

The London School of Economics and Political Science

**Between planned and emergent collaboration:
Boundary activation and identity development in the
psychosocial space of a Greek educational partnership**

Isidora Kourti

**A thesis submitted to the Department of Social Psychology
of the London School of Economics for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, London, January 2013.**

Declaration

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the PhD degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others (in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it).

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation from it is permitted, provided that full acknowledgement is made. This thesis may not be reproduced without my prior written consent.

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

Abstract

This thesis aims to expand our understanding of inter-organisational collaborations by exploring how the process of collaboration emerges over time and how collaboration partners (re)form their identities in the developing collaboration space. For the exploration of these aims, a practice-based study of inter-organisational collaborations is followed.

The study analyses the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias collaboration in Greece. In order to examine how the KEDDY collaboration unfolds, a longitudinal ethnographic research was conducted, collecting 43 in-depth interviews, 48 documents, observations of 13 partners' meetings and numerous field notes. The data was analysed qualitatively using thematic and narrative analysis.

The results show how, as they engaged in everyday working practices, organisational members demarcated the boundaries of the collaboration by producing two types of psychosocial spaces. The 'spaces of regulation' provided a stable meaning framework where the partners found continuity, while the 'learning spaces' offered them opportunities for renewal and change. These working spaces helped partners engage with the collaborative process in a flexible way. However, they required the activation of different types of boundaries and the establishment of different types of identities through identification loops. In this way partners were able to make sense of the constant changes in the collaboration space and organise their actions accordingly. Therefore, although some of the KEDDY collaboration features were designed a priori and provided continuity through regulatory spaces, this research illustrates how the day to day collaboration unfolds as partners also explore new practices. This indicates that it is not possible to predict the outcome of the collaboration process.

Notwithstanding the limitations due to the small-scale nature of this study, the results have useful implications for the understanding of the development and transformations of inter-organisational collaborations over time. This research contributes to the body of research in the area in that it strengthens the view of inter-organisational collaboration as a process and questions in which way it is currently understood in the context of contemporary inter-organisational collaboration studies.

Στον πατέρα μου, Παναγιώτη
To my father, Panagioti

*Keep Ithaka always in your mind.
Arriving there is what you are destined for.
But do not hurry the journey at all.
Better if it lasts for years,
so you are old by the time you reach the island.
Wealthy with all you have gained on the way,
not expecting Ithaka to make you rich.*

*Ithaka gave you the marvelous journey.
Without her you would not have set out.
She has nothing left to give you now.*

*And if you find her poor, Ithaka won't have fooled you.
Wise as you will have become, so full of experience,
you will have understood by then what these Ithakas mean.*

Kavafis, 1911

Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Lucia Garcia-Lorenzo, for her help, advice, and support throughout my research. I would also like to thank the London School of Economics and Political Science for their financial support.

I must also thank Prof Spyridon Soulis who has helped me gain access to KEDDY Aitolokarnanias. Most importantly, I would like to thank the partners of KEDDY Aitolokarnanias who welcomed me into their partnership and shared with me their experiences.

On a more personal note, there is a special place reserved in these acknowledgements for my husband, Dr Marios Tziannaros, for his continual patience, kindness and love. Without his support, I would have found it very hard to overcome hiccups and obstacles that I have encountered along the process of completing this thesis.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my father, Panagioti, without whose encouragement this thesis would not have been initiated. I would also like to thank my mother, Aglaia, and sister, Mary, for their constant love, support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	12
1. Exploring collaboration	18
1.0. Introduction.....	18
1.1. Collaboration as a social psychological phenomenon	19
1.2. Collaboration in organisational settings.....	21
1.2.1. Shifting from organisational to inter-organisational relationships.....	21
1.2.2. Defining concepts: Collaboration, partnership and collaborative process....	23
1.2.3. Forms of organisational collaboration	25
1.2.4. Motivations for inter-organisational collaborations.....	28
1.2.5. Facilitators and barriers to inter-organisational collaborations.....	29
1.3. The unfolding of inter-organisational collaboration	31
1.3.1. The tension: Organisational collaboration between structure and process ...	31
1.3.2. Exploring the practices of collaboration	34
1.3.3. The Concept of Practice in Organisational Research.....	36
1.3.4. The practice-based study of the collaborative process.....	38
1.3.5. The space of practice.....	41
1.4. Summary	43
2. The psychosocial space of inter-organisational collaborations.....	45
2.0. Introduction.....	45
2.1. Inter-organisational collaboration as an emergent space of practice	46
2.1.1. The concept of space in organisational research.....	46
2.1.2. Examining the space of collaborations	48
2.1.3. Defining the collaboration space.....	52
2.2. Boundary development in a collaboration space	55
2.2.1. The concept of boundaries	55
2.2.2. Defining the boundaries of the collaboration space	58
2.3. The loops of identification	60
2.3.1 The essentialist and constructionist approach to identity.....	60
2.3.2. Point of departure: Identification	64
2.3.3. The components of the identification loops	67
2.3.4. The process of identification in the collaboration space.....	71
2.4. Summary	72
3. Researching the collaboration.....	74
3.0. Introduction.....	74

3.1. Research strategy	74
3.1.1. Qualitative research	74
3.1.2. Case study research.....	75
3.1.3. Using ethnography as a framework for the case study	77
3.2. Research tools	82
3.2.1. Observing the inter-organisational collaboration.....	83
3.2.2. Interviewing	86
3.2.3. Collecting documents.....	89
3.3. The process of analysis	90
3.3.1. Thematic analysis: Composing a collective story	91
3.3.2. Narrative analysis: Exploring personal stories.....	99
3.4. Summary	111
4. KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias Partnership: The background	112
4.0. Introduction.....	112
4.1. The Greek educational system	113
4.2. The Greek educational system for students with disabilities	114
4.3. Centre of Diagnosis, Evaluation and Support (KDAY).....	116
4.4. Aitoloakarnanias Centre for Differential Assessment, Diagnosis and Support (KEDDY).119	
4.5. KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias Partnership	122
4.6. Summary	125
5. The co-authoring of the KEDDY narrative.....	127
5.0. Introduction.....	127
5.1. Re-constructing the space of the collaboration as a co-authored narrative.....	128
5.1.1. Referral	132
5.1.2. Diagnosis.....	136
5.1.3. Negotiation.....	140
5.1.4. Intervention	144
5.2. Discussion	151
5.2.1. Referral	152
5.2.2. Diagnosis.....	153
5.2.3. Negotiation.....	154
5.2.4. Intervention	155
5.2.5. Partners' ways of collaborating	157
5.3. Summary	157
6. (Re)Constructing identities in the collaboration space	159

6.0. Introduction.....	159
6.1. Performing personal narratives	160
6.2. Engaging in loops of identification in the psychosocial space of the collaboration	162
6.2.1. Narrative of contradiction	162
6.2.2. Narrative of compromise	172
6.2.3. Narrative of manipulation	178
6.2.4. Narrative of persuasion	186
6.3. Discussion	193
6.3.1. Maria's narrative of contradiction	193
6.3.2. George's narrative of compromise	195
6.3.3. Christine's narrative of manipulation	196
6.3.4: Rob's narrative of persuasion.....	199
6.4. Summary	201
7. Conclusions.....	203
7. 0. Introduction.....	203
7.1. Generating collaboration spaces	203
7.1.1. Opening up the exploration of the collaboration space.....	207
7.2. Between planned and emergent collaboration	208
7.3. Making the unfamiliar space familiar by engaging in loops of identification	212
7.4. Traveling in between spaces: Activating psychosocial boundaries and identities in order to adjust to emergent patterns of collaborating	215
7.5. Practical contributions	220
7.6. Further research and limitations of the study	222
8. Bibliography	225
9. Appendices.....	261

List of Tables

Table 1: Data collected throughout the four stages of the research	82
Table 2: Final codes and their description for the period 'Negotiation'	95
Table 3: Construction of a thematic code (collaborative practice: coping with fears) for the Negotiation period.....	96
Table 4: Emergent supportive space and its description for the Negotiation period	96
Table 5: Construction of the final category 'Developing tactics' for the Negotiation period	97
Table 6: Narrative content for 'Negotiation' based on main category and final codes	98

Table 7: Description of the interview participants and interviews for the second analysis	103
Table 8: Storytellers’ images, contexts, segments and turning points that characterise their personal stories.....	110
Table 9: Organising the dimensions in Anna's story. Adapted from Burke (1945).....	129
Table 10: Organising the dimensions in Anna's story. Adapted from Parker (2003)	130
Table 11: Complete narrative framework with horizontal dimensions (temporality), vertical dimensions (story elements and ideas) and themes for the reconstruction of Anna's story ..	131
Table 12: Boundary spaces, emergent narratives of belonging and ongoing transformations of the partnership during Anna's engagement in the partnership.	151
Table 13: Narrators’ expressed images, lived spaces, boundaries and turning points in constructing identities and organising identity narratives.	161
Table 14: Emergent patterns of collaborating based on the rising themes, activated psychosocial boundaries, dimensions and emergent identities in particular collaborative spaces	216

List of Figures

Figure 1: Extract from edited transcript from Maria’s interview indicating the narrative structure for “It is all about collaboration”	107
---	-----

Table of Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview topic guide	261
Appendix 2: Description of the meetings observed	262
Appendix 3: Description of the interview participants and interviews	263
Appendix 4: Description of the documents gathered.....	267
Appendix 5: Code/text occurrences for the Referral period	270
Appendix 6: Code/text occurrences for the Diagnosis period.....	272
Appendix 7: Code/text occurrences for the Negotiation period	274
Appendix 8: Code/text occurrences for the Intervention period	277
Appendix 9: Coding scheme with topic areas and description of basic area codes	280
Appendix 10: Final codes and their description for each period	281
Appendix 11: Thematic codes and their description for each period.....	283
Appendix 12: Emergent spaces and their description for each period	285
Appendix 13: Category-description for each part of Anna's narrative	286

Appendix 14: Overview of the ways of collaborating in all the periods of the enacted story .	288
Appendix 15: Categories of collaborating, practices and main themes for each part of the narrative.....	289
Appendix 16: Extract of interview transcript prepared for narrative analysis	290
Appendix 17: Analysis of Maria’s narrative of contradiction.....	292
Appendix 18: Analysis of George’s narrative of compromise.....	295
Appendix 19: Analysis of Christine’s narrative of manipulation.....	297
Appendix 20: Analysis of Rob’s narrative of persuasion.....	300
Appendix 21: KEDDY collaborative arrangements.....	303
Appendix 22: Summaries of the stories the initial analysis has revealed.....	305
Appendix 23: Table indicating the type, theme, main actors, reasons for presenting a story, level of description and collaborative outcome of the stories the initial analysis has revealed	308

Introduction

Many organisations form inter-organisational collaborations to respond to a demanding and unstable environment, achieve their aims, innovate, expand and become competitive. Yet, despite their importance, many inter-organisational collaborations fail (Prins, 2010; Olson et al., 2012). Given the prominence of collaboration, it is not surprising that it has been extensively researched (i.e. Gray, 2008; Hibber and Huxham, 2010; Savage et al., 2012). Contributions to the study of partnerships come from a wide range of disciplines including economics, sociology, economic geography, public policy and management. Their theoretical bases are also wide and include, for example, institutional theory (Scott, 2004), social network analysis (Barnes, 1954), transaction costs (Williamson, 1981), economics and critical management studies (Grey and Willmott, 2005). Yet, surprisingly, only a very small amount of this research addresses the practices of collaboration, which is the central focus of this study. A practice-based study of inter-organisational collaboration enables this research to examine what collaborative practices emerge over time and how these practices affect the collaborative process. As such, it will be possible to understand how partners collaborate in addition to how partnerships emerge in dynamic contexts.

In order to explore inter-organisational collaboration as a process that unfolds as participants engage in everyday actions and interactions, this research incorporates an emergent notion of space that provides the 'place' for social practices to be created, developed and expressed (Eikland, and Nicolini, 2011). Although the concept of space has been broadly used in the field of organisational studies (i.e. Foucault, 1995; Giddens, 1984; Weick, 1995; Dale and Burrell, 2008), the majority of existing research either focuses on the physical or spatial aspects of space. This research highlights the necessity of expanding the concept of space to incorporate aspects beyond its geometrical meaning. Building on Lefebvre's ideas (1991), organisational space is here perceived as a site of interrelated physical and psychosocial spaces. This three-fold construct would allow the exploration of how a collaboration's working spaces emerge and evolve through the interaction of actors, objects and physical environment.

Integrating the concept of space into the exploration of inter-organisational collaboration has a significant impact; it offers a new perspective that sees collaboration

as a psychosocial space mediated by material artifacts and practices. This emergent notion goes beyond the limitations of traditional views on collaboration, which emphasise either the structure of the collaboration or the required managerial responses to it (Hibbert and Huxham, 2010). The collaboration space is here explored through the processes of constantly drawing distinctions, reproducing psychosocial boundaries and generating different spaces for action. To this end, it is through daily working practices and relationships (Barnes, 2001) that collaboration participants achieve certain stability within constantly shifting boundaries (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). In fact, activating psychosocial boundaries will enable the conditions for partners to enter and leave particular spaces and in addition it will indicate how working spaces are produced, defined and integrated. This study therefore widens the current organisational perspectives on boundaries and shows that they are not simply established, rather they are developed through an evolving, dynamic and possible contested process of inclusion/exclusion (Barth, 1969).

Central to the process of boundary development is the formation of social identities. Identity development will help partners adjust to the changing psychosocial boundaries of the emergent spaces, and therefore understand these spaces and organise their own practices. Moreover, when partners face choices regarding goals, power, roles, decisions and rules the answer to the question of identity (who we are) affects their actions (Haslam et al., 2011). Hence, this research also examines how collaboration partners (co)construct and reconstruct their identities. In order to work towards this aim, the concept of loops of identification (Beech and Huxham, 2003) was employed. This concept treats identity as both relatively stable and dynamic, and therefore allows the examination of how partners re-produce particular personal and social identities appropriate to the situation they are living through. Loops of identification also help this study transcend traditional identity theories that consider practice and identity as separate sub-fields (Simpson, 2009). In fact, this study reveals the impact of the emergent psychosocial spaces and practices on partners' identity. It also illustrates that actors generate meaning, significance and sense of belonging through their engagements and social conduct in relation to the collaboration space.

However, this study was not only born out of research interests but also out of personal experiences. I have worked for several years in centres for students with special needs

in Greece. This experience indicated to me how important it is for these centres to collaborate with public organisations from different disciplines (i.e. schools, hospitals, social centres) in order to ensure that disabled students receive the help they need. Yet, my experience also illustrated that multidisciplinary collaborations can be more complicated in practice than they are in theory. This has triggered my interest to further explore inter-organisational partnerships.

This research examines collaborative processes through the analysis of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership which was established in Messologi (Greece) in 2000. The aim of the educational partnership is to support children with special needs so as to overcome their educational difficulties. The partners use the terms ‘disabled students’ and ‘students with special needs’ in order to refer to the children they support. Whenever these terms are used throughout this research, they cover all disabled students, students with long-term medical conditions as well as with learning difficulties.

The collaboration under research has four partners who come from different backgrounds: KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias, parents with disabled children, head teachers and teachers of local state schools as well as local government representatives. All the partners are interdependent and engage in constant interactions for the collaboration to achieve its aims. Every case the partners deal with is about different children with diverse disabilities and educational needs. They therefore have to tread a thin line between following the KEDDY collaboration protocol (the formal rules of the partnership stated by the government) and being flexible to meet the needs of each particular child. Within this ‘drifting’ context, the partners find themselves constantly having to negotiate boundaries, practices and identities. Thus, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias provides a suitable context to explore the dynamic nature of a collaborative process in which boundaries and identities become key.

This research illustrate how, as organisational members engage in everyday working practices, they demarcate the psychosocial boundaries of the collaborative process by producing psychosocial spaces of action: ‘spaces of exploration and learning’ and ‘spaces of regulation’. The collaboration space is composed by both types of spaces that help partners engage in the dynamic nature of the collaborative process and handle

ambiguous circumstances. Collaboration develops and is transformed according to each case, with the partners sometimes following the protocol and sometimes overriding it in order to respond to the needs of different situations. Hence, the collaboration space is not known a-priori rather it unfolds as designed and emergent practices interchange, shifting identities and boundaries while generating new spaces for action.

Secondly, this research reveals the connection between space, identity and boundaries. Through partners' (inter)actions new psychosocial boundaries are activated, causing identity clash. This conflict shifts the regulatory space of the collaboration and brings forward an exploratory space. This means that regulations are no longer useful to help partners organise their actions. In contrast, other elements, such as experience and identity, are brought into play to assist partners understanding of the new space. By engaging in loops of identification, partners (co)construct their identities. In this way, they adapt to the shifting boundaries of the collaboration, make sense of the given space and organise their practices. Emergent identities affect and are affected by the collaboration space, while they also have an impact on the collaboration itself.

The thesis is constructed as follows:

The first two chapters describe the theoretical position of this research in relation to studies of inter-organisational collaboration. The aim is to present the conceptual basis of the study and to summarise the basic assumptions and arguments of earlier studies in the area in order to use them as a mirror for the empirical findings of the analysis.

The first chapter therefore introduces the concept of collaboration as a social psychological act and presents factors that can motivate, inhibit or facilitate partnerships. It also introduces the specific characteristics of the collaboration under research. Then, it critically discusses approaches to the study of collaboration and explores to what extent these help or hinder a dynamic view of the collaboration. The third section of the chapter suggests that it is vital to observe the actual practices of collaboration in order to understand how the collaborative process is shaped. It therefore conceptualises collaboration as a dynamic, context-dependent and emergent process that unfolds through the partners' everyday actions and interactions. The last section presents several conceptualisations of practice in organisation studies and explains the need to

adapt a notion of practice that indicates the emergent nature of social practices over time and space.

The second chapter examines the space where collaborative practices are generated, framed and expressed. This space consists of the interrelated physical and psychosocial spaces that are constantly produced based on the unfolding psychosocial boundaries and on the nature of partners' actions and interactions within these boundaries. The second section therefore explores the concept of boundaries in organisation studies. This section suggests that through the interplay between boundaries and partners' practices, interwoven spaces of action emerge which all together produce the collaboration space. Activating psychosocial boundaries implies activating identities in order to make sense of new spaces and organise actions, interactions and experiences. As such, the last section of this chapter explores processes of identification in collaborations. More specifically, it illustrates how loops of identification reflect the dynamic process of identity construction and therefore assist this study to explore identity development in the unfolding collaboration space.

The third chapter presents and justifies the design of a research methodology appropriate to the investigation of the research aims. In particular, it introduces the use of ethnography as a framework for the case study which allowed the researcher to follow the KEDDY partnership for an extended period of time. Section two presents the data collected from observations of 13 partners' meetings, numerous field notes, 43 interviews and 48 documents. The chapter finishes by explaining how the data gathered was analysed using thematic analysis, with the help of Atlas.ti, as well as narrative analysis following a performative approach.

Chapter four presents the educational and historical context of the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership. It first presents the Greek educational system and the developments in the field of special educational needs that led to the establishment of KEDDY partnership. After presenting an overview of KEDDY, this chapter provides a description of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias, its role, aims and partners. The final section introduces the main collaborative arrangements between the partners of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias.

Chapter five presents the first empirical results of the study. The aim is to show the story of the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership in the eyes of the partners. Using the story of Anna, a KEDDY client, a collective narrative is composed in four time periods; Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention. In each period partners engage in and develop different working spaces where they either follow the protocol or override it in order to help Anna. As such, following her story, emergent and designed practices of the collaborative process are explored.

Using a performative narrative analysis of personal interviews, chapter 6 explores how the partners (co)construct and (re)construct their identities in the collaboration space. Maria, George, Christine and Rob's stories illustrate how partners constantly engage in loops of identification that demarcate the boundaries of emergent working spaces and help them organise their actions and relationships. The personal narratives also illustrate how emergent identities affect and are affected by the collaborative space while having an impact on the collaboration itself.

The last chapter of the thesis presents some concluding remarks. Firstly, it presents the conceptual framework that summarises the main concepts, underlying theory and research aims explored in this study. Then, it presents the main insights that this research offers. It indicates that social practices take place in evolving spaces of learning and regulation that require different ways of collaborating. The collaboration space therefore emerges through an interplay between planned and learning practices that shift collaboration boundaries and identities, generating new spaces of action. Moreover, this study highlights the fact that identification processes in inter-organisational collaborations are a sequence of interdependent and interwoven loops that are composed of psychosocial spaces, multiple foci of identification, salient identities and actions. These relational processes contribute to the redrafting of partnership boundaries and affect the unfolding of the collaboration. Finally, it is also shown that although partners may engage in the partnership with an ideal way of collaborating in their mind, they have learned to adjust to emergent patterns of collaborating in order to achieve their aims. The final section of this chapter makes methodological and theoretical suggestions for further research.

1. Exploring collaboration

1.0. Introduction

In recent years, inter-organisational collaborations in their many forms (i.e. alliances, cooperations, partnerships, joint ventures, etc.) have been extensively researched through investigation into a wide range of issues such as: identification of success and failure factors of the collaboration (Johnson et al., 2003); stages in the collaboration's life-cycle (Kanter, 1994); different typologies or characteristics of collaborations (Faerman et al., 2001); types of competencies, behaviours and tasks needed in partnerships (Gray, 1985); guidelines and steps for managing collaborations (Gray, 1989); and the development of tools and techniques to enable collaboration (Taket and White, 2000). A closely related specific area of research, which has been less explored, however, is the research concerning the practices of collaboration. In particular, there is a gap in collaboration studies regarding the ways in which the collaborative process emerges over time in the eyes of the stakeholders, especially in uncertain circumstances. This study aims to contribute to this area of research. By following a practice-based study of collaboration, it explores how partners through their daily actions, experiences and interactions (co)construct the collaboration space. This research will also examine the impact that this emergent space has on the partners and their working practices.

The first section of this chapter situates collaboration within the tradition of social psychology and presents it as a social psychological act. In the second section, the focus shifts to the context of inter-organisational collaboration. It therefore presents the transition from individual organisations to collaborative behaviour, in addition to different concepts and forms of collaboration. It also introduces the motives and conditions for the success or failure of partnerships. The last section of this chapter introduces the concept of practice as a key concept in the study of collaboration. After presenting the concept of practice in organisational studies, this section then shows how practice has been used throughout this research in order to explore the way in which partners collaborate and construct their identity.

1.1. Collaboration as a social psychological phenomenon

Collaboration is a social psychological act that depends on people's participation in social groups and their subsequent engagement in social activities and interactions (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). When groups interact, members' behaviour is affected by the properties that others have as members of social groups. This membership implies specific behavioural characteristics that people adopt as members of a social group and that later affect their interaction with in-group and out-group members. Therefore, collaboration depends on people's membership of groups which are socially created (Schruijer, 2008). People may be members of several social groups simultaneously, while personal and situational circumstances will affect their decision to select one group over the others. In any case, members need to be familiar with the characteristics, attitudes and behaviours that define a group. These will also define the intergroup relations that can be expressed through the collaboration between the groups. A relationship between two or more groups may be characterised as collaborative if cooperation, and not conflict, competition, isolation, etc. dominates their interaction (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). Whether people will collaborate or not depends on their response to the social environment, the social groups available as well as group members' behaviour, attitudes and characteristics.

Collaboration as a social psychological phenomenon has been broadly researched within the literature of intergroup relations (Hogg and Abrams, 2001). A strand of the traditional research in social psychology that deals with intergroup collaboration examines alternatives to collaborative action (such as groups in competition, conflict and isolation). It does so by following different perspectives which offer valuable information and explanations to intergroup interactions that appear in conjunction or as a consequence of intergroup collaboration (Hogg and Abrams, 2001; Schruijer, 2008). This approach has resulted in research focusing on: the individual characteristics of personality that explain in-group behaviour (Forsyth, 2010; Sidanius and Pratto, 1999; Altemeyer, 1998; Pettigrew, 1958); the various social functions of stereotypes (Miller and Prentice, 1999; Tajfel, 1981; Hogg and Abrams, 2001); the social categorisation into in-group and out-group (Corey et al., 2010; Abrams and Hogg, 2001; Moreland et

al. 1994; Ellemers, 1993; Turner et al 1987); and the goal between groups or individuals (Haynes, 2012; Pruitt and Kim, 2004; Brewer, 2003; Sherif, 1958).

The other strand of traditional social psychological research has concentrated on specific aspects of intergroup collaboration. Thus there is literature focusing on: discriminatory collaborative behaviour (Brewer, 2003; Otten et al, 1996; Tajfel and Turner, 1979); social influence (Pettigrew, 2008; Haslam et al 1998; Nemeth and Rogers, 1996; Moscovici, 1980); prejudice and social harmony (Brewer and Brown, 1998; Allport; 1954); competition (Kessler and Harth, 2009; Turner, 1999; Ellemers, 1993; Hogg and Abrams, 1995) and motivations for intergroup collaboration (Alle-Corliss and Alle-Corliss, 2009; Brewer, 2003; Greenberg et al, 1997; Hogg and Abrams, 1995; Festinger, 1954).

Collaboration is an intrinsically social psychological act, and traditional social psychology has developed a variety of theories and perspectives in an effort to understand how people behave in groups as well as whether or not intergroup relations will result in people's collaboration. These approaches however mostly treat collaboration as a given and tend to focus on inhibitors to collaboration, such as stereotyping, ethnocentrism, conflict, discrimination, prejudice, intolerance, hostility and racism (Hogg and Abrams, 2001). The emphasis has therefore been on the study of the more 'negative aspects' of intergroup collaboration (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). As a result, although there is a variety of explanations as to why people do not collaborate, the fact that groups collaborate appears as an intergroup behaviour that does not require an explanation (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). A few studies examine intergroup collaboration as a social act that benefits both the members of the in-group and of the out-group (Hogg and Abrams, 2001; Schrujijer, 2008). Thus, even though collaboration has been treated as a social psychological act, there is no consensus regarding what constitutes this act, how it emerges and how it changes. Moreover, most social psychological studies carried out on collaboration examine the correlation between collaboration and several factors that may affect it, and do not explain the different effects that collaboration causes to groups (Pruitt and Kim, 2004; Brewer, 2003). Instead, they tend to explain the behaviours and experiences that appear in conjunction with collaboration.

The present research aims to add to this wide-ranging tradition in social psychology by going beyond the inter-group behaviour studies. It does so by adopting a view of collaboration in which the collaborative process is presented as temporary and emergent. The boundaries are constantly negotiated by the partners in the collaboration, and 'in-groups' and 'out-groups' are transient and no longer clearly defined (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). In this respect, research in organisational contexts could contribute to expand the concept of collaboration within social psychology. The aim of the present study is to research the practices and processes related to the context of the collaboration in organisational contexts in order to understand how they affect the way partners construct and reconstruct the collaboration space, while at the same time formulating new identities. To this end and to better understand the collaboration under study and the challenges it faces, the following sections will explore the meaning of collaboration, the different forms it can take and the factors that may inhibit or facilitate the collaborative process.

1.2. Collaboration in organisational settings

1.2.1. Shifting from organisational to inter-organisational relationships

Increasing environmental turbulence transforms organisational life from every angle (Lash and Urry, 1987) and forces organisations to look for collective solutions (Prins, 2010) in which cross organisational or interdisciplinary work is increasingly important for survival and success. Partnering helps stakeholders to “appreciate their interdependencies, pool their insights, increase the variety of their repertoire of responses to problems and achieve increased reciprocity, efficiency and stability among themselves” (Taket and White, 2000: 14).

