support gifted learners but felt the constraints imposed by the broader system in which I worked. Things like curriculum, daily schedules, required course credits, timetabling decisions, requirements of the IB program, all placed demands and restrictions on my students and myself; solutions to these systemic restrictions existed in theory but felt like they were beyond the scope of my control. Seeing the need for broader change but feeling frustration at the complexity and roadblocks in the system, it was a logical shift to begin examining the process of change itself. In a case like this where we have a need, possible solutions, and evidence that these solutions can be effective, what is preventing change from happening and how could I be a part of the solution?

After choosing to focus my research on my experiences of educational change, I thought back over my teaching career and identified two types of experiences related to change that have fueled my interest in such processes. The first type of experience I recalled were times when change was needed but not attempted; I have observed and been a part of situations where I felt change was called for but found it impossible to generate the desire in others and the resources necessary to attempt the change. Secondly, I have been involved in change initiatives (provincial curriculum reform, IB program changes, professional learning communities and the School Reform Movement) that have deeply impacted my beliefs, attitude and outlook on how I will deal with change in education moving forward. These changes I see in myself stem from the strong emotions, positive and negative, that I remember experiencing in specific moments within the change processes. I am left with questions about myself as a participant, about the impact that these processes and the events and people within them had on my choices as a participant that I need to grapple with as a reflective practitioner. Why, as a participant in a gathering designed to generate change, does one conversation I am a part of seem circular, stilted and difficult, while another flows, generating actionable ideas and motivating me as a willing and eager agent to enact the change? There is a combination of psychology and social context involved that can allow for a perfect storm of productivity leading to change, or frustration, opposition, and lack of interest leading to disengagement and stagnation.

These are the ideas I explored as I reflected on the situations of change I examined. Before I begin to dissect these experiences, I want to provide some context by briefly describing my background as a teacher to help the reader understand where I come from professionally as this may inform my actions and reactions to the change processes I have been a part of.

How I came to be a Teacher in Quebec

I am originally from New Brunswick and completed primary and secondary school there. I went on to do a Bachelor of Science degree at the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, and a Bachelor of Education degree at the University of Regina. There was a five year gap from the time I graduated with my degree in Education to the time I began teaching. I lived in Ontario during this period and was not able to find work as a teacher. When I finally began teaching in Quebec in 2007, I was unfamiliar with the Quebec curriculum (Québec Ministère de L'Education, 2004 & 2007) which was new and had begun implementation at the secondary level in 2005 (Québec Ministère de L'Education, 2008). I found that my combination of science and teacher education degrees had prepared me well and, with the support of excellent colleagues, found my stride as a science teacher in Quebec that first year. I have now worked at three different secondary schools in Quebec. At the first school, I taught grade 9 and 10 Science as well as Computer Science, Environmental Science. At the second school, part of the International Baccalaureate program, I taught Science to grades 8 and 9, as well as Leadership and Cooking. In the third and most recent school, I taught English, Geography, History and Ethics.

As I've moved from being a new teacher in to now being in the middle of my career with more than ten years of experience in the classroom, I feel that I now know myself as a teacher and have developed my own style within the classroom, including how I deliver lessons and how I engage with students. My background of training and experience within the educational systems of four different provinces (New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Saskatchewan), and my teaching experience in three different high schools in Quebec has given me a lens of

perspective through which I view new situations in the realm of education. I find myself constantly asking questions: "How could we do this differently?"; "Isn't there a better way?". Within myself, I have thoughts that could answer these questions and want to provide that input, but hesitate because my current employment situation is such that I once again find myself as the new person, recognized by my administrators as having valuable teaching experience while at the same time being new to the school board and still learning the policies and procedures in this new setting. This makes me hesitate to share my ideas with my administrative team, for fear that they have not yet developed a level of professional respect needed to value my input. As I continue to develop in this new role, I am reminded constantly of why positive change is important and I see things that I thought were accepted norms in my previous school board that are not followed in the new school board in which I work, and I wonder if this is due to size, philosophy or just a lack of awareness of the possibilities that exist to do things differently than they're currently being done. Questioning how to do things better is a constant state of being for me. I am committed to the continued improvement of the educational system, for the benefit of students and also for the teachers and other staff who spend a large portion of our lives making meaning through our contributions of time, effort and emotional investment to the education and betterment of our students.

Relevance of My Study

My goal is for my conclusions to be useful for myself and others to inform educational change of the future for both designers and participants. I hope that I can provide an open and honest reflection and examination of my past experiences that will add to the broader

understanding of how educational change processes can motivate and support the type of desired change in teachers' professional practice for improvements in student learning and for society.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Self-Study and Critical Reflection through Autobiography

To tell my story and then examine the events, motivations and choices therein can be described as critical reflection on autobiography, a type of self-study. Samaras and Freese (2006) defined a self-study as a way in which teachers use reflection on their practice to "systematically and critically examine their actions and the context of those actions" and use that analysis to inform future decisions in their professional practice. My motivation for choosing to examine educational change using the methodology of self-study is elucidated by Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) who suggested that those involved in self-study wish to demonstrate theory with real-life examples and be willing to examine and share their private experiences and thoughts in the public venue of academic discourse. I want to wrestle with each of these lived experiences I'll share to discover my own motivations, biases, and how the actions and attitudes of others affected, and were affected by, my own. While Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) stated that there is no solid definition of self-study methodology, it is in large part a way of knowing "what is" (p. 2) by examining the practice of the teachers themselves. In my case, I will not be examining my teaching practices in the classroom per se, but instead my experiences during educational change processes I participated in as a teacher.

As I attempt to write my reflections on these experiences of educational change, this form of autobiography must, according to R.J. Graham (1989), include "an interweaving of self-consciousness and experience" (p.98) and include descriptions that make clear my "character, personality, self-conception" (p. 98). Graham, relying on the work of Weintraub,

stated that autobiography is written from a "nodal moment" (p.98) which he described as "a point of view which is located somewhere beyond a moment of crisis or a set of experiences which approximates the same function as a crisis" (p. 98). After the nodal moment has occurred, Graham suggested that patterns in the writer's experience which were previously hidden will become visible and reveal relationships between what had previously appeared to be disconnected events. In my analysis, I will need to identify the crises and discuss what the nodal moments have revealed about how my experiences of educational change are connected and identify patterns within them (Graham, 1989; Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001).

Use of Memory as Data Collection Tool

My use of autobiographical memory as a tool of inquiry to examine these past events, find connections within them, and look for moments of strong emotion and crisis was shaped by the work of Pithouse (2011), Kihlstrom (1998), and Payne and Blackwell (1998). Kathleen Pithouse (2011) described her study of teachers in South Africa writing and sharing their personal histories as students and then as teachers to examine how the authority in their past educational experiences and the context of apartheid has informed their teaching practice. A quote from this study resonated with me:

> My intention was for the project participants to make use of memory and story to bring significant episodes from their learning and teaching lives into immediate, felt experience so as to discern patterns of personal perceptions and reactions over time and also to consider what Mills (1959) explains as "personal troubles" might intersect with broader "public issues" (Pithouse, 2011, p. 8)

This quote speaks to exactly what I am trying to do in writing my memories of these experiences of educational change. The writing of these remembered events provokes the stronger "felt experience" (Pithouse, 2011) or emotional and physical feelings that I can then examine in the present to ask why I reacted so strongly to these moments and find patterns in my reactions and perceptions of what was happening in the process related to what was happening inside myself.

Pithouse (2011) included another description that I related to about the obstacles of sharing and analyzing my reflections. I connect to the feelings described by this participant as including "fear, uncertaintainty, cowardice and weakness (emotional)" (p. 187). I felt all of these emotions while writing about my memories and then examining them. There were times when I felt uncertainty about my own disagreement with a point or process and then cowardice for not speaking up about it. There were times when I was embarassed after I did choose to speak up in these situations, feeling that others around the room were judging me as being negative and not a team player. Both the times when I did confront others and the times I did not led me to wonder about my own emotional weakness as I reacted strongly to events within these change processes, wondering if others were feeling the same way or if I was alone in my frustration.

While there is certainly work existing in the literature to support the use of memory in writing autobiographical reflections as data (Graham, 1989; Mitchell, Strong-Wilson, Pithouse, & Allnutt, 2011; Radstone, 2000; Misztal, 2003; Branyon, Diacopoulos, Gregory & Butler 2016), there is also caution that memory is not a wholly reliable tool. John Kihlstrom (1998) stated that "memories can be distorted, biased, and otherwise changed by changes in perspective and other events that occur after the time of encoding" and that there is no proven way of determining which memories are credible and which are not (p. 18). This possibility of

misremembering and how it would affect the trustworthiness of my data was a big concern for me initially and influenced my decision to remove one of the experiences I had intended to include due to the amount of time that had passed since that event and my lack of ability to remember important details with confidence. In writing my other three reflections, I had a high degree of confidence in my memories. The events that elicited these reflections all occurred in the five years prior to writing about them, and my ability to recall details of the events and my internal dialogue related to them was sufficient to give me a high degree of confidence in this as reliable and worthy of inclusion.

Related to memory in autobiography is the suggested use of critical friends in the literature of self-study (Costa & Kallick, 1993; Loughran & Northfield, 1998; Schuck & Russell, 2005). A critical friend, in the case of self-study in education, "is a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person's work as a friend" (Costa & Kallick, 1993, p. 50). I initially intended to use critical friends to help me recall events which would in turn evoke memories of my internal dialogue related to the change initiatives on which I intended to reflect . Kihlstrom's work also supports the reason I decided not to use critical friends, teaching colleagues with whom I could discuss my reflections, to help me remember the events of the change processes I described. I will explain more about critical friends and how I tried to involve them in my work later in the methods section.

I chose to write these reflections exclusively from my own recollection, understanding that this limits the reflections of those events to my own ability to recall and describe them. I appreciate the fact that by limiting them to myself, I am avoiding those memories being changed

and biased by the memories and perspectives of others, but am also losing the opportunity for these memories to be enhanced. This was a choice of fidelity to my own recollections over attempting to increase the validity of the details of those memories.

Payne and Blackwell (1998) provide a description of two different types of truth in thinking about the past and the stories we tell about it. They use the term "historical truth" to apply to those events that actually took place and the term "narrative truth" to describe events that may or may not have happened but are believed to be true in the mind of the rememberer (p. 32). In my study, I as the rememberer cannot parse these two types of truth - for me they are one and the same. I worried at the beginning of the study that my narrative truth would have errors and omissions when compared with the historical truth. As I narrowed the focus of my analysis to examine the critical moments that generated strong emotions in me as a change participant, I came to believe that it was less important that I get the facts of the historical truth exactly right because it was the narrative truth that informs my actions and decisions as a future change leader and participant. This is not to say that I believe there to be errors or omissions in the reflection data. However, I recognize the possibility and believe that since the greater purpose of the study, to inform future change leaders and participants based on my own experiences, is based in the narrative truth, the risk of small errors and omissions in the historical truth does not negate my findings and conclusions.

Educational Change

Before beginning to share and discuss my experiences, I will clarify my use of the term "educational change" and differentiate it from "organizational change". To define educational change, I am relying on Michael Fullan's work (2007 p. 36) where he found that processes of

educational change involve one or more of three aspects; (1) a change in curriculum and guiding materials; (2) a change in the instructional methods; and (3) a change in the beliefs of those within the organization. A given change process could include one, two or all three of these aspects. Any change that affects the workings of the educational organization but has no effect on student learning through either a change in materials, instructional methods or beliefs would then be considered an organizational change but not an educational one. Over the last half of the twentieth century, Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan & Hopkins (2005) described processes of educational change as shifting focus. These evolving priorities for educational change have moved through the following stages: (1) addressing issues of race and school organization; (2) curriculum innovations, (3) effectiveness of teachers in the classroom, (4) improvement in individual schools, and (5) student assessment and broad politically-driven reform. In the early twenty-first century, the focus shifted again to reforms promoting inquiry-based and experiential learning (Kuhlthau, C., Caspari, A., & Maniotes, L., 2007) and, most recently, using design-thinking strategies to transform education systems , with the goal of preparing students to compete and thrive in the knowledge-based economy (Goldman & Kabayadondo, 2016; Kelly, 2016; Wright & Wrigley, 2019).

Several of these priorities are reflected in my own experiences of educational reform. As a new teacher, I was part of the broad changes in a provincial curriculum implementation. Next, I was initiated into a school that had adopted the International Baccalaureate program as a way to make itself stand out from other school options for parents and students. There, I helped create and participate in a PLC aimed at improving classroom science instruction. Lastly, I participated in a project to design and create a new school model centered on project-based learning.

This progression of educational change initiatives I have been a part of has been an opportunity to learn about how and why change processes are created and managed, and how I as a participant act, react and am changed by them. I will analyze my reflections of these experiences in educational change processes to look for patterns in what motivated me to participate in a way that was congruous with the desires of those leading the change process, factors that were neutral or de-motivating, and examine the lasting effects of the change process in light of my understanding of the designers' intentions. Fullan (2007) pointed out that the dichotomy between how change was intended versus how people actually experience it is "at the heart of the spectacular lack of success of most social reforms" (p. 5). He defined the implementation of change in the education system as requiring a change in practice; while this change could be at any level (laws and policy, school board and school organization, curriculum and educational programming) it must ultimately alter the practices of teachers and students within the classroom and the student learning that flows out of them to be considered an educational change process.

Gauging the Success of Educational Change Projects

What does it mean to say that a project has been successful? In the article, "The real success factors on projects," Terry Cooke-Davis (2002) leans on the work of de Wit (1988) and defines project success as a comparison of the final product to the overall objectives of the project. However, the de Wit article also states that "to believe that...one can objectively measure the success of a project is somewhat an illusion" (de Wit, 1988, p.164). Projects are measured against their own objectives to evaluate their success. De Wit argues that while some projects can be measured against very concrete objectives, in less concrete examples it is very difficult to

objectively measure the overall success of a project. Most change projects in education fall into this category of being less concrete than some examples found in the world of business or sport, where building a bridge or winning a gold medal provide very measurable objectives. In the three change initiatives I am examining the objectives included (1) learning and following the requirements of teaching in an IB program (IB Induction), (2) improving student understanding of scientific concepts (PLC), and (3) designing a school focused on project-based learning (School Reform Movement). The actions within these objectives (learning, following, improving and designing) suggest that the objectives are more abstract, making the assessment of their success more challenging.

Cooke-Davis (2002) points out that there is a difference between project success, as defined above, and the project management success of dealing with the various inputs and outputs that lead to overall success against project objectives. The article also notes that there is an important distinction between *success criteria*, those measures against which the success of the project are judged, and *success factors*, the "inputs to the management system that lead directly or indirectly to the success of the project" (para. 5). In my work examining my experiences of educational change, I will first give my assessment of project success but will concentrate my discussion on criteria that relate to success factors in the projects: agency, self-efficacy, group size, pre-existing relationships, politics, and hierarchy.

Can the success of a project mean different things to the project leaders than it does to other project stakeholders? De Wit (1988) argues that there are often differing objectives for different stakeholders and different levels of hierarchy within a project, leading to different evaluations of success. In my analysis, I will discuss my own assessment of success for each

project from my perspective as a teacher participant and compare this with my perception of the views of the change leaders and others in the hierarchies associated with the projects.

Change: Reasons for Failures in the Past

Given the time and capital, both human and monetary, invested in educational change processes, I have found it frustrating to see change initiatives result in only minor adjustments or a reversion to the old, familiar ways. This is put into clear focus by Michael Fullan in "The New Meaning of Educational Change" (2007) with his statement describing the effects of an attempted curriculum reform from the US in the 1960's: "innovations were adopted on the surface with some of the language and structures becoming altered, but not the practice of teaching" (p.4). There has been extensive history of change processes attempting to create something new and failing at those attempts, with change leaders left shaking their heads as to why their best-laid plans went awry. Curriculums have been adopted and then abandoned. Governments have instigated standardized testing and then followed up with ineffectual attempts to address low-scoring schools. In this book, Fullan described the challenges faced by teachers in adopting change and their consequent reticence to do so; he believes that teachers must be re-cultured regarding their role in educational improvement (Fullan, 2007).

Defining Politics in Educational Change Processes

The Cambridge English Business Dictionary defines politics as "activities that are related to getting or keeping power within a particular company, organization, etc." (n.d.). Thomas, Stoloff and the Comparative and International Education Society, in their book *Politics and Education: Cases from eleven nations* (1983), described politics in education as a form of seeking power and as attempting to influence the opinions and behaviors of others. Blase (1998)

uses the term "micropolitics" in a similar context, defining it as " the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organizations" (p.545). I will use the term politics in this work to include power dynamics within the organizations of the school board and the schools in which I was operating, as well as the broader provincial politics, or politics of state, in the case of how these impacted options for school choice in our geographic area.

Hierarchy in Educational Change

In my examination of factors affecting change processes, I have taken a view that leadership within these processes is not synonymous with hierarchy. This position is advocated in the work of Hatcher (2005), Rucherford (2006), and Coyle (1997). Coyle (1997) and Rutherford (2006) both argue that power and authority created by hierarchies in organizational structures of education need to be reduced and teachers should be empowered to collaborate for educational improvement and "to lead from within the heart of the school" (Coyle, 1997, p.48). Hatcher (2005) described the separation between power and leadership, claiming that power is associated with managerial relationships while empowerment is associated with leadership relationships. Hatcher (2005) advocated democratic distributed leadership, which he described as emerging in groups working toward a common goal. This helps to develop leadership relationships that are based on trust and knowledge instead of regulation and position. Hatcher's (2005) quote of Wainwright (2003) was very relatable to my experiences of change that have involved hierarchy: "I participate, we participate, but they decide over what kind of issue we can decide'(Hatcher, 2005, p.259). Democracy in educational systems involves not only being able to have a voice in decisions, but also getting a voice in which issues make it to the table to be decided upon.

Teachers and Educational Change

What is the role of teachers in educational change?

Teachers are integral to change processes in education (Fullan, 2007; Wedell, 2009). Ultimately, the success or failure of educational change is borne out in whether learning is improved, and this must mean some change in the practice of teachers. In his book, "Planning for Educational Change: Putting people and their contexts first", Martin Wedell (2009) stated that "ultimately, it is what teachers and learners do in a classroom that determines what an educational change will achieve in any setting" (Wedell, 2009, p. 11). Of all people tasked with the responsibility for educating youth, teachers have the most direct knowledge of the learning environment, the needs and abilities of their students, and the impacts that proposed changes will have on their students, both positive and negative. A study by Mayer and Marland (1997) showed that teachers had extensive knowledge about their students as a group and as individuals, and that this practical knowledge of the students helped the teacher to tailor their instruction based on their knowledge of the abilities, needs and personal situations of the group and individuals within it.

Teaching is an emotional profession; as teachers, we feel deeply about our relationships with students, colleagues and about ourselves and the roles we play (Nias, 1996; Kelchtermans, 2005; Hargreaves, 1998). Change initiatives can add to negative feelings of guilt and burnout experienced by teachers who want to continue to provide the attention and support they feel is important while meeting increasing organizational demands (Hargreaves, 1998). Educational change initiatives must consider how they impact the teacher, both in terms of their practice and

in terms of their emotions, so that their ability to know their students and to match their instruction to their students' needs, abilities and interests is enhanced, not diminished, and does not create increased likelihood of teachers experiencing negative emotional impacts.

What motivates a teacher to change?

Researchers have found five criteria that influence teachers in their decision of whether or not to incorporate new practices. These criteria include (1) the clarity with which the practice is presented, (2) the congruence with the teacher's philosophy and practice, (3) the cost in terms of time and effort, (4) their perception of the importance of the change, and (5) the teacher's perception of the difficulty of use (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Sparks, 1983). Guskey (1998) noted that teachers who had high levels of self-efficacy (belief in their abilities as a teacher), a trait found to be directly correlated with high levels of instructional effectiveness, were the most likely to have positive attitudes toward adopting instructional innovations, while those teachers assumed to be less effective in the classroom were least receptive to instructional innovation. One of the implications from this study is that teachers who are likely to volunteer for a program aimed at reforming their classroom practice are the least likely to need it, compared with those teachers who are unlikely to participate voluntarily.

Teachers' Confidence, Inner Dialogue and Emotions: Connection to Change Processes

There is a large body of work encompassing what researchers say about teachers' emotions, agency, attitudes and confidence within change processes (Nias, 1996; Ketelaar, Beijaard, Boshuizen, & Den Brok, 2012; Lasky, 2005; Zimmerman, 2006). Teachers' feelings are affirmed as being of "fundamental importance in teaching and to teachers" (Nias, 1996, para.3). Nias claims that in order to change the practices of a teacher, the teacher's emotional

reactions as well as the beliefs and values that underlie these reactions must be addressed. Ketelaar et al. (2012) found that teachers' increased agency in a change process was strongly correlated with teachers feeling ownership of that process, but that agency also allowed teachers to reject the process if it conflicted with their own professional identity and values. Early influences on teacher identity and the context of their current reform process interact to define teachers' perceptions of their agency, identity and sense of purpose in contexts of educational change (Lasky, 2005). I found it true that situations I faced in the reform processes I participated in raised questions that helped me to better delineate my own identity in the face of being asked to do something new, and that my answers to those questions and the emotions these answers generated drove my response and further participation in the process. I explore these ideas as they thread through my experience of educational change in Chapters 4 (Discussion) and Chapter 5 (Analysis and Conclusions).