This tendency towards partnering of various forms of external and internal collaboration (Hergert and Morris, 1988, Hagedoorn, 1993, Gulati, 1995) shifts the interest of traditional organisational studies from individual organisations to inter-organisational relationships and behaviour. Since organisations now operate within complex networks

of relationships, organisational research has started to explore the interdependencies associated with these relationships (Gray and Wood, 1991).

In particular, changes in organisational life along five dimensions (social, economic, cultural, political and environmental) have led organisations to move towards collaborations (Taket and White, 2000).

A number of economic changes has fostered the development of collaborations. Examples are: the change from a manufacturing to a service economy; increasing economic and political dominance of the professional/technical class; centrality of theoretical knowledge; knowledge-producing institutions in policy formation; future orientation and development of information-based technology; and creation of new intellectual technology that guides and manages socioeconomic development (Taket and White, 2000; Webb, 2004; Forsyth, 2010). These economic changes have also led to social changes such as different family forms; multiple roles and patterns of participation in the workforce; dependence on social skills; and emphasis on relationship development and networking (Harper, 1993; Giddens, 2006).

Shifts in the cultural context have also affected organisational life. Currently the interest is placed on the study of: individual characteristics; attitudes and social norms; value creation through innovation and change; freedom to grow and to fail; social influences; commitment and personal responsibility; and emphasis on the future (Tsasis, 2009; O'Donovan, 2006; Cummings and Worley, 2005; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006). These new perspectives open up the possibility of partnering as an effective way in responding to cultural changes.

Finally, political changes have led organisations into collaborative relationships. For example there is a tendency towards: participative decision-making; development of community-based rather than hierarchical structures; advocated individual and community development; democratic forms of organisation; and self-governing groups (Buchanan and Badha, 2008; Pfeffer, 1992). These new norms suggest a change in the way society and organisations operate, indicating the need for collaborative behaviour.

However, cultural, economic, political and economic changes are linked to the dynamic nature of the environment. Since the environment is changing rapidly and towards increasing complexity, organisations are seeking ways to respond to its dynamic, complex and turbulent nature (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). Inter-organisational collaborations become a response to complex environments, since under unstable conditions organisations become highly interdependent with others (Gray, 1996).

Organisations move towards collaborative relationships resulting in the development of extensive research into inter-organisational collaborations. In fact, a large part of the organisation literature explores a number of concepts used to speak about collaboration, different collaborative forms, motives for establishing partnerships as well as barriers and inhibitors to collaboration. These aspects will be presented in the following sections.

1.2.2. Defining concepts: Collaboration, partnership and collaborative process

The concept of collaboration is explored in many different fields. Disciplines such as economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science and management focus on collaboration and offer a wide range of theoretical perspectives (i.e. corporate, institutional, social, economic, political, etc.) for understanding collaboration (Gray and Wood, 1991). This implies different interpretations of the term collaboration. For instance, for biology living organisms collaborate to maximise the long-term opportunities for their genes (Wilson and Wilson, 2007). Technological studies view collaboration in terms of collaborative software packages that help action-orientation groups to cooperate, communicate and solve problems when they are in different geographic areas (Beyerlein, et al., 2002). The term collaboration acquired a negative meaning in the historical context as it usually refers to people and groups that help a foreign occupier of their country (Ortner, 1994). In music, collaboration describes the participation of many people in one concert, album or performance (Sawyer, 2003). For research, collaboration is when researchers cooperate for the creation of new scientific knowledge (Katz and Martin, 1997).

Similarly, in the organisational literature, “collaboration is treated as a broad concept in scope and, not surprisingly, even the most basic terminology – such as ‘partnership’, ‘alliance’, and ‘collaboration’- is subject to a wide variety of interpretations; and while many authors create specific definitions for their own purposes, there is no consistency of usage across the field” (Huxham and Vangen, 2001: 1). It cannot therefore be argued that there is one accepted definition of organisational collaboration. Instead, “collaboration can mean everything from simply sharing information/opinion or ‘working together’ to striving to arrive at win-win outcomes of conflict, to a specific means of regarding relational partners in interaction” (Beck, 2006: 200).

For example, Gray (1989) focuses on exploring differences between organisations that form collaborations. She suggests that in collaborations partners may understand problems in different ways. However, they can also explore their differences and find unique beneficial solutions. Other studies explore the shared aspects related to collaboration where collaboration, as a process of shared creation, generates a shared meaning, understanding, product and events (Das and Teng, 1997), or, as a fluid process, allows a group of diverse and autonomous actors to undertake a joint initiative in order to achieve common goals (Rosenthal and Mizrahi, 1994). Another strand of collaboration research focuses on the products of collaboration. This research suggests that when people collaborate, not only do they plan, decide and act jointly together, but they also think together and therefore the products of their work reflect all the participants’ contributions (Ray, 2002). Research into collaboration also stresses the beneficial relationship between organisations and explores how different organisations commit to a set of common goals, mutual authority and accountability as well as jointly developed shared responsibility (O’Looney, 1997).

An alternative concept used to talk about collaboration in this research is that of partnership. The concept of partnership also takes on a range of meanings. For instance, some organisational studies explore partnerships where definite partners (individuals or organisations) are bound together by a contract between themselves in order to combine their activities for the achievement of mutual aims (Kamensky and Burlin, 2004). Other studies examine partnerships as strategies applied when organisations wish to avoid conflict or to share a common vision (Shafritz, 1997), or they examine partnerships as emergent inter-organisational arrangements through which organisations actively

manage the complex nature of the work around them (Shafritz, 1997). In general, it appears that partnerships are a specific collaborative form where “two or more organisations with separate structures of accountability act together as partners in some common task/area” (Friend, 1990: 19).

The term collaborative process is also employed when referring to collaborative arrangements in this research. This term indicates that collaboration is not stable and ordered. It is also not a factor, tool or structure that is known and can be designed a-priori or can be constructed in a finalised and permanent way (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). Rather, in this study, collaboration is characterised by the activity that is embedded within it, and therefore by uncertainty and instability (Gherardi, 2000). Collaboration is therefore perceived here as a collaborative process that emerges over time through the partners' daily actions, experiences and interactions.

To summarise, collaboration studies do not use a single definition of collaboration but a typology of forms of collaboration (Shafritz, 1997). For example, collaborative alliances, joint ventures, partnerships, associations, participatory programs, cooperations, coordinations and networks are forms of collaboration (Gray and Wood, 1991; Huxham and Vangen, 2001). This research uses the terms collaboration, partnership and collaborative process interchangeably in order to examine how partners construct their collaboration space and their identities over time.

There is a variety of concepts and meanings regarding collaboration, and, similarly, there is also a variety of forms that collaboration can take. These forms are introduced below in order to describe the form of the partnership under research.

1.2.3. Forms of organisational collaboration

Organisational studies do not only offer a range of terms to describe collaboration, but also a range of forms that collaboration could take. A distinction between collaborative forms is the one between public and private collaborations which can occur either for profit or non-profit reasons (Beatrice, 1990; Rosenthal and Mizrahi, 1994). Public non-profit collaborations are designed by governments to meet the individuals' service needs

that a single provider cannot cover. They indicate different degrees of autonomy, power and resource allocation (Zajac and D'Aunno, 1993). Interdependence is the element that distinguishes different types of non-profit collaboration: from one simple transaction where organisations carry out an exchange to full legal mergers between organisations (Murray, 1998). Some collaboration researchers present different forms of public (profit and non-profit) collaborations. For example, Shafritz (1997) proposes five types: collaborations that share information and coordinate services; joint efforts for support, community planning, public education or fund-raising; joint delivery of programs with the use of new funding; validation of services that already exist; and full partnerships and mergers.

A further distinction is made between formal (joint program, joint venture and merger) and informal collaborations (sharing of information, resources and clients) (Guo and Acar, 2005). Collaborations may also vary from two organisations that work together as partners to large networks that work together to provide a system or service (Sowa, 2008).

Another distinction regarding the form that collaborations could take is that of collaboration within organisations (internal or intra-collaboration) and collaboration between organisations (external or inter-collaboration). This distinction can be further specified as homogeneous (either external or internal) or heterogeneous (a mixture of inter and intra forms of collaboration). Intra-collaboration refers to collaboration between members of the same community, team, program or organisation. It is described as a process through which different members of the same organisation, who have different perspectives on a problem and come from different disciplines, work together to explore their different perspectives and find solutions that could not be found if working alone (Gray, 1989). On the other hand, organisations form inter-collaborations to solve problems which a single organisation acting alone cannot solve, overcome conflicts with their competitors and face a turbulent environment (Anderson and Gatignon, 1986; Gray, 1996). Inter-organisational collaboration also assists organisations in solving social problems, building their agenda, providing services, enabling them to achieve goals as well as increasing empowerment and betterment (Faulkner, 1995; Shafritz, 1997), achieving efficiency, competence and positional advantage (Child and Faulkner, 1999; Nooteboom, 1989).

The study that this research is based on falls into the heterogeneous public non-profit collaboration category. It is a formal inter-organisational collaboration between four partners from different fields that have joined their efforts in order to provide a service. In the field of services, governments frequently use non-profit inter-organisation collaborations to deliver public services that a single provider cannot cover (Whittington, 2003). They help overcome organisational boundaries and allow those receiving the services to flow more easily between agencies.

Even though there is a growing interest in non-profit service collaborations, only a few studies have examined this type of collaboration, especially in the field of services for children (Glisson and Hemmelgarn, 1998), and this is a gap that this research seeks to fill. Organisational collaboration literature has studied to some extent the consequences of heterogeneous non-profit collaborations in the delivery of public services (Alter and Hage, 1993), but the majority of the studies indicate the failure of these collaborations (Harbert et al., 1997; Farmakopoulou, 2002). Moreover, despite the fact that joint work between specialist groups tends to have a powerful vision and rationale to provide better services for children and their families, there is insufficient evidence to support the view that these collaborations achieve their aim (Gardner, 2003). It appears that the governments responsible for the delivery of adequate services need to find ways to improve collaboration among service providers in order for the services to be successful. This research aims to contribute towards this aim.

Understanding better how people collaborate in dynamic and unfolding contexts and how the emergent practices affect the collaborative process will enable the improvement of the quality of the services provided by public (and private) collaborations. Moreover, uncovering the barriers and facilitators to collaboration will help in understanding why, despite their significance, collaborations face problems in achieving their aims. To this end, the following sections will explore the factors that motivate, facilitate and inhibit collaboration.

1.2.4. Motivations for inter-organisational collaborations

Collaboration literature also examines factors which motivate organisations to engage in different forms of collaboration. Although many factors motivate inter-organisational collaboration, the main driver invariably depends on the specific collaborative process. For example, organisations engage in collaboration to: increase the quality of solutions and the response capability; reduce the costs and risks; improve relations between stakeholders; and develop mechanisms to coordinate future interactions (Gray, 1989). Organisations may also collaborate to generate solutions to shared problems, increase willingness to implement and communicate these solutions (Olson et al., 2012). They also seek to reopen deadlocked negotiations in order to gain greater potential for innovative solutions and agreements that consider the interests of each stakeholder (Gray, 2008). Collaborative arrangements between organisations are also driven by the resulting reduction in costs (Harbert et al., 1997); increased availability of partners and easy access to collective knowledge (Child and Faulkner, 1999). Furthermore, through collaborations organisations may gain: enhanced social outcomes at lower costs than traditional arrangements; more comprehensive solutions to complex problems; or overcoming of institutional blind spots (Anderson and Gatignon, 1986).

Furthermore, different parties may decide to form inter-organisational collaborations when they become aware that the job cannot be completed alone and, thus, in order to succeed, they need to share resources (i.e. money, skills, manpower, ideas and insights) with others (Murray, 1998). Partnerships can also be stimulated as a way of ensuring protection, legitimacy and preservation of resources (Rosenthal and Mizrahi, 1994). Other organisations collaborate to achieve collaborative advantage, namely, access to resources and physical facilities, improved infrastructures, shared risks, efficiency, learning, moral imperatives, co-ordination and seamlessness (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). In addition, collaboration may be a source of inspiration and creativity that enables partners to greatly extend their network (Kamensky and Burlin, 2004). On the other hand, some organisations may be forced to collaborate, i.e. due to government pull or push (Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

The demanding and changing environment may also stimulate inter-organisational collaboration in order to integrate previously separated fields and combine the necessary

skills (Hoel, 1998). Such partnerships do not only involve collaboration across disciplinary boundaries, but also between sectors. Multidisciplinary collaboration promises results that form the basis of major developments and improvements at various organisational sectors, such as in product development, IT services, medicine, etc. (Gardner, 2003; Savage et al., 2012).

The inter-organisational collaboration under research was initiated by the government. Therefore, the four partners were forced to work together without consultation. However, the basic motive bringing these partners together was that each partner was from a different field (i.e. education, psychology, governmental services, etc.). Multidisciplinary collaboration appeared as the best way for the government to improve public educational services provided to disabled students.

1.2.5. Facilitators and barriers to inter-organisational collaborations

Even if organisations have many reasons to collaborate, inter-organisational collaboration does not come without a price to pay. In fact, it is not the best option under specific circumstances in which the costs may outweigh the benefits (Gray, 1989). Although the collaboration literature refers to various conditions for the success and failure of collaboration, since every partnership is a particular situated process, there is no clear pattern or fixed solutions and practices to support collaboration. Instead, it is only possible to identify some factors which may influence the likelihood of success or failure of collaboration.

For instance, inter-organisational collaboration can be successful when partners are able to recognise each other's contribution to the collaboration, and the collaboration is future oriented and emerges progressively (Kanter, 1994). Moreover, collaborations may succeed if partners are committed to the cause and the collaboration; respect and trust each other; follow a competent pattern of leadership and decision making (Rosenthal and Mizrahi, 1994); invest in developing the capabilities required for the collaboration; share resources; mutually exchange information; and have a clear vision (Shafritz, 1997). If partners dedicate an appropriate amount of time to collaboration,

constantly nurture the relationship, are flexible and adaptable (Prins, 2010), understand that there may be some differences in partners' perceptions in terms of the collaboration outcomes and also of their approaches, and start with small, achievable tasks to build trust (O'Looney, 1997), partnerships could succeed. Additionally, success could result when partners are able to manage the collaboration with a high degree of autonomy; promote open and frequent communication; and recognise the importance of the power games as part of the negotiation process (Huxham and Vangen, 2001). Although commitment in a partnership can also be very decisive for its success (Wilson, 2000), a relaxed attitude towards control on the part of the partners is also very important (Friend, 1990).

Collaboration studies also underline a number of conditions that may hinder inter-organisational collaboration. Some of these conditions are: cultural incompatibilities (Wilson, 2000); competitive, opportunistic and individualistic spirit as well as excessive control (Perlow, 1999); negative attitude and opposition to change attitude (Friend, 1990) and external pressures (Stohl and Walker, 2002). Lack of common agendas, different protocols and structures, exclusion of stakeholders from the collaborative process (Tsasis, 2009), and ideological differences (such as lack of communication, clear aims and responsibilities) can also provide barriers to collaboration (Olson et al., 2012). Additionally, organisational commitments that create disincentives, ideological differences, adversarial historical relationships, certain societal-level dynamics, different perceptions of risk, technical complexities as well as different political and institutional cultures between organisations are some of the reasons collaborations do not succeed or are never initiated (Gray, 2008; Savage et al., 2012).

Moreover, the core of many difficulties arising in non-profit public collaborations is that the agreements underpinning these collaborations are usually made by governments or institutions that employ collaborations, whilst the actual work is done by individuals from different sectors and from different organisations (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012a). This could mean that the established rules and structures may not correspond to the actual needs of the collaboration when put into practice. This may also indicate a clear power imbalance which can lead to opportunistic behaviours and an 'understandable temptation' for some parties to exert control over the others (Beck, 2006). This was actually one of the greatest barriers that the collaboration under

research was facing. The government established the protocol and structure of the collaboration and the partners were asked to follow these in order to achieve their aims. Yet the rules the government set did not always respond to the needs of the collaboration practices.

Nevertheless every collaborative process is a situated process and its end-result cannot be predicted. Even if it is possible to identify some of the factors that facilitate and inhibit collaboration, this may mean only taking into consideration these factors in order to support the collaborative process or decide whether a partnership should be initiated or not. In any case, “the best collaborations are done between equals. The journey to discovery almost always demands good traveling companions” (Schrage, 1990: 45).

The previous sections have presented the collaboration literature on the concepts, forms, motives, enablers and inhibitors of inter-organisational collaborations. The aim was to introduce the main issues/aspects in the field and familiarise the reader with the collaboration under study. However, there is a debate in the collaboration studies that has played a key role in the development and framing of this thesis. This debate is presented below.

1.3. The unfolding of inter-organisational collaboration

1.3.1. The tension: Organisational collaboration between structure and process

Collaboration research can be divided into two strands. The first focuses on the architecture of collaboration (structures, tools and different components of the collaborative arrangement). The second looks at organisational collaboration as a process unfolding in time and examines the phases or practices of collaboration.

A) Focusing on the architecture of the collaborative arrangements

Structures

One approach to the research into inter-organisational collaboration is the study of structural elements. Many organisational studies try to categorise and characterise collaboration, as it appears that the more complex the structure of the collaboration, the greater the difficulties may be in achieving its aims. From this perspective, studies investigate collaboration structures in an effort to simplify, improve or change them so as to enable the collaboration to succeed. For example, Walsh and Maloney (2007) discuss “the effects of group size, diversity, distance, group cohesion, task interdependence, competition, commercialisation and communication media on collaboration” (: 15). Other studies seek to identify: the importance of structural features, such as alignment of tasks, competitive pressure and distance (Cummings and Kiesler, 2005); the basic communication and structural characteristics required for collaboration (Keyton and Stallworth, 2003); or collaboration embeddedness in larger contexts (Stohl and Walker, 2002). Collaboration research may also focus its attention on components such as organisations' initial dispositions toward collaboration (Faerman et al., 2001), the extent of the interdependence with which the collaboration tasks are structured (Perlow, 1999) and the emergence of collaboration as a complex system (Browning et al., 1995; Savage et al., 2012).

Factors

A second common approach aims at identifying the individual or organisational attributes and behaviours which will indicate when the collaboration might succeed or fail. Research following this approach has focused on the: exploration of multi-dimensional pictures of factors affecting collaboration performance (Lorange and Roos, 1992); analysis of the role of trust and national culture in collaboration (Gill and Butler, 1996; Ring, 1997); and identification of the factors that contribute to good performance (Gray, 2008; Cropper, 1996; Pearce, 1997). The attributes identified in the organisational literature as leading to collaborative success include: partner selection, honesty, reliability, clarity of aims, CEO support, trust, shared power, open communication, shared vision, skilled convenors, etc. (Gray, 1989). Some poor performance factors are: personal agendas, poor managerial relationships, geographical distances, cultural differences, etc. (Beck, 2006).

Tools and Techniques

A third approach regarding the structure of collaboration has focused on developing tools and techniques to support collaborative workshops and similar events. These efforts usually have a background in strategy and management science, and are mostly concerned with modelling methods to support, for instance, decision-making processes or stakeholder management (Taket and White, 2000). The main aim tends to be the exploration of the strategic reasons which large firms might have for collaborating. This approach proposes participatory approaches to join agendas (Weisbord and Janoff, 1995), models that help in the exploration of issues related to collaborative situations (Taket and White, 2000), guidelines for successful collaboration (Ray, 2002; Haynes, 2012) and models for problem definitions relevant to collaboration (Crosby and Bryson, 2004).

B) Collaboration as a process

While the research on the architecture of collaboration does provide a fairly comprehensive description of the issues raised by those engaged in a partnership, it does not generally go deeply into the actual collaborative process. Namely, it is difficult to understand how the structure of collaboration emerges, what processes might influence the operations of the collaboration structure and why specific forms of collaboration structure emerge. However, if the collaboration is approached as a process, it is possible to understand how and why specific collaborative forms emerge and thus discover what facilitates and prevents collaborating. Collaboration studies that explore inter-organisational collaboration as a process follow two different perspectives.

Phases

One of the most common approaches to explain organisational collaboration is through its conceptualisation in phases or stages in a life cycle. Kanter (1994), for instance, frames collaboration through the metaphor of marriage. She suggests that successful collaborations can emerge in five overlapping phases: courtship, engagement, housekeeping (discovering the variety of ideas regarding the operation of collaboration), bridging and old marrieds (realisation of having changed due to the influence of the

collaboration). Other collaboration studies suggest that partnerships may follow the sequential phases of problem-setting, direction-setting and structuring (McCann, 1983; Gray, 1985). Organisational research which adopts this approach typically goes on to identify the activities that are characteristic of each phase (Das and Teng, 1997). Nevertheless, while this perspective emphasises change and development at different stages in the collaboration life, it is not clear whether there is commonality in the different phases the collaborative process undergoes. Instead, as this research will show, it is generally difficult to identify clear beginnings and ends in the process, let alone gain clarity into the phases in between.

Practices

Another approach to researching collaboration is the one that focuses on practices. This is a lesser used approach, especially when it comes to investigate the implications of collaborative practices for the different stakeholders involved and what can be learnt about the process of managing collaboration itself. Among some other researchers (i.e. Bechky, 2003; De Rond and Bouchikhi, 2004) Huxham and Vangen (2005) focus their research on collaborative practices and try to find ways to understand and influence the effectiveness of collaboration. They suggest a theme-based theory of collaborative advantage that encompasses 17 constructs, along with a set of perspectives that serves as “handles for reflective practice” (: 40). This area of collaboration research takes “an integrated research approach in which development, presentation and dissemination of practice-oriented theory are all part of the same research activities” (Huxham and Vangen, 2001: 3). This perspective perceives collaboration as a complex system, loosely coupled, which continually changes.

1.3.2. Exploring the practices of collaboration

Despite some well-known examples (i.e. Bechky, 2003; De Rond and Bouchikhi, 2004; Huxham and Vangen, 2005), surprisingly, only a very small body of collaboration research has addressed the practice of collaboration itself, an area that has remained relatively undeveloped up to the present. Traditional collaboration studies consider collaboration as a linear and ordered process. Although there is in fact mainly

uncertainty and instability, these studies search for stability and certainty by offering specific stages, tools or factors that can produce regularity within the context of collaboration. As a result, the existing theories and models on collaboration overlook the ways in which partners create, challenge and sustain different contexts, co-constructing spaces of action and belonging. Furthermore, current collaboration literature usually treats collaboration as a bounded entity without paying attention to its history, local relations and wider surroundings. Finally, little attention has been given to the practices of the collaborative process per se which can aid in the understanding of how collaborations are transformed over time through the processes of everyday working life. The present study aims to contribute to this area of research.

This thesis defines inter-organisational collaboration as a dynamically constructed space. Every collaboration is considered as a different product of specific context, time and circumstances that emerges through a particular way of engaging in collaborative work and participating in temporary working relationships (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012b). Therefore, this research perceives collaboration as not fixed or permanently constructed, and illustrates the temporary effects of ongoing collaboration. In fact, attention is focused on collaboration as a socially engendered and situated practice, in order to understand how collaboration emerges over time as its partners co-construct their own space of action, demarcate the collaborative boundaries and produce different identities.

The focus of this research is therefore on the partners' practices which will affect the emergence of the collaborative process. As opposed to an ontology of being, this study tries to anchor itself in an ontology of becoming (Chia, 1999, Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). An ontology of being emphasises a tendency towards reification and tends to see collaboration practices and actors in terms of static accounts of structuring (Czarniawska, 2008), as entities and things, as means to an end/goal (Cooper and Burrell, 1988). In contrast, an ontology of becoming focuses on tangled processes and activities. It focuses on the dynamics of how processual issues are made relevant to a specific context and calls attention to actual practice (Linehan and Kavanagh, 2004). This relational alternative sees not only organisations-in-the-making but also collaboration as being in the making, where there are no external fixed reference points rather only ongoing transformations “through continuously ongoing interactions among

the parties involved” (Bouwen, 2003: 343). From this perspective, the collaborative process emerges through the ongoing connections, both internal and external, which participants make. This implies that the collaboration which is now seen is one out of many possible outcomes (Hernes, 2008). Indeed, at any time, partners have available to them a number of possibilities from which they can choose how they will engage with the collaboration. On every occasion, they try to capture the dynamic nature of the collaborative process and treat collaborative phenomena as enactments and unfolding processes that involve their everyday choices, experiences and actions (Gherardi, 2012). In fact, partners “reweave their webs of beliefs and habits of action in response to local circumstances and new experiences” (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002: 580). The collaboration therefore becomes the result of how partners bring external and internal realities and experiences into its realm (Feldman, 2000).

To summarise, this research investigates collaboration from a practice perspective acknowledging that inter-organisational collaboration is an ongoing process with no easy routes to success. It also recognises the importance of viewing collaboration from a relational perspective where practices and processes are closely related and affect the future of the collaboration. Since the concept of practice is central for this research, the following sections will explore this concept firstly within organisational studies and then within the context of the collaboration under research.

1.3.3. The Concept of Practice in Organisational Research

In the late 1800s and the first part of the last century, the first theorising of practice appears (Whittington, 2006). However, in recent decades there is a ‘practice turn’ in the social sciences (Ortner, 1984; Schatzki, 2001) which is also presented by some experts in the organisational studies as a ‘re-turn to practice’ (Miettinen et al., 2009; Sandberg and Dall’Alba, 2009; Nicolini, 2009). Many researchers have developed and used practice approaches to better understand human action and social order across several fields such as: philosophy (Tuomela, 2002); psychology and education (Hutchins, 1993); anthropology and gender studies (Ortner, 1994); science and technology studies (Pickering, 1992). However, because of the diversity and variety of the practice

theories, the term practice is often used in multiple ways (Schatzki, 1996). For instance, most theories in philosophy identify practices as arrays of human activity; in science and technology as a set of human and nonhuman activities; and in social science as the skills or tacit knowledge and presuppositions that underpin activities (Turner, 1994).

In organisational studies, the practice turn has helped organisational researchers to observe and identify the issues that can affect the unfolding of organisational phenomena (Sandberg and Dall'Alba, 2009). It appears that the majority of studies agree on three points regarding the use of the term practice in organisational studies. First, that the practice horizon offers the meaning and the place for the development of discursive and material actions. The practices that constitute the horizon are inherently contingent and materially mediated. It is therefore possible to explore them by referring to a particular time, place and historical setting (Eikland and Nicolini, 2011; Schatzki, 1996). Second, practices are accomplished and perpetuated through reflexive human carriers, whilst human agential capability results from one or several socio-material practices (Reckwitz, 2002; De Certeau, 1988). Finally, practices are interrelated, producing a field, nexus or network (Giddens, 1984; Schatzki, 2001; Czarniawska, 2008). Therefore, social coexistence is establishing the field of practice as well as it being rooted in and established by this field (De Certeau, 1988). Within this field, practices can take a variety of material and social positions which indicates that studying practice means studying power in the making (Ortner, 1984).

Despite the agreement on these points, organisational research presents various approaches regarding the study or theorising of practice. The majority of these approaches can be classified into three categories (Schatzki, 2001). The first one refers to the establishment and development of stable and lasting organisational structures resulting in organisational order. Communities of practice (Wenger, 2000), the cultural view of organisational learning (Yanow, 2000) and durability of socially constructed identities (Kärreman and Alvesson, 2001) are examples of this classification. The second category convergent dynamic of human activity and presents the psychological basis of the human activity in organisations. Although this category is presented to a lesser degree in the organisational research, Samra-Fredericks's (2003) studies of real-time talking and Johnson et al.'s (2003) work on a closer appreciation of the myriad micro-activities belong to this category. Finally, in response to a need for a theory that

accommodates creative action, the third category concentrates on the contemporary post-humanist challenges. In the organisation studies, it is possible to see these challenges reflected in activity theory and the study of objects as mediators in meaning-making processes (Blackler et al., 2000).

Organisational theorists therefore adopt the concept of practice which appears more relevant to their perspective and/or the needs of their research. Similarly, in order to examine the collaborative and identification processes of the specific partnership under study, this research adopts a particular approach to practice that encapsulates some of the elements included in the perspectives presented above. This approach is introduced in the next section.

1.3.4. The practice-based study of the collaborative process

Given the multiplicity of the perspectives, issues and oppositions related to practice theory, there is no unified practice approach (Schatzki, 2001). Rather, “different actors by definition take different perspectives on issues” (Bouwen and Taillieu, 2004: 150). As such, “a practice approach is defined by identifying the common elements, themes or challenges each practice theorist understands as important and relevant” (Reckwitz, 2002: 13). In order to explore how the collaboration space and identities are transformed and changed through the practices of everyday working life, this study understands the collaborative process as fundamentally linked to social practice (De Certeau, 1988). This practice is perceived as a dynamic process that unfolds over time, emphasising both stability and change. In this process partners are “a locus in which an incoherent (and often contradictory) plurality of -such- relational determinations interact” (De Certeau, 1988: xi).

The unfolding nature of social practice over time and space as well as the related tension between stability and change is presented in Bourdieu’s (1973) distinction between *opus operatum* and *modus operandi*. *Opus operatum* “treats systems of objective relations as substances by converting them into wholes already constituted outside of the history of the individual and the history of the group” (: 63). This

perspective relates to those that perceive collaboration as structure or in terms of phases. *Opus operatum* focuses on the end result of collaboration, without paying attention to the processes and conditions that affect the result and, thus, the accomplishment of the actions. Within this view, collaboration is presented through a synoptic account as an accomplished event that “takes the form of a stage model in which the entity that undergoes change is shown to have distinct states at different points of time” (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002: 570). Following this approach it is not possible to capture the “fluidity, pervasiveness, open-endedness, and indivisibility” of collaborative actions and understand how the collaboration space emerges over time (: 570).

On the other hand, the *modus operandi* implies a particular notion of social practices that are produced by the *habitus*, “a system of durable, transportable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring representations” (Bourdieu, 1990: 53). These social practices are not determined by the future, are not the product of obedience to specific rules and, in addition, do not presuppose a specific end and factors that can lead to that end. In contrast, the practices produced by the *habitus* emphasise ongoing action where the past conditions, the anticipation of consequences and the specific context reproduce and give meaning to what is being done while “enabling one to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations” (:65). In this sense, the social practice unfolds “without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends” (: 56). *Habitus* is therefore perceived as “a style of engagement” that helps actors to attribute meaning (Chia, 2004: 30) and coherence to ‘situated actions’ (Suchman, 1987). Indeed, “in its social and dynamic form, the *habitus* is a form of life that expresses both the logic of what it is desirable or non-desirable and the style and taste formed within social practices” (Gherardi, 2004: 46). Moreover, *habitus* emphasises both change and stability: “being a product of history, it is an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 133).

Therefore, the concept of *habitus* is used in this research because it assists in the understanding of collaboration through social practices related to a specific context and history where the actors hold a key role. More specifically, it is possible to explore the way collaboration actors engage in various forms and use their previous experiences to make sense of the situation, identify themselves and decide on the best way to act based

on the specific context, situation and identity. Following this concept, this research perceives practice as a dynamic, temporal and social process which involves experience and action. Yet it also entails human conduct and the exercise of embodied social agency which go beyond the traditional boundaries that distinguish the individual and the social (Linstead, 2002; Langley and Tsoukas, 2010; Jarzabkowski, 2004; Nicolini, 2009). It therefore both sustains routines and allows possibilities for creative action (Simpson, 2009).

This definition of practice has three implications for this research. First, practice is perceived as a dynamic process that both converges and diverges (Simpson, 2009). Convergence refers to practices embodied in actors that help them achieve some degree of stability in social expectations and actions. Divergence refers to practices affected by current situations and experiences producing novel and different actions. Therefore, in order to analyse how the participants of the partnership collaborate, this study takes into consideration not only practices that follow the collaborative protocol but also practices that unfold during the collaborative process and affect the emergent collaboration space. A second implication is the understanding that it is not possible to predict a-priori the outcomes of the practice. Collaborative practices are enactments of both past and future. Therefore, actors' choices regarding their practices are affected constantly by the specific situations and social contexts that are themselves continuously changing. Hence, in order to understand the actions and interactions of the partners as well as the way they influence the emergence of the collaboration and partners' identity, the space and the time within which these collaborative practices were enacted and developed should be considered. A third implication is that practice and identity can be seen as mutually established social processes (Simpson, 2009). Despite the fact that many organisation studies perceive practice and identity as different subfields, this research links identity to the notion of practice (Simpson and Carroll, 2008). In particular, how partners through their actions (co)construct and reconstruct their identities in the space of the partnership is explored here. Thus, it examines how partners acquire meaning, significance and sense of self through their engagements and social conduct with/in the collaboration space.

To sum up, this study perceives the collaborative process as temporary organisation encapsulating one of the fundamental tensions in organisational life: that between

stability, order and structure versus change, flux and transformation generated by working practices as they happen (Nicolini, 2009). Collaborative life is organised, reproduced and transformed through actions, interactions and experiences. Nevertheless, perceiving practices as dynamic processes that unfold over time emphasises the necessity to examine where (the space) practices are produced, framed and expressed. By considering the space where practices unfold, it will be possible to understand their actual meaning and the emergence of the collaborative process through social practices related to a specific context and history. The next section will therefore explore the space where actions are generated.

1.3.5. The space of practice

This research follows the concept of habitus in order to explore the unfolding of collaboration through social practices. However, the use of this concept stresses the need to understand the context in which social practices emerge. For Bourdieu (2005), the habitus is created, developed, expressed and framed in a socially constructed space that he calls 'field'. A field is a "relational configuration endowed with a specific gravity which it imposes on all the objects and agents that enter it" (Wacquant, 1992: 17). "A field is also a space of conflict and competition as actors struggle to achieve their objectives... and also a space of play within a network of objective relations between positions" (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005a: 23). This field is presented as both physical and social, since "social space tends to be translated, with more or less distortion, into physical space" (Bourdieu, 2000: 134). As a social space, habitus offers a sense of one's place and a sense of the other's space (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005a). The way actors position themselves in their space affects their behaviour and others' behaviour both in legal terms and in terms of the sense of their place. The way actors will act in a space depends on the resources they have available, the way they perceive their space and their position within it.

In order to indicate how the space helps to produce and reproduce patterns of social actions and relationships, Bourdieu (1973) uses the concept of house. His description of Kabyle House brings together the concepts of space, time and social practices. The

Kabyle house is a microcosm of the world that is organised based on its inhabitants and their activities. In this house, “the bodies of men and women correspond, in their practice, to beliefs about how life is spatially and temporally constructed” (Bourdieu, 1973: 67). Furthermore, in this house there are oppositions structuring both the interior of the house and the external world. These oppositions are bounded through social practice. By providing a plan of the Kabyle House in parallel with information about the inhabitants’ culture and background, the way in which practices are affected over time by the positioning and manipulation of objects in space is illustrated. Practices are also affected by the actors’ spatial interactions with each other as well as their placement in, movement through and exclusion from a particular space.

Nonetheless, following Bourdieu’s description it is difficult to understand the role of the social space and its relation to habitus, in part because “nowhere in Bourdieu’s oeuvre does he treat the subject in detail” (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005b: 399). Although for habitus the social space translates into physical space, this translation is unclear. Social space is presented as a distributor of different kinds of goods and services as well as of individual agents and physically situated groups within the physical space. The possibilities for the distribution of these goods by the groups depend on agents’ locations within their space. In reality, the social space of habitus is a two-dimensional conceptual organisation of individuals, objects and dispositions. Since the space of social positions and lifestyle is presented graphically, the perception of social space has a very concrete meaning. It is actually a geometrical space which is constituted of physical boundaries such as walls, doors, partitions and the like. It is a space that is used and inhabited rather than produced and/or experienced.

To sum up, the concept of habitus helps to capture the unfolding nature of the collaboration under study and emphasises the essential role space plays in the generation and development of social practices. Yet this concept does not provide a satisfactory explanation about the space where social practices are created and framed. In order to be able to examine how the collaboration under study emerges in a socially constructed context, space cannot be treated, as the habitus suggests, as a thing in-itself which is to be filled with other things. Rather, space should be perceived as an extension of human agency and human intentionality. The way social practices are produced and expressed in the space of habitus does not correspond to the active

construction of particular spaces by their agents and their in situ practices. However, in this research collaboration partners' practices and interactions are expressed in a specific social space and are affected by it. This space also influences the way partners construct the collaboration space and their identity over time. Therefore, the question about the space where practices unfold remains.

1.4. Summary

This chapter has introduced the collaborative process as a social psychological act which, although it is possible to know some of the factors that may facilitate or inhibit it, cannot be predicted in terms of its end result. Transcending traditional inter-organisational collaboration research that perceives collaboration as a relatively linear and ordered process whose stages, form and factors can be described a-priori (Beck, 2006; Ring, 1997; Kanter, 1994), this study suggests that every collaboration may take a different form. Collaboration is therefore conceptualised as a result of specific context, time and circumstances. This result is shaped through a specific way of engaging in collaborative work and temporary working relationships. Thus, to be able to understand how collaboration unfolds, it is necessary to examine the social practices involved. These practices are dynamic processes that are generated and expressed over time in a specific space where the actors hold a key role (Bourdieu, 1990). The attention therefore shifts to the identification of a space that allows the production and development of these practices.

The next chapter is divided into three parts. The first part of the chapter begins by defining the concept of space in organisational studies. It then places space in the context of inter-organisational collaboration and of the way this study perceives collaboration. The collaboration is then defined as a dynamically constructed space that can be observed through its boundaries, while boundary characteristics affect partners' actions and interactions. The second part of the chapter therefore presents the concept of boundaries which fits the standpoint of this research. Boundaries suggest a social distinction based on identifications that help partners identify with the collaboration and act accordingly. The last part of the second chapter therefore examines the way partners

engage in loops of identification in order to identify themselves, make sense of their collaboration space and organise their actions.

2. The psychosocial space of inter-organisational collaborations

2.0. Introduction

The first chapter showed that every inter-organisational collaboration is a dynamically constructed process which may look similar to other situations but in reality it is not. In contrast, it emerges over time as partners act and interact in different contexts, time and circumstances. As such, everyday practices become key for the exploration of inter-organisational collaborations. Practices, produced by the habitus (Bourdieu, 2000), are perceived as styles of engagement and as dynamic processes that unfold over time and help actors attribute meaning and coherence to given circumstances (Chia, 2004; Suchman, 1987). The space within which the collaborative practices are enacted and developed becomes central for the exploration of collaborative practices and, therefore, the unfolding of collaborations.

This chapter presents organisational studies that have explored the concept of space in order to show that Lefebvre's (1991) approach is the most appropriate for this research. Space is presented here as constituted from interwoven and interdependent physical and psychosocial spaces (Lefebvre, 1991). It is continually produced and reproduced as partners engage in actions and interactions. Inter-organisational collaboration is perceived as a space that is transformed as partners engage in everyday working practices. This definition of collaboration indicates the need to examine the boundaries that allow the observation of the space and to present the conditions under which partners enter and leave a space. Yet, collaboration boundaries also establish social distinctions between those who are collaboration partners and those who are not (Hernes, 2003). This distinction is very important for the collaboration since it determines whether partners will identify with the collaboration and therefore act to achieve its aims.

This chapter consists of three parts. The first part starts by introducing the concept of space in organisation studies. It then places space in the context of collaboration and defines it based on the perspective that this research follows. The second part presents the concept of boundaries and indicates how boundaries are used within this study of

inter-organisational collaboration. The last part of this chapter investigates the process of identity formation and proposes the exploration of identity in dynamic collaborative settings through loops of identification.

2.1. Inter-organisational collaboration as an emergent space of practice

2.1.1. The concept of space in organisational research

The concept of space is used in different fields. For example, in astronomy, space is used to term the ‘outer space’, the infinite void that encompasses the galaxies (Bruce et al, 2005). In social science, the term space indicates the void that lies there to be filled and discovered (Flyvbjerg, 2001). In contrast, in technology space is not specific but it points at a ‘missing’ space that should be enacted around different contexts in technology to denote the possibilities that emerge for new interactions and ideas (Borgmann, 2006).

Similarly, the notion of space is broadly used in organisational studies. For example, “Foucault for one admitted that he was obsessed with the space metaphor” (Harvey, 1990: 205). However, his work focuses mostly on the effects of physical space on supervision (Foucault, 1995). Specifically, he uses space to indicate how, through spatial design, the system can ensure disciplined behaviour without spending resources on the direct supervision of the individuals. For Foucault (1995), the forces of repression, socialisation, disciplining and punishing are inflicted upon the space. He hence uses space to demonstrate how the domination of space constitutes the exercise of power in social life. Yet, in Foucault’s analysis, space is employed as a means of manipulation and indoctrination. Moreover, he does not explain what type of space he is referring to.

In contrast, in Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory, structure provides the binding of time-space in social systems. This allows “discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time-space and which lend them ‘systematic’ form” (: 17). Giddens tries to expand on Foucault’s concept of space as a means of repression.

However, not only does he accept the repressive use of the space, but he also opens up the mobilising aspects of space. Indeed, Giddens explains that space offers room for mobilising social action and therefore it is both embedded structurally and changes the structure in which it is embedded. Yet, in Giddens's space, actors are merely observers and do not actually participate in the changes taking place within the space.

Katz and Kahn (1978) also focus on the concept of space, claiming that space accommodates the study of aspects of organisational life that are not commonly studied. For them, "space, incorporating physical as well as social factors, offers a concept that allows us to see the organisation in a number of different ways" (: 62). Nevertheless, although Katz and Kahn suggest that the term space offers broader understanding of aspects of organisational life, they "do not pursue an open definition of space but choose to locate organisational processes with constructs such as power, communication, structure and roles" (Hernes, 2004a: 62).

Another perspective in relation to space comes from Weick (1995) who suggests that the process of sense-making takes place spatially. Thus, he supports the view that sense-making is subject to "boundary conditions within which explanations hold and outside of which they do not hold" (: 176). Within these boundary conditions a psychological space exists which provides stability to actions and interactions. This space is modified through action. Although Weick connects the reproduction of space with action, he does not explain satisfactorily the role of the actors in the reproduction process.

Dale and Surrell (2008) also explore the concept of space in organisations. They perceive space as "specific rather than abstracted, embedded rather than symbolic" (: 6) and explore organisations considering materiality, embodiment and space. Although in their analysis they speak of a social space that can be explored with the help of four dimensions (accessibility, appropriation of space, domination of space and future representations of space), they emphasise spatial and physical characteristics of space. They therefore explore the "interwoven nature of organisation, space and architecture" (: 3) in order to discover how the built environment affects everyday life.

As the first chapter indicated, inter-organisational collaboration emerges as partners engage in everyday actions, interactions and experiences. Therefore, in order to explore

the collaborative process, it is vital to examine collaborative practices which are produced, framed and expressed in specific spaces. These spaces do not have only physical characteristics, rather they also include social and psychological characteristics that contribute to their (re)production. Although organisational perspectives focus on the concept of space from different angles (i.e. Dale and Surrell, 2008; Weich, 1995), they do not explain how spaces emerge and evolve. Moreover, they do not present how the emergent nature of social space is produced through the interaction of actors and environment. Instead, they treat space as inside/outside emphasising its geometrical meaning. Most importantly, these perspectives do not explain how actions or processes can themselves become boundaries able to generate other spaces.

In order to capture the dynamic nature of inter-organisational collaboration, it is necessary to go beyond these conceptualisations of space to understand the active construction and reconstruction of spaces by agents and their in situ practices. Lefebvre (1991) analyses the production of space based on spatial relations and the ‘social space’ of lived action. His analysis provides a conceptualisation of space that corresponds to the dynamic characteristics of the collaborative process and therefore to the needs of the present study. This approach to space is presented in the next section.

2.1.2. Examining the space of collaborations

In contrast with the previously presented perspectives regarding the concept of space, Lefebvre (1991) perceives space as an entity in itself, and his analysis examines “not things in space but space itself, with a view to uncovering the social relationships embedded in it” (: 88). “Itself the outcome of the past actions, social space is what permits fresh actions to occur, while suggesting others and prohibiting yet others” (: 74). Space is not absolute, rather it is continually produced and also reproduced. It is a product of processes where the processes themselves create new spaces of action and interaction. This idea of reproduction emphasises an ontology of becoming. Indeed, space can be understood as both an actuality that can be perceived and as a potentiality that leads to new actuality. “Its potential lies in its being, which forms a basis for becoming” (Hernes, 2004a: 67). Space cannot be considered as disconnected from its

past, rather when a space is created a historicity is also created (Lefebvre, 1991). This historicity will constitute what the space is at different points in time. This means that it is hard to predict the outcome of the space. Firstly, this is because different currents, such as history and theories in vogue, affect its production. Secondly, it is because the actors, as active participants in the production of space, are able to manipulate it through their collective experiences and social practices.

The ontological and epistemological perspectives of space (Lefebvre, 1991) are very important for the understanding of inter-organisational collaboration as a space of change and movement. The epistemological perspective introduces three categories (spatial practices, representational spaces and representations of space) that explain how collaborative participants produce their space and position themselves in relation to it. Spatial practices express the perceived spaces of partners' daily actions. These practices (i.e. collaborative meetings and decisions) are reproduced through social interaction, and (re)create spatial relations between objects and products within the collaboration. They refer to the way the collaboration space is used and lived every day. Although it may not be coherent, spatial practice must have a certain continuity and cohesiveness. "This cohesion implies a guaranteed level of competence and a specific level of performance" from the partners (: 33). In contrast, representations of space (i.e. knowledge, structure, rules and ideologies that partners bring to the collaborative process) are created by those who manage the collaboration. They are the conceived spaces of those partners that dominate what should be shared and known to the other partners. They also refer to the conceptualised space where collaboration participants "identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived" (: 38). Finally, representational spaces (i.e. temporal non-verbal signs and codes that partners use to make sense of what happens around them) refer to the lived spaces of partners. These spaces are tied to their historical past and to the lived experiences that emerge through associated images and symbols. "As a result of the dialectical relation between spatial practice and representations of spaces... this is the dominated - and hence passively experienced - space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects" (: 39). Based on their characteristics, and the social and historical context representations of spaces, spatial practices and representational spaces work together towards the production of the collaboration space.

On the other hand, the ontological distinction presents the collaborative process as constituted from different spaces, namely physical (the space occupied by sensory phenomena), psychological or mental (logico-epistemological space) and social space (the space of social practice) (Lefebvre, 1991). The physical space of the collaboration is essentially material created by its partners with the aim to bind activity over time and space. It refers to tangible structures that intend to regulate work and interaction (i.e. budgets, buildings, rules, work schedules, etc.). This space has three main characteristics: it is tangible, instrumental and symbolic. It emerges through the need to obtain order, and thus its medium is regulation. In contrast, the psychological space of the collaboration is the space of thought (i.e. knowledge, learning, sense-making, etc.), and it accommodates the sphere of theory and meaning. It provides the context for partners' actions and interactions, although their physical co-presence is not necessary. The psychological space emerges through mutual understanding, and its medium is cues.

The social space of the collaboration consists of social relations and “incorporates social action, the actions of subjects both individual and collective” (Lefebvre, 1991: 33). It is governed by feelings and social rationality, and can take the form of trust, identity, love, dependence, etc. Social space emerges from partners' need to distinguish themselves from other collaborations and organisations. Its medium is the human presence which is not necessarily physical but also virtual and imagined. It is strongly identity-based as it helps collaboration partners shape their identity, which is essential to their existence. Indeed, “within it they develop, give expression to themselves, and encounter prohibitions” while producing their space of action (: 33-34). The social space of the collaboration is characterised by an emergent nature, and it has a history that endows it with specific characteristics and “contributing currents, signifying and no-signifying, perceived and directly experienced, practical and theoretical” (: 110). It is produced and reproduced through the partners' actions and interactions but it also constrains and affects the partners and their actions. “Social space is a social product... (that) also serves as a tool of thought and action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control” (: 26). As such, the social space results from a process that relates the physical environment, routines of everyday life, symbolic meanings and geographic structures. The social space of the collaboration is therefore

indistinguishable from and interrelated to psychological and physical spaces. It is the 'glue' that brings psychological and physical space together. In fact, the physical space provides the basis for the construction of the psychological space which then leads to the production of the social space. It is therefore possible to talk about a psychosocial space mediated by the material/physical space.

In fact, from a social psychological point of view, the collaboration space is a psychosocial space produced by material artefacts and practices (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012b). The psychosocial space of the collaboration represents the complete environment of the members and expresses the "totality of possible events" that coexist and are mutually interdependent (Lewin, 1936: 14). "The totality of possible cases is valid not only for the behaviour of the person within the situation but also for the possible changes of the person or the situation itself" (: 16). The psychosocial space consists of events of the past, present and future that affect partners and help shape the space. Each of the events determines the partners' behaviour and practices in any given situation they are in (Schultz and Schultz, 2004). Therefore, in order to be able to understand partners' behaviour and practices, the collaboration's psychosocial space needs to be explored and understood as a whole, shifting the emphasis "from objects to processes, from states to changes of states" (Lewin, 1936: 16).

Since actors engage in actions and interactions within specific collaborative situations, they constantly manipulate and construct different spaces. The production and reproduction of the spaces of the collaboration is therefore infinite and emerges from the daily needs and experiences of the partners. This places them at the heart of the construction of the psychosocial space and makes them active participants able to produce, manipulate and change this space. Indeed, the psychosocial space of the collaboration is constructed as partners act and interact in an effort to establish and understand routines as well as organise social relations based on given situations. This makes it apparent that the inter-organisational collaboration emerges through the partners' social practices. It also explains both its dynamic, fragile and temporary nature and the need for a plan that will hold it together even temporarily.

This ontological distinction of space is also presented in organisational studies. For instance, Parsons (1951) distinguishes between three classes of objects in social

systems: social, cultural (similar meaning to psychological) and physical. He also classifies three types of institutions: relations, regulative and cultural. Giddens (1984) also identifies three dimensions of structure: signification, domination and legitimation. Similarly, Scott (1995) indicates that institutions consist of regulative, normative and cognitive structures. Although there is no absolute correlation between these classifications and Lefebvre's forms of space, there is an approximate correlation that integrates them into the world of organisations.

Nevertheless, recent interest in the concept of space in organisations has mostly focused on the physical space and spatial aspects in organisations (Van Marrewijk and Yanow, 2010). For example, some organisational research examines the role of organisation's headquarters and of other buildings' spatial design in communicating organisational meaning (Goodsell, 1993; Van Marrewijk, 2009). Other studies investigate the relationship between built spaces and organisation identity (Yanow, 2005), and the relation between spatial aspects and organisation brands and goals (Gregson, et al. 2002; Felstead et al., 2005). Organisational theorists also examine the systematic study of organisational spaces and their meanings (Yanow, 2000; 2006) as well as the internal built environment of the organisations and their relation to other organisations and the social world (Dale and Burrell, 2008). Yet, as it was explained above, it is necessary to go beyond the purely physical space to understand how the psychosocial space is created in conjunction with the use of physical space. Then, an understanding can be reached of how actors through their social practices become active participants able to develop and change their collaboration space. Following this approach to space, the next section will explain how the concept of space is applied to the collaborative process producing the collaboration space.

2.1.3. Defining the collaboration space

In this research, the concept of space has neither a geometrical meaning nor an inside-outside meaning. Rather, it is considered as a site of social practices and reproductions which provides possibilities for becoming and consists of interrelated physical and psychosocial spaces (Lefebvre, 1991).

Collaboration as an ongoing process of “heterogeneous becoming” (Chia, 1999: 222) unfolds as partners engage in everyday working relations produced in and by interactions in different spaces. These spaces are (re)produced as partners engage in fresh actions which provide the platform for further practices. This reflects the conceptualisation of social practices as emergent over time, having no end states. Spaces therefore contribute to the transformation of the collaboration and constitute an integral part of the collaborative process. As a consequence, this research conceptualises inter-organisational collaboration as a multiple space affected by its history and constituted from its partners' actions, experiences and interactions (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012e). Indeed, it is perceived as a space that is continually produced and reproduced through the interaction of its participants between each other and with the environment.

Collaboration is therefore a site “of continuously changing human action (where) human agency is always and at every moment confronted with specific conditions and choices” (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002: 577). In fact, in the carrying out of actual collaborative tasks, partners have to interact, make sense of, modify, and adjust to the needs of a specific space. In this sense, stability and/or organisation are presented as exceptional achievements, not change (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). What the collaboration becomes depends on the construction and re-construction of its space. Collaboration is not therefore perceived as “a given entity that can be steered from outside, but an interactive space, continuously in-the-making” (Bouwen and Hovelynck, 2006: 130).

Partners play an active role in this (re)construction process since they try to “widen the common space for common action and mutual expectation” (Bouwen and Hovelynck, 2006: 140). When partners act in a collaboration space, they take the undefined context, time and situation and produce a (new) meaning of the space through their practices (i.e. establishing categories, producing labels, drawing boundaries, etc.). In an effort to make sense of present events, partners attach meaning to experiences that take place in the collaborative process. The understanding then provides a basis for action within a specific space. In their everyday working life members choose from different ‘interpretative templates’ (Czarniawska, 2008) to understand a given space and decide how they should act in a certain collaborative situation. In this way, meanings are “created (both in social interactions as well as in interactions with artefacts and nature),

deconstructed, negotiated and elaborated over time” (Czarniawska - Joerges, 1992: 33). “People negotiate their definition of a particular context to make sense out of the ongoing events and to coordinate efforts into jointly constructed projects” (Bouwen, 2003: 343). Negotiation involves a joint appreciation where members assess the current course of activity taking into account current norms, beliefs and experiences to decide collectively which actions and interactions are possible and desirable within a particular space (Trist, 1983). Based on this joint appreciation, collaboration participants agree on regulations regarding their future interactions in an effort to respond to change and establish a temporary order of their actions within a specific psychosocial space (Gray, 1989).

In this view, collaboration space is reconstructed as its participants attempt to attribute meaning, understand and organise actions and events. In fact, as partners are constantly engaging in activities within the collaborative process, they are constantly involved in the process of (re)producing interwoven psychosocial spaces that constitute the emergent collaboration space (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012d). These spaces produce different kinds of experiences, identities and agencies over time and help them make sense of their space. As such, the collaboration space is not there, available a-priori, rather it emerges, is always in motion and is simultaneously “perceived, conceived and lived” (Lefebvre, 1991: 33).

Defining collaboration as a psychosocial space that is reproduced by partners' social practices emphasises the need to examine not only what happens inside the collaboration space but also at its margins. Boundaries are inherent to the collaborative process since the collaboration space develops through processes of boundary setting. Moreover, boundary characteristics influence both the way partners act in relation to the collaboration space and the interaction of spaces when they come in contact. As such, it is necessary to explore the concept and role of boundaries in order to understand how inter-organisational collaboration emerges. This is the aim of the following sections.