Resistance of Teachers to Change

In Judith Zimmerman's (2006) article "Why Some Teachers Resist Change and What Principals Can Do About It" she addresses barriers that lead teachers to resist adopting changes that affect their school and their practice. The first major barrier Zimmerman addressed was "failure to recognize the need for change" (p. 239). Speaking from my own perspective as a teacher, the word "failure" used in this context seems like an automatic judgement that the teacher is in the wrong in not acknowledging that the change is necessary. While I agree with Zimmerman in principle, I would reword this point to entertain the possibility that the teacher does not believe that the suggested change is necessary or that they see possible solutions other than the change being proposed. A second barrier Zimmerman identified is habit, suggesting it

is easier for the teacher to remain in the knowledge and skills they already have than to put in the time and effort to learn something new. Next, she found that teachers who have previously experienced unsuccessful change attempts may be hesitant to embrace new change initiatives. Additionally, Zimmerman said that teachers may prefer the comfort of doing things in familiar ways and experience a fear of the unknown. Finally, she stated that teachers may resist change due to perceived threats to their expertise, to power relationships, to social relationships and to their resource allocations (Zimmerman, 2006).

Teacher Engagement in Change Processes

Engagement on the part of the teacher is dependent on the teacher's attitudes, beliefs, trust and respect for the authority requesting the change (Hargreaves, 2005). Teacher engagement is also impacted by the confidence teachers have in themselves as educators and the confidence they have in their superiors and colleagues to provide the support they will need (if any) to enact the requested change (Lopez, 2010).

Not all teachers react the same way to imposed educational change (Hargreaves, 2005). In addition to previous findings of teachers' gender (Datnow, 2000), subject specialty (Goodson, 1988) and personal orientations to change affecting their response to change processes, Hargreaves (2005) found that the stage teachers are at in their career, teachers' previous experience with change, their personality type in relation to adopting change (early or late adopters) and the generation to which they belong all factor into their emotions and attitudes vis-à-vis change processes. Hargreaves also stated that young teachers have enthusiasm but lack wisdom and experience, late career teachers had experience and wisdom but also often cynicism

and change fatigue. Hargreaves found that the mid-career teachers had a balance between enthusiasm, adaptability, flexibility and resilience.

I would situate myself as a mid-career teacher according to Hargreaves's criteria from this study, having worked between six and ten years at the points that the change processes I describe occurred. I relate most strongly to Hargreaves's (2005) descriptions of the mid-career teacher, being more relaxed and comfortable in my role compared with early career teachers but still enthusiastic and engaged compared with late career teachers. Hargreave's conclusion about mid-career teachers rings true for me: "in the middle years of teaching, teachers retain but also rein back some of their enthusiasm, and with growing confidence, competence and a sense of being established, they feel able to remain open to yet also selective about the change initiatives they adopt" (p. 981). I felt exactly this: more confident, eager but somewhat restrained, competent, established and with a confidence to evaluate and be selective in the changes I wanted to adopt in my teaching practice.

Others also describe how the confidence touched on by Hargreaves (2005) plays a role in teachers implementing imposed change processes. The research findings of Cecilio Lopez (2010) indicated that, in processes of educational change, confidence and moral responsibility led teachers to hold more positive perceptions of their new roles following an attempted change process. Lopez described this confidence in different aspects: confidence in teachers' own abilities, in the support from their colleagues, and in understanding what the expectations of them are. Confidence has been a major factor in my experiences of educational change. Having a sense of confidence in myself, my colleagues, and my understanding of the process and its goals, has been a driving force in those educational change processes I have been a part of that

have seemed positive and have met successful ends. Lacking confidence, as has been the case in other educational change processes of which I've been a part, has led to doubt, frustration, a lack of progress and lack of motivation. Understanding what impacted my confidence levels may help future designers of educational change processes improve confidence levels in their participants and, ultimately, lead to more lasting change.

Staff Development and Leadership

Staff development has been found to be crucial for the success of educational change initiatives. Joyce and Showers (2002) found strong positive links between staff development, implementation of the desired change, and student achievement. While staff development has been found to be important, not just any type of staff development activity leads to this type of successful change. Pink (1989) noted twelve barriers to creating effective innovation, including too little time for teacher planning of new practices, a lack of leadership for the projects from within individual schools, competing demands on teachers, and a lack of awareness when teachers lacked knowledge on how to implement the innovations. My experience has been that frequent change of leadership, lack of clear direction for change, and possibly a lack of time for leaders to focus on developing long term plans that integrate staff professional development with school goals has led to my own staff development activities feeling like one-off training events that lacked cohesion and purpose in the longer term.

Leadership style in a change process has an impact on the success of the initiative. Wanda Siu, in her article "Complexity Theory and School Reform" (2008), examined leadership styles in educational reform. Siu stated that complexity theory suggests that the context of a specific school affects the teacher interactions within it. In her study, she found that most high

school leaders employed a top-down communication style in their endeavors for educational change; Siu suggests that a more effective style for improving staff relationships and interactions, with the goal of more successful educational reform, is leadership that takes a more personal and caring approach. In "The Human Face of Reform", Robert Evans (1993) discussed strategies for assessing and developing readiness of teaching staff for change, of the need for authentic leadership in change processes, and for having measurement of progress that compares to both a real baseline and an ideal goal. Blase (1988) states that a facilitative leadership style by principals, involving "building trust, developing democratic decision-making structures, encouraging autonomy, encouraging innovation/risk taking" (p.550) contributed to an increased sense of efficacy in teachers, increasing teacher involvement in change initiatives. My experience with leaders in change processes is that those who are perceived as authentic are also usually perceived as trustworthy, an important component in generating my engagement as a participant.

Impact of Agency on Teachers in Educational Change

During meetings that were part of educational change processes, there have been times when a buzz of participant conversation, spoken in hushed tones, pervaded the room; this was not the conversation of engagement but the conversation of boredom or disinterest, talking about weekend plans or commenting on the poorly designed slides instead of thinking about and engaging with the presenter's topic. What makes the difference in eliciting participants to move beyond their apathy and into a state of engagement with the process? Agency may be one answer to this question. Agency is "the perception of or intention to exert choice and voice" (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018, p. 185). Teacher agency is recognized as key to successful and lasting

change initiatives (Tao & Gao, 2017; van Veen, Sleegers, and van de Ven, 2005; Vahasantanen, 2015). The conception of teacher agency has evolved from an older view of teachers as technicians implementing an imposed plan of change to the more current view that teachers themselves are co-creators of the change, involved in decisions of need, development and implementation based on their professional experience (van Veen et al., 2005; Ketelaar et al., 2012).

Two links between agency and social structure (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018) describe the way that agency and the limits placed upon it have shaped my experience of educational reform. The first limitation of agency comes from structural hierarchies and layers of authority built into the process. These, in my situation, included principals, school board officials, and the role of IB Coordinator. The second limitation of agency described by Wilcox and Lawson was the teacher's perception of their ability to make decisions within the process and to create change in these situations, also known as self-efficacy. These authors went on to say that the conditions within a school and school board, as well as the leadership style of the authority figures in those organizations, could have positive or negative impacts on the agency that teachers experience.

The literature links agency and self-efficacy, agency being the opportunity to make decisions that have impact while self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to perform in a given context (Bandura, 2005). In order to feel effective in a change scenario, teachers need to feel that they have the opportunity to have an impact on the situation and that they are capable of doing what is necessary to make that change happen. It also tells us that teachers that are more connected in collegial relationships have greater collective efficacy (their shared beliefs about

the group's impact on student learning) and have greater actual benefit to student achievement (Moolenaar, Sleegers & Daly, 2012).

There is a great deal to consider when examining why and how teachers participate in educational change processes and how the success of those projects is determined. Teacher agency, self-efficacy, relationships, politics, group size and hierarchies all play a part in creating change in educational systems. What does all of this look like in the practice of one teacher undergoing change? This is where my own personal story of experiences of educational change comes under the microscope. While much has been written examining teachers and their role in educational change, there is a lack of teacher voice in sharing their own views and experiences in this field of study. This is a gap I hope to fill, at least in part, with my self-study. Expressing and analyzing my own thoughts, actions and emotions related to these change processes will provide a small window of insight that could lead to greater success in future educational change processes with the ultimate goal being better educated students.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Introduction

My background in science and belief in scientific principles, as well as my experience of watching my spouse as he wrote dissertations in ecology for his masters and doctoral work, led me to believe that all good research must be quantitative. I'd thought that qualitative research was a misnomer that actually represented story-telling and for which I had little academic respect. Through my graduate classes, my understanding of qualitative research methods and the purpose they served grew, and I came to see my previous negative views on qualitative research as a naive and ignorant stance. In particular, when I discovered self-study autobiography as a form of narrative qualitative research, I knew that this would give a richer understanding of my experience to myself and other readers than quantitative methods could provide.

Once I'd settled on autobiographical self-study for my research, I believed I needed to have a predetermined approach or "method" and that this needed to be described prior to beginning the process of data collection and analysis. This belief in the need for a predetermined structure was a carry-over from my prior understanding about research and the influence of quantitative methods on how I believed good research was done. Unable to define such a method in advance, I decided to go ahead and write my reflections, hoping this would give clarity to my process. After completing the reflections, I still didn't have a clear picture of what my analytical approach would be. I wrote about my choices each step of the way, hoping that this would be acceptable but was embarrassed by what I believed was a failure on my part not to have this figured out in advance. Late in this process, I discovered Garman's (1996) work on qualitative research in which she gives criteria for judging the quality of the research and also describes

what she calls "menacing traps" graduate students and others in qualitative work often fall into (p.19). One of the traps she describes is believing that research method must mean a description of techniques to manipulate data. This is the struggle I was having. Garman said that method can have a second meaning, that of "logic of justification" (p. 20), where the researcher elaborates on the "logical issues and concepts and, ultimately, on the justifications that inform the inquiry" (p.20). The statement solidified for me something that one of my supervisors had been trying to explain but that I hadn't been picking up on. I didn't need to have the methodology figured out in advance. Instead, I could explain the logic of the decisions I made that lead me to perform the inquiry in the way that I did. This was freeing and felt true in relation to my process. It affirmed for me an appreciation for the value of qualitative methods in sharing and analyzing my story.

Purpose of My Study

As I said in the introduction, the purpose of my study is to openly share and examine my own experiences of educational change from my perspective as a teacher participant in various educational change processes, in order to help myself and others learn lessons that will enable future change leaders and participants to design and act within change processes to be more successful in enacting and sustaining the change objectives.

Research Design

The design of my study centers on analyzing my reflections based on memories from three educational change processes I participated in. I have included the steps that I followed in designing and analyzing the work, as well as methods I attempted and abandoned due to lack of fit with the project or failure to provide insight into the work. I included these abandoned

methods so that others could understand that my route to completion was not a straight and clear path, and to encourage others by sharing my perseverance to discover analysis techniques that gave new perspective to the pieces of my story and connected them in a way that felt true and honest to me. Including these abandoned methods was also a way of contributing to the field of self-study by being transparent about my full process and how the final work came to be.

I planned to write these reflections from memory as a chronological record and intended to fact-check certain aspects with other people who would act as critical friends in the process. With this plan in mind, I wrote a list of questions specific to each process that I would use to lead the discussion with critical friends involved in each of the three processes. When I later decided not to address these questions to critical friends because of concerns it would interfere with my own memories and perspective, I rewrote the questions so that they were directed at myself. These questions focused on: (1) perceptions of the goals of the process, (2) assessment of success and reasons behind this assessment, (3) salient memories from the project, (4) what I would do differently if I could do it over again, (5) the effect of the process on my teaching practice, (6) wondering about which pieces I had forgotten or chosen not to include in the reflections, and (7) the reasons behind these choices. I decided to use these questions as a guide for my reflection writing, and created a separate reflection for each change process. As part of writing my reflections, I reviewed my own personal notes and journal entries that I had written during the School Reform Movement process. I looked back at meeting itineraries, notes and lesson plans that were created as part of the PLC activities over the two years it took place. The reflections on joining an IB school were based solely on my memory of events; there was no documentation from that time that I relied on to trigger my memories as I wrote them.

The process of writing the reflections led me to change the number of processes I included in the analysis. At the outset of my study, I was intending to include four change processes and had created question sets for all four. I wrote the four reflections in sequence. As I began writing the reflection on my experiences in implementing the QEP, I realized that responding to each of the questions I had intended to use when interviewing critical friends about these experiences was not providing a chronological record of what had transpired. I felt I needed to create this chronological record of what happened and how I felt about it before I could ask deeper questions about the experiences. I made the decision not to include the questions as prompts for my reflections writing.

As I wrote the initial reflection on being a part of the implementation of a new curriculum, I struggled to remember facts that I felt were important and necessary for me to recount and evaluate the process and my role within it. The events had happened ten years prior to my attempts to describe them. I wrote as much as I could remember and consulted two friends, teachers who had shared these implementation experiences with me and who I considered potential critical friends. They also struggled to remember and were not able to answer my questions with confidence; thus, a critical friend relationship did not emerge from these interactions as there was no feedback shared and the encounter was brief and ineffective in informing my study. This lack of feedback from critical friends I attempted to involve at this early stage played into my hesitation to consult critical friends later on in the process. I discussed this lack of confidence in my ability to recall this oldest change process with my supervisors and decided that I would include mention of this process in discussing my motivation for the study, but would not use the reflections as data and would not draw conclusions directly

related to this curriculum implementation change process. While I did not include this curriculum implementation process in my study, the writing of this reflection helped me to frame the chronological style and the focus on moments and issues within the process that generated strong memories and emotions in me as I remembered them.

I moved on to writing the other three reflections and was able to write with confidence in my memories of the events, my emotions and some internal dialogue related to these change processes. I reread these 3 reflections multiple times after writing them and was initially disappointed in the flat tone, the chronological nature of the storytelling (although intentionally done) and the repetitive way I chose to relay my thoughts and feelings. In spite of this disappointment, I believed I had captured the essence of my personal perspective of these change processes and my actions and reactions in the face of them. I did further rereadings of my reflections and added details I had left out, either because I hadn't remembered them previously or because I hadn't felt initially that they were worth including. I was feeling insecure about how much color to add in terms of what had been going through my head at the time of the events that had motivated by choices. My next step, returning to the literature to examine the practice of self-study (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) and the use of present moments (Stern, 2004) gave me the confidence I'd been lacking to include this colour in the form of internal dialogue and emotions.

At this point of feeling insecure about what to include and feeling lost in the reflection data I had created, I was having trouble finding a focal point and method for my analysis. I returned to the literature and re-read Pinnegar and Hamilton's "Self-Study of Practice as a Genre of Qualitative Research" (2009). Pinnegar and Hamilton quoted Daniel Stern (2004) as saying

that change occurs in our lives in small moments, momentary events, or what Stern terms "present moments". I went over this section multiple times and wrote a note to myself that I needed to re-examine my reflections to look for critical moments. What were the events that changed or reaffirmed how I perceived my role in the process? To do this, I looked for moments of great positive or negative emotion in my reflections as a sign of important events, and examined the causes of these emotions.

The search for these present moments was a turning point for me. It allowed me to focus on what motivated me to buy in or check out as a participant in the process. I stopped worrying about being able to articulate the goals for each process as they may have been intended by the process leaders (consultants, school board, administrators) in each case and thought instead about how I viewed the goals going into each process, how my perception of the goal changed, my reaction after perceiving this change, and how that reaction affected my further participation and created or discouraged lasting change in my practice. I wrote pages of notes in my journal describing these for each of the three change processes.

I still felt I was lacking a rigorous approach to data analysis. I returned to the literature, finished reading Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) and followed that up with Samaras' "Self-Study Teacher Research: Improving Your Practice Through Collaborative Inquiry" (2011), paying special attention to the sections on data collection, analysis, coding and matrices. I followed Samaras' structure through the data collection and early analysis, looking for themes and questions that connected and enhanced the meaning of the experiences, but was still looking for a structure in my analysis that would add rigour to the process. My first step after this return to the literature was to create a Framework for Analysis (Appendix A) based on Pinnegar and

Hamilton (2009). In this I laid out my rationale and justifications for the study. I intended to follow this by coding the reflections to identify themes and patterns; I created frequency-based word clouds to generate ideas for coding, but these failed to give me direction in choosing themes. I abandoned using the word clouds and decided to proceed with coding the text by choosing an initial list of ten codes based on the themes that had become salient up to that point in reading and writing about the experiences, informed by terminology I felt applied to these themes from the literature. I decided I would use these codes as a starting point, then adapt, add or remove the codes as I reread the text. I had difficulty in the development of clear codes and in understanding how these codes would inform my analysis. As I went through the text of the reflections line by line, looking for sections that fit with the codes I had created, I kept asking myself what identifying these sections would tell me. I couldn't answer this question and was concerned that this analysis technique was not going to help me understand and describe my findings in a way that resonated with me.

I stopped trying to code the reflections and decided I needed to connect with my supervisors to discuss where I was stuck with the analysis and ask for advice. We met, and they asked me to describe what insight I had developed into the change processes since we last discussed it. I explained that I'd come to see the goal of each process differently than I had when I began each process. I was searching for connections that explained my strong emotional responses to certain moments in the change processes and helped me make sense of why I reacted so strongly at these times. I also shared that I'd had a moment where I realized that the three processes could be ranked and rationalized in terms of their effectiveness, and that there was an inverse relationship between my perception of successful outcomes compared with my

sense of purpose and ability to effect change in each process. My supervisors suggested that this sense of agency is something I should explore in the literature and see how it relates to my experiences. We also discussed the power structure and the social makeup of the groups involved in each process; I shared my perception that the more politically motivated a project had been, the less successful I felt the outcome was. We talked about the differences between the structural organization of the three experiences and identified group size as well as hierarchy of authority within the group as two other major factors that contributed to the success of the processes. Finally, we identified the quality of the relationships and the level of trust between group members as a factor that affected the outcome of the project. Out of this conversation, these six themes solidified as the focus of my analysis: agency, self-efficacy, group size, relationships, hierarchy and political motivations. My analysis would evaluate the role of these six themes in the success of the three change processes.

As I made decisions about how to organize the analysis, I considered the themes and decided that the most critical factor to the success of each project was my level of agency within it. In the situations where I felt empowered to make choices and believed that the objective of the process would create an ultimate improvement in student learning and student success, the project was more successful in creating that change. I decided that I would organize the analysis in descending order from greatest levels of agency, self-efficacy and project success to lowest levels of agency, self-efficacy and project success. My measure of success for each project was a comparison of the process and its final product with my understanding of the project's intended goal. Within each process, I would also discuss the other four themes (group size, relationships, hierarchy and politics) and their effect on my thoughts, feelings, engagement and actions within

each project and draw connections between them and project outcomes. In the final chapter, I have summarized my findings for each theme and then outlined the key takeaways for myself and others as future change leaders and participants.

Ethical Considerations

There is risk in this study, to myself and to those involved in the change processes I describe. The risk to myself is that I am sharing my thoughts and feelings and opening myself up to criticism and judgement as a result. There is also the risk of others who are either mentioned in the reflections feeling slighted by my sharing of things I perceived in a way they might view as negative or on points over which they disagree or their memory and interpretation of events is different from my own. I have avoided using the real names of people, schools and projects in order to make those involved less easily identifiable.

Trustworthiness and Quality in Qualitative Research

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) list three methods in self-study for developing confidence in the data we have generated and the conclusions we have drawn. These include (1) being skeptical and asking questions of our reflections and ideas, (2) using validation processes similar to other forms of qualitative methodology, and (3) the use of critical friends.

My own skepticism of my reflections and ideas has been like a devil on my shoulder since the moment I started to think and write about these experiences and my analysis of them. I've asked myself if I am remembering correctly, being reminded of Payne and Blackwell's (1998) distinction between historical and narrative truth. I've wondered if I'm being honest with

myself about my feelings, if I'm choosing to remember certain parts and not others, and the reasons behind those choices. I have tried, to the best of my ability, to record everything that has come to mind about the processes and my experiences there-in, but I recognize that my memories are tied to the emotions I experienced at the time and there are many things that I'm not remembering, likely because they did not elicit the strong emotions that helped to imprint them in my memory.

In order to provide validation in the reflections, I have referred to other source material including my journals, lesson plans, meeting agendas, and slides and handouts from the projects I was involved in. These have helped me to remember and also been a source of confirmation for the timing and details of events.