2.2. Boundary development in a collaboration space

2.2.1. The concept of boundaries

Most inter-organisational collaborations are shaped by their temporary and emergent character (Gray, 1989). They develop through daily working practices and relationships in which participants aim to achieve a certain stability within constantly shifting boundaries (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). A study of the collaboration space should take the boundaries and their dynamics as key. Because “if a distinction could be made, then it would create a space” (Brown, 1997 cited in Hernes, 2004a: 77) and “without boundaries a space cannot be a space, because without boundaries it cannot be distinguished from other spaces. In other words, we could not know how to observe the space” (Hernes, 2004a: 77).

The concept of boundaries therefore appears intrinsic to the collaboration space (Luhmann, 1995) and the exploration of the unfolding of inter-organisational collaboration. On the one hand, the concept of boundaries enables the understanding of the conditions for entering and leaving the space and also of how the space is produced, defined and integrated (Olson, 2008; Groenewegen, 2011). Moreover, as boundary characteristics influence the interaction between partners of the collaboration space, they also affect the way partners perceive and identify themselves and others. Boundaries are also “a useful metaphor for understanding the social practices in a range of spaces and at different levels of analysis” (Paulsen and Hernes, 2003: 303). On the other hand, the collaborative process (from formal collaborations to informal teams) emerges through the activation of boundaries and generation of distinctions, while it survives through the reconstruction of boundaries (Hernes, 2004b). As such, the boundaries cannot be perceived as stable. In contrast, they are created, reproduced and change through collaboration partners (inter)actions and past experiences within the space of the collaboration (Giddens, 1984).

The concept of boundaries has attracted researchers from different fields, such as anthropology (Barth, 1969; Pellow; 1996), political geography (Paasi, 1999), sociology

(Bechky, 2003; Abbott, 1995; Giddens, 1984), gender studies (Gerson and Peiss, 1985), economics (Williamson, 1981), management (Morgan, 1988; Ashkenas, et al., 1995; Groenewegen, 2011) and political studies (Shapiro and Hacker-Cordón, 1999). In organisation studies the focus on the boundary phenomenon has generated two main perspectives. On the one hand, boundaries are drawn analytically to describe the end of the organisation and the start of the environment (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). It is common for much organisational theorising to draw boundaries for analysis purposes and also use them to describe a stable order (Hernes and Maitlis, 2010). As a consequence, organisation theorists have used the concept of boundaries to define relatively stable system limits and specify the drawing of stable boundaries between the system and the environment (Groenewegen, 2011). Boundaries are therefore used as analytical tools that impose order on the complex reality, and hence they have been driven more by theory rather than by reality (Hernes and Paulsen, 2003). On the other hand, another part of the organisational research presents the concept of ‘boundaryless’ contemporary organisation which indicates that boundaries are no longer important (Ashkenas, et al., 1995; Linden, 2003). These studies diminish the importance of time-space stability and highlight fluidity and complexity. They also emphasise that the “idea of a discrete organisation with identifiable boundaries (whether defined in terms of physical location, the manufacturing process, or staff employed) is breaking down” (Morgan, 1988: 129).

These approaches indicate that boundaries are complex. In order to understand the multifaceted and composite nature of the collaboration space boundaries, four main ideas should be taken into consideration (Hernes, 2004a). Firstly, collaboration boundaries are central and not peripheral, and they are created, moved and consolidated by spatial dynamics. Secondly, boundaries are composite in the sense that the collaboration space consists of multiple spaces that have their own sets of boundaries. Thirdly, boundaries are not static, rather they are constantly subject to production and reproduction. Finally, the substance of the space affects the properties of the boundaries.

This study of boundaries entails not only tangible structures that can be seen (i.e. factory gates, job descriptions, agendas and programs) but also non-tangible phenomena (i.e. cognitive and social processes). To study boundaries that are non-tangible, organisational studies use proxies that distinguish boundaries based on the mechanisms

that are different from one form of collaboration to another and rule what happens inside boundaries (Hernes, 2004b). For instance, organisational research distinguishes between authority, political, task and identity boundaries (Hirschorn and Gilmore, 1992), task and sentient boundaries (Miller and Rice, 1967), functional, hierarchical and inclusionary boundaries (van Maanen and Schein, 1979), and boundaries as physical barriers, symbolic markers, judicial borders and administrative limits (Lawrence, 1990). Other studies differentiate behavioural and normative boundaries (Scott, 1998), expressive, bureaucratic, temporal, work-non-work, physical and individual-collective boundaries (Shamir and Melnik, 2003), and boundaries as checkpoints and psychological maps (Migdal, 2003)

Nevertheless, these frameworks tend to be one-dimensional as they only describe the influence of the boundaries on the organisation without explaining the processes that boundaries are related to. As such, they do not help capture the dynamic and complex collaborative processes. Some organisational studies try to overcome this constraint and study the multifaceted and ambiguous nature of boundaries by examining them in relation to space. For example, Lawrence (1990) focuses on the multidimensional nature of the boundaries and the interactions between these dimensions that link private and public space. Based on the design and the use of the internal and external spaces, he examines the interrelation between the spatial and the human attitudes of built environments. On the other hand, Carlisle (1992) argues that boundaries play a variety of roles for people in space, explaining that boundaries are drawn to establish identity, possession, outsiders and differences. Groenewegen (2011) agrees with this perspective. Rodman and Cooper (1996) examine the design of buildings to show how space can affect the nature, size, permeability and meanings of boundaries. Similarly, Lebra (1993) focuses on the intermeshing of domestic and public space, and suggests that boundaries are physically and symbolically demarcated through three dimensions: rank, function and sex of the members. Finally, Pellow (1996) examines the relation between the boundaries of self and society, and the physical place of both. He explains that members use boundary negotiation in order to transform public places into private spaces while trying to co-exist with others.

Despite the focus on the relationship between boundaries and space, these frameworks concentrate on the emergence of boundaries within the physical space. They therefore

overlook its relationship to the psychosocial space and ignore its participation in the reproduction process of space. On the other hand, Hernes (2004a; b) suggests a framework that captures not only the actual processes that the boundaries circumscribe, but also the influence of boundaries on the physical and psychosocial space of the organisation. Following his approach, the next section will present a framework suitable for the study of the boundaries of a collaboration space.

2.2.2. Defining the boundaries of the collaboration space

Boundaries are dynamic, enable action, and stimulate innovation and creativity (Paulsen and Hernes, 2003). They are produced through an ongoing, changing and sometimes contradictory process of inclusion/exclusion (Barth, 1969), while they are sustained and recreated through constant action and interaction generated in psychosocial and physical spaces (Marshall, 2003).

Hernes' (2004a; b) approach to boundaries reflects the dynamic nature of boundaries that allow the exploration and understanding of the collaboration space. Hernes (2004a; b) applies Lefebvre's (1991) distinction of physical, psychological and social space to organisational boundaries by using a proxy that differentiates between physical, psychological (or mental) and social boundaries. Physical boundaries are tangible and relate to formal rules and physical structures that regulate partners' action and interaction within the collaboration. Although their purpose is mostly instrumental, instrumental intentions can be interwoven with symbolic effects. Psychosocial boundaries, on the other hand, allow making sense of the world while bounding ideas that are important to the partnership. They are also related to social bonding and identity since they keep the partners together by helping them distinguish themselves from partners of other collaborations. Within psychosocial spaces, people develop norms of behaviour that help them regulate their behaviour and position themselves in relation to other partnerships.

Boundaries can have three different effects on the collaborative process (Hernes, 2004a; b). Firstly, physical boundaries as ordering devices establish the limits for acceptable

actions and interactions in the collaboration. They are related to the formal rules and physical structure that regulate the work of collaboration participants in the physical space as well as to the main ideas, concepts and social bonding of the partners in the psychosocial space. Secondly, physical and psychosocial boundaries as thresholds manage movement of internal and external issues. They therefore determine whether formal structures obstruct externals from entering a physical space, whether outsiders are able to incorporate core concepts and if outsiders can be perceived as full members of the partnership in the psychosocial space (Hernes, 2004a; b).

The third effect that psychosocial boundaries have on the collaboration space is particularly important for this research. Boundaries as distinctions help partners realise how distinct they are from external and internal spheres (Hernes, 2004a). They also help them draw distinctions from other groups and the wider society (Groenewegen, 2011). They are reflected in things like rules, structures, trust, ideas, concepts, loyalty, etc. If the way partners act is not in accordance with the distinctions they have drawn, they transgress the established boundaries. Boundaries can therefore be formed both to empower partners to act and, through their actions, to change the collaboration's boundaries as well as to ensure that activities and behaviour become stable or predictable in the collaboration space. In relation to physical space, boundaries as distinctions refer to the formal structure that separates partners from other collaborations. Regarding the psychosocial space, they clarify the core ideas and concepts that are different from those of other collaborations. They also establish the partners' social distinction from non-collaboration partners.

This social distinction is created through the emergence of identity and appears vital not only for the life of the collaboration but also for the process of space production. Notably, the formation of social identities is an integral part of the boundary development process since identity depends on the boundaries that partners draw in relation to others (Hogg et al., 2012; Hernes and Maitlis, 2010). The psychosocial space of the inter-organisational collaboration is produced out of the partners' need to distinguish themselves from other groups and organisations (Hernes, 2004a). They do so in order to interact and act in specific ways which help them realise that they are different from others. This will also affect the way partners interact with the members of the collaboration based on a given space (Haslam et al., 2011). As such, by exploring

identity it is possible to understand both the way that partners behave in relation to the collaboration space as well as how different spaces interrelate and interact when they come into contact.

This shifts the focus to the process of identification. By exploring how partners construct and reconstruct their identity, it is possible to understand how they adjust to the shifting boundaries, make sense of their space and organise their actions in the emergent spaces of the collaboration. It is therefore possible to understand how the collaboration unfolds. The next part of this chapter focuses on the exploration of identity construction within the boundaries of a collaboration space.

2.3. The loops of identification

2.3.1 The essentialist and constructionist approach to identity

The collaboration space is loaded with many identity issues since it includes many partners and the representation of their interests as well as the interests of the collaboration itself (Beech and Huxham, 2003). Before partners can act in a given psychosocial space, they need to redraft the boundaries, situate themselves and others, and define their respective social identities within the collaboration space. “Who we are is reflected in what we are doing and how others interpret who we are and what we are doing” (Hatch and Schultz, 1997: 357). Practice and identity are therefore intimately related as constituted processes (Simpson, 2009). These processes create and support the particular identities developed in the collaboration space. They do so through the production and reproduction of psychosocial boundaries which draw distinctions between those who are collaboration partners and those who are not, between what appropriate behaviour is in a given space and what is not (Hernes and Maitlis, 2010).

As mentioned earlier, the collaboration space consists of interwoven and interrelated physical and psychosocial spaces. Physical spaces are involved in the process of identity formation, offering materialistic characteristics that will affect the production of the psychosocial space where identities are formed. On the other hand, psychosocial spaces

are “strongly identity-based” (Hernes, 2004a: 123) as they emerge from partners' actions and their effort to socially distinguish themselves from other groups and the broader society. This distinction is produced through the emergence of identity, since being part of a psychosocial space implies a certain identity and patterns of action. Partners can then reproduce the space by drawing different psychosocial boundaries to correspond to different situations and events. Within these boundaries, a new psychosocial space that implies a different identity and related actions emerges. This indicates that partners cannot reproduce a psychosocial space without involving themselves (Hernes, 2003). In contrast, the reproduction of a physical space can happen with or without members' involvement, for example by following the collaboration rules.

There are two main streams to explore identity in organisations: the essentialist and constructionist. In relation to identity, the essentialist approach suggests that identity is stable and resists change (Ford and Ford, 1994). Identity remains true only to the extent that it is static (Albert and Whetten, 1985; Giddens, 1991), and it therefore includes forces for inertia such as nostalgia (Brown and Humhreys, 2002) and institutional conformity (Glynn and Abzug, 2002). Following this perspective, drawing on Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory, social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel and Turner, 1979) suggests that once social identities are established they strongly affect the way members act and are not easily changed.

Social identity is therefore defined as “the individual's knowledge that he/she belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him/her of the group of membership” (Tajfel, 1972: 31, cited in Haslam, 2001). This sense of belonging leads individuals to make comparisons between in-groups and out-groups in order to increase the positive feeling related to their identification with the in-group. To establish a positive self-evaluation, individuals make a distinction between social groups that stress that the in-group is better than and different from than the out-groups (Simon, 2009). Therefore, by enhancing their social identity individuals achieve positive distinctiveness (Haslam et al., 2011). They do this, firstly, through categorisation that emphasises the need for distinguishing features (Sani, 2012), and secondly, through social comparison that promotes the selection of intergroup differences that favour the in-group (Brewer, 2009).

Furthermore, belonging to a group offers a psychological state that generates “distinctly ‘groupy’ behaviours, such as solidarity within one’s group and conformity to group norms” (Hogg and Abrams, 1995: 3). This happens because in-group members interact more frequently with each other than with out-group members. Hence, they share ‘unique cognitive structures’ (Granitz and Ward, 2001) and common features that are perceived as definitive (Leyens at al., 2000). “People perceive their group’s relative position on a dimension of social comparison to be secure in the sense of being both stable and legitimate” (Haslam, 2001: 36).

However, members’ sense of belonging may also lead them to enhance and stabilise their identity through social creativity and competition (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Social creativity relates to members’ efforts towards achieving stability and legitimacy of their identity through the finding of a new dimension to compare in-group and out-group, the assignment of different attributes to the in-group, or the comparison with a different group. On the other hand, social comparison relates to maintaining social identity by conceiving some “cognitive alternative to the status quo” that helps members confront the out-group and secure their relative status (Haslam, 2001: 40). Whatever the case, it is expected that individuals’ attitudes and behaviours can be predicted based on the group they have identified with.

In relation to the inter-organisational collaborative process, social identity theory implies that it is difficult for partners to form a common in-group identity (Huxham and Vangen, 2001), since partners do not share many characteristics and they usually rely on their differences when forming their identity in the collaboration space. Hence, partners tend to create different in-groups and even though they could develop a degree of collaborative in-groupness (Eden and Huxham, 2001), it would be very fragile due to the changes of the collaborative structures (Beech and Huxham, 2003).

On the other hand, the constructionist approach emphasises the dynamics of identity. This approach suggests that since life is continuously moving (Hosking and McNamee, 2006) and “all things flow” (Whitehead, 1978[1929]: 208), individuals cannot form an absolute and finite identity. In contrast, actors acquire identities that are defined as “relatively stable, role-specific understandings and expectations about self” by

participating in collective meanings (Wendt, 1999: 21). The process of generating collective meaning is continuous, and its form and content can shift from one context to another. Similarly, individuals may be perceived in a different way by different individuals and in different contexts. This meaning-making process is a social activity. The emergent meaning is created in action and regenerated through the process of interaction (Gergen, 2001; Simon, 2009). Interaction, as a process through which identities are formed (Hosking and Morley, 1991), does not happen in prior, fixed and independent identities (Nooteboom, 1989). Instead, identities are generated, sustained and transformed through interaction (Wendt, 1999; Hopf; 2000), while also being open to intervention and interaction by others (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002).

The self cannot hence be perceived as a “unity, a single self that unifies our acting. Rather, the self emerges as an effect of how different acts interact” (Hosking and McNamee, 2006; 167) and generate meaning from their context. As such, social identities are not fixed but ‘radial’ (Lackoff and Johnson, 1999), which indicates that although the members of a group share some essential characteristics, these characteristics will change in different contexts and will not always be shared by all the members. Therefore, the formed identities are not finite based on definitive features that determine partners' actions and interactions (Hosking and McNamee, 2006). Rather, partners' social identities are a reflection of the different socially-learned interpretations which they bring to events. They also reflect partners' engagement and interactions with each other in order to achieve their aims (Gergen, 1999).

Regarding the collaborative process, the constructionist perspective of identity implies tension “between the need for consistency of identity and the need for adaptability” (Beech and Huxham, 2003: 33). Thus, collaboration partners are flexible and able to adapt to the needs of the collaboration space, the shifting boundaries and the emerging needs, goals, decisions, etc. of the partners. When they do so, they change the way they think and act, and hence they change the perception of their identity and of that of others (Zhang and Huxham, 2009). However, partners also represent an organisation in the collaborative process and, by identifying themselves with the partnership, may not be able to represent their organisation effectively (Beech and Huxham, 2003).

This research follows the constructionist approach in order to explore how partners (re)construct their identities in inter-organisational collaborations. By focusing on this approach, interactions can be used to understand how collaboration partners act and interact based on the way they identify themselves and others, and also on their expectations of others' contribution to their goals. Furthermore, by perceiving identities as dynamic and fluid, it is possible to explore how partners change the way they identify themselves and others over time based on emergent psychosocial spaces and boundaries. However, identity is also perceived as relatively stable and therefore as a platform to understand partners' (inter)actions within the collaboration. In addition, focusing on in-groups in terms of their shared and stable features allows the understanding of the collaborative process as a whole (Beech and Huxham, 2003; Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

This study examines the emergence of identity in the collaboration space following the 'cycles of identity formation' (Beech and Huxham, 2003). Loops of identification treat identity as both relatively stable and dynamic. They hence help capture not only the emergent and dynamic nature of the collaboration space but also the way partners identify themselves within the emergent psychosocial spaces. Before examining the construction of identity through loops of identification, it is important to define what the process of identification is exactly and what factors may affect it.

2.3.2. Point of departure: Identification

Social identity derives from the process of social identification that "places the group in the individual" (Hogg and Abrams, 1995: 62). "Identification occurs when members of a group or organisation come to see their membership as self-defining" (Pratt, 1998: 172). Indeed, "through identification, individuals define themselves as members of social categories and ascribe characteristics that are typical of these categories to themselves" (van Knippenberg and van Schie, 2000: 138). Therefore, identification is the perception of belonging to a social group which is defined as "two or more individuals who share a common social identification of themselves or, which is nearly the same thing, perceive themselves to be members of the same social theory" (Turner,

1999: 15). This allows individuals to perceive themselves based on the characteristics they have in common with the members of their group (Hogg and Vaughan, 2010). Sharing relational experiences with other members allows them to “explore one's place and position in the group and to come to the awareness that “this-is-me-in-this-group” (Bouwen and Hovelynck, 2006: 143). “This perception of the self as a group member provides a basis for the perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioural effects of group membership” (van Knippenberg and van Schie, 2000: 138). Identification based on a specific group affects partners' attitudes and actions which will be dictated by their group membership (Deaux, 1996).

The process of identification is different from the resulting social identity. Social identification refers to the process of constructing an identity, whilst identity refers to the self-image that arises out of this process (Hogg and Vaughan, 2010). Similarly, collaborative identity is the identity that partners adopt in the collaboration space. It is therefore different from the collaborative identification which is a particular kind of social identification which ascribes the processes that help individuals to identify with the collaboration, and to form their identity as collaboration partners. The term collaborative identification refers to the merger of the self and the collaboration (Rock and Pratt, 2002). However, the degree to which partners identify with the collaboration, or distinguish themselves from it, affects whether they will act and interact based on the collaboration to which they belong (Sani, 2012). The more they identify with it, the more likely it is that they will perform collective action. “Collective action occurs when a person's behaviour is structured by a particular group membership (i.e. it is informed by shared values, norms and goals) and he or she acts in concert with other group members” (Haslam, 2001: 274). Fostering collaborative identification among partners can therefore lead to a variety of benefits for the partners and the collaboration. For example, if partners form an identity based on their collaboration, they will develop a sense of belonging which will increase safety and self-esteem while decreasing uncertainty (Deaux, 1996; Pratt, 1998; Zhang and Huxham, 2009). These feelings will reduce levels of turnover and will enhance partners' motivation, trust, job satisfaction and performance (Mael and Ashforth, 1995; Brewer, 2009). Moreover, they will increase the possibility that partners will follow the collaboration's standpoint, develop homogeneous behaviour (Hogg and Abrams, 1995) and act in the collaboration's best interest (Dutton et al., 1994).

Despite the importance of identification for the collaborative process and its partners, in organisational collaboration literature the process of identity formation is an area less explored. This is due to the fact that most of the studies attempt to identify factors that may influence the collaborative identification and not the process itself. As such, studies suggest that the process of identification can be influenced by predispositions, presumed and taken-for-granted identification categories (Pratt, 1998; Oslon et al., 2012) which in some cases are not understandable to others (Huxham and Vangen, 2005) or depend on a sense of how others will identify them based on specific categories (Beech and Huxham, 2003) or on roles from previous or other current jobs (Dutton et al., 1994). The collaborative identification can also be affected by personal characteristics, qualifications and professional status (Mael and Ashforth, 1995). In addition, collaboration partners usually identify with high status partnerships in order to maintain and increase a positive feeling of themselves (Ellemers, 1993). The relative size of the collaboration may also determine identification too. In fact, as partners wish to maintain their individual distinctiveness, they tend to identify with relatively small collaborations to avoid being similar to a large number of people (Brewer, 2009; Rock and Pratt, 2002). Partners also tend to identify with collaborations they have more in common with, and with which they share similar activities and preferences (Mael and Ashforth, 1995). Finally, identification is context-dependent and can be affected by both the presence of in- and out-group members as well as by the approach partners follow on the basis of their group membership (Turner et al., 1987).

It is therefore apparent that organisational collaboration literature recognises the importance of identity for the life of the collaboration and provides many studies that explore the factors that can have an impact on identity formation. However, although these studies do offer insight into the characteristics of identity and the factors that influence the identification process, they do not offer an in-depth examination of the ways in which the identity is constructed in the context of inter-organisational collaborations. This research aims to fill this gap by providing an approach to identity formation in the collaboration space. This approach is introduced in the following sections.

2.3.3. The components of the identification loops

As stated earlier, through their agency, collaboration partners continually reproduce their psychosocial space, establishing different distinctions and boundaries in order to make sense of their space, organise their actions and correspond to given spaces. Emergent identities not only affect the way partners act but are also affected by the partners' interactions and actions. This constant (re)construction of identities is presented in this study through loops of identification (Beech and Huxham, 2003) which set the dynamic processes by which identities are formed and assigned to self and others. These loops also capture the dynamic nature of the collaborative process where partners' practices are placed at the centre of attention so as to provide an understanding of both the emergent psychosocial spaces of the inter-organisational collaboration and the identities that emerge in these spaces. In the identification loops, identities emerge out of different interwoven components which affect the stability and change of identities within the collaboration space. These components (psychosocial spaces, multiple foci of identification, salient identities and actions) are explored in the following parts.

2.3.3.1. The psychosocial space

The first component of identification loops is the specific psychosocial space where the identification process starts. As outlined above, “identity is mobile, a process not a thing, a becoming not a being” (Frith, 1996: 109). It is “a dynamic construct that may not only develop and change over time but is also context dependent” (Ellemers et al., 2003). In fact, it is constantly transformed based on a 'radical historization' (Hall, 1996). In a specific psychosocial space, partners take into account the historical past, previous and current experiences as well as interactions in order to select an identity which is situationally suitable. As “identities are always relational and incomplete, in process” (Grossberg, 1996: 89), the focus is not on who collaboration partners are but on who they might become (Hogg and Vaughan, 2010).

Therefore, it is not possible to refer to a single stable identity since identity is in a constant process of becoming and its relative standing is subject to change (Ellemers and Barreto, 2000). “Identity is always a temporary and unstable effect” (Grossberg, 1996: 89) of collaboration partners' relationships within the collaboration space. In fact, based on a specific psychosocial space, partners evaluate previous and current experiences and develop a sense of who they are, what their goals should be, and how they should act (Mael and Ashforth, 1995). Talking about identity means talking about a particular kind of experience and the movement between different situations and spaces. It also implies that identity is not a thing but a social process, a form of interaction and a way of dealing with a particular kind of experience. As such, “social identities are produced and reproduced through specific social processes” that take place in specific psychosocial spaces (Deetz, 1994: 28).

2.3.3.2. Multiple foci of identification

In a specific psychosocial space collaboration partners “can consider themselves in terms of multiple overlapping or cross-cutting group memberships” (van Knippenberg and Ellemers, 2003: 34). In the organisational collaboration literature, multiple identities may be presented between one’s collaboration, one’s organisation, one’s department and one’s work group (Tsisis, 2009; Olson et al., 2012). Similarly, some studies also distinguish between the self as an individual, an interpersonal being and a group member (Brickson, 2000), between one’s collaboration, one’s organisation, work team and own career (Ellemers, 1993) or between professed, projected, experienced, manifested and attributed identities (Soenen and Moingeon, 2002). Other studies suggest that informal and formal groups within the collaboration (i.e. based on age, nationality, sex, ethnic background, culture, work, departments, organisations, etc.) may be equally likely foci of identification as the collaboration as a whole (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Zhang and Huxham, 2009).

Therefore, in inter-organisational collaborations a partner can simultaneously be, for example, a member of the collaboration as a whole, of a partner organisation, of a department, of a departmental group or of their profession. All these memberships offer

partners potential foci of identification (van Knippenberg and van Schie, 2000) from which they need to choose. For partners to be able to act according to the needs of the partnership, they have to choose the identity that best fits a specific psychosocial space of the collaboration (Haslam, 2001). However, usually the working life of the partners takes place mostly within the space of their partner-organisation. There, they work, interact with others and obtain their experiences. Hence, partners tend to identify themselves with their organisation and not with the collaboration (Ellemers et al., 2003). This means that they function, act and develop their beliefs, norms and interests based on their organisational identity without serving the aims of the partnership as a whole. It is therefore important to explore how partners can construct their collaborative identity.

2.3.3.3. Identity salience

The self is “defined in a dynamic manner by the group membership or categorisation that is activated and hence salient in a specific context” (Terry, 2003: 225). “Identification with a group affects the behaviour to the extent that the group membership is salient” (van Knippenberg and Ellemers, 2003: 36). Only then, are partners’ attitudes and actions in agreement with those of their identity. As such, identity salience increases conformity since the more salient the identity, the more agreement is expected between the collaboration partners. In contrast, when partners disagree, there is more pressure for conformity (Hogg and Vaughan, 2010). As such, the salient identity minimises intra-collaboration differences and maximises inter-collaboration differences (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008).

The available psychosocial space influences the salience of an identity. In a particular space, there is an interaction between identities that have prior meaning, and are hence available and accessible, and identities that fit a space (Haslam et al., 1998). Partners can draw not only on accessible identities, but also investigate how well they fit the specific space. The identity that best fits this space (Oakes and Turner, 1990) and helps partners place themselves in it will become salient (Hogg and Terry, 2000). However, “the salience of identity is also influenced by commitment to that identity” (Rock and Pratt, 2002: 53). Identity commitment is affected by relational and emotional benefits

associated with the selection of an identity (Stryker, 1987). When the collaborative identity is salient and partners fail to internalise the norms and goals of the collaboration, identification results in negative feelings. However, if partners are committed to their collaborative identity, this identity becomes more chronically salient, and therefore it impacts more on members' behaviour and actions. A collaborative identity also provides partners with a common perspective on reality and aligns their unique experiences, perceptions and interactions (Haslam, et al., 1998). Moreover, it provides a "platform for new experiences" (Haslam, 2001: 280).

2.3.3.4. Identity's interdependence to action

Another characteristic of identification loops is that the emergent identities are interdependent on action. Identity formation is an interactive process that includes actors with different backgrounds, skills and experiences. Based on the available psychosocial space, these actors focus on ongoing action and everyday experiences in order to explore and socially construct their identity (Gergen, 1999). This means that identity and action are involved in a constant interdependent relationship where they mutually influence each other (Haslam et al., 2011).

Thus, through the process of identification partners learn "not just what is normal for an ideal and typical group member but also what the limits of group behaviour are" (Hogg and Abrams, 1995: 150). Collaboration partners will therefore exert "effort on behalf of the collective because it leads individuals to experience the collective's interests as their self-interest" (van Knippenberg and Ellemers, 2003: 32). It also directs them to determine and change attitudes and behaviours towards each other. Partners hence internalise collaborative identity and act in terms of a "shared, collective conception of self" (Haslam, 2001: 282). This identity is both the vehicle that determines appropriate action (van Rekom, 2002) and a process of referent informational influence (Turner, et al., 1987) that leads the partners to act according to their collaboration membership (Hogg and Vaughan, 2010).

However, other partners interpret the way a partner (inter)acts in a specific psychosocial space. Based on their interpretation they attach an identity to this partner (Turner, 1999) and engage with him in the collaboration space (Hogg and Abrams, 1995). This engagement affects the way the partner perceives himself. Indeed, when a partner experiences negative emotions from others' actions, he will try to adopt a new identity and change the way he acts in a current space (Brewer, 2009). However, if his identity elicits positive interactions with other collaboration partners, he will try to maintain these positive feelings by stabilising, even temporarily, his identity and acting in accordance with it (Dutton et al., 1994).

2.3.4. The process of identification in the collaboration space

In this study, the process of identification in inter-organisational collaborative contexts is presented as a sequence of interdependent and interwoven loops (Beech and Huxham, 2003) that are composed of psychosocial spaces, multiple foci of identification, salient identities and actions. Through loops of identification, partners accommodate the shifting collaborative boundaries by (re)producing the spaces of belonging that are appropriate to the situation which they are experiencing. As a truly social psychological act, social identity cannot exist except in relation to other(s) and cannot be sustained except through continuous operations that serve to uphold distinctions from that other(s) (Haslam and Schultz, 1997). These relational processes contribute further to the redrafting of the collaboration's boundaries and the emergence of the collaboration space (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012b).

The identification process starts from a specific psychosocial space where a partner encounters multiple foci of identification. Each time a partner has to redraw the boundaries and choose the identity that fits best to the given space. The identity that he chooses comes with specific norms, beliefs, attitudes and actions. When the identity becomes salient, the collaboration partner internalises these norms, beliefs, attitudes and actions, and (inter)acts according to these. Other partners interpret his actions and interactions, and accordingly attach to him an identity. This affects not only the way other partners act and interact with the partner but also the way he interprets how others

have received his identity. If the partner experiences positive effects, he will maintain his/her identity for as long as it corresponds to the given space. However, if he experience negative reactions, he will start another loop of identification.

However, in the collaboration space loops of identification may also be initiated for a different reason. As explained previously, (see section 2.1.3.) through their (inter)actions partners can produce different psychosocial spaces. New loops of identification are then generated in order to help partners identify themselves and therefore establish new boundaries, organise their (inter)actions and make sense of the emergent space.

This research therefore suggests that the process of identity formation is everlasting. Collaboration partners constantly engage in loops of identification in order to make sense of psychosocial spaces of action, while also identifying themselves within these spaces. Repetitions of similar experiences and actions within the loops of identification may lead to temporary identity inertia. This means that the way partners identify themselves and others identify them remains stable, even temporarily, through different loops of identification (Beech and Huxham, 2003). However, this does not imply that identity is permanently static, rather that through the processes of identification the identity inertia can be dissolved. Therefore, collaboration partners constantly engage in loops of identification which are actually processes of identity (co)construction and reconstruction arising out of specific psychosocial spaces and actions.

2.4. Summary

The second chapter builds on the first chapter which has highlighted the importance of exploring partners' everyday practices in order to understand how the inter-collaboration emerges in dynamic contexts. The first part of the second chapter therefore shows that practices are produced in spaces that have physical and psychosocial characteristics (Lefebvre, 1991). These spaces are considered as sites of social practices and reproductions. In fact, actors, as active participants, can produce new spaces through their experiences and actions. These spaces contribute to the transformation of the inter-

organisational collaboration and form the collaboration space. The concept of boundaries is necessary to observe a space and understand the conditions for entering and leaving a space. The second part of this chapter therefore explores boundaries. In order to capture the dynamic and complex nature of the collaborative process, boundaries are perceived as ongoing and possibly contested processes of inclusion/exclusion (Barth, 1969). They are actively (re)produced and maintained through action generated in psychosocial and physical spaces. Boundaries, spaces and practices hence appear as processes mutually composed. However, boundaries are also important for the collaboration space because they help partners socially distinguish themselves from non-collaborative partners (Hernes, 2004a). This social distinction is produced through the emergence of identity. Therefore, the last part of this chapter examines the process of identity formation. Loops of identification (Beech and Huxham, 2003) are employed to understand how partners, through psychosocial spaces, multiple foci of identification, salient identities and actions, constantly (co)construct and reconstruct their identities in the collaboration space.

After presenting the development of the theoretical framework for the exploration of the research aims, the next chapter will describe and justify the design of a research methodology appropriate to investigate the emergent nature of the collaborative process and identity construction. The aim of this chapter is to make the research process more transparent by presenting the selected research approach and methods for data collection. It also provides a detailed description of the process used to analyse the gathered qualitative data.

3. Researching the collaboration

3.0. Introduction

“Methodology refers to the entire scientific quest that has to fit the obdurate character of the social world under study” (Hyvärinen, 2008: 447). Any research involves a particular framework of ideas embodied in a methodology which is designed and carried out to investigate an area of research (Checkland, 1991). Methodology is not a set of logical procedures that can be applied to any research problem (Bryman, 1988; 2012). On the contrary, it includes a range of strategies and procedures from which the researcher has to choose based on a basic rule; the design and methods selected should match the research questions. This thesis aims to examine the emergent nature of inter-organisational collaboration and identity construction. This aim led to the adoption of a qualitative research approach and the employment of particular research tools for data collection (observations, field notes, interviews and documents) in addition to analysis processes (thematic and narrative) that allowed the exploration of the phenomenon under study.

This chapter is devoted to clarifying, describing and justifying the design of the research methodology employed in this study. The first section of this chapter discusses the reasons for choosing a qualitative approach. Then it introduces the selection of an ethnographic case study as a research strategy in addition to the employment of observations, field notes, interviews and documents to gather data. The chapter ends with an exploration of the thematic and narrative analysis used for the interpretation of the data and the exploration of the research aims.

3.1. Research strategy

3.1.1. Qualitative research

Qualitative research is conducted to understand processes and social interactions, uncover the meaning that people give to their experiences and to understand the social,

cultural and physical context in which activities take place (Hennink et al., 2011). “It allows the explorations of people's beliefs, experiences, behaviour, interactions, perceptions, attitudes, feelings and motivations and to understand how they are formed” (Purmessur and Boodhoo, 2008: 2). This research approach was therefore particularly useful for the present study which emphasises the socially constructed nature of identities, actions, interactions and experiences as ongoing processes. By conducting a qualitative study this research has managed to explore the meanings of practices and processes as well as of the dynamic and ongoing character of the collaborative phenomena. This research approach also promoted the understanding of how and why specific identities, interpretations and actions were created, shared, rejected, used or reused by collaboration partners in a specific space. Most importantly, “the ultimate goal of qualitative research is to understand those being studied from their perspective” (Gorman and Clayton, 1997: 23) and “the strength of qualitative data is its rich description... (that) is ensured by the breadth of the context captured with the data” (Glazier, 1992: 6-7). These features were well suited to this study which examined the unfolding of inter-organisational collaboration based on the way actors have experienced their space over time.

3.1.2. Case study research

“There are few studies in which social processes are tracked over time in ways which make it possible to analyse the different contributions and influence of participants” (Hosking and Morley, 1991: 151-152). This study aims to contribute to filling this gap. In particular, this research is a longitudinal study of a specific collaborative process and of the practices, identities and experiences that are related to this process and take place in different psychosocial spaces. Aims, beliefs, practices, interactions, roles, norms, trust, identities, etc. are not observed as fixed characteristics within the collaboration space. Rather, they are part of the flow of the events and the relationships that take place over time within the different spaces the collaboration provides. Change is therefore placed at the centre of the research focus.

The main aim of this research is firstly to explore how the collaborative process emerges as a physical and psychosocial space based on partners' social practices. Secondly, it examines the effect of identity and identification processes on a collaboration space, and vice versa. To achieve these aims, a case study research approach was particularly useful. Its main advantage is its potential for detailed inquiry into social processes that are examined in relation to the context in which they unfold (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Indeed, "case study consists of a detailed investigation, often with data collected over a period of time, of one or more organisations, or groups within organisations, with a view to providing an analysis of the context and processes involved in the phenomenon under study. The phenomenon is not isolated from its context (as in, say, laboratory research) but is of interest precisely because it is in relation to its context" (Hartley, 1994: 208-209). The use of a case study has therefore enabled a processual and contextual analysis of the practices, identities, meanings and interpretations that took place and were constructed in the space of the collaboration.

By using the case study strategy, this research has explored both what was common and particular about the case (Yin, 1989; Marshall, 2003), drawing on its nature, its historical background, the physical setting and the partners' contribution to the context (Stake, 2011). Furthermore, this research strategy has allowed the exploration of areas of the collaboration life which would not have been able to be explored with a single, fleeting contact (Martin, 1992). Reducing the likelihood of misinterpretations by employing various methods for the collection of data together with enabling the research of the collaborative process through the eyes of the subjects who told their own story were also benefits related to the use of a case study (Hartley, 1994; Barbour, 2008). Moreover, this strategy has assisted in the exploration of how the inter-organisational collaboration may develop and also the discovery of the collaboration narrative as it emerged from the way partners make sense and interpret their space of action constructing and reconstructing a shared narrative (Czarniawska, 1997). Indeed, with the use of a case study this research managed to explore the emergent collaborative processes and practices that are not well understood and represented in the organisational collaboration literature.

To sum up, the case study was the most suited strategy for the present research as it has assisted in the detailed exploration of processes and practices in the partnership,

illustrated the emergent processes and the dynamic nature of inter-organisational collaboration as well as generating new questions. Moreover, the use of the case study framework has positively affected the decisions made regarding the application of multiple methods for data collection, which have offered a greater understanding of the phenomena under study. It also increased the credibility of the interpretations supported by this research. However, the advantages that this research has gained by employing a case study for qualitative research would have been cancelled if an adequate fieldwork approach has not been selected. The next section will present how this research has used ethnography as a framework for the case study.

3.1.3. Using ethnography as a framework for the case study

Ethnography is a strategy whereby observation is interwoven with other procedures in order to familiarise with the subject matter (Flick, 2007). It is based on individuals ability to observe individuals, their interactions, practices and contexts as they take place in situ (Flyvbjerg, 2011). The researcher observes “people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions; in fact collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues with which he or she is concerned” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 3). The long engagement of the researcher with the participants can provide insight into the emergence of processes and practices over time.

As such, ethnographic research is particularly useful for studying interactions, lived experiences and everyday practices that are difficult to be accessed through other research tools alone. It also provides access: to the meaning of practices (Schutz, 1964); the events as they unfold over time, the social process involved (Bryman, 1988; 2012); the context of actions and the way participants make sense of their social reality (Hennink et al., 2011). For these reasons, this study conducted an ethnographic research in the field (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). By engaging with the social context, and embracing all forms of social interactions, actions and processes that occurred in the field, the researcher understood, described and explained collaboration in its context. It

was therefore possible to explain how partners interact and construct their space of practice and identities within the collaborative process.

Using ethnography this research has achieved a “thick description” (Geertz, 1973: 6) of the collaboration life by “representing the social reality of others through the analysis of one’s own experiences in the world of others” (Van Maanen, 1998: ix). “Experience is intersubjective and embodied, not individual and fixed, but social and processual....It will always be dependent on a multiplicity of locations and positions that are socially constructed. These positions are different for each individual, as well as for each culture that ethnographers come into contact with as field-workers, observant participants, and collectors of life stories” (Tedlock, 2000: 471). Indeed, the ethnographic approach has allowed the incorporation of emergent data and of a narrative approach to presenting partners’ experiences, processes and practices. Choosing ethnography to investigate members’ stories, the social construction of concepts and theories, as outcomes of the research process and not as pre-formulated ideas, is stressed. This has enriched the construction of findings and their potential to make a contribution to a processual understanding of the collaboration practice.

The most common critiques of ethnography are the contamination of the natural setting by the ethnographer’s presence and the non-accurate representation of the field due to the ethnographer’s over-connection with it. The researcher managed to overcome these limitations by interacting ‘casually and non-directively’ with collaboration partners without “crossing over the line into friendship” (Adler and Adler, 1994: 380). Moreover, by staying intellectually and critically independent from the natural setting, an accurate image of the inter-organisational collaboration reality was created through a sanitised relationship with the empirical world (Emerson, et al. 2011).

Before conducting the ethnographic research access to the field had to be negotiated and participants had to be selected. These research activities are presented in the following subsections as tales in order to provide an insight and relate the reader to the research process and context.

A research tale: Accessing the field

In order to explore the collaborative processes and practices over time, it was necessary to conduct a longitudinal study with an inter-organisational collaboration that I could observe over time. Firstly, I established the requirements of a case study that would provide me an in-depth exploration of my research aims. Then, I started searching for this case study. A couple of years ago, while working for a centre for children with disabilities, I came across the KEDDY partnership. I noticed some of the challenges this educational collaboration was facing as well as how important this partnership was for the local community. This personal experience together with some initial research on the inter-organisational collaboration indicated that KEDDY was well suited to the aims of my research. I therefore decided to seek access to this collaboration. To gain access, I asked for the help of a Professor at the University of Ioannina in Greece who was responsible for the introductory training of employees in every KEDDY. I first contacted him in December 2007 to obtain more information about KEDDY. He explained to me how KEDDY was collaborating with other public organisations to improve the educational services of children with special needs. He also talked about the collaborative processes, and the positive and negative aspects of the partnership. This educational collaboration appeared very interesting to me as a researcher and as a person. It was also appropriate to the requirements of a case study that would help me explore my research aims.

In January 2008, I arranged a face to face meeting with the Professor to discuss the possibility of conducting a study with the KEDDY partnership. The Professor decided to assist me in gaining access to the field not only because he wanted to help me but also because he thought KEDDY would benefit from my study. From a list of 55 KEDDYs, he suggested conducting the research with KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. He argued that KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias was one of the best operated KEDDYs and, since he was in constant contact with its manager, it would be easier for me to gain access. The Professor made the initial contact with the manager who was happy to hear more about my research. A first contact was made with him in February 2008.

Afterwards, access to the field was negotiated over three months. Although there were four partners involved, the discussions took place only with the KEDDY

Aitoloakarnanias manager who was the key-contact to all the other partners. The manager's initial hesitations were mostly related to the disruption of the smooth running of KEDDY from my presence as well as the distraction of the partners' relationships. After one meeting and the exchange of several emails and telephone conversations, I gained access to the field in June 2008.

Another research tale: In the field

I entered the field in July 2008. The manager introduced me to KEDDY employees as *“a PhD student from the LSE. She is studying issues of collaboration. She would be around for a while asking questions and observing the collaboration for her research. It would be great if you could spend some of your time answering her questions and explaining how our partnership works”* (KEDDY Meeting, 1:1). In order to establish an initial rapport, I further explained the purpose of my research, and talked about myself and the university I was studying at. I also asked employees general questions to engage them in brief conversations. The KEDDY employees were very friendly and soon I felt part of their team. They spoke to me during their breaks, brought me coffee and food as well as inviting me to their offices for chats. Yet, as the manager said to me, I managed to keep a distance from them: *“I like the fact that you don't get too involved with the employees. You are close to them and they trust you but you have managed to keep your distance”* (KEDDY Manager, 52:1). During my field visits, I was dressed in a professional manner to fit in with the style of the partners. I also had my digital recorder and notebook with me at all times in order to be always ready to collect data.

The criteria for the selection of my research sample were participants' identification as KEDDY partners, and their direct and constant collaboration with KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. In order to identify the potential participants for my research, I took into consideration who the law specifies as being KEDDY partners. In addition, the KEDDY manager presented the partner-organisations and their employees.

Firstly, from the list of the prefecture nursery and primary schools as well as of the special primary and secondary schools, I selected one school for each of these school types. From the four schools I had initially chosen to collect data, it was quite easy to

gain access to two of these (special primary and special secondary school), whereas it was difficult to access the primary school and impossible to access the nursery school. I therefore had to select another nursery school from the list. Although access to the schools was negotiated for several months, in the end, I managed to obtain the permission to collect data by interviewing the head teachers and teachers of disabled children in each school.

I then identified the three government representatives who were directly collaborating with KEDDY. The process of collecting data from them was also problematic. On the one hand, the school consultant was very happy to help me with my research but he did not have sufficient time. Therefore, we had to reschedule our appointment three times before we met. Similarly, despite the willingness of the director of the department of secondary education to help me, it was hard to find time to do so. In contrast, the director of the department of primary education was hesitant about speaking to me but in the end he decided to do so.

Regarding the parents, I chose five parents who had visited KEDDY to take their children's diagnosis when I was there. The first two parents I approached refused to talk to me, but the other three were happy to share their experiences with me. Regarding KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias, all of its employees participated in the research.

To explore how the collaboration space and partners' identities emerge over time as well as to obtain a complete idea concerning the ways in which processes and practices unfold in the context of the partnership, I collected my data in four stages. The first stage of my research was conducted in July 2008 when I observed one KEDDY meeting and one partners' meeting and collected 5 interviews and 13 documents. In November 2008, the second stage of my research took place. I then collected 13 interviews and 9 documents and I observed 3 KEDDY and 2 partners' meetings. In January 2009, the third stage of my research was conducted and I collected 16 interviews and 10 documents. I also observed 4 KEDDY and 2 partners' meetings. In September 2009, my research was completed with the collection of 9 phone interviews and 9 documents. See the table below for a summary of the data collected in the four stages of the research.

Table 1: Data collected throughout the four stages of the research

	<i>KEDDY Meetings Observed</i>	<i>Partners' Meetings Observed</i>	<i>Interviews Collected</i>	<i>Documents Gathered</i>
Before the first field visit	-	-	-	7
1st Stage: Jul 2008	1	1	5	13
2nd Stage: Nov 2008	3	2	13	9
3rd Stage: Jan 2009	4	2	16	10
4th Stage: Sep 2009	-	-	9	9
<i>Total</i>	8	5	43	48

After selecting the case study, gaining access to the field and choosing the participants for the research, it was necessary to develop the tools for the data collection. These tools are presented in the next section.

3.2. Research tools

This research is a longitudinal study of a specific partnership and its partners' collective practices and experiences. The aim was to identify how the collaborative partners construct and reconstruct their space of action as well as their identities over time and therefore. In this way, it was explored how the inter-organisational collaboration emerges as part of a flow of events, behaviours, practices, experiences and relationships. In achieving this aim, the research tools that were selected and used for this study were of great importance. On the one hand, interviews helped in the collection of in-depth data regarding members' interpretations and meanings. They therefore allowed the construction of a collaborative narrative. Yet, "the richness and depth of understanding would not have been reached on the basis on interviews alone" (Steyaert and Bouwen, 2004: 149). Observation allowed the exploration of the phenomenon in situ while field notes enabled the capture of the details of the ongoing events. Finally, documents offered insights into collaborative activities and issues that would have otherwise been missed. The next parts describe these research tools in detail.

3.2.1. Observing the inter-organisational collaboration

The context of this research has offered many opportunities to observe the partners' working lives, and explore their actions and experiences. KEDDY meetings and partners' meetings were observed too. The observation of these meetings allowed the researcher to come "in contact with the evolution of the different voices as they develop and emerge in a living social context, expressing the construction and deconstruction of shared meaning" (Steyaert and Bouwen, 2004: 143). KEDDY meetings were established by the manager and they took place once a week. All employees had to attend them. The secretary took minutes and the rest of the staff presented their weekly cases. The aim of the meetings was to reach a final collective decision regarding the diagnosis and educational support plan for each case. On the other hand, the partners' meetings took place when partners believed it was necessary for some of the partners or all of them to meet and discuss a case or issues related to the collaboration. Usually, only the partners involved in a specific case or task attended these meetings.

The first visit in the field lasted one week. It was in the summer and the schools were closed. Thus, not many things happened in KEDDY, especially in relation to the partners' interactions. However, one KEDDY meeting and one partners' meeting were observed (see appendix 2 for a description of the meetings observed). Moreover, this visit offered an opportunity to observe the KEDDY employees in their daily practices and interactions. Field notes were made on the physical setting, employees' body language and facial expressions when they were engaging in tasks with each other. However, the visit was quite short and did not allow participants to become accustomed and behave spontaneously in the presence of an 'external' (Hennink et al., 2011).

The second visit lasted three weeks and provided many opportunities for observation. During this visit, a rapport was soon established with the KEDDY employees who quickly became very relaxed and comfortable in the researcher's present. During this visit, some interesting incidents regarding employees' interactions and actions (both under pressure and not) as well as engagements in routine and irregular practices, were observed. In addition, through the observation of 3 KEDDY and 2 partners' meetings, the way that partners collaborated was captured (see appendix 2).

During the third visit, four weeks were spent in the field. The participants were directly familiarised with the presence of an 'external' who appeared not to affect their daily interactions and work practices (Barbour, 2008). The partners' activities, emotions, relationships, collective processes, interactions as well as processes and practices in shifting contexts, were captured. The observations were completed by capturing 4 meetings between KEDDY employees and 2 between partners (see appendix 2).

Capturing everything that was going on was not possible (Hamera, 2011) since, for example, when the researcher was in one room something else was happening in another room. However, this is to be expected when carrying out observations (Flick, 2007). At the end of the third stage of the research, the collaborative process had been observed in three phases from July 2008 to January 2009, and 5 partners' and 8 KEDDY meetings had been recorded (see table 1 for a summary of the meetings observed and appendix 2 for their detailed description). During the observation of partners' working life, field notes were made, while when observing the meetings, both field notes and digital recordings were collected. The next subsection will discuss in detail how the field notes were produced.

3.2.1.1 Recording field experiences

The ethnographic approach stresses the importance of taking field notes. "Fieldnotes are accounts describing experiences and observations the researcher has made while participating in an intense and involved manner" (Emerson et al., 2011: 5). They have constituted a central research activity in this study and were carried out with as much care and awareness as possible. The aim of the researcher was to capture "the 'voice of the user', without losing what is elegant and useful" (De Zeeuw, 2001). During the collection of data, resisting the temptation to observe everything and the fear of missing some vital incident in withdrawing from the field was difficult but necessary. "Someone (to be called 'researcher') has to choose what observations are to be accepted as material for use in attempts at transfer" (De Zeeuw, 1995). As such, what was recorded depended on the general sense of what was relevant to the research issues, as well as on background expectations (Wolfinger, 2002). During the early days of the research, the

notes were fairly broad and without emphasis on any particular aspects. However, the focus and the detail of the field notes changed over the course of the research (Hamera, 2011) as the research progressed and emergent ideas were identified. Eventually, the notes became more restricted and specifically focussed on the subject.

The recording of events that were not immediately understandable but which could prove significant later was very important. Even the briefest of notes appeared to be valuable aids in gaining a more complete idea of events. “A single word, even one mere description of the dress of a person, or a particular word uttered by someone usually is enough to ‘trip off’ a string of images that afford substantial reconstruction of the observed scene” (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973: 95). Moreover, notes were made of what was said and by whom while non-verbal observations (such as pauses, laughs, late arrivals) were also captured (Steyaert and Bouwen, 2004).

Ethnographers should record not only what they see but also what they hear (Silverman, 2005). During the note making, particular attention was placed on ‘situated vocabularies’ or actual worlds employed by the partners. These provided valuable information about the ways in which partners organised and made sense of their psychosocial space, and “so engage in the social constructions of reality” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 145). Moreover, the record of the terms and idioms of identity used by partners in different contexts as well as the trace of these contexts helped in the further exploration of the process of identity formation.

The aim was to make notes during the observations in order to prevent the information from trickling away (Bryman, 2012). As such, notes were made during the meetings and while observing the KEDDY employees’ daily working lives. However, there were some instances where it was not possible to make direct notes as it was inappropriate. For example, during the researcher’s discussions with employees or when employees had arguments and private discussions note making could have made them feel uncomfortable or disturbed them. In these cases, notes were made as soon as possible after the observed actions so as to be able to capture the details of the events. For that purpose, the manager’s office was used or any other office that was available and quiet. When all the offices were occupied, notes were made in the KEDDY’s kitchen.

The writing was ongoing and there was always sufficient time to make notes since “there is no advantage in observing social action over extended periods if inadequate time is allowed for the preparation of the notes” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 144). When in the field, some time during the lunch break and before the departure from the organisation was dedicated to work on the notes and to making “deeper and more general sense of what is happening, or begin to explain it in a conceptually coherent way” (Miles and Huberman, 1984: 69). However, at the end of the day another fresh look at the field notes was necessary so as to work on them, develop and expand them.

The notes were written in two stages. The first stage was a straightforward and pure description of the events. The second stage was the writing of comments, ideas and experiences arising from the events. All the notes were included on the same page but they were separated with brackets [] that clearly indicated when the pure description of the events ended and when a subjective description started. Questions marks ??? were also used to indicate gaps and uncertainties in the records. At the top of the page, details of who was present, where and when were always included. Finally, at the side of the page details of who said and did something were noted.

However, this research did not only gather data from observations and field notes. In order to explore in depth the collaboration practices and the partners’ actions, interactions and experiences, interviews and official documents were also collected (see table 1). These research methods are presented in the following sections.

3.2.2. Interviewing

Farr (1984) describes the interview as an ‘inter-view’ explaining that it is “a technique or method for establishing or discovering that there are perspectives or viewpoints on events other than those of the person initiating the interview” (Farr, 1982 in Gaskell, 2000: 38). Therefore, both interviewer and interviewee act together and reciprocally influence each other in making sense of events and situations (Barbour, 2008).

As a method of data collection, interviews have some constraints. For example, they can be time-consuming, costly, overly personal, difficult to analyse and open to bias (Hennink et al., 2011; Barbour, 2008). Moreover, empathy between interviewer and participant as well as discrepancy between what participants say and what they actually feel may affect the quality of the data collected (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998). Yet, interviews were used in this research as an important method of data collection which enabled the research of situations, actions and meanings. They also assisted in the collection of participants' interpretations in their own languages and categories (Bryman, 2012), in the understanding of their context of action and in the exploration of their sense-making processes (Mishler, 1986; Marshall, 2006).

In this study, semi-structured in-depth interviews provided an initial framework for areas of discussion whilst allowing the respondents to set the agenda of the interview. They also enabled the exploration of issues as they arose and offered openness (Flick, 2007) in the sense that the areas of respondents' sense-making were determined only to a small extent. Semi-structured interviews offered a space for negotiation of meanings and surprise elements (Gaskell and Bauer, 2000), providing a friendly emphasis to data collection (Silverman, 2005). Moreover, they facilitated immediate responses to questions allowing both parties (interviewer and interviewee) to explore the meaning of the questions and answers as well as to resolve any ambiguities. Semi-structured interviews have also enabled a degree of rapport by encouraging participants present their experiences using their own worlds. This resulted in a greater amount of information gathered.

Therefore, in this research, the interview guide was used as a guideline for the interviews and not as a standardised format that indicates what should be asked, in what words and in what sequence (Hennink et al., 2011) (see appendix 1 for the interview topic guide). The interviews were exploratory, and each of them was different based on a negotiation of meanings. Emergent meanings allowed some level of mutual understanding while different degrees of attention were placed on different topics based on participants' experiences. In this way, participants' own stories were collected and integrated in their context of social action.