Throughout the study, I have been conflicted over the use of critical friends to inform and hone my work. I have received encouragement from my faculty supervisors to use critical friends to read over my reflections and to interrogate me with questions about what is missing, why I included what I did, and to find deeper meaning through further explanations. Samaras (2011) and Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) both encourage the use of critical friends, with Samaras stating that while self-study necessitates a focus on the practice of the individual, there is also a "commitment to checking data and interpretations with others" (Samaras, 2011, p.4). Both the literature and my supervisors have pointed to the importance of involving critical friends in my process, but I have held back at different points for various reasons. I wrote the question sets (Appendices A-D) with the intention of interviewing critical friends before writing my own reflections. I changed my mind about doing so because I decided that since my data was autobiographical in nature and needed to include details about my choices and how these

were influenced by my feelings and my internal conversations and rationale, I didn't want the opinions and ideas of others clouding what I remembered of events and how I thought and felt about those moments. This choice is supported by the work of Kihlstrom (1998), who describes the way memories can be lost, altered and biased with the passing of time and with influence from other people. After the reflections were written, I again hesitated to share these with critical friends because I had the impression that in this instance a critical friend would need to be someone who was a part of the change process being discussed. There was no one who participated in those three processes with me that I felt comfortable sharing my detailed thoughts and feelings about myself and about the events of the process with. I did not want to put these people in a situation where either they felt bad about something that had happened during the time of the change process, or they felt conflicted because they learned something about someone else that they worked with. I did not want to create the possibility of these critical friends intentionally sharing information from my reflections that I would have preferred to keep private, or letting something slip unintentionally that caused hard feelings or gave a negative impression to other colleagues.

I did initiate one critical friend conversation with two former colleagues, intending to share my experiences with them so they could further question me and help me see pieces from those experiences I may have missed or understand them in a new way. This conversation did not add anything to my understanding of my own experiences. As I shared, these critical friends were reminded of their own experiences of educational change processes and replied that they would hesitate to participate in such experiences, believing them to usually be ineffective and taking too much time away from their classroom work. This reinforced for me that there is a

pervasive cynicism among teachers in relation to change processes. It is teachers' belief in the value of the process that is critical to their engagement in that process. As a consequence of this engagement, improvements can be realized when teachers invest in the process. It is this belief, engagement and investment on the part of teachers that creates successful educational change; without it, change in education is lip service that is not affecting student learning for the better. This is not to say that failed change can be blamed on teachers: if teachers choose not to engage and a change process fails as a result, one must also ask if the change process was worthy of their engagement to begin with.

Garman (1996) provides a set of criteria for assessing quality in qualitative research. These eight criteria include ethics, verite, verisimilitude, utility, rigour, vitality, aesthetics, integrity. Ethics has already been discussed above. Verite is described by Garman (1996) as work that seems authentic and that either fits with other work done on the topic or clearly explains why it has departed from those lines of thought. Being the author, I attest to the authenticity of the work and have tried to share experiences in a way that relays that authenticity to the reader. I have found corroboration in the literature for both the foundation of my work and the direction of my conclusions. Verisimilitude requires that my work portrays events in a way that allows them to be understood as real life experiences (Garman, 1996). Descriptions in my work have included both events external to myself and the internal dialogue of feelings and thoughts that have resulted in my response to these external events. This internal/external exposition of the events described enhances the verisimilitude and helps the reader feel my lived experience as a teacher and a human in these situations.

This study demonstrates the criteria of utility, or useful contribution to the professional field, by sharing my experiences of a teacher undergoing educational change in my own voice, a representation I found lacking in the literature and one that was alluded to by both Fullan (2007) and Hargreaves (1998). Garman (1996) describes rigour as depth of reasoning and intellect, aesthetics as work that is pleasing to read and insightful to experience, and vitality as work that is important and demonstrates vibrancy in its portrayals. Integrity requires the work to be structured logically and cohesively. I have relied on the perspective of my supervisors to confirm these four criteria in my work (rigour, aesthetics, vitality, and integrity) as I find them difficult to assess on my own, being at the center of my personal narrative and undergoing self-study based in my own memory of experience.

Chapter 4: Discussion

As I've followed the path of reflecting on these events and searching them for connections and repeated themes, within the individual change processes and then commonly across all three experiences, the questions I've asked myself about the processes have evolved from being mostly outward-focussed questions of "Why did *THEY*?" to also turning inward to ask "Why did *I*?". As Spillane, Reiser and Reimer (2002) point out when they talk about moving beyond a "dispassionate cognitive perspective" (p. 401), I found it necessary to examine my emotions to help make sense of educational reform attempts I had been a part of.

At the outset of examining these processes of change, I believed I would be able to evaluate the events as an outsider looking in at motivations and events, and give my observations as a witness to what went on. I thought about the experiences as things other people did which I observed; I initially did not put my own experience at the center or consider that my emotions were an important piece of the narrative. I am not alone in neglecting the role of emotion in change processes; Hargreaves (2005) noted that studies of educational change up to the early 2000's had often overlooked the emotional realm. The deeper I got into my reflections and the more I grew in understanding of self-study methodology and the need to understand emotions and motivation as a teacher undergoing change, the more I came to understand the necessary role my own motivations and emotions played in my role as a change agent in these processes, and that a discussion of that inner piece must be included in this self-study, not just as an addition, but as data that plays a central role in the ultimate success of the change processes.

As a teacher, I have had many warm and meaningful moments with my students; moments that have spurred me to continue in the teaching profession when other forces such as

politics, feelings of impotence, and misplaced priorities of leadership have discouraged me. However, in my life as a teacher there are many hours and days of the school year when I'm interacting with other adults: in meetings, workshops, conferences, and on special projects. Of all those adult interactions in my professional world, it was during change processes that I experienced some of the greatest confidence and success, but also the most frustration and disappointment. In the same vein as the comments that Kelchtermans (2005) quoted from Nias (1996), I feel passionately about my students but also about my colleagues, my professional skills, and the possible effects that changes in my professional realm can bring. There are so many settings and reasons to interact with teachers, administrators and other adults who are implicated in the running of the education system. Change for teachers can enhance their professional lives but can also create "conflict...and ambiguity, intense and negative emotional reactions" (Schmidt & Datnow, 2005, p.949). Part of the reason I chose to examine my experiences of educational change was because of the deep, lasting memories of the emotional highs and lows they had created in me, leaving memories of interactions and emotions stronger than those of any other in my teaching career. Why had change processes generated these stand-out moments of emotion for me?

Looking back on my reflections as a participant, I see a spectrum of my own efficacy as a change agent across the three experiences. My options and decisions about how to act were influenced by my belief in my own ability to impact the situation. Self-efficacy, agency, and engagement are three criteria found to effect innovation implementation by teachers (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018). Imants and van der Wal (2019) described professional agency as being "associated with individuals who, alone or in groups, in a given situation, make decisions, take

initiatives, act proactively rather than reactively, and deliberately strive and function to reach a certain end" (p. 2). Wilcox and Lawson (2018) defined agency similarly but more succinctly as "the perception or intention to exert choice and voice" (p. 185). There are elements of agency in how I came to be a participant in these change processes and in examining the elements within each process that I could choose or change. My personal course of action in each context must also be considered. Wilcox and Lawson (2018) applied the term engagement to the actions taken by a teacher in a change setting, and differentiate engagement from agency by calling engagement "agency-in-action" (p.186).

Many definitions of teacher self-efficacy have limited their scope to the teacher's belief in their impact within the classroom; my experience as a teacher undergoing examples of educational change beyond the classroom required a broader definition. Although the experiences I've reflected on occurred outside the classroom, I was still acting in my role as teacher and felt the term "teacher self-efficacy" applied. I found the work of Friedman and Kass (2002) that described teacher self-efficacy more widely as the teacher's perception of his or her ability to perform tasks related both to student learning in the classroom (classroom efficacy) and also related to the broader school organization and its social and political processes (organizational efficacy). Because the three change processes I examine in this study occurred in an educational context outside the classroom, I will be implying this organizational efficacy in my use of the term "self-efficacy".

Fullan (2007) stated that improvement of relationships within groups in educational change contexts is a key factor in improving the future success of such processes. In my work, I have noted and examined differences in both group size and the relationships between group

members as possible contributing factors to successful change. This led to several questions. How did the number of people and my relationships to them help or hinder the change process? Did it make a difference if there were different levels of authority (hierarchy) involved? How did the politics involved affected my agency and my motivation in each setting?

In this analysis, I will examine six factors affecting change processes including agency, self-efficacy, group size, relationships within the group, hierarchy and politics as these relate to each of the three change processes individually. I define group size as the number of people directly involved in the change initiative, including those present in positions of authority and those engaged specifically as direct participants in the change process. I will also examine the relationships, or connectedness, within the group, the extent to which members of the group (participants, leaders and consultants when present) have preexisting relationships and the nature and depth of these relationships.

I define hierarchy in the groups studied as being an examination of any differences in levels of power or subordinate/superordinate relationships within the group structure of the change initiative. Lois Brown Easton (2011) indicated that the existence of hierarchy can be an impediment to a key factor in participant engagement within change processes, the notion of shared purpose. She described communities as places where purpose is determined by all participants working together, and contrasts this with organizations which have hierarchy dictating the purpose to those who join the organization. I have looked at hierarchy as a factor affecting my participation as a teacher in change processes and in the broader effect of the hierarchy on the project success.

The final factor I have examined and related to change project success is politics, which I have used the definition from Thomas et al. (1983) of politics being a form of seeking power and attempting to influence the opinions and behaviors of others. In the context of education, Marsh (2007) described three ways that conceptions of power and politics can affect decision making. In the first, power is the ability to influence a person or group to make decisions or take actions they otherwise may not have made. In the second, power is able to prevent certain issues or concerns from being raised. And in the third, power allows for the desires and needs of an individual or group to be manipulated by someone, either intentionally or unintentionally. I examined if and how power dynamics within the change processes I examined affected my participation in those processes and the broader success of the change project.

With myself at the center of this study, I have ordered the discussion of these factors based on the proximity of the locus of control to me as the participant. As such, I begin by examining those factors which are centered on me as the participant (agency and self-efficacy), to those factors which connect me to others (relationships within the group) and finally to those which are outside of me (group size, hierarchy and politics). I will look at how the impact of these factors affected my engagement in the change processes. In the final chapter I will summarize how each of these factors influence change processes in general and how being mindful of them can improve change processes of the future. I decided to discuss the order of change processes in descending order of agency and success instead of ordering them chronologically; I found that those projects with higher agency were more successful, and wanted to emphasize how the other factors were implicated as change success and teacher agency diminish.

Change Process 1: Professional Learning Community

In 2015, I founded a Professional Learning Community (PLC) with three other grade 7 and 8 Science teachers with the goal of addressing persistent misconceptions in Science education. Our group's operation and aspirations aligned with Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace and Thomas' definition of a PLC as "a group of people sharing and critically interrogating their practice in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-oriented, growth-promoting way" (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace & Thomas, 2006, p. 229). Funding for our teachers' release time was paid for by a Professional Development and Improvement Grant (PDIG) from the Leadership Committee for English Education in Quebec (LCEEQ), a group that administers professional development activities and funding for English education within the province of Quebec. Our group of four teachers, all volunteers who freely chose to participate in the project with no pressure from administration, were supported by a school board science consultant as well as a professor and a graduate student from a local university. I had met the university representatives through my participation in a previous project they were conducting on misconceptions in Science education and how to address them in pedagogy. The professor agreed to be a part of our PLC and support us in our work identifying and addressing misconception of Science concepts; the teachers in the group, in turn, agreed to be observed and interviewed about our PLC work as a contribution to the professor's ongoing study of these misconceptions and how to address them.

Our PLC held regular monthly meetings that collaboratively generated lessons focussed on improving areas within the science curriculum identified by literature and by the teachers themselves based on their experience and knowledge of their students (Mayer & Marland, 1997)

as well as data from final exam results. An excerpt from my reflection describes our group's process:

> At our first meeting, we decided that we wanted to develop intentional lessons for addressing certain misconceptions, test them out in class, and then bring back our observations and assessments. We would then discuss how the lesson went with the students, examine our assessments for signs of improvement in understanding, decide how we would tweak that lesson for future groups, and then move on to the next topic and repeat the process. The first step we took in this process was to divide into two teams; the first team of two teachers taught mainly Secondary I Science (grade 7) and so would develop and test lessons for this group, while the second team would work on lessons for Secondary II Science (grade 8)...[Our process was to] identify a topic students struggled with, plan the lesson, teach the lesson making small adjustments as we went, share our observations, reflections and examples of student work, and make final tweaks for how we would do it differently in the future (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019).

After the first year, we reapplied for funding to continue with a broader goal of addressing Science misconceptions in more grade levels (7-10). Our PLC re-formed for a second year with a change in membership; one of the previous year's teacher participants decided not to continue, and four other teachers joined who taught grades 9 and 10 Science in our school. The professor and graduate student from McGill did not continue for the second year, as the focus of their project and funding had been for the single year addressing misconceptions at the grade 7/8 level. This new group met at the same rate of once per month and worked together to create, execute and improve lessons targeting topics of misconception based on our school's data from

provincial and school board Science exam scores. In this second year, we also shared knowledge of areas of struggle for students in higher grade levels so that those teaching the lower grades could use terminology and address topics in a way that supported the learning of related concepts in these higher grades.

Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas, and Wallace (2005) identified eight characteristics of successful PLC's. These include shared values and vision; collective responsibility for pupils' learning; collaboration focused on learning; individual and collective professional learning; reflective professional enquiry; openness, networks and partnerships; inclusive membership; mutual trust, respect and support (p.i). Our PLC exhibited all eight of these characteristics in the formation of our group (invitation to all individuals at the related grade levels), the carrying out of our individual responsibilities within the PLC, our collaboration and inquiry methods, the connections to school board and university projects and personnel, and the quality of relationships that demonstrated the highest levels of mutual trust, respect and support. Bolam et al. (2005) also named three measures of success in PLC's: (1) having an impact on student learning, (2) impact on "professional learning, performance and morale" (p. vi), and (3) "its operational performance as a PLC" (p. vii). Our PLC was successful in all three measures: student learning was improved, professional learning took place and morale was improved as relationships were strengthened through shared experience, and the group as a whole functioned smoothly and cohesively in achieving its goals. In light of Bolam et al.'s (2005) characteristics and criteria, our PLC can be deemed both effective and successful.

➢ **High Level of Agency, High Self-Efficacy**

Of the three change processes I've examined, my creation of and participation in the Science teacher PLC provided the highest levels of agency and self-efficacy, and resulted in the greatest success in terms of project outcomes meeting objectives. Agency, our control over decision-making and action within the group (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Imants and van der Wal, 2019) was determined completely by us as teachers within the PLC, with the support of the science consultant, university professor and graduate student. Participating teachers in the group were equals and there was no hierarchy as administrators were not part of the membership. Self-efficacy (Bandura, 2005; Friedman & Kass, 2002), my perception of my ability to perform the tasks necessary in this change context, was also high as I was creating, teaching, reflecting on and revising lessons that we as a group of teachers were creating. We were supported in our endeavors by a science consultant who provided scientific and pedagogical information, as well as university experts in the field of misconceptions in Science education. Analysis of student assessments, combined with feedback from other teachers in the group about the results in their own classes, gave us data to support the fact that our work in the PLC was improving student learning, contributing to an increase in my personal level of self-efficacy and to the collective efficacy of the group (Moolenaar et al., 2012).

The idea to form this group was my own, inspired by an existing Math PLC already operating in our school and motivated by the encouragement of one of my vice-principals. Each person in the group had been free to choose to join, and we chose to participate already having a rough idea of what participation would look like based on anecdotes shared by our colleagues from their Math PLC.

The objective of our PLC was grounded in improving student learning, a core characteristic of PLC's that helps to create shared norms within the group of teacher participants (Hord, 1997; Bolam et al., 2005). Our objective was clearly stated from the outset: to find science concepts that students struggled with and to develop new ways to teach those concepts to improve student understanding. This project had the greatest success in terms of meeting its objectives, with shared ownership by all participants in applying changes to their teaching in the concept areas identified and bringing back evidence to the group that the new lessons were having a positive impact on student understanding for those concepts. These teachers continued to use the lessons developed and collaborate on new lessons, based on the principle of identifying and addressing misconceptions, after the PLC was no longer formally meeting.

Relationships and Group Size

The size and makeup of this PLC, a group of seven participants developing science lessons for students in grades 7-10, aligns strongly with Roberts and Pruitt's (2009) recommendations for PLC's to optimally have between five and nine participants and to have several members from within the same subject area working together. This was the smallest group size of the three change processes discussed. Within this small group, there were strong positive pre-existing relationships between all the teachers as well as with the school board consultant that contributed to a sense of confidence in participants that their contributions and ideas would be trusted, valued and acted upon. Watson (2014) cautioned that while mutual trust and strong social ties are important, there is a tipping point where too much closeness and trust can impede growth if those in the group are all so close that diversity in thought is lacking. I think there was a balance struck in our group between the ability to maintain close trusting

relationships while still being able to question and objectively examine each other's work; however, I recognize that the group experienced very little conflict and wonder if I might be blind to the lack of diversity Watson (2014) described. My reflections stated:

> The four teachers in the group were all friends and enjoyed social time together with other members of the staff. We were all familiar with the science consultant who had been in their position since the four of us began our teaching careers with the school board . . .there were never any strong points of disagreement within the group. Occasionally there were differing ideas on how to proceed, and I remember a time when I became frustrated because I could not understand the perspective on a concept that someone was trying to explain to me. All members of the PLC had an extremely high level of professional and personal respect for one another, and so any differences of opinion were resolved with input from the other members of the group. When the two teachers working on lessons for Secondary II students had different ideas on how to approach a topic and couldn't decide which to proceed with, they would ask the others in the group for their input and opinions and then were always able to agree on a path forward.(Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

My supervisors have wondered at the lack of conflict I describe from this PLC, surprised that such harmony existed and asking about the conditions around and within the PLC that allowed for it. What may have contributed to the lack of conflict and the closeness of the relationships in this group of teachers (Watson, 2014; Bolam et al., 2005) is their sharing of physical space in their department workroom which encouraged collegiality and promoted stronger collegial and personal relationships, and the fact that these teachers regularly socialize outside the school

environment for functions such as birthday parties, baby showers, and sporting activities. I can attest that the lack of conflict and general agreement that I've described did exist, and I infer the reason for that to be that group members valued our personal and collegial friendships above our need to be right, or to outshine other members of the group in terms of ideas and contributions. I do recall one incident of frustration from the PLC, and described it in my reflections:

> There were never any strong points of disagreement within the group. Occasionally there were differing ideas on how to proceed, and I remember a time when I became frustrated because I could not understand the perspective on a concept that someone was trying to explain to me...my colleagues could tell that I was frustrated. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

In this situation, we decided to call an end to our meeting at that point, as it was already mid-afternoon and we had been meeting for several hours. This was an intentional strategy to deal with my frustration by admitting that it could be due at least partly to fatigue. A further comment in the reflection confirms that, in this case, our strategy of putting off the conversation solved the conflict. "When we met the next time...I still didn't fully understand the point from the previous conversation but I now felt it was less important and was able to move past it without it becoming a major stumbling block." (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

This moment of frustration on my part is the only conflict I recall in the PLC meetings during the first year. In the second year, I don't recall any examples of conflict although there were times where members of the group were more comfortable taking their assigned tasks and working on these separately instead of in the larger groups setting. The overall lack of conflict may be an example of Watson's (2014) caution in a uniform group of colleagues with such close

relationships, and it is possible that more diversity of opinion would have strengthened what was already a successful PLC by our measure and when held in comparison to Bolam et al.'s (2005) success criteria. It is also possible that these close relationships contributed to our mutual agreement within the project that the outcomes had, in fact, been successful. There was evidence from student work as well as the outside opinion of the school board consultant to add a measure of objectivity to our own internal assessment of this success.

The school board consultant who joined our PLC to support the teachers had previously worked with all members of the group. This consultant was respected and admired for their knowledge, having a pleasant and efficient nature, and their willingness to always quickly assist the teachers they worked with in an impartial way, making all those they worked with feel equally supported and valued.

The two group members who came from a local university were most often in the role of observers; they were studying our PLC experience as it related to their research project addressing misconceptions in science education. These university representatives did not have pre-existing relationships with most of the teachers involved, but were trusted for their expertise. The relationships between the university representatives and the teachers did not develop into deep or personal connections but the professor and graduate student were shown to be trusted in two ways: the teachers asked for their input in identifying science misconceptions, and the teachers were sufficiently comfortable with the presence of these two people, coming in from outside the teachers' circle of close colleagues, to be able to interact comfortably in the group without the need for pretense or formality. The role of the university representatives was to support the teachers in identifying areas of misconception in their students learning, based on the

professor and graduate students work on a project where such misconceptions had been identified. As their role was mostly to observe while providing some support in the area of identifying misconceptions, the fact that they were new to the group and did not have pre-existing relationships with the others did not create any dampening of the interactions between the teachers themselves which might sometimes be found when new and unknown members are added into a small group such as this.