The aim of the interviews was to achieve an understanding of the phenomena under study and the context in which partners told their stories. The researcher was sharing with the participants the same language, similar upbringing, knowledge about the geographical and socio-political context as well as experience in dealing with disabled children. This common ground offered considerable insight into the surrounding context and the local society of the respondents. Moreover, it helped in the achievement of openness, successful communication, mutual understanding, trust and insightful exchanges which it made the data collected richer and more meaningful for the aim of this research. Nevertheless, this shared knowledge did not prevent the researcher from formulating questions and seeking explanations about known and taken-for-granted issues in order to avoid making implicit assumptions.

For the collection of interviews, on the one hand, it was necessary to collect data from all the KEDDY employees and the three most important government representatives with whom KEDDY had to collaborate. This offered a complete picture of the way in which the collaborative process works. On the other hand, teachers and head teachers from four schools as well as three parents of disabled children were selected. The criteria used for the selection of the sample were respondents' identification as partners and their direct engagement in the collaboration (see also section 3.1.3. for the sample selection). Other information, such as age, gender, educational level, occupation and position in the hierarchy, did not affect the selection of the participants.

After the completion of the four research stages, 43 interviews (9 phone and 34 face-to-face interviews) were collected from 22 male and 21 female participants (see table 1 for the summary of the interviews collected and appendix 3 for a description of the interview participants and interviews). From those interviews, 21 were with KEDDY employees, 6 with governmental representatives, 12 with school representatives and 4 with children's parents. Apart from one interview where the participant did not allow the recording of the discussion, the rest of the interviews were recorded with the agreement of the respondents. The length of the interviews ranged from eighteen minutes to one hour and twenty minutes (see appendix 3).

3.2.3. Collecting documents

Another research tool for the collection of data was the informal and formal documents of the collaboration. These documents allowed information gathering on issues that could not have been readily addressed through other methods (Bryman, 2012). Collaboration documents were products resulting from socially organised activities as well as tangible outputs of communication and interaction within the collaboration space (Stake, 2011). They therefore assisted in the understanding of how different partners interpreted the life of the inter-organisational collaboration; how they perceived themselves and others; and how they made sense of their social reality. Documents “are often contemporaneous records of events in organisations” (Forster, 1994: 148) and were used in this research as devices that provided a careful observation of historical processes and developments in the collaborative process.

Collaboration documents situated the immediate research context in the wider societal context, and provided information about the setting under research and key figures in the collaborative process. They also enabled the understanding of the categories participants have developed, interpretation of specific stories and particular events they have related with, as well as exploration of the processes the participants used to describe reality. Finally, the collaboration documents operated as a device for triangulating the collected data (Flick, 2007). For example, they improved the quality of the research by comparing data and supplementing other information. In some cases they also challenged information received from the participants.

The collaboration documents have therefore been mainly used to: record events; double-check information; perceive specific situations, practices and interactions from a different angle; look closely at historical processes and developments in the collaboration; and track the changes of certain events, problems, decisions and actions throughout the life of the partnership. The collected documents (see appendix 4 for a description of the documents gathered) were perceived as context-specific and were conceptualised in relation to the other research methods used in this study.

The KEDDY partnership produced a series of official (formal) and informal documents. However, it was impossible to use the entire range and quantity of the produced

documents. As such, only 48 documents, which could be fully understood within the broader context of the inter-organisational collaboration (Marshall, 2003), appeared relevant to the research purposes, and were not fragmented and subjective, were selected (Forster, 1994; Silverman, 2005) (see table 1 for a summary of the documents collected and appendix 4 for their detailed description).

The collection of the documents started before the first field visit and was completed after the last visit in September 2009 (see appendix 4 and table 1). Firstly, documents related to the establishment and operation of KEDDY in general and then to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias were collected. Then documents regarding the new law for KEDDY's operation and consequent changes in KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias' operation were found. The collection of documents continued while in the field with the help of the partners. At the end of the research, formal and informal documents regarding the inter-organisational collaboration were gathered. The official documents included annual reports, formal letters exchanged between partners, governmental documents for the establishment and/or improvement of local educational facilities, governmental reports regarding changes in the KEDDY partnership, and employment records. Partners also shared informal documents, such as minutes from their meetings, letters exchanged informally between partners, personal correspondence, newspaper articles, etc. (see appendix 4).

With the gathering of documents this research completed the data collection that included also observations, field notes and interviews (see table 1 for summary of the data collected). The next section will explain how the qualitative data gathered was analysed in order to explore how the partnership under study emerged over time and how the partners' identities were constructed and affected the partners' ways of collaborating.

3.3. The process of analysis

Collecting qualitative data is only one aspect of the research process. The other aspect is reading, understanding, and interpreting the data collected. This requires inductive

thinking, achievement of a deeper understanding and active engagement with the data. Indeed, data analysis is a very complex and mysterious phase of a qualitative research. If a qualitative researcher wants to generate findings that transform raw data into new knowledge, they should engage in an ongoing discovery and a constant refinement of their interpretation skills (Taylor and Bodgan, 1998).

The data collected for this research intended to capture the processes and practices related to the collaboration as they were described by its partners. For that reason, two kinds of analysis were applied to the data collected. Firstly, a thematic analysis explores how the space of the inter-organisational collaboration emerges over time through the members' actions, interactions and experiences. Then, a narrative analysis discovers how the partners of the collaboration construct and reconstruct their identity within the emergent spaces of the collaboration. The aim of these two different types of analysis is to contrast all the stories being told by all the stakeholders and incorporate their different views. These views will indicate both commonalities in the way stakeholders understand inter-organisational collaboration and differences in the way they live it. To summarise, they will offer an in-depth exploration of how people collaborate in dynamic and emergent contexts. The next sections will describe in detail how the thematic and narrative analysis was conducted.

3.3.1. Thematic analysis: Composing a collective story

3.3.1.1. Using ATLAS.ti for data analysis

The software package ATLAS.ti was used for the thematic analysis of the data. ATLAS.ti was chosen because it provides the tools for the researcher to be rigorous and consistent (Kelle at al., 1995; Silverman, 2005). Moreover, this software can handle large bodies of qualitative data that can also be triangulated from different sources of information (Muhr and Friese, 2004). One of the main advantages of ATLAS.ti is the ability in handling the quotations too. Text segments that a researcher has marked and/or coded are treated as computer objects. This allows segments to be nabbed,

adjusted and included in network diagrams. Tools also allow cutting and pasting of quotations which is very helpful during the presentation of the analysis.

The recorded interviews and meetings were transcribed into Word whilst the field notes and the documents were also transferred into Word so as to enable the researcher to introduce them to the software. ATLAS.ti offered a variety of tools to systematically approach the data which could have not been meaningfully analysed by formal statistical approaches. The software helped in dealing with the inherent complexity of the data collected and with the exploration of the complex phenomena concealed in the data. It also provided an intuitive and powerful environment that kept the focus on the analysed material. Finally, it offered “tools to manage, extract, compare, explore, and reassemble meaningful pieces from large amounts of data in creative, flexible, yet systematic ways” (Muhr and Friese, 2004: 1).

ATLAS.ti also offered another very important feature for the analysis. It allowed the facilitation of the coding and analysis process. Indeed, by opening and highlighting the portion of the document that the researcher wanted to code (quotation) and dragging the code from the code manager, the process of analysis was very simple. Moreover, all the data material was indexed based on the primary text number and the quotation number. For instance, 29:18 refers to the 29th quotation of the 18th text. This allowed the researcher to know the context every time the information and quotations arrived.

3.3.1.2. Reconstructing KEDDY’s story

The data collected was extensive and only if the analysis had a specific focus would it have been able explore the data in depth in order to answer the research questions. The initial analysis of the data revealed many children’s cases that indicated how the collaborative process works (see appendix 22 for the summaries of the stories the initial analysis has revealed and appendix 23 for a table that indicates the key elements of these stories). Some of the cases demonstrate the successful operation of the partnership where partners follow the protocol, adjust to the needs of a particular case and thus achieve the aims of the collaboration without encountering particular difficulties. However, some other cases illustrate the fact that some partners find it difficult to

collaborate, follow the partnership regulations, adapt to the changing needs of every case, and therefore help the children who seek support from the partnership.

The story of Anna is one of the cases that emerged from the initial analysis (see appendices 22 and 23 for further cases). Anna is one of KEDDY's clients and, as such, one of the reasons the partnership was set up. The first analysis of the data is based on her story. One of the reasons behind the choice to reconstruct KEDDY's narrative around Anna's case in particular is that her story was mentioned in most of the interviews, filed notes and documents collected. Moreover, partners referred to this case almost daily in order to provide examples of good and bad collaborative practices. Most importantly, when referring to her case, partners told not only stories about how KEDDY 'should' operate ideally but also how it does operate in practice. Anna's story therefore brings the partnership's difficulties, challenges and practices to life. It also shows the heterogeneous nature of the collaborative process through different participants' experiences but focuses also on Anna and her particular experience with the KEDDY partnership. The first process of analysis, the thematic analysis, therefore explored how the collaborative processes emerged in Anna's case.

The initial analysis aimed at identifying the collaborative processes and partners' actions and interactions that would later allow the exploration of the partners' main ways of collaborating and constructing identities. With this aim, multiple readings of the field notes, partners' meetings, interview transcripts as well as of the documents were firstly conducted. The initial analysis then looked for social practices (i.e. production of diagnosis and educational plan, establishment of school units, control and distribution of resources, creation of documents, etc.) and collaborative processes (i.e. role definition, power games, interventions or discussions, partners' inclusion or exclusion to specific processes, etc.) as shared themes relating to the life of the collaboration. The themes were produced from comparing and contrasting the texts from observations, field notes, interviews and documents gathered. They were perceived as relevant or not depending on the frequency of their appearance. This analysis sought to uncover commonalities and differences within those themes.

This preliminary examination of the data began to expose four different periods which were meaningful for all the partners of the inter-organisational collaboration: Referral,

Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention. All the texts were therefore organised and divided into these periods. The coding of the texts was conducted again for each time period in order to explore the collaborative practices and processes in each period (see appendices 5, 6, 7 and 8 for code/text occurrences for each period).

The next step of the analysis was the development of the actual coding scheme for analysis which aimed at identifying similarities and differences across partners' opinions regarding the collaborative process. The initial codes were many and broad. In order to make better sense of them they were reorganised to three main topic areas for the collaboration: 'partnership's scope and conditions', 'network of relationships between partners' and 'collaborative arrangements'. The coding was further systematised by specifying these topic areas in relation to basic area codes (see appendix 9 for the coding scheme with topic areas and description of basic area codes). For instance, for the second topic area in the coding scheme (network of relationships between partners) a distinction was made according to partners' relationships and interactions with the schools, KEDDY employees, parents and government representatives (see appendix 9). As such, each social practice and collaborative process could be linked to the particular actors of the inter-organisational collaboration.

In order to produce the initial storyline shared in a particular period of time, the general basic area codes were specified in order to present the partners' interplay for each period. The codes that indicated the same processes or interactions, or had the same or similar meanings, were merged in order to reduce the long lists of codes. Following this process, the final codes that are used in chapter 5 emerged (see appendix 10 for the codes for each of the four periods). See for an example Table 2 below. These emergent codes identify the main relationships, interactions and experiences of the partners over time. Based on these codes the story elements were reconstructed.

Table 2: Final codes and their description for the period ‘Negotiation’

Topic Areas	Partners' interplay (Codes)	Code-description for the <i>Negotiation period</i>
<i>Partnership's scope and conditions</i>	Present the report to the mother Acceptance of the report	Refers to the presentation of the final diagnosis and educational plan to the child's mother Refers to the mother's acceptance of the report
<i>Network of relationships between partners</i>	Stereotypes Fears Dispute	Refers to the mother's hesitation to sign the report due to fear of stigma Refers to the mother's fears regarding her child's future Refers to the mother's request for KEDDY to reexamine her child
<i>Collaborative arrangements</i>	Meetings with the mother Explaining the procedures Persuading the mother	Refers to the meetings between the mother and KEDDY employees so as to convince her to sign the report Refers to KEDDY's efforts to convince the mother by presenting the formal collaborative processes Refers to the mother's decision to sign the report

Yet, in order to understand the unfolding of the collaboration life, there were codes that needed further specification. In fact, although the initial stage of the analysis had successfully captured collaborative action over time, it had also indicated the emergence of practices that were peculiar and distinct for each time period of the collaboration. For example, in ‘stereotypes’, ‘fears’ and ‘dispute’ (codes for the topic area ‘Network of relationships between partners’ for the Negotiation period), the partners generated the collaborative practice ‘coping with fears’ (see table 3). The thematic codes of this research therefore emerged from these higher-order codes (see appendix 11 for the thematic codes and their description for all periods) that described the practices of each time period. In this way, a number of commonalities and differences in the partners’ accounts, processes, activities and tensions in the collaboration were identified.

Table 3: Construction of a thematic code (collaborative practice: coping with fears) for the Negotiation period

Partners' interplay (Codes)	Practices (Thematic codes)	Thematic code- description
<i>Stereotypes</i> <i>Fears</i> <i>Dispute</i>	Coping with fears	Refers to searching for ways to overcome partners' fears and anxieties

The practices emergent in each time period were different. A careful examination of the practices of each period indicated that they were generated, framed and expressed in different contexts/spaces of the collaboration. The next stage of the analysis therefore identified the main space of each time period where the practices were produced. The table below explains how the space in the Negotiation period emerged from the thematic codes of this period. Appendix 12 presents the emergent spaces and their description for each period.

Table 4: Emergent supportive space and its description for the Negotiation period

Thematic codes (Practices)	Emergent psychosocial space (Category)	Space description
<i>Developing solutions</i> <i>Coping with fears</i> <i>Realising expectations</i>	Supportive (Negotiation period)	Psychosocial space: providing support to the partners is the central characteristic of this space. Partners have to support not only those partners the procedure specifies but also other partners in order to realise their goals Physical space: KEDDY

The codes (partners' interplay) that emerged initially were examined again taking into consideration the thematic codes (practices) and emergent spaces. This examination revealed that partners followed different ways of collaborating based on the given space and related practices. The result was the identification of different ways of collaborating (final categories) in each space of the collaboration. These final categories therefore emerged from particular practices that were grouped into interplays in which the partners were collectively engaged over time in each space. Table 5 provides an

example of the construction of the final category ‘Developing tactics’ (see appendix 13 for the description of all the final categories, and appendix 14 for an overview of the categories of collaborating in all the periods of the enacted story).

Table 5: Construction of the final category ‘Developing tactics’ for the Negotiation period

Partners' way of collaborating (Category)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)	Main Themes
Developing tactics <i>(Supportive space)</i>	Developing solutions	Present the report to the mother Acceptance of the report	“Teachers have the responsibility to meet with the parents and present in detail their child’s report” “It is difficult for the parents to accept that their child is disabled. Similarly, it is difficult to accept our report”
	Coping with fears	Stereotypes Fears Dispute	“My child is different... different means subordinate” “I panicked! I thought that Anna had something serious” “Since she didn’t understand Anna’s learning difficulties, she should trust the experts”
	Dealing with expectations	Meetings with the mother Explaining the procedures Persuading the mother	“Employees should engage in informal discussion with the parents...to help them understand their child’s disability” “She didn’t know how things work in KEDDY...I had to go through the collaborative protocol” “They have studied these issues... I had no other option than to trust them”

The emergent categories allowed the construction of the collaboration story in chapter 5 which focuses on the partners’ practices as well as the ways in which they collaborated and constructed their space of action. Table 6 indicates how the third part of the narrative (Negotiation) in this research has been constructed based on the codes and the main category identified (see appendix 15 for the categories of collaborating, practices and main themes for each part of the narrative).

Table 6: Narrative content for ‘Negotiation’ based on main category and final codes

Narrative part	Category (Way of collaborating)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)
Negotiation	Developing tactics (<i>Supportive space</i>)	Developing solutions	Present the report to the mother Acceptance of the report
		Coping with fears	Stereotypes Fears Dispute
		Dealing with expectations	Meetings with the mother Explaining the procedures Persuading the mother

Following the procedure of the first analysis presented in this section, the rationale behind the focus of this study was presented. This analysis led to the exploration of the unfolding of the inter-organisational collaboration based on the partners’ everyday experiences, practices and interactions that were produced, framed and expressed in different spaces. The emergent collaboration space was tied to various ways of collaborating that were appropriate to different circumstances. These ways of collaborating will be narrated as a collective story in chapter 5 which will provide a complete description of the framing and reconstruction of the collective story.

However, the examination of the findings of the first analysis also indicated that in the emergence of the collaboration space, the activation of boundaries and development of identities play a central role. These processes were also vital for the survival and the future of the collaboration. As such, the next step of the analysis focused on the exploration of the collaboration boundaries and identities. The process of the second analysis is presented below.

3.3.2. Narrative analysis: Exploring personal stories

The enacted ways of collaborating that emerged in the first analysis were not only about processes and activities. They were also about emergent identities and boundaries which helped partners make sense of the collaboration space and their actions. However, in order to explore these issues, the process of analysis had to change fundamentally. To account for the inter-organisational collaboration as an emergent space of action, the analysis needed to go to another level and analyse the text in a way that allowed the exploration of whether the partners had a shared sense of belonging and how they (re)drew the boundaries of their space in relation to the identities they had formed. Any efforts to fragment boundary development and the partners' identities into thematic categories would have not been sufficient for the aim of the present research. Only by following a different analytical process, was the researcher able to explore the partners' social practices, identity and boundary formation in the changing collaboration space.

“Human life is a process of narrative interpretation” (Widderhoven, 1993: 2) and narrative analysis motivates the investigation of “how narratives are constructed, what their place is in human life, who is entitled to tell them and when, how they are received, and how they work in the social world” (Hyvärinen, 2008: 447). Narrative analysis therefore cannot be separated from questions regarding the narrative formation of selves, identities, social realities and practices (Hyvärinen, 2008). The second analysis was hence conducted using this analytic approach which is about “how protagonists interpret things” and how the researcher interprets their interpretations (Bruner, 1990: 51). The personal stories of the participants became the object of investigation which helped the researcher connect people, social movements and practices (Garcia-Lorenzo et al., 2008). This process of analysis enabled the examination of the natural and historical contexts where the stories were performed, giving priority to personal experiences and practices rooted in specific spaces and situations over time (Riessman, 2008).

Since “narrativity is woven into acting” (Hyvärinen, 2008: 448), by exploring the emergent narratives it was possible to explore and understand how practices were formed and changed. Storyteller and listener interacted in specific contexts that became the basis for the researcher's interpretations (Garcia-Lorenzo, 2010). It was due to this

subjectivity and the priority given to human agency and context that narrative analysis became the most appropriate approach to examine identity through the practices in the unfolding collaboration space. By analysing personal narratives, this research was able to examine the social processes that formed and changed the life of the collaboration and partners' interactions as well as to explore both individual and collective actions and meanings expressed in specific spaces (Laslett, 1999).

3.3.2.1. Analysis of personal narratives

The exploration of personal narratives is a case-centred research (Mishler, 1999) that indicates the relationship between biography, history and society (Mills, 1959). Personal narratives “are located in particular times and places, and individuals' narratives about their troubles are works of history, as much as they are about individuals, the psychosocial spaces they inhabit, and the societies they live in” (Riessman, 2002: 697). The personal experiences that people present in their stories provide information about: social and historical processes and practices; contemporary beliefs; cultural shifts; and historicised views about concepts, ideas, relations and identities (Wells, 2011; Bold, 2012). Telling stories is an everyday activity used by people of every social background in a variety of settings (Garcia-Lorenzo, 2008). The impulse to narrate is so natural that people translate knowing into telling (White, 1987).

Similarly, in this research participants sometimes provided long stories in order to organise their experiences, events and reality in meaningful answers as well as to reply to the interviewer's questions. These stories became the tool for the second analysis. In particular, they were treated in this study as devices for “meaning-making structures” (Riessman, 1993: 4) that allowed respondents to “impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives” (: 2). In the interviews the partners presented “autobiographical narratives” (: 2) by which they talked about their lives, and claimed identities that affected and were affected by the context.

Moreover, personal narratives which emerged in interviews were used as “agents acting in life worlds of moral complexity” and as opening discursive spaces for research

subjects (Riessman, 2002: 707). Personal narratives were composed in the dynamic space that the interaction between narrator and interviewer created. They were not fixed stories formed in a similar way for different audiences (Bold, 2012). On the contrary, they were alive and fluid (Riessman, 2008; Currie, 2010). From that perspective, personal narratives were very important to represent and analyse multiple identities in different spaces since they enabled “the active, self-shaping quality of human thought, the power of stories to create and refashion personal identity” (Hinchman and Hinchman, 1997: xiv). “Personal stories are not merely a way of telling someone (or oneself) about one’s life; they are the means by which identities may be fashioned” (Rosenwald and Ochberg, 1992: 1). In personal narratives partners used cohesive strategies to organise their time and space, disclose their identity and justify their actions (Bamberg and McCabe, 1998).

As a consequence, personal stories performed in interviews were used in the second analysis as interpretative devices that the partners employed in order to (re)present themselves to themselves and other participants of the collaboration space. They also described how this (re)presentation affected the collaboration space they inhabited and its boundaries (Lawler, 2002). Partners' personal stories therefore enabled the exploration of the partners' identity construction in the emergent context and the shifting boundaries of the inter-organisational collaboration, as well as the exploration of their relationship to the collaboration space and the collaboration itself. However, it was not possible to analyse all the personal stories collected from the participants. A selection had to be made.

3.3.2.2. Locating personal narratives for analysis

The aim of the second analysis was to explore how individual partners constructed and expressed different identities based on specific situations over time. These identities were examined in relation to specific spaces and boundaries of the collaboration in order to understand the effect they had on the collaboration space and the partnership. In order to achieve this aim the selection of interviews for analysis was vital.

The first criterion was the selection of an interview from one member of each partner-organisation (KEDDY, schools, government representatives and parents of disabled children). After dividing all the partners' interviews into these four categories, two sub-criteria were applied based on the information that emerged from the first analysis. Firstly, the partners should have been working in the partnership for more than a year. The initial analysis of the data indicated that many collaboration partners worked for the partnership for one year and then they moved to different places, positions or organisations. As such, in order to ensure that the partners had experience working on the partnership as well as knowledge of the collaborative processes and practices, only the partners who were actively involved in the collaboration for more than one year were included in the selection process. This criterion also enabled the analysis of interviews of those partners who had shared collaborative practices and experiences over time.

After filtering the interviews based on the first criterion, the second sub-criterion was applied. This indicated that the partners should have dealt with at least one case that followed all the periods of the collaborative process that were identified in the first analysis. In fact, the previous analysis demonstrated that four periods were meaningful for all partners when they dealt with their cases (Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention). In each period different partners were involved and different collaborative processes and practices were followed for the achievement of the partnership goals. However, as the first analysis indicated, not all the cases that KEDDY collaboration had dealt with were completed. For example, some children had exited the collaboration to seek help in private organisations while in other cases the parents did not welcome KEDDY's recommendations and therefore did not allow the continuation of the collaborative process. The aim of the second analysis was to ensure that the partners' interviews would provide at least one story which illustrated how the collaboration space was experienced by them and in relation to their partners as well as presenting processes of identification. As such, only the interviews of participants who were engaged in a complete case (following the periods which emerged in Anna's case) were included in the selection process.

From the interviews that fulfilled these two criteria four interviews were selected for analysis. Despite the fact that gender was not a requirement for the selection, the

interviews are of two men and two women. The interviews lasted between 44 and 80 minutes. Table 7 describes the interviews selected. The way that these interviews were analysed is presented in the next subsections.

Table 7: Description of the interview participants and interviews for the second analysis

Interviews	Partner-organisation	Role	Duration
<i>Maria</i>	KEDDY	Psychologist	Audio/57'
<i>George</i>	Parent of a disabled child	Parent	Audio/53'
<i>Christine</i>	Primary School	Teacher	Audio/74'
<i>Rob</i>	Government Representative (KYSPE)	School consultant	Audio/44'

3.3.2.3. Performative approach to narrative analysis

In order to analyse the personal narratives of the participants, the performative approach to narrative analysis was adopted (Goffman, 1959; Riessman, 2002; 2008). This approach suggests that social actors usually do not provide information to their audience, rather they present dramas. As the dramaturgical metaphor indicates, a social actor will stage performances of desirable selves to fit the expectations of others and confront difficult situations (Goffman, 1981). When individuals enter a context where other people are, they try to acquire information about themselves or use information that they already possess. In this way they are able to define the situation, organise their expectations and the best way to act. However, individuals want to convey a desirable self and will therefore organise their activities in order to emphasise and dramatically present positive facts that will help them become significant to others (Riessman, 2008).

Using Goffman's (1959) performative approach to explore identity development, it can be claimed that the identities formed were inauthentic since the narrators did not provide information to their audience rather they presented dramas and staged performances in order to project preferred selves. However, for this study the performative perspective was used to emphasise that when members performed, they

did so in relation to an audience, they produced “performances with others” (Young, 2000: 109). Performances were treated as “expressive attempts to involve an audience” (Riessman, 2003: 7). During their interviews, the participants told stories they developed in collaboration with an audience (the interviewer or with other collaboration partners) (Wells, 2011). The social and historical contexts also played an important role to the stories the partners expressed. In fact, storytellers “look back on and recount lives that are located in particular times and places”, structuring therefore their performances temporally and spatially (Laslett, 1999: 392). Their performances were “socialised, moulded, and modified” based on specific contexts and events (Goffman, 1959: 30).

As such, in this research the performative element does not propose that participants stage an identity. Instead, it suggests that storytellers accomplished and expressed their identities with an audience, and therefore identities were dynamically constructed in a social interaction with others. In this way, as the second chapter stated, this research goes beyond the traditional perspective that perceives identity as stable and resistant to change. This study questions the static nature of identity and examines how it is (re)constructed in relation to the dynamic context of the inter-organisational collaboration and in the presence of others. The researcher arranged the events and elements of the story into an order, and took into consideration related events in order to provide the context where the story was placed and the identity was constructed.

It is therefore apparent that the dramaturgical perspective was the most appropriate to study how the partners identify themselves in the collaboration space and how they told others about themselves. Analysing identities performatively enabled the researcher to explore possibilities that she would have missed with static concepts of identity. It allowed the exploration of the formation of partners’ identity in relation to a specific space, boundaries, actions and interactions with other partners. Indeed, it helped this study investigate how the identities were produced in social interaction “performed, produced for (and by) audiences in social situations” (Goffman, 2003: 701). As such, the second analysis analysed the text of interviews exploring personal narratives where “everyone is always and everywhere, more or less consciously, playing a role...It is in these roles that we know each other; it is in these roles that we know ourselves (Park, 1950 cited in Goffman, 1959: 17). The aim was to explore how the participants constructed their identity in the dynamic and complex collaboration space.

3.3.2.4. Analysing narratives as performances

In theory

The performative approach stresses “narrative as action” (Riessman, 2003: 8) and the analysis does not focus only on what is told (the events that the language describes) (Bold, 2012) but also on the telling (the positions of characters, listeners and self) (Mishler, 1995). Following this line of thought, the analysis of the interviews was built on the poetic structural approach (Gee; 1986; 1991). This approach explores the poetic features embedded in personal narratives by analysing the structure and meaning of the text in relation to its context. This narrative analysis did not seek to identify a plot in the text. Instead, it left space for the open-endedness of the narratives and therefore the inclusion of the ambiguities related to the process of identification.