Through the discussions, lesson planning, in-class delivery and the multiple iterations of these lessons addressing misconceptions, we as a collective of teachers who had highly developed interpersonal relationships were able to improve our students' understanding of Science concepts. In the two years after the PLC began, two teachers where were both ten-year veterans in the profession shared with me anecdotal evidence that their students who had been part of the lessons developed and taught by teachers in the PLC had more retention and depth of understanding of the concepts of basic atomic structure and density. Without the time to sit together and discuss student exam results that was afforded by the PLC and its funding for release time, we did not have the time to evaluate the impact of specific lessons from the PLC on student exam performance in future years after the PLC was complete.

These strong collegial relationships were held among all the teachers of the grade levels being addressed by the PLC; because of this, cohorts of students within our school were more likely to go on to benefit from stronger prior knowledge as the encountered more difficult related concepts at higher levels of Science. Teachers of higher grade levels could be confident that their students had received the same type of instruction and use of vocabulary for these difficult concepts. These strong interpersonal relationships (Moolenaar et al., 2012) wherein all teachers

involved in the project were connected in collegial relationships to one another made it possible to have the combination of desire, subject and contextual knowledge, and highly developed interpersonal communication skills that made the achievements of the group in addressing these misconceptions possible. Other factors that Moolenaar et al. (2012) found contributed to increased likelihood of teachers discussing their work together were gender, grade level, working hours, formal position and experience. When the first year group for the PLC is compared along these lines the four teachers had commonalities in the grades they were teaching (7/8). There were three men and one woman, three of the four held permanent "tenured" teaching positions, and they worked the same hours, often in shared workspace. Age and experience, were also common factors as all four were between the ages of 28 and 38 and had taught approximately 8 years each. In this first year of the PLC, gender may have played less of a role, but experience, grade-levels taught, age and career stage likely all contributed to the effective communication within the first year PLC group.

In the second year of the PLC, the age range was broader (late 20's to mid-50's), as was the range of teaching experience. The range of grades taught also varied more, from grade 7 to grade 11. This second year of the PLC saw initial dedication but then declining commitment, where my reflections record that "people would leave the room for longer periods of time to check on students or to teach an occasional class." Toward the end of this second year, I reflected that we "agreed that it felt like the PLC had run its course. People seemed to be losing interest and wanted to spend their time focusing on teaching instead." This feeling of stress and guilt at being away from the classroom is described by Hargreaves (1998) who pointed out the conflict created within teachers who want to innovate while still putting pressure on themselves

to provide attention and support to their students and meet organizational demands. The increased differences in the membership that second year contributed to the PLC ending; three of the four founding members were still present and enthusiastic, but the work was more spread out among the different grade levels and less focussed than it had in the first year, leading to fewer whole-group discussions on the topics of misconception being addressed decreasing the sense of common purpose (Moolenaar et al., 2012).

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications

There was no hierarchy within the PLC group in terms of formal authority. There were no bosses or authority figures. No one was in a stronger position to make or judge the actions and participation of the group members; each member was equal in terms of position and voice. Leadership in this case was a clear example of the power of democratic distributed leadership to effect change (Hatcher, 2005; Coyle, 1997; Rutherford, 2006). It was accepted that any comments shared on the work of others were for the sole purpose of making that lesson better. We shared our thoughts and ideas with one another and made it a comfortable space where feedback was rewarded with affirmation and appreciation. This structure is affirmed by both the shared leadership approach promoted by Hord (1997) and the increased agency and success associated with projects that involve greater teacher ownership of the process emphasized by Ketelaar et al. (2012).

Politics (Thomas, 1983; Marsh, 2007), the act of seeking or maintaining power or trying to influence the actions and decisions of others, played a part in the start-up of the PLC project by being the catalyst for its creation. There were several different political factors that motivated the creation of the PLC. A Vice Principal at my school who was in their second year as an

administrator, suggested I come up with a project proposal that could be funded through the Professional Development and Improvement Grant (PDIG). This encouragement for me to apply for this grant was likely spurred by several factors. The school board I worked in had a typical path for the development of administrators, most often moving them from being a teacher to a high school vice-principal, then an elementary principal and finally a high school principal in schools of increasing size. The Vice Principal in question had been in their VP role at our secondary school for one year. Because this person was a very new administrator, they were in the process of building credibility with their superiors and it would look good for me to have initiated the application for funding as the principal would know this was associated with this Vice Principal. This person was an upwardly mobile administrator who showed leadership and ambition to move up the chain to be a principal in a very short time. Being associated with this grant application would look good for them. Secondly, the administrators have regular meetings together at the school board where initiatives such as PDIG funding are discussed and the application for them encouraged. There was constant competition for status as the premiere high school in our board and in the local geographic area. Any funding, even money that did not go directly to fund student activities could be hailed as something that set the school apart.

Applying for and securing PDIG funding also looked good for me as a teacher and I felt gave my administrators an impression of leadership. I was proud and gained confidence after being asked to develop such a project as I felt that it suggested confidence in my both my knowledge of subject and pedagogy, and in my ability to enlist others to participate. This vote of confidence from my Vice Principal reinforced my beliefs about my self-efficacy (Guskey, 1988) and created a high level of engagement in me as well as confidence in the support of my

superiors (Lopez, 2010). I was identified by my vice-principal as someone who was willing and eager to innovate and am pleased that this reinforces the belief I have about myself as being open to new ideas and practices. I had also only been in this school for a year at the time this opportunity was presented and was trying to develop my own reputation as a teacher leader. In my reflections on the startup of the PLC, I described myself as being "excited and proud of myself for having made this connection [with the McGill professor and their project] and secured the professor's participation" (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019).

While all these factors explain some aspects that helped to get the project off the ground, once it was running there was no longer any reason for the participants' decisions and actions to be colored by political impact or ego. Administrators were not participating in the PLC meetings, and asked occasionally about the meetings and their progress but there was no formalized information sharing with our administrative team. Administration was mostly uninvolved and unaware once this project got funding and began meeting. The principal came in to say hello at one meeting, and that was the extent of administrator participation. They did not inquire beyond an occasional "How's it going?" and did not seem interested in hearing details about the progress. In spite of the encouragement toward shared leadership involving administrator participation in PLC's (Hord, 1997; Roberts & Pruitt, 2009), the hands-off approach of our administrators to motivate and support teachers in getting the PLC underway and then letting us lead and direct it without administrator participation is supported by the work of Blase (1988) who argued for leadership that encourages autonomy. I think that the lack of administrator participation contributed to the PLC's success by putting everyone in the PLC at the same level of power and ownership in the process, devoid of hierarchy and the variations and

influences of power that come along with it. The Math PLC on which our PLC was modeled was recognized as making a significant contribution to Math pedagogy at our school and also occurred without administrator participation; teachers representing the Math PLC were asked to present their project as a model for others to school board officials, showing the administrators had some knowledge of the project's success, likely from speaking with the teachers involved. The lack of communication about our PLC with administration may have been because administrators were busy, took us at our word that our work was going well, and were predisposed to believe in the value of PLC's based on the previous success of our Math colleagues.

The influence of having university representatives as part of the PLC did not create a perception among the teachers that we needed to tailor our project in any way related to future academic articles that might be written about our work. While we had gone through ethics approval for the university representatives to potentially include descriptions of our work in an article down the road, this is not something that was on the minds of the teacher participants while it was in progress. Our choices about when and where to meet, what subject areas to address, which teaching methods to employ, what evidence to bring back to the group from the classroom, and how this evidence would be evaluated and used to improve future practice were all decisions made together with input from group members with the sole objective being to work together for improved student learning.

In my work to create and be a part of this Science teacher PLC, I experienced high levels of agency, a sense of project ownership, and high self-efficacy that all fed my engagement in the change process and contributed to the project's success. Having a small group of

closely-connected teachers who had a habit of collaborating with one another created a social environment in the PLC that encouraged productivity and provided support. While politics and hierarchy played a role in establishing the PLC, they were absent in the operation of it and this equality and shared singular purpose among PLC participants also contributed to its success.

While this change project was successful in its improvement of student learning and enhancement of our collaboration as teachers, it is important to note that the PLC did not have the same level of effect in changing me as a professional as did the other two change processes I examined (IB induction process and School Reform Movement). Through the PLC, I adopted new techniques and took new approaches in teaching certain concepts, but because there was no major conflict or crisis involved in the PLC, there were no nodal moments (Graham, 1989) which might have caused me to reexamine my beliefs or philosophy about my teaching practice or to connect with other such moments of crisis to inform my identify as a teacher and change participant. This suggests that it is possible to adopt new ways of working without requiring major shifts in identity or philosophy of participants, but also highlights that successful changes in practice are not necessarily indicative of significant personal and professional growth.

The PLC provided an opportunity for me as a teacher to feel supported, powerful to create meaningful and measurable change for my students, and a positive reinforcement that will encourage me to engage in similar collaborative efforts with fellow teachers in the future. However, as I mentioned above, the PLC did not challenge my beliefs or my values; it did not play a major role in changing me. The next change process I will discuss, that of becoming a teacher at an IB school , stretched me as a person and challenged my perceptions of my what

maintaining my teaching identity was worth when weighed against confrontation and lack of agency in my teaching role.

Change Process 2: Induction into an IB School

In August of 2012, I gained full-time tenured status within my school board, a coveted position that means job security and one that can take years, sometimes decades, to attain. I came to be at a school that was part of the IB program as a result of my school board's staffing process and the union regulations that force the school board to assign teacher positions based on their days of experience in the school board. The choice of which school I ended up at was largely outside of my control. When I reached the point in my seniority with this school board where I could apply for a full-time permanent position, there was only one position available and it was at the IB school that provides the context for the next change process to be discussed. After the staffing process for the school year was complete, I received a letter informing me that my post was now permanently at an IB high school (grades 7-11) that I will from this point forward refer to as "The School".

This new position required me to move just a few kilometers across town from my previous school where I'd taught during the first three years of my career. I had not previously worked in an IB school and did not have knowledge of the program or how it impacted the practice of a teacher working within it. During those three years as a new teacher at my first school, my teaching identity had grown and I had made a couple of connections to teachers in my new school who were spouses or close friends of colleagues at my previous school. In reflecting on my identity at that time, I said:

> I felt more competent and confident as a teacher and more ready to take on a leadership role. I had a clear understanding of the curriculum and had three years of experience in the classroom; not enough to make me an expert but enough that I believed in myself, my teaching abilities and my knowledge of the system and the curriculum. I had made acquaintances with a couple of people in the staff I was joining, and I had taught one of the two courses I was taking on in my new post (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019).

I received very little communication from the school prior to my first day on the job and no training on IB philosophy or methods was provided to me before the school year began. I learned later that the absence of training in the early days of my time teaching at this school was symptomatic of a general lack of training provided in a meaningful and timely way. This led to a fragmentation and reduced engagement on the part of staff in their approaches to IB tasks. An absence of induction training did not mean that I was alone to figure out my teaching role. The staff I worked with were extremely collaborative and supportive and took the time on a daily basis to connect, reflect and discuss improvements in an informal way. An excerpt from my reflections speaks to these collegial relationships:

> Everyone in the room taught either Math, Science, or a combination of the two. I connected quickly with two teachers, one who had previously taught the Sec II science course and one who was teaching it with me now. Both of these colleagues went out of their way to provide me with guidance and ready-to-use materials for class. There was another new teacher in the room, also teaching Sec II, who had never taught in an IB program before either. I teamed up with them to develop and share lesson plans, evaluations and to plan content order. This gave me someone to bounce ideas off of and

> to reduce my planning workload a little. They and I would regularly reflect on and discuss the lessons, identifying what went well and what did not, and making suggestions to improve the lesson the next time it was taught. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

I entered the school as an unknown to my colleagues and quickly overcame some initial challenges to build strong collegial ties. At the same time I experienced nodal moments (Graham, 1989) in The School related to agency, identity, leadership and politics which I will describe in the sections that follow. The result of these events ultimately led to me leaving my position at The School and considering abandoning teaching as a career.

➤ **Moderate Agency, Varying levels of Self-Efficacy**

I have ranked my IB induction process at the school as being in the middle, between the high of the PLC and the low of the School Reform Movement in terms of both agency, or my "perception of or intention to exert choice and voice" (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018, p. 185) and the consistency of my perception of self-efficacy, or my belief in my ability to successfully perform in the ways expected of me in this IB context (Bandura, 2005; Friedman & Kass, 2002). There was an evolution of my agency over the course of my time at this IB school. In my reflections, I wrote that I "felt like I was starting as a new teacher all over again" and had very little say in the early choices about my teaching role or the process of learning to become an IB teacher. I experienced conflict early in my role related to this lack of agency. In my reflections I describe these events:

> My first conflict at The School was born out of my lack of knowledge about the program. In meeting with my teaching colleagues for grade 8 Science, I found out that they taught a unit each year on the science of flight, then had students create kites as their

> summative project. I was told this was "the IB project" for grade 8. My first reaction to this news was to ask why we were teaching about flight and building kites when this had no connection or basis in the Quebec curriculum (Quebec Education Program)...I resented being told I had to do something that I didn't see a reason for…I was approached that same day by the teacher who was the unofficial leader of the science department. There were no "department heads" or "lead teachers" as this type of position had been done away with in our school board. However, this teacher had the most seniority in our department and was well liked and respected, so had the unofficial authority to speak when something in the department went awry. In this case, the thing going awry was me. They came to see me and asked if I could explain my objection to teaching the kite unit. After I told them my objection was that it was unrelated to the QEP, they explained that teaching this unit was not optional and was expected of all grade 8 science teachers; all grade 8 science students in the school had to do it. It was not within my professional purvey to opt out. They told me that doing the unit was mandatory because it covered design requirements that were necessary as part of the IB program. I was upset and angry; I had already put my year's plan together and was frustrated that I was finding out about this at what I considered a late point. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

As I've described in this section from my reflections, I felt that decision making and choice were outside of my control and this affected my teaching identity, reducing the confidence I had built in my knowledge of what my role was supposed to be (Lopez, 2010). I was exhibiting the resistance Zimmerman (2006) described of a teacher being asked to change

but failing to see the need for this change. At this early point in my adaptation to my new school environment, I felt my self-efficacy was low, not believing that I could perform my teaching tasks according to the expectations of the IB program because I didn't understand what those expectations were. This combination of low self-efficacy and my resistance to change in this scenario aligns with Guskey (1988) who found teachers with high levels of self-efficacy more likely to embrace change initiatives.

As my first couple of years passed at The School and I came to understand the expectations of me in the context of being an IB teacher, I gained the confidence to speak up and make changes and found a way to generate the agency that allowed for these changes to be made. This increased my self-efficacy, which was further enhanced when I was approached by administration to lead a team of teachers mentoring new teachers and facilitating staff development activities. I record in my reflections:

> After this slightly rocky start, I was determined to make changes to the IB Interdisciplinary Project before the next school year. At the same time, I found that the curriculum for grade 7 and 8, which together made up Cycle I, did not have a clear order of topics. Some teachers covered things in grade 7, while others did not. Students wrote an end-of-cycle exam at the end of grade 8, and it was expected at that point that students would have covered all the topics from the Cycle I curriculum. This forced us as grade 8 (Secondary II as it's known in Quebec) teachers to spend weeks at the end of the year reviewing all the Cycle I (Grade 7 and 8) topics to make sure all students had seen everything before the exam.

> I wanted to find a more cohesive delivery plan for the curriculum that would allow all our Cycle 1 Science teachers within each grade to teach the same topics, order and use a common vocabulary. An opportunity to do just that came up in the Fall of my first year there, when the Science Consultant from the school board sent out a request for interested teachers to participate in a project, in cooperation with another school board, to develop a proposal for a common order of the Cycle I science curriculum...I called a meeting of our Cycle I Science teachers, with whom by now I had become friends. We had discussed this project together informally as the year went along and they had agreed that we needed a clearer plan for what topics were taught in each grade. At this meeting, I spoke about the project, its conclusions, and gave them each a paper copy of the proposed order. After giving them a chance to look it over, I asked if there was interest in trying out this order in the coming school year. There was general agreement, with most teachers seeming pleased. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

This section demonstrated my growing trust in relationships with my colleagues, my increasing engagement with them in collaboration, and my rising belief in my own ability to be effective in solving the problems I had seen as barriers early in my time at The School. These events of connection and collaboration increased our collective efficacy as Science and Math teachers and were beneficial to our students' achievement (Moolenaar et al., 2012).

I described this IB induction process as an initially successful change because while I did become effective at fulfilling the expectations of IB, as time went on I became disillusioned with the leadership of the program and chose to leave the school as a result. This came about after I experienced a prolonged lack of agency related in my role on the school's IB Steering

Committee. Literature emphasizes the importance of teachers as being co-creators in change processes (van Veen et al., 2005; Ketelaar et al., 2012). The changes proposed and enacted around the issue of purchasing the Managebac platform to support IB processes did not take teacher concerns and desires into consideration and led to changes that were imposed by leadership but resisted by teaching staff. I discussed this issue in the following portion of my reflections:

> I had been growing in my appreciation of the IB program's philosophy, but also disenchanted with what I felt was poor communication around changes that the administration and IB Coordinator were implementing in the form of a new computer platform called Managebac, used for unit planning, calendar organization and communication between teachers, administrators, parents and students. This system was proposed after our IB Coordinator was introduced to it and heard it praised by coordinators from other schools. The possibility of purchasing it for a one-year trial was spoken of at the IB Steering Committee. Before the trial began, a few teachers including myself were given access to try the system out and give our feedback. My impressions from my short test-run with the program was that the layout of the Managebac platform was not user-friendly; I found that it was not intuitive for the user as to where to click to find different types of information. I found it difficult to understand where unit plans were stored, how they were sorted, where to go to add information and where to go if I wanted to see other peoples units. I relayed this information to the IB Coordinator and instead of receiving it as valuable feedback, they repeatedly told me that I was mistaken, that this was not their impression or the impression of others who had tested the program

> in our school, and that IB coordinators from other schools had told them how effective and easy this program was to use by their staff. I didn't feel heard and it was frustrating. This made me angry, as I believed my feedback was valuable and supported by similar feedback from others. It made me not want to discuss further with the IB coordinator as I felt I was labelled biased against IB and against the Managebac program. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

In the events leading to the purchase and attempted implementation of the Managebac program, my agency was reduced and with that my engagement in further change attempts within The School dropped precipitously. I felt like I had no voice and as a consequence had no ability to be effective in creating change (Bandura, 2005). My agency was being limited both by the hierarchies in place within The School (administration, IB Coordinator, IB Steering Committee) and my own perception of my ability to make decisions and create change in this environment (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018).

The structure of this change process was different from the PLC and the School Reform project in that it was not a stand-alone project with a beginning and an end. This process was about learning to fulfill my obligations as an IB teacher at The School so that my students would benefit from my understanding and application of the techniques and philosophy of the IB program. When I first joined the school, I assumed that there were certain techniques and relevant training required to become an IB teacher, and I expected that this was the goal of the induction process. What I came to understand as I went through the induction process was that the intent was mostly about learning to do administrative things like filling in unit plans and mentoring students through a project, requirements that the IB organization expected of the

school in order to maintain its accreditation. There was, at the time I joined the school, no program in place to educate all new staff on the norms and expectations it had for its IB teachers. This prevented an efficient passage of staff together through Tuckman's (1965) group development stages of forming, storming, norming and performing. The school administration and some members of staff were very preoccupied with the school's IB status when considering internal policy and priorities, because the IB program is what they believed the school's reputation in the community was grounded in since their inception of the IB program in 1992. While maintaining that status was important, there was no measure inside the school of how effective we were as teachers at delivering on the IB philosophy in the confines of our individual teaching. No one came into my classroom to assess my teaching based on the tenets of the IB program. As a staff, we were not provided with training or mentoring directly from IB staffers. Once every five years, a small group of people representing the IB organization visits the school, meet with select teachers and students chosen by administration, and sit in on predetermined classes to decide if the program was doing what it needed to do to continue using the IB name. There was handwringing on the part of the IB Coordinator at our school that these visits go well so that our accreditation with IB not be jeopardized. I would estimate our school paid in the range of $50,000-$100,000,with adherence and assessment fees combined, to use the IB name. I had heard anecdotal accounts from teachers at the IB conference I attended in California that there were vast differences in programming and quality in IB schools around the world. Given the amount of money our school was paying, and the relative strictness to which I believed we adhered to the IB program and methods, most teachers in our school were convinced that the worst thing that could happen if the IB evaluators found fault with our program delivery

would be a warning, suggested minor changes, and a follow-up inspection by the IB auditors, likely at the school's expense.

My realization about the goal in this process was that it was not really about becoming a certified and capable IB teacher, but rather about doing all the minutia necessary to satisfy the IB organization and allow the school to keep its IB status. Students in our school benefitted from the IB program in many ways, but some of these were not tied to having teachers who were firm believers or adopters of IB philosophy. All IB students benefited from opportunities to complete the IB Personal Project, an individual design project, and also to earn an IB certificate. The efficacy of their classroom teachers was not dependent on those teachers adopting the IB philosophy, although Guskey (1988) would have argued that those teachers who were adopters of the IB philosophy as an instructional innovation would be more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy, which correlates with higher levels of instructional effectiveness. Teachers in our school held a wide array of beliefs about the value of the IB program. As a consequence, there were some who participated whole-heartedly and gave great attention to each task, others who mostly ignored the IB tasks knowing that they would be chased down for the things that absolutely had to be done and the rest would be allowed to slide with little or no consequence. Most of the staff fell somewhere in between, with tasks getting completed, usually by the deadline, but with less than enthusiastic participation. It was common that teachers who were in the later stages of their career and had been a part of the school for many years showed diminished enthusiasm and the greater cynicism about the value of the IB program and the tasks associated with it. This supports Hargreaves (2005) statements about late career-stage teachers

having increased likelihood of developing cynicism and showing signs of fatigue in the face of change initiatives.

In terms of my own beliefs and participation, at the time I joined The School, I had a very high opinion of the IB program based solely on the reputation that The School had within the school board. When my former principal from my previous school had said goodbye to me as part of their public remarks during the end of year staff party, the principal had teasingly announced that I was leaving this other school to join "The Academy", a pretentious nickname for The School given by other teachers and administrators in the school board. There was a pervasive jealousy and resentment of the school's reputation and high demand for student admission to The School over other high schools in the board, and a belief that other schools with equally strong programs were being overlooked by potential parents and students.

In spite of a few moments of anxiety and awkwardness, mostly due to lack of information, I came to accept the expectations placed on me as an IB teacher at The School because I believed that most of the things we were expected to do as part of the IB program encouraged good teaching. I attended an IB Conference in Lake Tahoe, CA, at the end of my first year at The School and came away believing more strongly in the program. I wanted to learn more about the IB personal project, an individual project designed, built and reflected on by each IB student entering grade 11 at The School, so I could improve my mentoring abilities and was more convinced that most of what we were asked to do within The School's IB program was in line with what I believe good teachers should do and be.

Relationships and Group Size

When considering the number of participants involved, my induction into the IB Program at The School can be thought of in terms of three different circles of people. The first, smallest circle, was made up of six people and included myself, the IB Coordinator and the school administrators to whom I reported. It was within this circle that my own tasks as a teacher were evaluated, and these were the people who had direct authority over me and were responsible for anything that I did or did not do in my professional capacity. Beyond this, there was a larger circle of about 20 that included the Math and Science teachers. These were the colleagues that I collaborated with and interacted with on a daily basis, and who supported me in learning the ways of IB. We sat together during all our non-teaching periods, as the classrooms were always in use and not available during our spares. We shared a common space to plan our lessons, do corrections and to eat and talk. The last and largest circle included the full staff at The School, numbering about 100 people. This group met for staff and IB meetings and shared in our equal responsibility for fulfilling IB tasks.

Unlike the PLC change process, which occurred at a later point in my career in this school after I'd developed strong collegial relationships, in the case of my induction as an IB teacher I had no prior relationships with any of the staff except for my acquaintance with one teacher whose spouse had been a former colleague of mine. At the same time, other members of the staff had well-developed and sometimes contentious relationships with each other. To me, the administrators, IB coordinator, teachers and staff were all new faces. I walked into the office on my first day I found myself being introduced as "the new science teacher". I met the twenty or so teachers who would become my new colleagues and support system. At my previous school, I'd had close relationships with my teaching colleagues and I had become friends with

many of them outside of work. I was nervous at having to leave that environment and start over. I found out later that some of my new colleagues were equally nervous to meet me and to see how I would integrate into this group of teachers' social dynamic. Most of the teachers in this group I was joining had developed very close relationships, enjoyed working together, and were hoping I was going to fit in and not rock the boat. They were disappointed to lose the person who had been replacing me while I was off on maternity leave, as that teacher had fit in and become a part of this tight group. My arrival was the cause of that teacher's departure and, in a sense, I was responsible for that teacher having to go; the group wanted to see if I was worth it. Given this situation and not knowing any of my colleagues, their personalities, roles, strengths and weaknesses, made me hesitant to ask individuals for help at first because I didn't know who could or would be willing.

As the new person, I found myself trying to rebuild an identity as my previous perceptions of my identity were being challenged in my new context (Lasky, 2005). At my last school I'd felt capable, confident and trusted. I came into The School on the first couple of days with this confidence still intact. A disagreement between myself and a teaching colleague, related to an IB teaching requirement, was the first major negative incident I experienced at The School and left me feeling unsure of myself in my new role. I was told I had to teach a unit on a topic not found in the Quebec curriculum in order to fulfill IB requirements. After initially arguing against this, believing that this should be a decision for me to make as the classroom teacher, the IB Coordinator and a teaching colleague both insisted that I comply. My previous confidence in feeling that I understood my role and my ability to navigate within my professional world was shaken. I felt at that moment that I lacked agency, being unable to effect change in a

decision that impacted what would happen in my classroom. I didn't like conceding to others on an issue of what and how I would teach, for the benefit of a program I didn't yet understand either the value or the workings of.

I had less agency in becoming an IB teacher at The School than I did as part of the PLC. For teachers in the IB program, there were deadlines and deliverables that followed a set schedule throughout the year. We did not hold ownership of this process and found little agency in the IB tasks expected of us (Ketelaar et al, 2012). Monthly IB meetings were held to remind staff of which IB obligations were upcoming and to provide details on how to complete these tasks. There was an annual cycle of unit plans to be created and revised within and across disciplines, IB report cards, personal project mentoring and evaluation, as well as the annual open house where we invited prospective parents and students to visit and were expected to arrange for IB-inspired activities to try to convince them that they should come to our school.

I wanted a stronger voice in the decisions made involving IB issues. To do this, I joined two IB-related committees. One was the reading committee for the grade 11 IB students' Personal Projects. I joined this to increase my understanding of the personal project and also to build relationships with the teachers on this committee, who included the IB coordinator and held a good deal of influence within the school. I felt that to be able to speak to issues in the school, I needed to better understand the IB program and this project was a major part of that. Being a part of this group allowed me to see a variety of project examples beyond the one or two students I was mentoring. It also allowed me to hear comments and discussion amongst other teachers on the committee who had years of experience with the projects. Before joining this committee, I'd found it difficult to understand the various stages of the project at the level I

needed in order to feel effective as a mentor to students. After sitting on this committee, I felt more confident in mentoring students, in speaking about the personal project with staff, students and parents, and in participating in staff conversations about IB in general. At this point in my relationship with the administrators and IB Coordinator, I felt appreciated for my involvement and relied upon for input on decisions related to the IB program and the school. I was asked to teach a class in Leadership, called upon to organize large-scale student events, and invited to sit as part of a committee creating the School Success Plan, including deciding up objectives and strategies for the next five years in the life of the school.

The second committee I joined to increase my voice in school decisions was the IB Steering Committee, the body in the school that was meant to act as liaison between the staff on one hand and the IB Coordinator and Principal on the other. A series of events related to this committee was a turning point in my relationship with the IB Coordinator and school administration. During a meeting with other IB coordinators from local schools, our IB Coordinator learned about an online dashboard available for purchase that purported to streamline IB tasks and to act as a communication hub where IB information could be shared between stakeholders (teachers, administrators, students and parents). I had been one of several teachers asked by the IB Coordinator to test out the functionality of this dashboard and report back our impressions. In testing the dashboard, I found it difficult to navigate and lacking in the fluid connectivity and live updating I had come to expect with our use of Google Apps for Education whose use had been adopted and promoted by the school board over the previous few years, and for which I had been praised for developing and delivering workshops to staff. My negative report of the dashboard, and similar reports by others, were not welcomed by the IB

Coordinator of by the coordinator's allies on the IB Steering Committee. They were not moved by these issues we reported. In their view, the dashboard was something we could trumpet to parents as making us new and current in terms of our IB program. It also made less work for the IB Coordinator by having unit plans created online instead of in hard copies that had to be managed and filed. The topic of the dashboard occasionally came up but the committee didn't have any final discussions about its purchase. In the meantime, the IB Coordinator's attitude toward me changed. They were short with me in conversation, and spoke negatively about me in conversations with others, sometimes even while I was standing within earshot. My ideas and opinions, when shared in meetings unrelated to IB or the dashboard, received negative attention from the IB Coordinator and the previous confidence I had felt in meetings and decision-making that involved school leadership diminished.

Toward the end of the year, the IB Coordinator and Principal announced that they had made the decision to purchase the contract to use the dashboard. This decision was made without full consultation of the IB Steering Committee and appeared to have been done for political reasons in an effort to have the same technology and online communication tools as other IB schools in our area, a fact that could be used to promote The School to bolster enrolment. The decision to make the purchase was made in the face of opposition from many teachers who'd been asked to try out the dashboard before the purchase. This decision, the way it was taken, and the overall change in attitude toward my voice within the IB program, made me feel ignored and that my voice had been further diminished. There had been other previous points of disagreement between myself and school leadership that had been of a more personal and/or philosophical nature, which I had been willing to move past. I saw these previous events

as isolated, not affecting my day to day professional interactions and not having negatively impacted my relationship with these members of the school's leadership or my reputation within the school. This situation around Managebac was different. There were incidents during this time where I was not only criticized for my opinions, but on several occasions I was accused of having generated negativity within the staff toward the decisions taken by school leadership in regards to Managebac specifically and the IB program more generally. I was referred to by the IB Coordinator, in their conversations with other teachers, as being an uninformed negative influence on my colleagues. In fact, these teachers whom I was accused of having influenced were the ones who had approached me with their opinions and whose views I was trying to represent to the IB Steering Committee. I had joined the committee to have a greater impact but the experience of being on the committee instead compounded my discouragement. I felt that my reputation was suffering unjustly and, given how difficult the job of teaching is and how much I was already investing in terms of time and emotions, I was discouraged and disheartened at the turn my relationships with some members of the school leadership had taken over the decisions regarding Managebac and my attempts to create change.

This series of events caused me to examine my role at The School. I still wanted to be involved in leadership and decision making. However, I no longer wanted to be a part of the leadership team at The School as it did not align with my values of transparency, treating others with respect, kindness and compassion, and of holding the education of students as our top priority in decision making. This conclusion led me to disengage from efforts to be further involved in leadership and decision-making at The School and I considered, for the first time, that it might be time to move on to a new role outside of The School and possibly outside of

teaching. I began the process of applying to become an RCMP officer. While on this path, my partner received an offer of employment that ultimately resulted in me abandoning the RCMP job so that we could move to Ottawa for his new position. This gave me time and space to consider whether teaching was still what I wanted and I made the decision to start over at a new school and to keep my eyes open for other opportunities, in education and beyond.

I was sad to leave my colleagues, many of whom I had grown to love, as is often the case with teachers as we feel deeply about our students and our colleagues (Kelchtermans, 2005; Nias, 1996). In spite of that, I felt relieved to move on from this teaching role in which I felt mute, undervalued and powerless. My administrators spoke highly of my teaching skills, my relationship with students, my ability to communicate and interact with parents, and my leadership among the staff. However, because of decisions that were made and the resulting impact on my relationships with school leaders, I also felt that my agency and voice had been diminished and that the political nature of the decision making by school leadership prioritized school reputation and enrolment issues above student learning, staff engagement, and treating each other with kindness and respect. I needed a change. I wanted to work in a setting where I felt listened to and appreciated. In spite of my belief that there was value in what the IB program at The School promoted, the school environment made it impossible for me to be the leader and change agent I wanted to be while staying true to my own values. It was time to go, but I was not leaving this change process empty-handed. Through it, I had learned the philosophy and practice of being an IB teacher and could carry this with me. The influence of IB will inform my teaching, encouraging me to incorporate a global perspective and cross-curricular techniques, and to use inquiry to guide my students in whatever teaching position I hold, even if I never

teach in an IB school again. I've also learned about navigating social dynamics that affect educational decision-making in schools and hope I can use what I've learned to be more egalitarian and transparent as a leader, and to listen to my staff to understand their concerns and motivations to create an environment of respect and encourage buy-in on change processes.

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications

Politics, as I've previously defined in terms of seeking and maintaining power or attempting to influence the decisions and actions of others (Thomas, 1983; Marsh, 2007), played a critical role in understanding the decision-making and agency-related issues I experienced during my induction as an IB teacher at The School. Controlling the conversation and driving progress based on the school leadership's priorities while ignoring or diminishing the importance of the priorities of others in the system who have less power, such as teachers, is one of the aspects of power identified by Marsh (2007). Decisions of the leadership at The School, especially the principal and IB Coordinator, were made with the constant need to keep reputation top of mind as it relates to school enrolment. Because of these priorities, the power of school leaders was often used to quash or minimize issues voiced by teaching staff when these issues ran counter to the school leadership's priorities. English-speaking parents in the urban area where The School is located have more options for school choice than do parents in almost any other part of the country. The issue of school choice in Quebec is of special significance because of parallel French and English school boards, a healthy and diverse private school system which includes religious and non-religious options, and the existence of protectionist language laws.

Quebec is the only unilingual French province in Canada and in 1977 its government passed the Charter of the French Language, known commonly as Bill 101, in an effort to protect the French language and enable French-speakers to attain more powerful positions within the Quebec economy. The Charter required that all children attend French school, unless at least one of their parents attended the majority of their elementary school in Canada in English. Schools in the English school boards offer a minimum of 50% French Immersion programming at the elementary level and options for enriched French at the secondary level. For those parents who have this English eligibility, they can choose for their child to attend an English school, a French school, or one of the many private schools, all within a short drive and accessible by public transit.

This ability to choose on the part of parents creates a high level of competition between schools. In the context of my study, this competition is important because it has an impact on decision making within the schools. Decisions are no longer primarily based on providing the best education for their students. School leaders feel pressure to create and promote a school brand that makes the school attractive to prospective parents. The potential for drastic shifts in enrolment impact teacher jobs and nullify investments in infrastructure and programming. To maintain enrolment and provide stability and continuity in their own existence, each school takes steps to make itself stand out from the crowd.

This is the situation in which The School found itself when I came on staff. The IB program was their point of pride. Any threat to it caused school leadership to circle the wagons. I got so frustrated sitting in meetings where instead of talking about good pedagogy we would focus on issues of school reputation. I believed that if we focussed on student learning and good

teaching, provincial exam results bear this out and parents and students would be attracted to the school as a result. I didn't think that we needed to put on a show for parents at Open House night, or to develop gimmicks and programming aimed at attracting parents and students when these efforts did not improve student success. If our teaching was strong, which in my opinion it was, I believed we would attract top students through the reputation of our results and that these results would continue. Most, though not all, of the teachers at this school believed they were good at teaching but were always looking for ways to improve their pedagogy, a sign that Moolenaar et al. (2012) pointed out as a key feature of collective self-efficacy. I recognize that I was considered an outsider because my opinions were based on experiences in other parts of the country. To those who had worked for most of their career in this English Quebec mentality, it was fully accepted that posturing for parents was necessary. Any effort aimed at breaking out of this system was abandoned in favor of finding success within it.

The choice to purchase the IB dashboard was one example of a decision that was made by school leadership, those holding the power to make decisions and dictate priorities (Marsh, 2007), because of the politics surrounding competition. There were other IB schools in our own board that we were competing with, and they had already purchased the dashboard. "How does it look if we are the only school that isn't offering this to students and parents?" our principal and IB coordinator asked the staff, as a point in support of their decision to purchase it. Never mind that we already had software that did all these things, most of which were more user friendly and could be accessed at no additional cost.

There was a definite hierarchy in the IB induction change process, with the principal at the head, followed by the IB coordinator, the senior department teachers, and then myself. If a

teacher was not fulfilling their IB obligations, the IB coordinator might approach them directly or might discuss it with a more senior teacher who would then approach the teacher in question. Failing either of these approaches, the IB coordinator would go to the principal who would then speak to the teacher and apply pressure for them to conform to expectations. Being a person who liked to be seen as following the rules and completing the expectations of my role, I always fulfilled my IB tasks, even when I disagreed with them. There were times when I would have conversations with any of those people in the chain above me about changes we should make to the way we did things, but this never prevented me from doing what was expected of me. In the first couple of years, as I grew to appreciate the IB program and was enjoying my experience in the school, the structure for what was expected of teachers in performing IB tasks frustrated me occasionally, but I was growing in my confidence and leadership within my role there.

The hierarchy within the IB program at The School, those in positions of power over me including the principal and IB Coordinator, reduced my agency by limiting my ability to make decisions about how I would participate and by failing to provide timely and effective support and training on change initiatives these leaders imposed. This had negative implications for my teaching practice, both inside the classroom and as a teacher participating in school governance and leadership initiatives (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018). There was a breakdown in communication between the teachers (including myself) and the leadership (IB Coordinator and Principal). We teachers would express our need for support, often in the form of training, but the supports were not provided adequately or in a timely way. An excerpt from my reflections bears this out:

> I know many of my colleagues still felt the apprehension, lack of confidence, and sometimes frustration, that they had expressed to me five years before. Their opinions

were sometimes shared with the IB Coordinator, but there was a stall in communication between teachers and the IB Coordinator that limited their willingness to improve in that role, as well as the IB Coordinator's ability to understand and provide the type of support that was needed for this improvement to occur. When the teachers expressed frustration, they were letting off steam but also looking for support and resolution to their problems. When the IB Coordinator listened to their frustrations, I believe the Coordinator heard complaining and perceived laziness on the part of teachers unwilling to put in the work needed for the program to run to its full potential. From my perspective, it was true that what was needed was more time, as well as more training. Teachers felt overworked, felt like their voices were ignored, and that more expectations were being added to their role without anything being taken away. Since teachers' pay wasn't increased to compensate for extra work (there's no overtime pay in teaching), many chose to focus on their classroom teaching and did not put in the extra time required to learn what was expected of IB mentors and to do the job to the best of their abilities...I expressed at an IB Steering Committee meeting that staff felt some type of formal training was necessary, and that staff were feeling lost as they tried to get into Managebac and navigate through it. After some coaxing by a couple of others on the committee who supported that need, the IB Coordinator agreed to arrange training. Several weeks later, this training was provided as a full-staff meeting in the library. In this setting, 80+ staff sat and watched as a representative from Managebac projected an image of his computer screen and demonstrated how to navigate the different aspects of the program. There was no hands-on training provided. My colleagues and I left this

> training feeling even more frustrated than we had been before the training was provided. I felt angry and embarrassed because I had advocated for training to be delivered and had been assuring my colleagues that they just needed to hang in there - help was on the way. When it came, it was done in such a way that very little learning took place. We felt like the training had been a waste of our time. We could barely see what the Managebac representative was doing on his computer because of the relatively small size of the screen compared with the size of the room. Without manipulating the program ourselves, none of what the Managebac representative talked about sank in and we were more convinced than ever that both the program and those representing it were not connecting with users in a way that was helpful or that supported our needs as The School IB teachers. What we needed was training and time. We received poor training and the expectation that we would use a portion of the time that was already taken up with other things to learn how to use the program and then continue to use it in spite of its inadequacies. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019).

These leaders (principal and IB Coordinator) within the IB program had the final say on what was provided to support teachers and how things were done, far from the democratic distributed leadership described by Hatcher (2005). I had to follow those decisions and be ultimately accepting of the support they offered if I were to fulfill the requirements of my job. Marsh's (2007) description of power being used to prevent certain issues from being dealt with can be seen here in the case of teachers' concerns about Managebac being ignored because they did not align with the purpose of the administration who held the power in decision-making.