Following the poetic structural narrative approach, the text was analysed in terms of stanzas, scenes and parts (Gee, 1991; Riessman, 2008) (for an example see figure 1). Stanzas were used here to incorporate for analysis non-narrative parts of the interviews. “Each stanza is a particular ‘take’ on a character, action, event, claim, place of information, and each involves a shift of focal participants, focal events, or a change in the time of framing of events from the preceding stanza...it represents an image, what the camera is focused on” (Gee, 1991: 23). Gee (1986) suggests that stanzas fall into related pairs that he calls strophes. “The strophe is a pair of stanzas of alternating form on which the structure of a given poem is based” (Gee, 1991: 24). However, here because of the direct performative reference of the narratives, stanzas were not organised into strophes, but into scenes (Riessman, 2008). Scenes described the action that took place in a different time and setting, and helped achieve coherence in the story. They also made clear the different ways the narrators position themselves in the interviews. Therefore, where narrative segments appeared, they were directly presented in scenes. Finally, the scenes fell into parts, larger units that built the story as a whole.

In practice

For Maria's narrative the whole interview transcript was used for analysis. However, for the other three narratives (George, Christine and Rob), only long portions were chosen excluding parts of the interviews that repeated points already made and/or parts that led the story in other directions.

Then the transcripts were prepared for analysis (see appendix 16 for an example of a transcript prepared for narrative analysis). Brief exchanges between the researcher and the interviewee, the interviewer's questions, and the clarification questions were deleted. Paralinguistic utterances (i.e. 'a', 'uhm', etc.), silences (indicated with --) and discourse markers (i.e. 'it's', 'so', etc.) were included. When the narrator presented in detail information that was clearly irrelevant to the aim of the analysis, the content was summarised and marked with []. For example, "Anyway, he told me about KEDDY [Maria presents general information that she exchanged with the manager about KEDDY]". Whenever necessary for the flow of the text and meaning, the researcher added some information presented in (). Namely, "All the team members (psychologist, teacher and social worker) met to discuss their evaluation and diagnosis." Furthermore, in order to facilitate the flow of the text, the researcher corrected and/or deleted obvious mistakes in the narrators' speech. For instance, "Kate presented her arguments and my ideas e! I meant arguments" became "Kate presented her arguments and my arguments". Finally, when necessary, the researcher replaced pronouns that the narrators used (i.e. she, her, we, them, etc.) in order to keep the flow of the text. For instance, in the phrase "she presented her arguments and my arguments" became "Kate presented her arguments and my arguments".

The edited transcripts were then examined to determine the beginnings and endings of the narratives. This was a complex interpretative task. In George's narrative, the researcher signalled the beginning and ending of the story with questions. In Christine's story, the boundaries of the stories were not clearly presented and their identification was a subjective endeavour by the researcher based on the context, theoretical interests and emergent issues. On the other hand, the start and finish of Maria's story was similar to the beginning and ending of the interview. Finally, Rob indicated himself when his story started and when it was over.

Once the boundaries of a narrative were decided, the researcher read the narrative several times in order to identify the main image of each narrative. For example, in some interviews, the main image was presented in the first lines of the transcript; for instance, in Maria's story the phrase in the first scene of the first part "I thought that the power of collaboration was in acting as one unit to achieve our aims" offered the main image of the narrative "The power of collaboration is in working together". The main image could be present in other parts of the interview too (i.e. the "only if we collaborate, we can achieve our aim") or at the end of the story, such as "KEDDY partnership will achieve its aims only if the partners actually collaborate". Each narrative main image framed the whole narrative, indicated its tone, provided its theme and gave a title to the personal narratives (see table 8 for the images that characterise narrators' personal stories.).

The edited transcripts were then divided into stanzas, scenes and parts. See figure 1 for an example of the narrative structure that was followed in the second analysis. The scenes were particularly useful in the method of analysis since they indicated how the boundaries and the way partners identified themselves were changing during the interview. At the end, the narratives were structured with a main image and parts (i.e. part 1, 2, 3, etc.) that included stanzas and scenes. An important aspect of the narrative analysis was the chronological ordering of the text within the interview. Intentional change of the order was therefore avoided by the researcher. Appendices 17, 18, 19 and 20 show the complete analysis conducted for every narrative presented in chapter 6.

Figure 1: Extract from edited transcript from Maria's interview indicating the narrative structure for "It is all about collaboration".

Frame: lack of cooperation

Working for KEDDY's collaboration creates mixed feelings. Do I enjoy it? I am not sure. Sometimes yes, sometimes no. To be honest, when I arrived in KEDDY two years ago, I was very excited. It was a new challenge for me. I was aware, in broad lines, of KEDDY's role and aim. That is the reason I applied for this position. I found fascinating the fact that the partners have to overcome so many difficulties in order to support disabled children. You know this is a closed society with many stereotypes. [She talks about the negative image the society has about disabled children]. I can still remember the excitement of my first day at work. I was naive back then. I thought that the power of collaboration was in acting as one unit to achieve our aims. I

couldn't see any other way to make it work. However, I didn't know much about the collaboration, I had to learn how it works.

Part 1: Entering KEDDY

Scene 1: Meeting the nice manager

I met the manager while I was waiting outside KEDDY. It was the first day you see, and I had arrived quite early. He invited me into his office and offered me a coffee. (Manager's name) is a really nice person, everyone likes him. Well, not everyone exactly but everyone should like him. Anyway, he told me about KEDDY [Maria presents the general information that she exchanged with the manager about KEDDY]. From what I understood, employees were expected to work in teams for the production of diagnoses and educational plans. He told me that KEDDY's employees are like a family and I could always ask for their advice. Yet, he made it clear to me that he should be informed about everything and that all reports should be signed by him.

Scene 2: Meeting the helpful colleagues

Stanza: 1) Then he introduced me to the rest of the team. **2)** He asked everyone to come to his office, which is also our conference room. **3)** Everyone was nice. **4)** I guess they were truly nice, they didn't pretend then. -- **5)** Oh, actually apart from (employee's name) who wasn't very sociable, everyone else was. But that's his style, not that he doesn't like me. **6)** I was very nervous and I think they could see that. It is a bit stressful to meet fourteen people in one day! **7)** But when I saw how nice they were to me, I relaxed and became friendly. **8)** (secretary's name) gave me a tour of KEDDY and he also showed me my office. **9)** (physiologists' and social workers' names) explained to me the main rules of the collaboration and their role in KEDDY. They also offered me their help. **10)** Kate (KEDDY primary teacher who will later be a main actor in the narrative) explained to me how the production of the reports works. **11)** At the time, I didn't realise that she was actually trying to show me the boundaries between my work and hers. **12)** I thought she was trying to help me.

The personal narratives were also analysed for the identification of the turning points in the stories (see table 8 for the points of each narrative). These were moments when the storyteller indicated a fundamental shift in the expected course of life, practice and interactions. Turning points in stories “open up directions of movement that were not anticipated by and could not be predicted by their pasts” (Mishler, 1999: 7-8). For example, in George's story, scene three of part two introduces the social worker's diagnosis which offers the turning point of the narrative, since after this scene the narrative takes a different direction. As a consequence, turning points “fundamentally

change the meaning of past experiences, and consequently an individual's identity" (Riessman, 2002: 706). They were therefore particularly useful in indicating how identities and boundaries changed in different spaces over time.

The process of analysis also aimed at discovering the narrative context/space of the personal narratives (see table 8 for the narrative space of each story). Personal stories were about individuals who were trying to make sense of their reality as it was expressed in a specific context. As such, every story was produced, articulated and positioned in a dynamic space, while the narrator was represented as an agent that acted in this specific space. Rob's narrative unfolds in a contrasted space, Maria's in a competitive space, Christine's in an exploitable space and George's in a defensive space. Indeed, "narratives... articulate the deepest structures of the social world and their contradictions" (Bourdieu et al., 1993: 511), and only by taking into consideration the context of the telling coherence was established. As highlighted in chapter 2, constructing identities is an ongoing, context-specific activity (Ellemers et al., 2003). Therefore, locating the stories in narrative spaces enabled the exploration of the way storytellers positioned themselves in the changing space of the collaboration.

The performative approach to narratives indicated how collaborative partners identified themselves and others in interaction with others, since the narratives were performed in a specific space and for/with a specific audience. As such, in the stories that will be described in chapter 6 there is also a reference to the researcher's questions as well as to the participants' interactions to the presence of the listeners. This illustrates the co-construction of the narratives at different points of the text (see appendix 17 in Maria's narrative part two, scene three for an example). From this perspective, identity cannot be seen as absolute and finite, but rather as generated and transformed through interaction in relation to specific contexts (Hopf; 2000) in which the actors try to generate meaning from these contexts and establish new boundaries (Hosking and Morley, 1991). In this sense, both the way the identities affected the collaboration space and the way identities were affected by it were examined.

To summarise the second process of analysis, all the texts were analysed seeking to identify parts, scenes and stanzas in addition to narrative spaces and turning points. The analysis focused on the narrators' own structuring of the story in order to discover how

the partners (co)constructed and reconstructed their identity and organised accordingly their actions in the collaboration space. The outcome was the emergence of self-narratives (see table 8) that describe the participants' self-understandings and the process of identification in the collaboration space.

Table 8: Storytellers' images, contexts, segments and turning points that characterise their personal stories.

Storyteller	Main image	Narrative space	Story segments	Turning point	Evolving Narrative
Maria	"The power of collaboration is in working together"	Competitive	- Entering KEDDY - One case two diagnoses - Experienced vs. inexperienced - Being a psychologist	Disagreement with teacher about diagnosis: expanded and shifted boundaries	<i>Refusal</i>
George	"I will do everything for my son"	Defensive	-Facing the news about Mike's disability - Being in KEDDY - Compromising	Social worker's diagnosis: blurred and redrawn boundaries	<i>Resistance</i>
Christine	"If there is no trust, there are no results"	Exploitable	- Exploring the ground - Writing the report - Rejecting challenge	Discussion with colleagues about integration unit: crossed and activated boundaries	<i>Naivety</i>
Rob	"Every rule in the collaboration needs its own exception"	Contrasted	- Producing report - The delay - Overcoming the protocol	Special consultant's denial to prioritise a case: working across boundaries	<i>Ambiguity</i>

3.4. Summary

This chapter has presented the methodological approach of this study. Qualitative research allowed the in-depth exploration and understanding of the research issues based on the perspectives of the participants and the context in which they lived (Hennink et al., 2011). It also enabled the researcher to address ‘how’ questions that described processes, behaviours and actions (Marshall, 2006). Social science methodology is very rich regarding the different ways it offers for data collection. The basic rule for the selection of the methods for this study was to match them to the research questions. As presented in the first and second chapter, this study aimed at exploring processes and practices in order to understand how the inter-organisational collaboration unfolds over time and how the partners construct their identity. With this aim, observations, field notes, interviews and documents were collected from a case study. The data gathered was analysed following two different processes of analysis. Firstly, a thematic analysis was conducted in order to explore collaborative processes and practices that helped the researcher to identify how the collaboration space emerges. Then, a narrative analysis was employed that allowed the exploration of the identification processes in the complex and dynamic space of collaboration.

Having formulated the research questions through the development of a deductive conceptual framework and having presented the research approach that enabled the researcher to collect data to answer these questions, the next step aims to familiarise the reader with the context and history of the case study. In this way, a basis for understanding the specific nature and circumstances in which the collaboration was set up and developed will be created. The next chapter will therefore introduce the Greek education system and the developments in the field of special education that led to the establishment of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. It will also describe the roles of the partners and the main collaborative arrangements that shaped the partnership under research.

4. KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias Partnership: The background

4.0. Introduction

After the presentation of the research questions in addition to the selected methods for the exploration of these questions, this chapter introduces the context of the case study, the KEDDY (Centre for Differential Assessment, Diagnosis and Support of children with special needs) Aitoloakarnanias partnership. The inter-organisational collaboration under study was embedded in a wider organisational and socio-educational environment. The intention is to provide an account of the history of this collaboration in order to understand its special nature and the circumstances that shaped the partners' actions and interactions. KEDDY partners construct the space of the collaboration by dealing with these circumstances in specific ways while demarcating the boundaries of the partnership and the partners' different sense of belonging. By focusing on the partners' practices, experiences and interactions within the historical and social context of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership, it will be possible to investigate the emergence of the collaborative process as well as the ways in which partners identify themselves.

The first section of this chapter aims at familiarising the reader with the Greek educational context. The second section introduces the history and developments over time regarding the education of disabled children. The next section introduces KEDDY as the main public service for the educational support of students with special needs, while the fourth section discusses the establishment, role, development and operation of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. The final two sections present the role of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partners (school teachers and head teachers, parents with disabled children and government representatives) and describe the collaborative arrangements.

4.1. The Greek educational system

In accordance with the Greek Constitution, education in pre-school, primary and lower secondary school is compulsory for all children aged from 6 to 15 years. The Greek government provides free education for all the educational levels, from pre-primary to higher education. Following the rules of the European Commission, the current policies and goals of the Greek Ministry of Education rest on five pillars (EURYDICE, 2009b: 8):

- “Human-centered education in the context of which measures for the support and integration of at-risk social groups will be taken
- Environmental education for sustainable growth
- Digital convergence (equality of access, developing new technology, distance teaching, reducing digital illiteracy, etc.)
- Multilingualism and language learning
- Connecting education to culture in order to reinforce and update the cultural consciousness and strengthen values”

Children’s school life can start from the age of 2.5 years in nursery schools (pre-school education). Alternatively, children can go to infant schools at the age of 4 (pre-school education) where they can stay for two school years. After infant schools, children are admitted at the age of 6 in primary schools that they attend for six years (primary education). The secondary school is split into gymnasium (first 3 years) and lyceum (final 3 years). The gymnasium is the last mandatory educational level and consists of three grades that students attend between the ages of 12 and 15 years. When students complete all the three grades, they are awarded a school-leaving certificate which is necessary for enrolment in the next educational level (EURYDICE, 2012). After gymnasium, students can either go to a technical-vocational educational institute or to a lyceum. If students choose to enrol at lyceum, they follow three grades from the age of 15 to 18. The technical vocational schools are divided into vocational upper secondary schools for students from 15 to 18 years of age (EPA.L) and vocational training schools (EPA.S) for students from 16 to 18 years of age.

After the completion of the secondary school, students may choose to enrol in post-secondary institutions of vocational training or of higher education. The post-secondary

institutes of vocational training are open to students of 18 years of age and over. Students can get two years of initial vocational training or, if they already had a vocational training, one year of further training (EURYDICE, 2012). On the other hand, higher education consists of two parallel sectors that can enrol students of 18 years of age and over: the university sector and the technological sector. Technological education institutions aim at development and progress in the fields of science and applied research (Terzis, 2010). In contrast, universities consist of various faculties covering a range of related disciplines. Their aim is to provide students with theoretical knowledge and all-round training (Kyriazis and Asderaki, 2008). On completion of their studies, students receive a degree based on their specialisation. The university sector also includes the Hellenic Open University which operates for students who are unable to attend classes in universities. It provides educational opportunities to a wide spectrum of people and age groups, and it follows a similar structure and requirements to the rest of the Greek universities (Katsaros, 2008).

This section has outlined the Greek educational system as this information is important in order to understand, as discussed in the next chapter, how KEDDY employees decide which grade students with special educational needs will attend as well as the kind of support they will receive. The following section will explore the development of the policies in the field of special needs education. It will also introduce the establishment of KDAY (later KEDDY) as part of the latest reform in special needs education.

4.2. The Greek educational system for students with disabilities

The private sector supported the educational needs of disabled children until 1913. However, in 1913, the Greek government introduced the first educational reform for children with special educational needs (Bouzakis, 2002). Disabled students were mentioned in the reform in relation to the problems they were causing to the education of 'normal' students. The suggested solution was their isolation from mainstream education in order for 'normal' students to benefit (Bouzakis and Berdousi, 2008). In the 1929 reform the government appeared willing to deal with the issue of disabled students. However, it again suggested that disabled students should be isolated from

mainstream education in order to promote ‘normal’ students’ learning and protect them from possible ‘infections’ (Saiti, 2009).

A further reform was introduced in 1964. This reform concentrated on the education of ‘normal’ children without reference to the education of disabled children (Bouzakis and Berdousi, 2008). However, the 1985 educational reform stated that “the goal of special needs education is the same as of primary and secondary education for every grade and every type of school” (Bouzakis and Berdousi, 2008: 97). In the resulting law 1566/1985 the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (YPEPTH) appeared for the first time as the exclusive convenor of special needs education. It also established a range of services for this field (i.e. the Council of Special Needs Education, school counsellors for special needs education) (Bouzakis and Berdousi, 2008). Moreover, it encouraged the collaboration between various disciplines (i.e. doctors, psychologists, social workers, special educators, etc.) in order to support disabled students (Darra et al., 2010). All these initiatives indicated a shift in the overall perceptions of disability and an effort to provide more humane treatment of children with special needs. In fact, law 1566/1985 indicated that disabled children should share buildings with ‘normal’ students although they would be taught separately. However, many provisions of the 1985 law were partly implemented (Bouzakis and Berdousi, 2008).

Despite these reforms, organisations for students with special needs and a more sensitive section of the public, and the European Union urged the Greek government to improve public special needs education (Saiti, 2009). The result was law 2817/2000 which sets out government policy towards the education of disabled students up until the present. The basic aim of the special needs education is now the inclusion of people with special needs in mainstream education. This law introduces integration units that are established at all educational levels and in every school that has children with special needs (Stefa, 2001). Integration units are inside the mainstream school and students attend them with the support of a specialist teacher, but only for a few hours a day. In parallel with an integration unit, students attend the mainstream classroom with extra support from their teacher. Students are therefore encouraged to stay in mainstream classes for as many hours as possible. Moreover, this law establishes the design and development of individualised educational plans for disabled children, who

now receive a full diagnosis specifying their disability and the special educational needs related to their disability. It is estimated that since law 2817/2000, 30% of the population of students with special needs attend special schools, while the remaining 70% stay in mainstream schools with parallel support from integration units (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2005).

Law 2817/2000 identifies the following types of educational provision for disabled students (Greek Government, 2000:7):

- “Mainstream primary schools with support from special needs education teachers for disabled children aged between 6 to 12 years.
- Special educational needs units situated in mainstream primary and secondary schools.
- Special schools: nurseries for 4 to 6 years of age, primary schools for 6 to 14 years of age, secondary schools for 14 to 22 years of age and independent special units for educational and professional training for 14 to 22 years of age.”

On the practical side, the most important measure that has been taken to support children with special needs is the establishment of a new institution, the Diagnostic Evaluation and Support Centre or KDAY. In 2000, the Greek government defined the setting up of 54 KDAYs in different towns in Greece. These operate under the supervision and inspection of YPEPTH. KDAY centres are responsible for the assessment of intellectual disability and placement of disabled students in the appropriate school and grade. The next section will present in detail the establishment, aims, development and operation of KDAY (later KEDDY).

4.3. Centre of Diagnosis, Evaluation and Support (KDAY)

KDAY centres are established to provide and coordinate special needs education services at local level. Every KDAY consists of a multidisciplinary team: psychologists, teachers, physiotherapists, social workers, occupational therapists and speech therapists. As the law specifies, KDAY’s main responsibilities are (Greek Government, 2000):

- The identification of the type and degree of disability of children with special needs.
- The design and development of individualised educational plans for children with special needs.
- Recommendations for the students' enrolment and attendance in appropriate schools and classes based on their individual needs.
- The evaluation of disabled students' educational progress with the help of school consultants, teachers and head teachers.
- The support of disabled children who face problems at school (i.e. discrimination, harassment, etc.).
- The specification of the devices required in order for students with special needs to study more efficiently.
- Suggestions to the schools in order to be disabled friendly.
- Recommendations for appropriate assessment of disabled students according to their individual needs.
- Suggestions for the establishment and closure of special schools and integration units.

Furthermore, KDAY centres support people who are engaged in the education of children with special needs (i.e. teachers, head teachers, school consultants, etc.). They also offer help to parents with disabled children (Saiti, 2012). KDAYs also organise informative meetings and programs for parents and teachers of disabled children as well as for the public. Programs are also organised by KDAY in order to increase public awareness regarding the everyday problems of students with special needs (Darra et al., 2010).

To be able to fulfill its responsibilities, *“KEDDY should always inform parents before taking any action. Only if the child's parents give their permission, can KEDDY take action to support the child....If the parents do not give their permission, KEDDY has no further authority and responsibility”* (Government Representative, 9:34).

KDAY tries to eliminate stereotypes towards disabled students. It therefore shifts attention to the fact that “any individual from a given society could potentially be considered disabled for a part of their life, thereby imposing a need for care and

prevention for all human beings and not just for disabled people” (Vislie, 2003: 26). *“In KEDDY, we think of disabled students as temporarily disabled due to diseases or incidents, because of their age or any other reason that restricts the way they function in their social environment for a period of time. We always believe or hope that every child with special needs will be able, at some stage, to overcome the difficulties and become an equal member of our society” (KEDDY Manager, 7:1).*

KDAY centres have a considerable impact on the Greek educational sector. As such, the setting up of 54 KDAYs, as law 2817/2000 indicated, soon appeared insufficient to cover the needs of the population with special educational needs. As a result, in 2003, the Greek government announced the establishment of 4 more KDAYs.

In 2008 a new law, which still applies, was introduced to improve the sector of special needs education. Although law 3699/2008 does not change the KDAY centres’ responsibilities and aims, it renames KDAYs (Diagnostic Evaluation and Support Centres) as KEDDYs (Centres for Differential Assessment, Diagnosis and Support of special needs education). The evaluation of disabled students now takes place through the process of differential assessment (or diagnosis) which aims at excluding categories of disabilities in order to reach the dominant diagnosis (EURODICE, 2012). This process is part of a broader process that collects information about students and then designs and develops individual programs based on their needs. The multidisciplinary team of KEDDY is again responsible for the diagnosis and assessment of students with special educational needs. Nevertheless, in reality these changes highlight policies and practices already established in the previous law. *“In 2008, the Ministry decided to rename KDAY to KEDDY. However, nothing changed in practice. We changed our name plate of course but we continued our operation as usual” (KEDDY Employee, 11:19).*

In the 2005/06 school year, out of 19,460 students with special educational needs, 13,618 attended special classes within mainstream schools and 5,842 attended special needs education schools. In the 2008/09 school year, 16,118 attended mainstream schools and 6,659 attended special schools, while in 2011 approximately 19,000 disabled students were in mainstream schools (EURYDICE, 2009a; 2012). Therefore, it seems that the Greek government has succeeded in its aim to prevent the isolation of

disabled students by incorporating them in mainstream schools. KEDDY centres have had a significant role in the achievement of this aim.

After describing the conditions that prompted the establishment of KEDDY centers and after presenting their aims and operation, the next section will introduce the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership, where this research has collected its data.

4.4. Aitoloakarnanias Centre for Differential Assessment, Diagnosis and Support (KEDDY)

Greece is divided into different prefectures. The Prefecture of Aitoloakarnanias is the largest one (5448 km²) with a 252,000 resident population. It is situated in the western part of Greece, and its neighbouring prefectures are Arta, Karditsa, Evritania and Fokida. It is divided into five provinces (Mesologi, Nafpaktos, Vonitsa, Xsiromeri and Trichonida) and its main towns are Mesologi, Agrinio, Amfilochia, Nafpaktos and Vonitsa. Although the largest town is Agrinion, Mesologi is the capital of Aitoloakarnanias for historical reasons. Mesologi is located between the Acheloos and Euenos rivers and is built in the entrance to the Gulf of Patraikos.

Each prefecture has its own local council (Nomarxiako Sumvoulio) dealing with governmental issues at local level. Although Aitoloakarnanias council collaborates with the main government body, it deals itself with issues within its territory. The council is the link between the local population and the Greek Ministries as well as between YPEPTH and KEDDY. Although the government decided the establishment of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias, the local council is responsible for the actual establishment, financial support, and operation of KEDDY.

Following law 2817/2000, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias was established in 2000 in order to support the local population with special educational needs. As the law specified, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias was located in the capital of the prefecture, Mesologi. For the first years of its operation, KEDDY operated in a classroom of Aitoloakarnanias special primary school. *“It was a very difficult period for us. We did not have a proper*

building. Aitoloakarnanias council placed us in a room of the special primary school without any equipment. People were wondering about our role... People assumed that our role was restricted to supporting disabled children within the special school” (KEDDY Employee, 5:21).

As in every KEDDY, the employees of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias are divided into two categories: teachers (pre-school, primary and secondary school teachers) and special needs staff (psychologists, speech-therapists, occupational-therapists and social workers). KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias does not participate in the selection, employment and dismissal of its staff. Rather, the staff are selected through a specific governmental process, ASEP (higher council for the selection of governmental staff), which follows accurate procedures for the selection of staff in every governmental service. Law 2817/2000 indicated a preference to hire KEDDY employees’ with specialisation in the area of special needs education. However, a requirement that law 3194/2003 stipulates is that KEDDY employees should have a bachelor, masters or PhD related to special needs education. Alternatively, they should hold a certificate from yearly governmental seminars focusing on special needs education. Relevant experience is important but not required (Terzis, 2010). *“We have made some progress since 2000. Now KEDDY employees should have specialisation in the area of special needs education in order to be hired. Unfortunately, we haven’t managed to establish another very important requirement: employees’ working experience with disabled children” (Government Representative, 9:5).*

Some employees are permanent staff and some temporary (they are employed only for 9 months, from October to June). However, those who work as temporary staff at the same KEDDY for four years can become permanent staff. The total number of employees for each KEDDY depends on the child population in each prefecture. As the government specified, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias started its operation with five employees: two permanent (a teacher of primary education and a social worker) and three temporary (a psychologist, pre-school and a secondary teacher).

After three years of operation within the special school, in 2004 Aitoloakarnanias Council decided to transfer KEDDY into a new and independent building. Currently it operates there with 15 employees: 2 teachers of preliminary education, 4 teachers of

primary education, 2 teachers of secondary education, 1 secretary, 3 psychologists, 1 speech therapist and 2 social workers. Of those employees, 4 are permanent staff (a social worker, a psychologist, the secretary and the manager/teacher of primary education).

In accordance with his job responsibilities, the manager of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias participates and organises events and seminars to inform and support teachers, government staff, parents of students with special needs and the broader community. He should also approve the diagnosis and educational plan for every student. In addition, the manager submits proposals for the establishment of new special schools and integration units as well as managing the staff meetings which take place once per week. *“Our manager has established weekly team meetings. Every Wednesday KEDDY is closed to the public and all employees gather to discuss their cases... The aim of the meetings is to exchange opinions and share our specialised knowledge in order to produce more accurate diagnoses and educational plans for every case...These meetings also help us increase our knowledge and are vital for new employees who do not have relevant experience” (KEDDY Employee, 6:7).*

The prefecture of Aitoloakarnanias has twenty-five integration units at all educational levels, one primary and one secondary special school as well as one Centre for the Education, Support and Development of students with special needs (KEKYKAMEA) for mature disabled students. Based on a student’s diagnosis and educational plan, KEDDY employees decide whether the students should attend a mainstream school or a special school. However, KEDDY's aim is to support disabled students within mainstream schools whenever possible since *“an inclusive education can break down the barriers while both disabled and non-disabled children can benefit from being at the same educational environment” (Government Representative, 21:5).*

If KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias decides that students should stay in mainstream schools, they attend regular classrooms in which they are supported from specialists, or either in integration units/classes or in special classes within the school. Alternatively, students attend special schools that help them develop their personality and improve their abilities and skills, so that they will be later able to attend mainstream education.