The effect of this hierarchy made my induction into IB and the fulfilling the expectations placed on me a less successful change process than the PLC experience had been because, although I engaged for a time and became a leader and supporter of the IB program within the school, in the end I disengaged from wanting to be a part of the IB program at The School and was willing to walk away from the school because of the way politics and hierarchy combined to affect their school environment and decision-making processes. Looking at the different factors I examined related to change processes, agency and self-efficacy in this example fluctuated greatly, beginning and ending at low points but having periods in the middle where I found and used opportunities to generate change in myself, with my students as an IB teacher, and within my school as an organization. Joining this larger group that had pre-existing relationships that I was not a part of and was unfamiliar with, building my own relationships within this group and finding my identity and my role in this organization took time and was built through both the positive social interactions and the crises I experienced along the way. Politics played a role in the decision-making of authority figures in the school's hierarchy, and these decisions were related to maintaining our level of student enrolment by continuing to promote our school's image of high student achievement and relating this achievement to our IB program. This political influence on decision-making contributed to my eventual disengagement from being involved in promoting change and staff development, as leadership on these issues was neither facilitative nor distributed (Harris, Moos, Moller, Robertson & Spillane, 2007) but instead showed itself to be autocratic, ignoring input from teachers and prioritizing school image over staff feedback. An excerpt from my reflections describes an instance of such autocratic decision-making by the school leadership:

> Months after this training session, I expressed at another IB Steering Committee Meeting that the Managebac program had not lived up to what was promised in terms of serving our needs. At this point it was revealed that the administrators and IB Coordinator had already signed on for a long-term contract with Managebac, agreeing to pay many thousands of dollars per year for its use for several years to come. I expressed my frustration that the training provided had been inadequate and that the functions of this program were not nearly as effective as some of the Google programs that we were already using, specifically Google Classroom, which was of no cost to the school and for which training had already been provided. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

The time I spent learning to become an IB teacher at this school reinforces what Schmidt & Datnow (2005) said about teachers undergoing change: there were times where learning about the IB philosophy and the school's norms around its IB program enhanced my pedagogy and my professional life, but there were also times of the conflict and intense negative emotions these authors described. The nodal moments (Graham, 1989) in this process included the initial conflict with colleagues and the IB coordinator relating to the teaching of a topic outside the provincial curriculum and the conflict, lack of agency and disengagement I experienced as part of the IB Steering Committee and the decisions surrounding the adoption of the Managebac software program. These nodal moments changed me in substantial ways that I will discuss in more detail in the final chapter.

Change Process 3: School Reform Movement

In my fifth year of teaching at The School in 2017, the year after we wrapped up our PLC meetings, an administrator who was familiar with my interest in educational change made me aware of a change initiative which I will refer to as the School Reform Project. The objective of this project was to gather a variety of stakeholders with different types of interest and involvement in the education system and bring them together to design a pilot project for a school designed around project-based learning. The people gathered to design this school included school board officials, administrators, teachers, parents, local general community members and members of the business and technology sector. This group met over several months to brainstorm and develop a project-based learning school, with the design centering on five principles: Spatial, Temporal, Andragogical, Relational and Communal (Hass Plattner Institute of Design at Stanford University, 2019; nEDworks/LEARN, 2017).

➢ **Low Agency, Low Self-Efficacy**

Of the three change process I participated in and reflected on for this study, my participation in the School Reform Movement was the one in which I felt the lowest level of agency, or ability to express my own voice and choice (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018) and which provided me with the lowest perception of my self-efficacy (Bandura, 2005) in creating meaningful change. I had come to know and recognize the feelings and experience associated with high levels of self-efficacy in the PLC and developed a recognition of what agency looked like for me as a change participant through both the PLC and the IB Induction Process.(Lasky, 2005). I had also struggled to find my voice and develop an identity through the IB induction process and did not want to feel mute or lacking purpose in the School Reform movement as a result. I quickly recognized that there was little opportunity for agency in the School Reform

Movement. My lack of agency and self-efficacy resulted in me having serious doubts about this project's ability to create meaningful and lasting change, doubts about the intent and goals of the project leadership, and led me to anticipate and then experience negative feelings of disappointment and frustration about the lack of impact my participation would have in creating a viable school model.

After initially learning of the project, I volunteered to be a part of this initiative to design a new school model and contacted one of the two people spearheading the project, asking to be included. My motivation to participate stemmed from my interest in project-based learning, developed while reading about educational differentiation and programming for gifted learners for a university graduate course. This motivation remained in spite of the negative reaction of my colleagues, as I describe in the following excerpt from my reflections:

> I received emails from the project leader, sent to all those who had signed on to participate, stating that they were needing additional participants and to try and drum up interest among colleagues to join the project. This concerned me slightly; I wondered what I was getting involved in and if this was a good use of my time if they were having trouble getting others to join. At this point it was early-mid December and the first meeting was to take place in mid-January. The message said that they only had half of the 50 participants they were hoping for. I shared this email with our Math/Science team and spoke to several colleagues, but the response was general disinterest and everyone I spoke to chose not to participate. I thought at the time that this was mostly because I was not able to share a clear picture of what they would be participating in, since I didn't clearly understand it myself, and given the vague nature of the invitation they did not

> want to take time away from their students or invest the time that preparing for a substitute teacher requires. Colleagues commented that this sounded like "just another wasted school board initiative", "it'll get sidelined like everything else", and "this is just another flash in the pan." (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

I arrived with enthusiasm at the first School Reform project meeting, expecting that I would be working with others who were equally engaged in designing a school model that would allow students to connect and integrate learning with their passions and their community, and ultimately get more out of their education. My experiences in several other projects including exam development, curriculum mapping, and the PLC had been very positive experiences for me and I was basing my expectations for this School Reform Movement on these past experiences (Lasky, 2005). I was also aware of some of the failings of my IB Induction in terms of training, communication and group cohesion, and did not want to see those mistakes repeated in this project.

From the outset of my participation in the School Reform Movement, the organizers had a clearly planned agenda for how we as participants would spend our time, and there was no room for input on the process. There was very little for participants to do in the way of decision making, a red flag that the key aspect of participant agency in this process was limited (Tao, 2017; van Veen et al., 2005; Vahasantanen, 2015). When we arrived, we were placed in predetermined groups that had each been assigned to develop one of the five components of the school design, as determined by the project leaders. Their abbreviation for these project pillars was STARC, which stood for Spatial, Temporal, Andragogical, Relational, and Communal.

Participants were placed on one of these five teams and during each session their design work was to focus on their particular aspect of the design.

My enthusiasm for the project began to wane on the morning of that first day. Events and circumstances shifted my mood and engagement level from excitedly engaged to cynically detached, with these changes starting to happen before the first meeting was called to order. My career stage, as examined by Hargreaves (2005) may help explain this shift from initial enthusiasm to disengagement. Had I been a young teacher, new to the profession, I might have accepted everything that happened in these sessions as just the way things were done and not questioned the motives or strategy of the leadership, instead feeling pleased just to be included. Had I been an older teacher, at the end of my career, I might likely have reacted with more cynicism initially and avoided joining the group in the first place. My status as a mid-career teacher gave me a combination of enthusiasm and discernment that lead me to give this change initiative a chance but then to decide that it wasn't worthy of my engagement because the design product we were developing lacked depth and rigour, and the design process had been intentionally created to make it so. The proposal as we developed it was a series of suggestions for things to include in a school centered on project-based learning, but did not contain specific instructions for what the schedule, course-design, staffing, or staff-student relationships or community connection aspects would be and how these could be linked together in a way that was feasible given the constraints on resources that were described to us during the project. Schools would need to operate in existing buildings. There were contract limitations from the local and provincial agreements with teachers unions that would limit changes that could be

made to staffing. And there was no mention of extra funding that would be available to a school that wanted to adapt to our suggested format.

On the morning of the first meeting, before things got underway, I'd had a quick conversation with an acquaintance, a school principal who had been a former teaching colleague. I mentioned how few teachers and administrators there were in the room and wondered out loud why so few people were willing to participate. The principal's response was that most people saw this type of project as a waste of time and that I shouldn't get my hopes up that something lasting would come of this. In the principal's view, it was an exercise meant to generate ideas that would probably never come to fruition. At that moment, I had written off these comments as cynical and believed that I was definitely there to design a school, with every expectation that it would one day become a reality. By the end of that first day, I looked back on his comment and was already starting to see myself as naive and foolish.

I continued to attend the remaining design sessions, but it was out of a sense of obligation to follow through because I'd made the commitment. I no longer had a sense of shared purpose with others in the room. When I had to miss one of the sessions because there was something in my classroom that I had to be present for, I felt no sense of loss.

At different points in the process, I spoke up and raised concerns I had about the lack of coherence between the groups and my feelings that some of the activities meant to generate creative thinking had been a waste of time. My comments were politely acknowledged but I didn't see any changes happening as a result. In having my voice unheard, my agency was further diminished. I had no power to make changes to the structure and no depth of relationship that prompted me to speak with the project leadership on a deeper, more personal level. The

structure of the group felt artificially imposed by someone who had read a textbook on systems thinking and generating creative ideas and tried to mash the two things together. I felt anger and resentment rise up inside me when these activities were proposed, and had a hard time tamping down my physical reaction so that I could put my opposition into words. Sometimes I half-heartedly participated for the sake of trying to get along. Other times, I sat in my chair with my arms crossed, feeling my body tense and hearing my heart pounding in my ears.

At one point a consultant working on the project asked me if it was okay to interview me for the blog post they were hired to write about the project. I told the consultant my feelings at that point were entirely negative and I didn't think I had anything to share that they would want to include on the blog. They told me they hoped something would happen to improve my outlook on the project, and they moved on to interview someone else. I was very aware of the negative reaction I was having in the project meetings and did not want to be the person they interviewed, as I was concerned that either no one else was having this same reaction or that no one would admit to feeling the way I did. It's possible that my comments could have been framed in a constructive way. However, I had tried already shared questions and concerns with the group and felt that these had not been addressed. I felt like I stood out in the group as a voice of negativity. I was aware that negative voices often get sidelined and ignored, and I didn't want to compound the lack of voice I was already feeling in this group.

Unfortunately, after briefly sharing my feelings about the project with this consultant, I saw no improvement. I felt like the project leaders could have put any group of people, even those who'd never received a day of training related to education, into that room and come away being able to say that people were consulted and they had a plan to move forward with the

project. I think the plan they moved forward with was the plan the leadership had conceived before the consultation began. It left me feeling like my input lacked value and purpose. I will be more hesitant to sign up for such a process in the future and would ask more questions about the intent and the process.

Relationships and Group Size

Project volunteers for the School Reform Movement met for the first time in the boardroom at a school board office in an urban Quebec setting. Volunteers were ushered into the large room that had tables for each group of ten participants as well as a head table at the front for the project leaders and their associated consultants. The fifty volunteers were seated in predetermined groups of ten. These volunteers came from different backgrounds and included current and former teachers, administrators, parents, community members, business leaders and school board staff.

Most of these volunteers were strangers to one another. I knew two other people in the room, neither of them well. One had been a former teaching colleague who was now a high school principal. The other was a former administrator and consultant with the school board who now worked at a private school. This person had led an educational technology workshop I had attended a few years before and had left a very negative first impression with me, an impression that would be reinforced during the project proceedings. My reflections record that very little time was given to relationship-building:

> The activities that session leaders took us through were often designed to inspire outside-the-box thinking but to me seemed like preschool antics. There was too much time given to these activities, and very little time given to what I believed were important

> basics of group dynamics such as getting to know one another. In an activity where we were asked to interview someone in our group and then tell the group about them, we were not given enough time and the level of "knowing" was shallow and rushed - we were asked to question each other for 30 seconds. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

After the first day of sessions, there was spotty attendance by the other participants. This made it more difficult to get to know group members as some people missed over half of the sessions. It also prevented the project leaders hope of a flow of ideas between groups due to low numbers of group members. In my own group of ten, at one of the subsequent sessions there were only two of us who showed up. We were supposed to rotate some of our group members into the other four groups that day to share ideas about the different aspects, but there were not enough people in attendance to allow us to do so without dissolving our group completely. My reflections show a growing frustration at this point:

> As we got further and further into this exercise, I remembered the comments of my colleagues and the principal about the project not accomplishing anything that would last and needing to stay emotionally unattached in the process. I was struggling. I didn't feel like it was a good use of my time and regretted choosing to be away from my students...Having people not showing up consistently was a major hurdle for the flow and continuity of the groups we were participating in. Many people who had attended the first session were not present at subsequent sessions. I felt like I needed to attend, in spite of my frustration with parts of the process, because I had made a commitment and said I would be there. But having many people missing and not being able to count on teammates to show up made it very difficult when it came time to dig deeper into ideas

> generated in previous sessions, as the person who had initiated the thought was not there. Also, there was supposed to be some switching of people between groups to allow for better understanding between groups of what was being discussed in all aspects of the project. This wasn't possible in many cases because there were not enough group members present who had consistently attended to allow for the switching to occur without eliminating the original group completely. I wondered if people were not attending because they, like me, felt that the process was not turning out to be as concrete and meaningful as they had initially hoped, and they allowed competing priorities to take them elsewhere. (Personal Journal, August 31, 2019)

This last statement brings to mind Hargreaves (1998) statements about teachers who participate in educational change processes experiencing guilt about their time away from students and the conflict that this creates. I felt this intensely and wished I were back at school with my students.

One structural piece that made the process frustrating for me in terms of participation was the rigid way the design teams were organized. Sessions were delivered by the consultants who would lead a full-group creative thinking activity or deliver a monologue on a given topic, after which questions were asked and we were supposed to break into our teams for discussion, to develop ideas for our design component of the school. The problem with this was that it seemed impossible and disingenuous to talk about designing a single aspect of what a school should/would be like without also having conversations about the other aspects. How could we plan a timetable without knowing whether there would be teaching of individual subjects and how many would be taught? How could we think about time allotted for activities when we weren't allowed to discuss what the spatial layout of the school would be and what facilities we

would have to access? Ironically, in the first set of slides we were shown during the first design session, the goal of the project was stated to be "the reinvention of the High School experience" and "the DECOMPARTMENTALIZATION of learning" (emphasis theirs). In the way they organized the design sessions, they compartmentalized us as designers in such a way that success was a near impossibility based on this structure alone. Cooke-Davis (2002) would qualify this compartmentalization as a potential project management success factor, and I believe the project leadership team would argue that their STARC compartmentalization of project teams was a success factor in their design development. As a participant, I believe this structure had a detrimental effect and was a contributing factor to the development of a design that lacked depth and cohesion.

The fact that we were expected to have these conversations about design right from day one, with no general agreement as to what the basic outline of these five aspects would be, left me in doubt that we would be able to produce any type of usable model. This then led me to wonder if producing a usable model was actually the goal of the process. I decided it was not. There were no experienced veterans of project-based learning schools brought in as advisors, in spite of the fact that the project leaders kept showing videos and news clippings as evidence that such schools did exist and could thrive. One example shown was of Hobsonville Point Secondary School in Auckland, New Zealand.

If there were people out there with such experience, why weren't we relying on their advice of what worked, what didn't, and why? We were not asked to review case studies or examples of what had been tried elsewhere. Instead, it felt like we were asked to reinvent the wheel. This reinforced my impression that our purpose was not to create a usable model.

Instead, I felt we were there so that the project leaders could say we were consulted. I felt used. My respect deteriorated, and confidence in the project leadership, my engagement in the process, and willingness to act in alignment with the project and its leadership's stated goals, quickly diminished (Hargreaves, 2005; Lopez, 2010).

Hierarchy, Political Motivations and Implications

The School Reform Movement had a clear hierarchy established before the project began in terms of change leaders and participants. There appeared to be political motivations and personal ambitions associated with the creation and implementation of the School Reform Movement. Both of the people at the head of the project were in politically-sensitive leadership positions and were in the later stages of their careers. Beyond improving the education system and leaving their own legacy in the form of this project and any school reforms that may result, their motivations were, to some extent, political by the nature of the positions they held.

These two leaders clearly held the reins of the project and all decisions in the room were passed through them. This leadership was neither authentic (Evans, 1993) facilitative (Blase, 1988) nor distributed (Hatcher, 2005). When a difficult question was posed to one of the consultants during a session, the consultant would either automatically defer to one of the two or would answer and then look to these two leaders for affirmation or further input. It was a top-down model of leadership, where all the answers came from above. Early in the process, sessions that provided participants the opportunity to build relationships were cut short in favor of keeping to the agenda and proceeding with the systems approach to managing the design process.

Why would educational leaders invest time and money to bring a group of fifty people together for six days for a consultation to develop suggested criteria and the most basic plans for a school when they could have put together much more detailed planning by basing the school design on existing models? I could only see one answer. For reasons of credibility, it seemed they had designed a process that included this consultation in order to secure funding for the project on the front end and then use that consultation to give credibility to their ideas on the backend. Others looking in would see that they consulted with this wide swath of people in designing their model. If a new idea arose in the consultation that improved upon their existing ideas, they would incorporate it. But if nothing new was added, they could say they consulted, take the model they already had in mind, and move forward. De Wit (1998) described the possibility of various stakeholders having different objectives within a project. This suggests that while my objective for the development of a quality school design was definitely not met, it is possible that the objectives of the project leadership team differed greatly from my own and that their objectives were achieved. It is also possible that there may have been a level of self-deception occuring in the minds of the project leaders akin to that described by Cam Caldwell (2009) in his work on ways that leaders practice self-deception to align their actions with their beliefs about their own identity. In this case, it is possible that the leaders were able to proceed with this consultation process having convinced themselves that by doing so they were staying true to their perception of their own identities as orchestrators of collaborative processes and ultimately of collaborative design.

The project leadership of the school reform process included a hierarchy: there was a clear delineation between those who were the creators and leaders of the project, and those who

were participants. I don't believe that these differences of position and power within the project caused me to behave differently as a participant. I did not perceive any threat to my employment that might have limited my willingness to speak as a participant because, although this project was associated with my school board, it felt very separate from my teaching role. Short of being disrespectful to others or behaving in a way that would be inappropriate in any setting, I don't believe my lack of engagement or questions of the process could have endangered my teaching position. There were many other participants who were present that were not employed by the school board but were being asked the same questions and involved in the same discussions that I was. At no point was I concerned that my job as a teacher was in danger because I voiced my disagreement with the process or the reasons behind it. There was a possibility that some of the people in that room could be part of the hiring process if I applied to become an administrator in the future, but my questions and comments were never made in a way that I believed put my future as an administrator at risk.

My conclusion about the School Reform Movement from my view as a participant is that it was not an effective change process because the process was not designed to not produce an actionable model based on research or experience, and therefore not a model that could be reliably invested in. In this project, we were not participating in a real design process but in a consultation for the sake of consultation alone. I felt like we were guinea pigs in a process meant to test out a systems approach to facilitating group design.

As a participant in the School Reform Movement, I lacked agency and self-efficacy in the structure of the project. My perceived lack of purpose and inability to effect change in this setting was so frustrating that I found myself having internal conversations to calm down, to

control my physical reaction, to refrain from walking out of the room. These physical reactions that speak to the potential frustrations of change processes described by Schmidt and Datnow (2005). If the organizers had been more forthright about the intent and structure of the process, they might have come across as more transparent but this probably would have resulted in greater difficulty recruiting volunteers. There was an absence of relationship between group members in the project teams and a lack of support and contribution from group members who either attended sporadically or stopped participating all together. Politics was certainly a factor for the creation of the project by project leadership but should not have limited the project's potential for success. Hierarchy existed in the form of levels of power to make decisions and allow issues to be addressed in this project, project leaders; these levels of hierarchy, from highest to lowest levels of power and authority, included the two project leaders, several project facilitators and hired consultants, and finally the fifty or so project participants.

If given the opportunity to go back and choose again, I want to say I would never have gotten involved in the School Reform Movement project. But is that actually the case? I'm not sure. Participating in this School Reform Movement was not a positive experience for me , but it taught me lessons that may help me be more successful as a designer and participant in future change processes. I better understand those circumstances of change processes that result in non-meaningful outcomes. I also recognize the consequences for participants when consultation is not meaningful, and how this negatively impacts participants' desire to engage in future change projects. I've learned what it feels like as a participant to sign up for something and later discover that my time and resources were used in a way other than I had expected based on the invitation. I understand better why my teacher friends are reluctant to participate in change

processes such as this one. I learned these things at a cost of time with my students as well as the mental and physical stress of experiencing these sessions and the negative emotions they created in me. I am thankful for the lessons but resentful of the process I went through to learn them.

Chapter 5: Analysis and Conclusions

Connections to Educational Change

My son asked me today why my research matters. Was anyone going to read it? Who cares what I think about educational change? In the first second or two after he asked, I panicked. Why did it matter? Did it matter? Then I remembered why it mattered to me, and why it would matter to him, and others like him, as he gets older. Change processes cost a lot of taxpayer money and require large investments of time by teachers and other educators. The resources spent on failed change processes could have been redirected to benefit society in other ways, such as educational and healthcare personnel and infrastructure. It is important to study the ways that we try to implement change so that our change attempts can have the greatest possible positive impact and so that resources are not wasted.

The purpose of this study was to share and examine my experiences of educational change from my perspective as a teacher, to help myself and others learn lessons that could improve the design and participant engagement in educational change processes of the future. Through my examination of these three processes of change including the IB Induction Process, the PLC and the School Reform Movement, I have identified six factors (agency, self-efficacy, group size, relationships, hierarchy and politics) that impacted my thoughts and feelings going through each process as well as how these affected my decisions and actions as a participant and change agent. I examined the "nodal moments" (Graham, 1989), also described as "present moments" by Stern (2004), the points in time that I experienced strong emotions in these processes, to look for connections between my internal dialogue and these six factors. I will now summarize how each factor was implicated in these change events, make connections with the

literature on these factors, and then share my take-aways for change participants and designers of the future.

Summary of Factors Affecting the Success of Change Processes

In my discussion of factors affecting the success of change processes, I have intentionally grouped the first four factors into two pairs based on the interconnected nature of each pairing. Agency and self-efficacy are positively correlated in educational change settings (Bandura, 2005) and I felt that a discussion of agency is intertwined with the beliefs of self-efficacy it allows for. In the second pairing, I have discussed group size and relationships together due to the impact of group size relationship-building (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009) and the importance of strong trusting relationships in the context of these projects (Wilcox & Lawson, 2002; Moolenar et al., 2012; Fullan, 2007). I have chosen to discuss hierarchy and politics separately because, while there can be strong connections between these, neither must inherently be a part of the other.

Agency and Self-Efficacy

Agency, having choice and voice as a change participant (Bandura, 2005) and self-efficacy, feeling capable of doing what's necessary to be effective in one's role (Freidman & Kass, 2002) are both correlated with higher success in change initiatives (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Imants & van der Wal, 2019; Tao, 2017; Van Veen et al., 2005; Vahasantanen, 2015;). The three change processes I have described allowed for differing levels of participant agency. The process that allowed for the highest agency was the PLC, with the IB induction process allowing for a moderate level of agency and the School Reform Movement allowing participants a very low level of agency. High levels of agency resulted in more positive experiences for me as

a participant and a higher degree of self-efficacy in the project, in accordance with the findings of Lasky (2005). In the situation of change where I experienced the highest level of agency, the PLC, I was able to make choices that allowed my actions to match my beliefs and values (Nias, 1996). In line with the earlier quote from Imants and van der Wal (2019), that agency is "associated with individuals who, alone or in groups, in a given situation, make decisions, take initiatives, act proactively rather than reactively, and deliberately strive and function to reach a certain end" (p. 2). We as teachers in the PLC were able to be proactive in our decisions and actions to address misconceptions in student understanding of scientific principles. I felt ownership, also correlated with greater change success (Ketelaar et al., 2012). I could make decisions based on what I believed to be both ethically right and effective in improving the education of students.

As my level of agency decreased in the IB induction and was at its lowest in the School Reform Movement, decisions were made the project leadership and the facilitators working for them that affected me and required me to act in ways that were in contrast to my values and beliefs. In these situations where I lacked agency, my choices were necessarily reactive rather than proactive. The more often these decisions went against what I believed was right, and the greater the impact of these decisions on the success or failure of the attempted change, the more frustrated I became (Schmidt & Datnow, 2005). Built up over time, this frustration led to disengagement with the process (Tran, 2008) and at that point the change process for me was dead. As a participant, at the point that I've decided not to care and not to engage, the investment of time and material resources spent on having me there are wasted. This also created a negative impact on my view of future change processes and my willingness to

participate in them, one of the barriers to teacher engagement noted by Zimmerman (2006) and also discussed by Hargreaves (2005) and Lasky (2005).

Group Size and Relationships

There was a correlation in my experience between group size and relationships in the success of change initiatives. Previous studies have found optimal group sizes for some change initiatives (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009) and have indicated that trusting relationships . It has been found that increasing the number of trusting relationships improved change outcomes (Bolam et al., 2005; Fullan, 2007). This could mean either reducing group sizes, forming larger groups that contain a strong, trusting relationships, or forming larger groups and then building opportunities into the process for such relationships to develop. One thing that I found improved the likelihood of successful change was when it was implemented by a small group of trusted colleagues. In our PLC, there was a group of seven teachers who shared strong, trusting, collegial relationships; Roberts and Pruitt (2009) described this as falling within their ideal range of five to nine participants.

The IB induction and School Reform Movements both had larger group sizes, over 50 people in total in each compared with eight in the PLC, and in both cases the success of the changes in the IB and School Reform processes compared to their stated objectives was lower than in the smaller PLC group setting. There were smaller breakout groups that worked as part of the IB induction and the School Reform Movement. In the IB induction process, these smaller groups took different forms; the 20 Science and Math teachers worked closely together and shared space in a departmental workroom on a daily basis. This daily interaction helped to build collegial relationships that were stronger and more trusting. A different breakout group in the IB

induction, the IB Steering Committee, was composed of about ten administrators and teachers together with the IB Coordinator. The smaller group size in this case did not contribute to increased trust in relationships; this was likely due to the fact that this group met only once a month and that the group was composed of people from different polarized social groupings within the staff. There were strong loyalties among smaller groups within the staff, divided along the lines of subject area departments. Administrators and the IB Coordinator were outside of these smaller staff groups. The breakout groups in the School Reform Process began with 10 participants in each. There was very little opportunity to build relationships in these groups because there was minimal time allotted to relationship building activities in the design of the sessions. Also, attendance at these sessions dwindled after the first week. Thirdly, project leadership asked some participants to switch between groups so that ideas could be shared from one group to another; this limited relationship development.

The IB induction and School Reform Movement also had weaker relationships between participants compared with the PLC, in which the teacher participants had all shared prior social and collegial relationships. In the IB induction, which involved around 100 people, the relationship strength varied. Although I had very weak relationships with all involved at the outset, strong trusting relationships developed over time with some colleagues involved in the IB program, some relationships remained weak and others went from weak to strained. The School Reform Movement involved around 60 people and most of these people were strangers to one another at the outset and were not provided the time and opportunity to develop strong trusting relationships. This lack of collegial relationships was linked with lower collective efficacy and

reduced benefit to students (Moolenaar et al., 2012) in the form of a weaker school model being produced.

Achieving successful change in larger groups is more challenging than in smaller groups (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009), and some of the challenges include a lack of pre-existing trust in interpersonal relationships (Bolam et al., 2005), fewer opportunities to have meaningful conversations with change leaders and other participants to grow trust, understanding and confidence in the support of their leadership (Lopez, 2010), and the potential for a lack of transparency on the part of change leaders about project objectives and motivations due to competing priorities that generates distrust and resistance on the part of participants (Zimmerman, 2006). These challenges can prevent participant engagement or lead to their eventual disengagement in the project (Hargreaves, 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018). This creates a limitation in the design of change projects: bringing people together who have preexisting relationships is not always possible, nor is it necessarily desirable. Different experiences and perspectives from participants are key to developing ideas that are well thought out and have been critically assessed by those with these lenses of different experience and perspective; too much closeness in relationships can impede change (Watson, 2014). In my experience, positive pre-existing relationships facilitated productivity and project success, as in our PLC. There were differences depending on whether the context of the project was limited to a single school environment, such as the PLC and IB induction processes, or went beyond a single school such as the School Reform Movement. In a school context, leaders should structure an environment where positive relationships are encouraged through organization of physical space (departmental or staff rooms, spaces to relax and talk), social events, and strategic hiring to find

new colleagues that can work with and enhance the social fabric of the school (Hord, 1997) and lead to greater trust and collective efficacy (Moolenaar et al., 2012). In the context of a project whose scope goes beyond a single school, time and structure need to be included in the process to build relationships and grow trust as participants and leaders come to know and understand each other, including each others' backgrounds and strengths, as well as their motivations and desires concerning the project and are also able to develop their own participant identity in the specific context of the project (Lasky, 2005).

Taking a look at the leadership of these projects, our PLC was a clear example of shared teacher-led change that improved student learning. While literature advocates for authentic, distributed or facilitative leadership (Evans, 1993; Blase, 1988; Pink, 1989; Rutherford, 2006; Hatcher, 2005; Coyle, 1997) and encourages a caring and personal approach (Siu, 2008), leadership in both the IB induction and the School Reform Movement was top-down with decisions being dictated by leadership and motivations behind them sometimes lacking transparency. In my experience, creating successful and lasting change in a large group setting was more difficult to manage. When considering trust in interpersonal relationships, there is an inherent difficulty in growing and maintaining close trusting relationships between group members as group size increases. Trusting relationships take time to build and are built individually, one interaction at a time. In the School Reform Movement, individuals were brought together who were mostly strangers to one another. Activities within the sessions that would have allowed participants to build relationships, even as simple as learning each other's names, were rushed through due to time constraints. Project leaders and facilitators placed priority on creative thinking processes and allowed large periods of time for activities that

encouraged creativity. Activities that involved "getting to know you" conversations, such as interviewing others within our group, were only afforded a few minutes. For these conversations, we were asked to stick to a script provided by the facilitators of what questions we would be asking, and to write very brief point form answers. Most of these questions were superficial and the script provided no room for delving deeper for better understanding. Had project leadership assigned a higher priority to building relationships, I predict it would have resulted in higher participant attendance in the sessions. Having more participants attend consistently would have increased the opportunity for stronger relationships to form, and would have also made it possible for group members to move between groups to share ideas while leaving the original group membership mostly intact and able to carry on with them.

This lack of relationship hampered the success of the SRM in two ways. First, it gave too much power to the leadership of the project and too little agency (Ketelaar et al., 2012) to participants because they were isolated individuals without a support network in the room, taking the confidence away from participants (in themselves, fellow participants and leadership; Lopez, 2010) to ask difficult questions about content or process. Secondly, it held back the collective efficacy of the group (Moolenaar et al., 2012) because participants were barely aware of the names, professional roles, experience and strengths of other participants and their ability to contribute to the group, leaving potential questions unasked of each other and possible gains in the project unrealized. With weaker relationships, as was the case in both the IB Induction Process and the School Reform Movement, lack of trust and questioning of motives quickly took root in me when decisions seemed to lead participants away from the projects' stated goals. There was no basis of trust to ask the questions that could have returned me to a productive

mindset and away from the path of disengagement, that could have helped me as a participant to understand and appreciate the decision makers' motivations. Wilcox and Lawson (2018) found that social isolation during reform professes resulted in stress, fatigue and disengagement by participants. I experienced all of these in both the SRM and the IB Induction.

If the group is shaped by a hierarchy and there is a delineation between change leaders and participants, successful change on the part of participants requires engagement with the process (Brown Easton, 2011; Bolam et al., 2005). To be able to engage, participants need to understand what improvement the change will bring and trust in the change leaders message and motives (Hargreaves, 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018). In order to grow this understanding, participants must be able to ask questions of change leaders and express concerns in order to understand the need for change and buy in to the process.

Transparency in larger groups can be a more complex issue for change leaders, as there may be differing levels of trust in relationships (Hargreaves, 2005) between change leaders and various participants. In addition, larger projects may be motivated by reasons that are polarizing, making it difficult to garner agreement by all participants but requiring change on the part of all nonetheless. I found that leaders in the School Reform Movement and the IB Induction appeared to choose to limit the transparency of their motivations for the change process or to slant their messaging around a particular change initiative. This may have been caused by the leadership's belief that their own priorities for the projects were not aligned with the priorities and values of participants (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Lopez, 2010; Nias, 1996). In such cases, the change leaders may feel compelled to gain support from participants who might be opposed if all the reasons behind the change process were shared. They choose to limit the stated objectives or the

motivation behind the project to gather the widest possible engagement by participants. In my own experience, I think that trust in the change leader is a more important factor than belief in the change process. I would prefer that a leader say that they recognize that a particular change creates difficulties or that, while the change is necessary and mandatory, they themselves find it difficult to believe in its effectiveness for improved educational outcomes. If the leader is forced to implement something they don't believe in, I think it is better in terms of leadership that they find a way to share with participants the sentiment that they themselves are having the change forced upon them rather than pretend that they are in full support of an initiative and then fail to convince participants of its value. This authentic and facilitative leadership is advocated for by school reform theorists (Evans, 1993; Siu, 2008; Blase, 1988; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Bolam et al., 2005). This authentic, facilitative leadership in change processes could lead to the distributed leadership described in the next section dealing with hierarchy.

Hierarchy

There is a correlation between hierarchy and reduced agency (Brown Easton, 2011) that can limit the success of change initiatives. Replacing authoritative top-down leadership with democratic distributed leadership in change processes can increase agency by involving teachers and other change participants in both the issues to be discussed and the decisions that flow out of those discussions (Coyle, 1997; Rutherford, 2006; Hatcher, 2005). The change project that I found to be the most successful, the PLC, did not involve any type of hierarchy, had the highest agency, and was most successful in meeting its objective. The lack of hierarchy gave us equal ownership (Ketelaar et al., 2005) as teachers and empowered us to lead the PLC the way we thought best, resulting in high engagement and high self and collective-efficacy in the process

(Friedman & Kass, 2002; Moolenaar et al., 2012). In contrast, the IB induction and School Reform Movement both involved clear organizational hierarchies involving managerial relationships (Coyle, 1997; Rutherford, 2006; Hatcher, 2005) which correlated with lower levels of participant agency (Brown Easton, 2011), and both were less successful at meeting their objectives in comparison to the PLC.

In the case of the IB Induction, the change leaders set out the expectations and participants were required to meet those expectations with very little room for individual choice and decision making. In the case of the School Reform Movement, the structure of the process was laid out by the change leaders and limited the ability of participants to engage in the process of creating real and sustained change in the form of an actionable model for a school centered around project-based learning. The hierarchy in this case also controlled the resources and time available as part of the imposed structure, and the lack of both resources and time in this process further weakened participants ability to produce a school model that was well researched, coherent and actionable.

A quote from author Cam Caldwell (2009) in the paper, "Identity, Self-Awareness and Self-Deception: Ethical Implications for Leaders and Organizations", articulates the reason for the frustrations that I felt as a participant under the leadership in this School Reform Process:

> Identifying the under-lying ethical assumptions implicit in each person's meditating lens allows individuals to identify the duties that they owe and helps to clarify moral responsibilities. Self-deception is the unconscious process of choosing not to acknowledge implicit moral duties owed to ourselves and to others. (p. 402)

As I evaluate my own motivations and examine the reasons for my increasing lack of desire to engage in the School Reform project as it progressed, I believe that Caldwell's conclusion as stated above is born out in my belief that although I was fulfilling the moral obligations I had as a participant in the School Reform project, the leaders of the project were not fulfilling their moral obligations to me as a participant. My obligations as a project participant were to attend and participate within the framework of the project as laid out by the leadership team, and to use my past experiences to generate and share ideas that would help inform the project design (Lasky, 2005). The obligation of the project leaders was to create an environment conducive to creating an actionable design. In such an environment, participants would have been supported with information already known about how similar schools have been designed and run; meetings would have been structured in a way that allowed collaboration with other participants so that information and ideas were shared across the group, not isolated within subsections addressing individual topics that prevented the entire group from developing their design in a cohesive way. In this way, the ideas produced from participants would have had the underpinning knowledge and rigour to bring new insight and useful additions to the school design project. To put it another way, the obligations of the project leaders were to create an environment rich with informational resources and to make use of the participant contributions in a tangible way that gave the contributions credibility and added value to the project design (project management success factors; Cooke-Davis, 2002). When we finished this design phase of the project, we had not produced a well-researched, actionable model for a project-based school. The product of these meetings contained a wish-list of things to be included in and those to be avoided in a school centered on project-based learning, but did not have a detailed plan

from which time and resources could immediately be invested to make this school a reality. In my opinion, these leadership obligations were not met. This eroded my initial trust that the project leaders would use my experience and time in a way that was meaningful not only to them but to me. My decision making through the progression of the School Reform movement aligns with the work of Doyle and Ponder (1977) and Sparks (1983), who described teacher decision making during instructional innovation. Feeling that my actions lacked meaning and value (lack of self-efficacy; Friedman & Kass, 2002) and that the actions of the group were not producing a design that was rigorous and directly implementable (lack of collective efficacy; Moolenaar et al., 2012) resulted in my emotional and mental disengagement from the project (Tran, 2008; Lasky, 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018), in spite of my continued physical attendance at the meetings.

This experience has shown me that, as a teacher, I can become disengaged from a change process when I lack trust in the project leaders or when I feel that my engagement is not contributing to a final result that is both actionable and meaningful. For the project to have meaning to me, it must align with my personal morals and values and I must be convinced that it provides some form of necessary improvement in order to engage with it. Partial engagement, or going through the motions of project participation, is always a possibility, when there is a hierarchy ensuring those below them comply with expectations, but does not provide the impact and change created when participants believe in and engage fully with the process. Supporting evidence for this statement comes from my own experience of seeing a few of my colleagues who taught with me in the IB program but did not believe in the value of its philosophy or the tasks expected of them as part of the program requirements. These teachers, who I would

describe as partially engaged because they were required to complete the tasks while not believing in their value, did not work to tailor their lessons to the objectives of the IB program and did not provide the support needed for student mentees to excel in completing their Personal Project. Those teachers who believed in the program and who saw their role and the expectations of them as integral to student achievement and success (Guskey, 1988) were more often associated with students who excelled in their Personal Project and who demonstrated the characteristics of the IB Learner Profile (Inquirers, Knowledgeable, Open-Minded, Caring, Risk-Takers, Communicators, Thinkers, Principled, and Reflective; The IB Learner Profile, 2010) more completely than those of teachers who were less engaged with the IB philosophy.

Political Motivations and Implications

I have defined politics in education as the seeking of power and attempting to influence the opinions and behaviors of others (Murray & Stoloff, 1983; Blase, 1998). It appeared to me that the more politically motivated the change processes were , the less successful those processes were over the long term. The PLC, devoid of politics except for administrators playing a minor role in the project's startup, was a major success. My IB induction, though initially successful, ended in disengagement because of the politics behind decision making processes by leadership. The power dynamic involved in this decision-making was caused by the competing priorities faced by leadership and that leadership's ability to use a top-down communication and decision-making approach (Siu, 2008; Blase, 1988) when they perceived that their own priorities differed from that of their teaching staff. And the School Reform Movement project, with leaders in politically sensitive roles, a larger budget and an apparent need to impose project organizational structures and constraints that limited participant agency in

the process, generated the least successful change in terms of product and had the greatest negative impact on me as a participant. Van Veen et al. (2005) and Ketelaar et al. (2012) both stated that teachers need to be co-creators in change processes, involved in decisions of need, development and implementation based on our own professional experience. The SRM did not provide the opportunity for teachers to co-create in this way; too much was predetermined by leadership and the limits to agency and efficacy produced frustration and disengagement as predicted in the literature (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Hargreaves, 1998; Schmidt & Datnow, 2005).

Analysis of Methodology

Self-study and Autobiographical Inquiry

I had a moment of connection while reading Pithouse (2011), when she referred to the agency of one of her subjects. The subject described his appreciation for leading in his own learning and controlling the way he understood issues in and related to his own story . This made me realize that what I have appreciated the most about the process of the self-study methodology is the agency and ownership (Ketelaar, 2012) it provided me to make decisions about how my past is described and shared, being allowed to examine my own story in a way that creates meaning for me, and the power to allow my story to provide insight to others in the field of educational change studies.

Memories and Emotions during Reflection Writing

Studying my experiences in this way provided an opportunity to examine my identity as a teacher, leader, and participant in these settings and in the present (Graham, 1989). I was able to take each experience as it arose and unpack the details of what happened external to myself, then

ask myself questions about what was going on inside of me, to examine my reactions, at times my inaction, and the attitudes and beliefs that I held in those moments and that I have come to form more recently through their analysis. I feel more confident after going through this analysis (Lopez, 2010), less critical of myself for the moments in the past where I've been uncertain and felt weak and ineffectual, and reminded of participants in other studies of teacher change who expressed feeling these same emotions (Pithouse, 2011). I can see how the structures surrounding the change processes played a part in shaping my ability to effect change in the moment, and appreciate the lessons I have learned to adapt my own practice in light of these experiences (Pink, 1989).

Critical Friends

Regarding my decision on the use of critical friends in my study: I went back and forth between feeling that including them was important (Costa & Kallick, 1993; Loughran & Northfield, 1998; Schuck & Russell, 2005) and weighing that against the impact and bias that might bring into my own memories of these events (Kihlstrom, 1998). In the end, I held one brief conversation about my work with colleagues that served to reinforce my belief that teachers in general are hesitant to participate in change processes and cynical of both the motivation behind them and the possibility for improvement they hold. Even now that the research and writing is drawing to a close, there is a part of me that wants to share my analysis and conclusions with some of these former colleagues, but I'm held back from doing so by the risk that they would only humour me and have no real interest in knowing about and discussing it, and that they would then know my inner dialogue as it relates to these processes and people and

that this could endanger both my future relationships with those people and could cause hurt to some of those described herein.

Conclusions

Take-aways for Future Designers and Leaders of Change Processes

A key takeaway for leaders of change is that trust is required among participants and between participants and change leaders (Evans, 1993; Siu, 2008; Blase, 1988; Hargreaves, 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018). Strong relationships are the key to maintaining this trust (Fullan, 2007) in times where the value of the change process comes into question. If trust exists, participants will be willing to ask the hard questions that may lead them to see the issues and concerns they have in a different light or for the project as a whole to change in a way that makes it more purposeful. If trust doesn't exist and participants disengage, there is little that can be done to fix the situation. Even in a scenario where hierarchy allows the change leaders to enforce new policies and procedures exactly as they have been written with no leeway for teacher interpretation, participants upon whom the change is forced and who don't believe in its methods and goals, will not implement that change in the way it was envisioned. The change will not realize its potential.

Based on my self-study, my experiences and their links to the work of others in the literature as I have described above support the following recommendations for change leaders of the future. Those wishing to lead innovation in education should look to build change processes that:

1. Focus on building and maintaining trusting relationships (Fullan, 2007; Bolam et al., 2005; Watson, 2014).

2. Leaders themselves believe in and for which they can provide clear, explicit objectives and justifications that encourage participant buy-in by demonstrating the need for change and the improvement the change will bring. (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Sparks, 1983; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Evans, 1993; Siu, 2008; Blase, 1988; Hargreaves, 2005).
3. Keep group sizes as small as the project allows for communication and trust-building in relationships. (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009; Moolenaar et al., 2012).
4. Provide a high degree of agency by allowing change participants to help set priorities for what needs to change and then to be a part of the decisions on how such changes can be accomplished and what the participant's role in that will be (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Imants & van der Wal, 2019; Tao, 2017; Van Veen et al., 2005; Vahasantanen, 2015).
5. Minimize hierarchical structures, adopt facilitative or distributive leadership styles, and encourage bottom-up decision-making (Evans, 1993; Siu, 2008, Blase, 1988, Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Van Veen et al., 2005; Ketelaar et al., 2012; Brown Easton, 2011; Hord, 1997; Coyle, 1997; Rutherford, 2006; Hatcher, 2005).
6. Provide transparency around political motivations behind change initiatives and seek to eliminate politically motivated changes, especially by leadership, that do not improve student outcomes (Bolam et al., 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018).

Change leaders must ask themselves the question "Why are we doing this?" and be able to provide a clear answer that shows participants the leadership has worked the need and the implications for the change in their own minds. Change leaders must have reasons that they can

state and stand behind, that they believe are compelling for participants as well. If change leaders understand the relationship between need and solution, they should not only be willing to engage in conversations but should encourage those conversations with participants. From the examples of change I examined, the PLC participants had a clear and engaging objective, while in the IB induction the "why" questions were often avoided or answered with hierarchical justification but weak rationale, saying this is what we have decided as a school must be done to fulfill a certain program requirement. In the School Reform Movement project, I was strongly engaged with the idea that we needed a new school model to improve student engagement in education, and this is what motivated me to participate. Once the process began, my questions of "why" in regards to process and the motivation of leadership were not provided with answers sufficient to convince me that the time and effort we were putting into the sessions was providing any real, actionable solution to the problem of student engagement that had brought me to the project in the first place. This lead to frustration and my disengagement from the process, in spite of my continued attendance.

Take-aways for Future Participants in Change Processes

Participants in educational change processes have a responsibility to exercise professionalism by investing their time and effort to make the education system the best that it can be for the benefit of students' learning and welfare. This involves seeking opportunities to learn about and implement changes that will improve their practice for the benefit of their students. Change participants may choose to be a part of such processes, though often change initiatives are imposed on all those within an organization. Whether the change process is chosen or imposed, participants should be aware that their understanding of the process, its

objectives and motivations, leads to their own level of engagement and has a strong impact on the ultimate success of the change and on the education system as a whole. Change initiatives are expensive and require time investments by teachers. As such, teachers have a professional duty and a moral obligation to do their part to make the change as successful as their role within it allows for the overall betterment of the education system and for society.

This self-study supports the following suggested considerations and actions by participants in change processes:

1. Recognize that trust among participants and between change leaders and participants improves outcomes, and be willing to invest in building and maintaining these relationships (Fullan, 2007; Bolam et al., 2005; Watson, 2014).
2. Seek to clearly understand the need for change and the improvement the change provides, recognizing that their engagement in the process depends on believing that the need exists and that the proposed process provides a feasible solution. Ask questions and seek answers until they are satisfied that the change is worthwhile. (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Sparks, 1983; Pink, 1989; Zimmerman, 2006).
3. Seek out opportunities for meaningful and lasting change by looking for change processes that, where possible, include or allow for:
    a. Working in a small group of trusted colleagues (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009; Moolenaar et al., 2012).

   b. High levels of participant agency (Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Imants & van der Wal, 2019; Tao, 2017; Van Veen et al., 2005; Vahasantanen, 2015); and
   c. Minimal hierarchy or political motivation (Ketelaar et al., 2012; Brown Easton, 2011; Blase, 1998; Coyle, 1997; Rutherford, 2006; Hatcher, 2005).

4. Keep in mind that the failure of one change initiative to meet its goals should not prevent them from participating in future change processes but should motivate them to ask different questions in future, to evaluate their own actions as a participant, and to get involved in shaping and leading change initiatives in line with their own beliefs and objectives (Zimmerman, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005; Tran, 2008).

Impact on My Future Practice

My experiences in change processes have been a mix of positive and negative that will lead me to participate in and lead change differently in the future. I will look for opportunities to participate in PLC's and in other teacher-driven change initiatives that have clear and direct links to improvements in student learning (Ketelaar et al., 2012; Van Veen et al., 2005; Bolam et al., 2005; Hord, 1997; Roberts & Pruitt, 2009), especially if these initiatives are in small groups and are with teachers with whom I have already built trusting collegial relationships (Bolam et al., 2005; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Moolenaar et al., 2012). My participation in larger change projects such as the School Reform Movement and IB induction have had negative aspects, mostly related to agency and hierarchy, that have built up a level of cynicism in me. I still intend

to seek out and create change initiatives, but will be more selective in the projects I choose to participate in when given the choice. I will make more of an effort to understand the structure and objectives of these processes so that my agreement to participate is more likely to result in engagement and a sense of self-efficacy in the process. By doing so, I can be more confident that I am contributing to a project whose outcome will have a positive impact on the education system and ultimately improved student learning and welfare.

My research has highlighted for me that trust in relationships is essential and needs to exist amongst colleagues and between change leaders and participants (Fullan, 2007; Bolam et al., 2005; Watson, 2014). This shines a light on my own introverted nature and the need for me to put more effort into building and maintaining trusting relationships and to act in an extroverted way when the situation calls for it. In my life among other adults, especially in situations that are new and when people are unfamiliar, I tend to hold back from engaging in conversation and prefer to survey the crowd from a distance. I become more comfortable and can open up after I've gotten to know people but building these trusting relationships takes me a great deal of time. One of the takeaways for me is that if I want to build my leadership skills to lead successful change initiatives, I need to build trust by putting a higher priority on getting to know my colleagues and letting them get to know me (Moolenaar et al., 2012; Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Blase, 1988; Siu, 2008). This will require me to initiate relationships with colleagues rather than wait for time and circumstances to bring us together.

This research has also made clear the need to explicitly share with change participants the need that a change process addresses and the improvement that it brings (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Sparks, 1983; Pink, 1989; Evans, 1993). In my own practice as a future change leader, I will

spend time becoming confident in my own understanding and belief in the change in question. After securing this confidence, I will then address these issues directly with participants at the outset of a change process and encourage participants to ask questions if they are struggling to understand or buy-in to the reasons behind the change initiative.

When I have led workshops in the past, I've encouraged participants to ask questions about motivation and purpose and have tried to share the reasons I believed in what I was sharing with them, be it a lesson plan or a piece of educational technology. Through this research, I see that belief in the value of the process and the reasons behind it were critical to my own engagement in producing and maintaining the change (Zimmerman, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005). In my future practice as a change leader, I want to encourage participants to ask these questions about value and purpose. Recognizing that a need exists and then believing that the change process can provide a solution allows change participants to realize and internalize this justification, and to persevere toward the goal if the process becomes muddied. It is not enough to say that this strengthens participant engagement: participants can't engage in sustained change without believing in the value of what they are doing.

References

Bandura, A. (2005). Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds),

Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents (pp. 303-337). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Blase, J. (1998). The Micropolitics of Educational Change. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *International Handbook of Educational Change* (pp. 544-557). Kluwer International Handbooks of Education, vol 5. Dordrecht: Springer Science Business Media.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S. & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities* (No. RR637). London: Department for Education and Skills.

Branyon, A., Diacopoulos, M., Gregory, K., & Butler, B. (2016). The power of autobiography: Unpacking the past, understanding the present, and impacting the future while establishing a community of practice. In D. Garbett & A. Ovens (Eds.), *Enacting self-study as a methodology for professional inquiry* (pp.119-125). Herstmonceux, UK: S-STEP.

Brown Easton, L. (2011). *Professional learning communities by design: Putting the learning back into PLC's.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Bullough, R.V. Jr. & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for Quality in Autobiographical Forms of Self-Study Research. *Educational Research*, *30*(2), 13-21.

Caldwell, C. (2009). Identity, self-awareness, and self-deception: Ethical implications for leaders and organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90*, 393-406. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/stable/40665340

Cooke-Davis, T. (2002). The "real" success factors on projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *20*(3), 185-190. Retrieved from: https://www-sciencedirect-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/science/article/pii/S0263786301000679#BIB9

Costa, A. L. & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational Leadership*, *51*(2), 49-51.

Coyle, M. (1997). Teacher leadership vs. school management: Flatten the hierarchies. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *70*(5), 236-239.

Datnow, A. (2000). The Gender Politics of Change. In A. Hargreaves, Educational Change Takes Ages: Life, Career and Generational Factors in Teachers' Emotional Responses to Educational Change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *31*, 967-983.

De Wit, A. (1988). Measurement of project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, *6*(3), 164-170. Retrieved from: https://www-sciencedirect-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/science/article/pii/0263786388900439

Doyle, W. & Ponder, G. (1977). The practicality ethic and teacher decision making. *Interchange*, *8*, 1-12.

Evans, R. (1993). The human face of reform. *Educational Leadership, 51(*1), 19-23.

Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(2002), 675-686.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College

Press.

Garman, N. (1996). Qualitative inquiry: Meaning and menace for educational researchers. In P. Wills & B. Neville (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice in adult education* (pp.11-29). Ringwood, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.

Goldman, S. & Kabayadondo, Z. (2016). Taking design thinking to school: How the technology of design can transform teachers, learners, and classrooms. In S. Goldman & Z. Kabayadondo (Eds.), *Taking Design Thinking to School* (pp. 21-37). New York, NY: Routledge.

Goodson, I. (1988). *The making of curriculum*. USA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis.

Graham, R. (1989). Autobiography and education. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, *23*(2), 92-104.

Guskey, T.R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 4*(1), 63-69.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14*(8) 835-854.

Hargreaves, A. (2005). Educational change takes ages: Life, career and generational factors in teachers' emotional responses to educational change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(8), 967-983.

Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., & Hopkins, D. (2005). International Handbook of Educational Change - Introduction. In D. Hopkins (Ed.), *The Practice and Theory of School Improvement: International Handbook of Educational Change* (pp. vii-xi). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Harris, A., Moos, L., Moller, J., Robertson, J., & Spillane, J. (2007). Exploring different perspectives and approaches to the practice of school leadership. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alma_Harris/publication/242263887_Challenging_Leadership_Practice/links/0046352afb73a0c0c3000000.pdf

Hass Plattner Institute of Design at Stanford University (2019). Stanford d.school. Retrieved from: https://dschool.stanford.edu/

Hatcher, R. (2005). The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *26*(2), 253-267.

Hord, S. (1997). *Professional Learning Communities: Communities of Continuous Inquiry and Improvement.* Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, TX. Retrieved from: http://www.sedl.org/pubs/change34/4.html.

Imants, J. & Van der Wal, M. M. (2019). A Model of Teacher Agency in Professional Development and School Reform. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* (2019). DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2019.1604809

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Retrieved from: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/mcgill/detail.action?docID=3002066#

Kelly, R. (2016). *Creative development: Transforming education through design thinking, innovation, and invention.* Canada: Brush Education.

Ketelaar, E., Beijaard, D., Boshuizen, H. P. A., Den Brok, P. J. (2012). Teachers' positioning towards and educational innovation in the light of ownership, sense-making and agency. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(2012), 272-282.

Kelchtermans, G. (2005). Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: Self-understanding,

vulnerable commitment and micropolitical literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21* (2005), 995-1006.

Kihlstrom, J. (1998). Exhumed Memory. In S.J. Lynn & K.M. McConkey (Eds.), *Truth in memory* (pp.3-31). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Kuhlthau, C., Caspari, A., & Maniotes, L. (2007). *Guided inquiry : Learning in the 21st century*. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited.

Lasky, S. (2005). A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(2005), 899-916.

Loughran, J. & Northfield, J. (1996). *Opening the classroom door: Teacher, researcher, learner.* London: Falmer Press.

López, C. (2010). Moral Responsibility and Confidence as Factors that Influence Teacher Involvement in Educational Change. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 12*(1), 63-78.

Marsh, J.A. (2007). *Democratic Dilemmas*: *Joint Work, Education Politics, and Community*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mayer, D. and Marland, P. (1997). Teachers' knowledge of students: A significant domain of practical knowledge. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *25*(1), 17-34.

Misztal, B. A. (2003). *Theories of social remembering*. Maidenhead, PA: Open University Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Mitchell, C., Strong-Wilson, T., Pithouse, K. & Allnutt, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Memory and pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Moolenaar, N., Sleegers, P., and Daly, A. (2012). Teaming up: Linking collaboration networks, collective efficacy, and student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. *28*(2), 251-262.

nEDworks/LEARN, (2017). NEXTschool - STARC Systems. Retrieved from: https://hosted.learnquebec.ca/nextschool/wp-content/uploads/sites/23/2018/03/STARCsystems.jpg

Nias, J. (1996). Thinking about feeling: The emotions in teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *26*(3), 293-306. Retrieved at: https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/doi/abs/10.1080/0305764960260301

Payne, D. G. & Blackwell, J. M. (1998). Truth in memory: Caveat emptor. In S.J. Lynn & K.M. McConkey (Eds.), *Truth in memory* (pp.32-61). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Pink, W. (1989). Effective development for urban school improvement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Pinnegar, S. & Hamilton, M. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research*. Springer, Netherlands.

Pithouse, K. (2011). The future of our young children lies in our hands: Re-envisaging teacher authority through narrative self-study. In C. Mitchell et al. (Eds.), *Memory and pedagogy* (177-190). New York, NY: Routledge.

Politics [Def. 3]. (n.d.). *Cambridge Business English Dictionary*. Accessed on September 15, 2019. Retrieved from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/politics.

Québec Ministère de l'Éducation. (2004). *Quebec Education Program: Secondary School Education, Cycle One*. Retrieved from: http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/PFEQ/qepsecfirstcycle.pdf

Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. (2007). *Quebec Education Program: Secondary Cycle Two.* Retrieved from: http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/education/jeunes/pfeq/PFEQ_presentation-deuxieme-cycle-secondaire_EN.pdf

Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. (2008). *Study on the implementation of the Québec Education Program in Secondary Cycle One: Research Report 2003-2006*. Retrieved from: http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/en/references/publications/results/detail/article/pilot-schools-study-on-the-implementation-of-the-quebec-education-program-in-secondary-cycle-one/

Radstone, S. (2000). *Memory and methodology*. Oxford: Berg.

Roberts, S., & Pruitt, E. (2009). *Schools as professional learning communities : Collaborative activities and strategies for professional development* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rutherford, C. (2006). Teacher leadership and organizational structure. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*(1-2), 59-76.

Samaras, A. & Freese, A. (2006). *Self-study of teaching practices primer*. New York: P. Lang.

Samaras, A. (2011). Self-study research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA:SAGE Publications.

Schmidt, M. & Datnow, A. (2005). Teachers' sense-making about comprehensive school reform: The influence of emotions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(2005), 949-965.

Schuck, S. & Russell, T. (2005). Self-study, critical friendship, and the complexities of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education*, *1*(2), 107-121.

Siu, W. (2008). Complexity theory and school reform. National Association of Secondary School Principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, *92*(2), (pp. 154-164).

Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1983). *Inservice Education: Training Activities, Teacher Attitude, and Behavior Change*. University Microfilms.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*(3), 387-431.

Stern, D. (2004). *The present moment in psychotherapy and everyday life*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M. & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*(4), 221–258.

Tao, J. & Gao, X. (2017). Teacher agency and identity commitment in curricular reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63 (2017), 346-355.

"The IB Learner Profile: A singular capacity for invigorating campus life" (2010). Retrieved from: https://www.ibo.org/globalassets/publications/recognition/learnerprofile-en.pdf

Thomas, R., Stoloff, D., & Comparative and International Education Society. (1983). *Politics*

and education: Cases from eleven nations (1st ed., Pergamon international library of science, technology, engineering, and social studies). Oxford Oxfordshire: Pergamon Press.

Tran, H. (2018). Teacher agency in times of educational change: The case of transitioned teachers in Vietnam. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *20*(5), 544-559.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *63*, 384-399.

Vähäsantanen, K. (2015). Professional agency in the stream of change: Understanding educational change and teachers' professional identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 47*, 1-12.

van Veen, K., Sleegers, P. & van de Ven, P. (2005). One teacher's identity, emotions, and commitment to change: A case study into the cognitive-affective processes of a school teacher in the context of reforms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(2005), 917-934.

Wainwright, H. (2003). *Reclaim the state*. London: Verso.

Watson, Cate. (2014). Effective professional learning communities? The possibilities for teachers as agents of change in schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, *40*(1), 18-29.

Wedell, M. (2009). *Planning for educational change: Putting people and their contexts first*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. ProQuest Ebook Central, Retrieved from: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/mcgill/detail.action?docID=602007.

Wilcox, K. C. & Lawson, H. A.(2018). Teachers' agency, efficacy, engagement, and emotional

resilience during policy innovation implementation. *Journal of Educational Change*, *19*(2), 181-204. Retrieved from: https://doi-org.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/10.1007/s10833-017-9313-0

Wright, N. & Wrigley, C. (2019). Broadening design-led education horizons: Conceptual insights and future research directions. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *29*:(1), 1-23. Retrieved from: https://link-springer-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/article/10.1007%2Fs10798-017-9429-9

Zimmerman, J. (2006). Why some teachers resist change and what principals can do about it. *Nassp Bulletin, 90*(3), 238-249. Retrieved from: https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/doi/pdf/10.1177/0192636506291521

Appendix 1: Framework for Analysis

A Teacher's Perspective on Experiences of Educational Change: A Qualitative Self-Study

Author**:** **Melanie Sleep**		
	Purpose What is the purpose of the study?	The purpose of my study is to openly share and examine my own experiences of educational change in a number of contexts from my perspective as a teacher in order to help myself and others learn lessons that may influence the design of, and participation in, successful educational change processes of the future.
	Definition of self-study What definition of self-study am I using?	Systematically and critically examine their actions and the context of those actions" and use that analysis to inform future decisions in their professional practice (Samaras and Freese, 2006). Those involved in self-study wish to create "living examples of the practices and theories we value", and have a "willingness to grapple with and make public the private" (Pinnegar and Hamilton, 2009). My work is a self-study because I am examining my own experience as a teacher participating in processes of educational change in order to make my experiences, including my inner thoughts and decision-making processes, public in order to inform future change processes with the goal of making those future change processes more successful.
	What is the definition of self-study methodology? How I define my methodological approach becomes essential for readers to discern whether they are reading a	My self-study methodology involves writing reflections from my memories of the events of three change processes in which I participated, and share my internal dialogue of thoughts, feelings and internal reactions related to these events, as well as the consequences of how my internal dialogue affected my practice as a participant in these change processes.

	self-study	
	What are the rigorous research practices of S-STTEP methodology? The use of strategies that fit my questions empowers any study.	The writing of reflections and review of documents from the time of these change processes allows me to expose the events of these periods as well as what I was thinking and feeling about and in response to these events at the time they were occurring. Reviewing and comparing these reflections, once written, allows me to see more clearly how I was motivated or demotivated to change according to the expectations and intentions of the leaders in these processes, and to recognize patterns related to my behavior related to these experiences.
	What is the explicit evidence? Evidence of data collected, like excerpts from field notes or interviews help readers see the connections the researcher identifies	Evidence includes written reflections, journal entries, lesson plans, meeting agendas and slide presentations from meetings.
	What is the authority of experience expressed in the paper? The way I position myself within practice - experience theory informs the reader about the study and my stance.	The authority of experience expressed is my own as a teacher undergoing these change processes and sharing from my personal reflections of events and my internal dialogue from that time.

	How is the research situated within a related yet broader research literature? A self-study must be situated within the broader related research literature to help the reader understand the frame presented.	Self-study: Samaras (2011), Pinnegar & Hamilton (2009) Educational change: Michael Fullan (2001) Nodal moments:Bullough & Pinnegar (2001), Graham (1989) Memory work:
	What is the story of self? The ways I situate self provide evidence of self-study.	The "self" in this case is me studying my own thoughts, actions and reactions as they relate to educational change processes I experienced, and analysing these to help myself and others create more effecting change processes in future.
	What are the questions raised while reading this study? This addresses the queries that emerge when reading any research.	Are there reasons that a person designing a change process would have a stated goal that differs from their actual goal? Could situations like this happen unconsciously? What could be done to avoid situations like this from happening if it is unintended? If it is a conscious choice, is there a better way to go about stating the goal so that participants feel their participation aligns with the stated goal?