Although most KEDDYs in Greece operate five days per week from 9:00 to 15:00, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias has a different schedule. It is open twice a week until 18:00 and the rest of days until 13:00. *“The building was big enough when KEDDY had 10 employees. Now we have 15 employees and there are not enough desks for everyone. Therefore, we decided to split our shifts so as to be more effective at our work... In this way, we all have our space to work and KEDDY is open more hours. So, we actually help more students”* (KEDDY Employee, 9:9).

The busiest period for KEDDY is at the start of every school year. Then, due to the high number of students who go to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias for diagnosis and evaluation, there is a waiting list of three and four weeks. In some cases employees may decide to give priority to children at pre-school age or at the first grades in the primary school. *“If the diagnosis of a disabled child happens in an early age and is followed by early interventions, the child has more chances to improve their educational performance”* (KEDDY Employee, 7:22).

The prefecture of Aitoloakarnanias has approximately 24,000 students per school year and in the 12 years of its operation KEDDY has dealt with approximately 2,000 students. During the school year 2011/2012, KEDDY helped 380 students to address their learning difficulties and produced 351 diagnoses and educational plans. Yet, *“only if KEDDY collaborates successfully with its partners, will it achieve its aim to support students with special educational needs and give them equal opportunities for: full participation and contribution to society; independent living; financial self-sufficiency and autonomy; safeguarding of their rights to education; and social and occupational integration”* (Partners' meeting, 10:1). Therefore, the discussion now shifts to the partners' roles and collaborative arrangements that shape the partnership under study.

4.5. KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias Partnership

In order to achieve its goals, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias should collaborate with teachers and head teachers in public schools in the prefecture of Aitoloakarnanias (special and mainstream schools of preliminary, primary and secondary education), parents of

disabled children as well as local governmental services [School consultants of special and mainstream education, Aitoloakarnanias Central Departmental Council of Primary Education (ACDCPE) and Aitoloakarnanias Central Departmental Council of Secondary Education (ACDCSE)]. Each of these partners has a specific and very important role to play in the successful operation of the collaboration. However, it is vital to remember that this is not a normal partnership. The partners are not bound by contract. Moreover, despite the fact that KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias was established to serve the collaboration, the government requires that other partners work for the partnership. They therefore involuntarily engage with the partnership on the top of the other roles and responsibilities they have. See appendix 21 for more information regarding partners' formal and informal collaborative arrangements.

School teachers and head teachers initiate the collaborative process. In particular, school teachers usually identify children with disabilities and present their evaluation to their head teachers who are responsible for contacting the school consultants. School consultants make suggestions that teachers follow in order to help the children overcome their learning difficulties. Teachers later report to the school consultants who assess children's performance and decide whether they should be referred to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. When children are referred to KEDDY, school teachers should produce evaluation reports with information regarding the children's performance and behaviour inside and outside the classroom. These reports are vital tools for KEDDY employees since they frame children's behaviour in the school environment. KEDDY is unable to obtain this information from any other source. When KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias produces a diagnosis and educational plan for disabled children, head teachers are responsible for discussing KEDDY report with the children's teachers. Teachers then follow KEDDY's suggestions in order to support the children and, if necessary, they contact KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias to request clarifications and help in carrying out the suggestions included in the report. Finally, head teachers are also responsible for implementing suggestions made by KEDDY and approved by ACDCPE or ACDCSE (i.e. establishment of integration units, purchase of equipment, etc.). See appendix 21 for more information for the collaborative arrangements of the partners.

"We [schools] have many responsibilities in this partnership... All the partners are interdependent... For example, we need the government funding to implement KEDDY

suggestions. KEDDY needs our help to apply its interventions. Government representatives need us, although they don't admit it, in order to assess and report students' progress" (Head Teacher, 7:17).

On the other hand, parents of children with special needs are always the first point of contact since their consent is necessary at every step of the collaborative process (see appendix 21 for further information regarding partners' formal and informal collaborative arrangements). Firstly, when head teachers suspect that children face learning difficulties, they contact the parents asking for their permission to seek the school consultants' intervention. If parents do not give their permission, head teachers have no authority and the supportive process is not initiated. Later in the supportive process, if school consultants decide to refer children to KEDDY, they have to request the parents' permission. Only if parents agree, will children go to KEDDY for diagnosis and evaluation. Finally, when KEDDY employees produce children's diagnoses and educational plans, they meet with the parents to present the children's reports. Parents once again have to make an important decision. If they accept the report and give their permission to send it to their children's schools, the collaborative process continues. If the parents accept the report but do not wish its circulation to the students' schools, KEDDY has no further authority and the collaborative process is terminated. Parents may also decide neither to accept the report nor to send it to their children's schools. This again means the end of the supportive process.

"Our role is very important. We [parents] are responsible for the future of our children...We have to listen to the experts and allow them to do their job...No, without our consent the supportive process doesn't continue... They (partners) need our consent and we need the partners' expertise and resources" (Parent, 3:14).

Government representatives have two different roles in the collaboration: school consultants examine and support children, while ACDCPE and ACDCSE directors provide the necessary resources (see appendix 21 for the collaborative arrangements between the partners). On the one hand, following head teachers' requests, mainstream education school consultants have to examine children to verify if they have a disability. Then, if necessary, they suggest a programme so as to help these children overcome their learning difficulties. Consultants monitor the progress of the students with their

teachers' help. If the consultants' suggestions are not effective, they request the intervention of the special education consultant. The special consultant also examines the children and suggests interventions. If after these interventions the children's performance is not improved, he requests their referral to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. On the other hand, depending on the students' educational level, ACDCPE or ACDCSE forward KEDDY requests regarding the establishment of a school unit or the purchase of school equipment to the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (YPEPTH). If requests are refused, ACDCPE or ACDCSE contact YPEPTH again regarding the same request. In addition, when YPEPTH approves the establishment of a new school unit or the purchase of equipment, ACDCPE or ACDCSE deal with the implementation of the request. They do so by collaborating with the schools and KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias.

“Based on a child’s diagnosis and educational plan, KEDDY makes suggestions regarding the support of a student. Government representatives are then responsible for the realisation of these suggestions. We have the power to keep the supportive process moving... As soon as the funding is approved, we have to collaborate with KEDDY and the child’s school to implement the suggestions... Government representatives usually do not have knowledge on issues of special educational needs. We have to collaborate with KEDDY and the schools. Otherwise, the collaboration will not be successful” (Government Representative, 13:34).

4.6. Summary

This chapter has introduced the most important aspects in the educational and social context that have been signalled as significant in the development of the inter-organisational collaboration under study. It has also described the role of the partners and the main collaborative arrangements they should follow in order to deal with their cases successfully and therefore achieve the aims of the collaboration. As such, this chapter has helped clarify what the KEDDY collaboration is and what the partners do officially and unofficially to make the partnership successful.

This chapter also made it apparent that the partners are interdependent and this is what keeps them together. Only if they collaborate successfully, will KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias Partnership achieve its aim to support children with special needs so as to overcome their educational difficulties and become equal members of society. The nature of the collaboration (interdisciplinary), the complexity of the partners' relationships and the constant transformation of the collaborative process in order to serve different cases, have made this partnership suitable for the exploration of the research aims of this study. In fact, the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership has enabled the examination of the inter-organisational collaboration as a dynamic process that emerges as partners engage in different children's cases where they needed to be flexible and organise their practices according to the particular needs of each case. Moreover, this partnership has allowed the exploration of identity as dynamic and fluid and which is constantly reconstructed through the partners' actions and interactions in different contexts and for different cases and circumstances.

The next chapter explores the emergent nature of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership through a collective narrative developed into four time periods. This narrative, Anna's story, indicates how in emergent spaces the partners organised their actions in order to deal successfully with a specific case. Anna's story therefore indicates the link between actions, interactions, experiences and space. It also illustrates how the partners have to move between emergent and established practices in order to adapt to the needs of the given case.

5. The co-authoring of the KEDDY narrative

5.0. Introduction

The first and second chapter of this thesis reviewed the existing literature and theories in order to develop a conceptual framework that represents the concepts, underlying theory and research questions explored in this research. The third chapter presented the selected suitable fieldwork approach that enabled the collection of data to answer the research questions. The fourth chapter introduced the context where the case under study was developed in order to provide an account of the general collaboration history as well as to understand its specific nature and circumstances. This chapter brings together the main theoretical, methodological and contextual points of the previous chapters in order to illustrate the ways in which the collaboration partners, through their everyday practices, demarcated the boundaries of the collaboration (co)constructing and reconstructing different spaces of action and belonging. In order to do so, this chapter focuses on the ways in which the collaboration partners as a collective gave significance to particular experiences, events and actions. The narrative presented here tells of specific actors and their interactions and relationships. It also exposes practices, collective experiences and sense-making processes.

As presented in the methodology chapter, observations of the collaborative process, interviews with individual partners and partnership documents were analysed to produce categories that represent the practices of the KEDDY collaborative process (see section 3.2). These categories are here organised into a narrative, which consists of four parts, in order to reconstruct the collective story of the inter-organisational collaboration. This story offers a comparison between the guidelines suggested by the official collaboration protocol and what actually happened in the case of Anna who requested the help of the partnership (see subsection 3.3.1.2. in the methodology chapter for justification regarding the selection of Anna's case). Anna's case was selected as an example of the cases that the KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership has struggled with (see appendix 22 for the summaries of all the stories that the analysis has revealed and appendix 23 for a table indicating the key elements of these stories). Through Anna's

story, this chapter illustrates how the collaborative process of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias partnership unfolded.

The first section of this chapter presents how the categories that emerged from the process of analysis are presented in a narrative form in order to construct the main collective story. The second section describes the collaboration process based on an enacted narrative developed over four time periods (Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention). The last section of the chapter discusses each narrative part separately with reference to the framework developed in the first and second chapters.

5.1. Re-constructing the space of the collaboration as a co-authored narrative

The methodology chapter has described the first data analysis procedure that was used to explore the unfolding of the collaborative process in Anna's case (see section 3.3.1. for a description of the first analysis). The present section organises the categories emergent from this analysis into a narrative structure. This approach was chosen to represent the data because it allows the identification of the actors as well as the context of their actions and processes (Bold, 2012). A narrative structure also provided a comprehensive summary of the data collected, producing stories in each period which composed the main reconstructed narrative. This narrative highlights the different types of experienced spaces, boundaries, identities and collaborative practices enacted by the partners of the collaboration.

The four parts of the narrative presented in this chapter have been built upon two main dimensions. Firstly, this is done horizontally according to the four time periods expressed by the participants. The horizontal dimension reflects the temporal positioning of the story and also highlights the nature of the ongoing space construction by the members of the partnership. This dimension is organised in the classifications of four time periods as they emerged from the first process of analysis which was described in the third chapter (see section 3.3.1.2.).

Secondly, the parts of the story were organised vertically in terms of the elements and key ideas of each story. The vertical dimension allowed the re-construction of the narrative by identifying the main elements of each story: scenario, main participants and the main action (Burke, 1945 cited in O'Connor, 1995: 775). These elements are involved when social action occurs, but different types of action emphasise different elements. The main elements of each story enabled the description of the dynamic processes as well as of the main transformations and shifts of the partners' actions, interactions and shared experiences. They also helped the organisation and more effective exploration of the themes selected by KEDDY partners and included in their own descriptions of the collaborative process. The material already coded and categorised was therefore organised according to the questions presented in table 9:

Table 9: Organising the dimensions in Anna's story. Adapted from Burke (1945)

When, where and why?	<i>Purpose and Scene</i>	<i>When did an action or event occur? Where did the action or event take place? Why did an action or event occur?</i>
Who?	<i>Agents</i>	<i>Who initiated, led or developed an action or an event?</i>
What and How?	<i>Agency and Act</i>	<i>What happened? What acts defined and constituted an action or event? How did an action or event occur and develop?</i>

However, in order to place the storyteller at the centre of the narrative as observer and actor, the vertical dimension was also organised with Parker's (2003) key ideas in narrative analysis: temporality, event, context, agency and format. Since temporality is used in the horizontal dimension and agency holds a similar meaning to Burke's (1945) agency; event, context and format are Parker's key ideas that complete the vertical dimension (see table 10). The order of the story, the social relations that affect what it is important and what is not, the style in which the story is told and the plot drivers enabled the stories to be reconstructed so as to both represent KEDDY participants and

reflect on the representations. In addition, Parker’s ideas enabled the exploration of how partners' stories are connected with the stories of others and how they need to be located in a certain culturally-specific context in order to be fully understood.

Table 10: Organising the dimensions in Anna's story. Adapted from Parker (2003)

Event	How is the event related to the acts? How do people relate it to other events? What is the main plot that people use to narrate the event?
Context	How does the context help people to make sense of the acts? What cultural and social relationships embed the story?
Format	What is the style in which the story is told?

By adopting this framework to present the data, the journey of the collaborative process is (re)constructed through Anna’s story (see subsection 3.3.1.2. for an explanation regarding the use of Anna’s story). Her story unfolds through a narrative developed over four periods of time: Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention (see table 11). The narrative tells of specific actors, interactions and relationships as well as presenting partners’ actions and experiences. It also describes partners’ efforts to make sense of their reality and co-construct the space of the collaboration over time. The enactment of a specific narrative both enabled and constrained the emergent space of collaborative action and experience. The collective narrative shows how the stakeholders develop boundaries and identities through interpreting and legitimating particular practices while creating and sharing this narrative over time. As such, the stakeholders co-generate the conditions upon which the collaboration space emerges.

Table 11: Complete narrative framework with horizontal dimensions (temporality), vertical dimensions (story elements and ideas) and themes for the reconstruction of Anna's story

Temporality	Referral	Diagnosis	Negotiation	Intervention
Scene and Purpose	Overcoming resistance	Getting into the system	Understanding Anna's report	Disclosing Anna's report
Agent/s	The school (teacher and head teacher), education consultants and Anna's mother	KEDDY experts (psychologist, teacher and social worker)	KEDDY experts and Anna's mother	Government representatives, school and KEDDY experts
Act/Agency	Sending Anna to KEDDY	Producing a diagnosis and an educational plan	Consequences of Anna's evaluation	Transferring Anna to a new school and establishing an integration unit that was not used afterwards
Event	Refusing externals' intervention	Following bureaucracy	Rejecting KEDDY's diagnosis	Trying to fulfil roles and promises
Context	- Enforced interaction - Resistance	- Regulated relationships - Procedures	- Personal interaction - Denial	- Repeated interaction - Constant efforts
Format	Epic	Knowledge	Reflective	Ironic
Common themes	- Following procedure - Engagement through regulation - Transfer Anna to KEDDY	- Overcoming resource shortages - Diagnostic team meetings - Co-production of Anna's report	- Explanatory meetings with Anna's mother - Meetings to overcome the mother's refusal - Sending Anna's report to her school	- Disclosure of Anna's report - Meetings with government representatives - Production of documents - Transfer of student - Creation of unit

5.1.1. Referral

The *Referral* period introduces the start of the supporting process. In Anna's case it was initiated by her mother who found herself trying to convince the school (teacher and head teacher) that her daughter needed extra support. The school resisted initiating the supportive process for fear of unwelcome interventions from people outside the school (government representatives and KEDDY). After a long period and many delays, Anna's mother managed to get her daughter referred to KEDDY.

Scene: Overcoming resistance

For KEDDY, the collaborative process starts when a child faces educational difficulties and has to be referred to the centre. *“Out of all the children who come to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias, 90% comes through their teacher's mediation” (KEDDY Employee, 3:7)*. The usual procedure suggests that if a teacher suspects that a child has special needs, they send a report to their head teacher. If they both agree that the child has educational difficulties, following the protocol, they arrange a meeting with the parents to discuss their evaluation. *“Both the teacher and the head teacher should meet the parents. However, usually only one of them sees the parents as we believe that it isn't necessary to be both present. If the parents have further questions, of course they can call us to discuss them” (School Teacher, 12:27)*. Then, the protocol indicates that parents have to provide their agreement allowing the school to investigate the case further. *“Unfortunately, parents don't always allow the school to take action to support their children. In these cases, the school has to follow the official protocol and respect the parents' decision. Thus, it does nothing to help the child” (Head Teacher, 9:28)*.

However, sometimes, as for example with Anna's case, this process takes a different form. The mother realised that she had educational difficulties and spoke to Anna's teacher. Yet, *“the teacher refused to write the report for the head teacher and told me that Anna was lazy and wasn't trying hard” (Anna's Mother, 25:26)*. The mother could not question the teacher's knowledge and authority as the teacher was educated and she was not. However, she could not accept that her child was lazy and sought help outside the school. She then heard about KEDDY. *“Although parents should be informed about KEDDY's existence and role, I was not. I live in a village and there nobody ever came*

to inform us about KEDDY... I don't remember seeing any article or local announcement about KEDDY" (Anna's Mother, 5-7:26). The mother contacted KEDDY, but she was told by an employee that in order for Anna to be supported, the protocol required her school to provide a report referring Anna to KEDDY.

"The collaboration had to follow the official process, which I know it was time-consuming, but it was necessary to follow it in order to support Anna. More specifically, the school teacher had to examine Anna and then, if necessary, to ask the head teacher to request the intervention of the consultants of primary education. The consultants then could refer Anna to KEDDY" (KEDDY Employee, 23:11).

Agent: The school (teacher and head teacher), government representatives (education consultants) and Anna's mother

The regulations indicate that when a disabled child is identified "*the head teacher needs the teacher's report to call the school consultant for mainstream education" (Document, 2:33). The education consultant takes the teacher's report as guidance to observe the student. Then, if the case warrants it, the consultant requests the mediation of the special needs education school consultant.*

"The special consultant observes and interacts with the child. His aim is to evaluate the child's educational skills in comparison to the skills of other children of the same age. He then suggests interventions in order to improve the student's school performance" (Government Representative, 26:18). In fact, "the suggestions of the special needs education school consultant are very important at this stage. He is the most qualified to suggest how to support the child within the school context" (KEDDY Meeting, 4:4).

However, the partnership does not always follow this ideal process, as in Anna's case, where regulation was constantly contested. When Anna's mother asked the teacher to comply with the government regulations and write the report for KEDDY, the teacher refused to share her knowledge with KEDDY, claiming they were people she did not know. "*I didn't write the report because I know Anna better than KEDDY who had never met her... I was her teacher. Who were they? How could I trust them without*

knowing them?” (School Teacher, 9:38) Moreover, “the school considered KEDDY employees as ‘externals’ and didn’t release information to us...They believed that by hiding information they were helping the child” (KEDDY Manager, 26-27:1). The mother then called KEDDY to explain the situation. The protocol did not clarify whether it was part of the KEDDY employees’ responsibilities to go to the school. Due to time constraints, the manager decided to call the head teacher. He explained to him that the rules indicated that the teacher should provide the report. He thus managed to convince the head teacher to request that the teacher write the report.

“I couldn’t say no to my head teacher. He makes the decisions and I have to obey. At the end of the day, he is my boss and he has the authority.... I called KEDDY and asked them to give me more information about what they wanted me to do...No, I didn’t meet them directly. The KEDDY employees had no time for an appointment and since it was unclear whether it was part of their job responsibilities to meet in person with the teachers, I received the information I needed over the telephone” (School Teacher, 26-28-29:38).

Yet, the difficulties did not stop there. When the teacher provided the report indicating Anna’s learning difficulties, the head teacher *“refused to contact the primary education consultant. Why should I allow people outside the school to intervene? Why share information with them? Why should I trust someone I don’t know in person?” (Head Teacher, 9:39)* Once again KEDDY’s manager had to use the collaboration regulation to convince the head teacher to comply and collaborate with the school consultants (firstly with the mainstream education school consultant and then, after more resistance, with the special needs consultant) to observe Anna. *“I clarified to them [school consultants] that they should be very careful so as not to disturb the school processes. I think I made clear that this was my school and they needed my consent before doing anything” (Head Teacher, 15:39).*

Act: Sending Anna to KEDDY

The regulations of the collaboration indicate that the school teacher should follow the suggestions of the special needs education school consultant in order to support the

child within the classroom. Nonetheless, the support the teachers can offer is usually restricted as most of the time they do not have experience and training in the field of special educational needs. The special consultant *“evaluates the progress of the students for a short period that varies from one to several months based on the child’s disability and educational needs”* (Document, 22:12). The evaluation takes place with the teacher’s help. With informal conversations the teacher usually reports the student’s progress over the telephone. If the consultant decides that the suggested interventions are not sufficient to help the child improve their educational performance, *“he contacts the child’s parents and arranges a meeting. The aim of the meeting is to present them with his evaluation of the child. If the case warrants it, the consultant suggests the child’s referral to KEDDY”* (Partners' Meeting, 16:3).

“If the parents refuse KEDDY’s help, neither the school nor the school consultants have the authority to take further action and the collaborative process stops there. Nobody can force the parents to do something against their will” (Document, 2:14). School and consultants are forced by the collaborative regulations to comply with the parents’ decision. The child therefore remains at the mainstream school supported by the interventions of the special consultant which the teacher implements. However, if the parents agree to refer their child to KEDDY, the actual supportive process starts.

Yet, in some cases the collaboration partners do not follow the partnership protocol. Such an example is Anna’s case. Indeed, when the special needs education consultant observed Anna, he thought she was dyspraxic and made some suggestions for her support to the teacher. However, once again, the teacher was not willing to help Anna. *“I couldn’t take on the responsibility of helping Anna since I knew I didn’t have the relevant knowledge and training. It was not part of my job requirements to have experience working with disabled children. Also, it wasn’t part of my job responsibilities to spend extra time learning how to help Anna”* (School Teacher, 22:38). The teacher made it clear to the consultant that she could not support Anna.

As the regulations suggested, the consultant could not force the teacher to help Anna. *“Since valuable time had been lost, I ignored the official protocol... The official protocol recommends that the child should be first supported within the school following the consultant’s suggestions which the teacher implements. Then, if the*

consultant and the teacher cannot help the child, they refer them to KEDDY” (Government Representative, 11-14:43). Therefore, “without the teacher’s support, the consultant was forced to refer Anna directly to KEDDY” (KEDDY Meeting, 27:6). He met with the mother and, with her agreement, he requested KEDDY’s help.

5.1.2. Diagnosis

In the *Diagnosis* period the school had to wait for a long time before booking Anna an appointment with KEDDY. When Anna was finally examined by KEDDY’s team, the psychologist and teacher who examined her disagreed on the diagnosis of her problem. After the KEDDY manager’s intervention, Anna’s final diagnosis and educational plan were produced.

Scene: Getting into the system

The usual procedure suggests that once a consultant has referred a child to KEDDY, the school should make an appointment with KEDDY for the child’s examination. *“Appointments should be made by KEDDY teachers. Based on the child’s educational level, the pre-primary, primary or secondary school teacher will make the appointment and will examine the child later.” (Document, 14:33)* Yet, *“The law specifies that in every prefecture there is only one KEDDY centre to cover the needs of the local students” (Partners’ Meeting, 23:1).* The prefecture of Aitolokarnanias is the largest prefecture in Greece and KEDDY need to cover the needs of approximately 24000 children per school year. Delays are therefore likely even if *“KEDDY’s aim should be to examine a child within two weeks” (Partners’ Meeting, 11:5).*

In contrast with the cases where the partners follow the protocol, in Anna’s case the collaborative process took a different form. When the school contacted KEDDY to book an appointment for Anna, the KEDDY employees were attending a seminar and only a few employees were available. Although the teachers of pre-primary and secondary education were there, the official procedure stated that they could not book

appointments for other colleagues. *“We had to go through the formal procedure to make sure that we would not do anything wrong...In the past I booked an appointment for another colleague and she got angry with me because she had other plans on that day... I didn’t know what my role required exactly... I can’t say that I am 100% sure now, but at least I know that I shouldn’t book appointments for my colleagues” (KEDDY Employee, 13-15-18-19:22).*

According to the rules, the school had to contact KEDDY a number of times before making an appointment for Anna. Further delays emerged as it was the first school term. This is a very busy period for KEDDY because most of the cases appear at the start of the school year. *“Anna had to wait 4 weeks to get examined. Wasn’t it a long time? The whole process started in September and she was examined at the end of November. Why did she have to go through all this bureaucracy?...Why didn’t KEDDY have more employees since they knew this is usually a busy period?” (Anna’s Mother, 3-4:41).*

Agent: KEDDY’s experts (psychologist, teacher and social worker)

The regulation suggests that *“firstly, the psychologist examines the child and then the KEDDY teacher while the social worker speaks with the parents. This sequence is flexible but should be followed whenever possible” (Document, 24:12)* The psychologist uses the appropriate psycho-metrical tools that are available and approved by the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (YPEPTH). *“Using these tools and clinical observations the psychologist assesses the child and produces an individual report” (KEDDY Meeting, 5:1)* and *“at this stage, as the official regulation suggests, the psychologist has the authority to decide whether it is necessary for the child to see another specialist i.e. a child-psychiatrist, neuro-psychiatrist, etc.” (Government representative, 17:33).* Next, the teacher produces an individual report using educational tools approved by YPEPTH as well as considering observations during the assessment and the school teacher’s report. Finally, the social worker meets with the parents in order to evaluate the child’s home environment as well as parents’ attitudes towards the child. The social worker also produces an evaluation. *“If the social worker thinks that there is something wrong with the child’s home environment, he contacts*

other governmental services, such as the police, the association for abused children, etc.” (Government Representative, 31:33).

At the end of this process, the team has three individual reports. The standard procedure suggests that the team members meet to discuss their individual evaluations and agree on a common diagnosis and educational plan for the student. *“An informal rule suggests that the team members should meet as soon as possible after the child’s examination so as to keep the fresh sight of their observations and evaluations” (KEDDY Meeting, 5:8).*

Nevertheless, although this is how the inter-organisational collaboration should work ideally, in practice, as in Anna’s case, things can be different. Although Anna met with the psychologist and the teacher, her mother did not meet with the social worker as he was transferred to another KEDDY two days before Anna’s appointment. *“As the official protocol recommends, we could not produce a diagnosis without the social worker’s evaluation. We had to wait for the new social worker and the next available appointment was 15 days later” (KEDDY Employee, 15:24).* Anna’s mother felt considerable frustration over the constant delays and requested that the formal procedure be ignored. *“We couldn’t change the process. This is how it works... I did see her point. She didn’t know how the process works... It is one of these times where I have to be strict and make clear that I make the decisions. I decided to follow the formal procedures” (KEDDY Manager, 26-2:35).*

Following the protocol, two weeks later the social worker met with the mother. After two days the team gathered to produce Anna’s diagnosis. Since the social worker had no significant observations regarding Anna’s home environment, the teacher and psychologist had to make the final decision. However, they disagreed on the diagnosis. The psychologist held the view that Anna was both dyspraxic and dyslexic while the teacher suggested that Anna was only dyspraxic. Unexpectedly, the discussion that followed was not about Anna’s diagnosis. It was about who was right and more powerful: the teacher or the psychologist? *“The psychologists believe that because we haven’t studied psychology, we can’t produce a valid diagnosis. They want us to stay focused on the educational part of the report” (KEDDY Employee, 32:36).*

“We should have had a clearer separation of our responsibilities: the psychologists to do the diagnosis and the teachers to produce the educational plan. We shouldn’t be mixing those two... We speak a different language and we consider different criteria when we evaluate a child... And yes, I do think that psychologists’ evaluations are more valid than yours [teachers] because we have studied psychology for years...How do you feel when I insist on my opinion about a child’s educational support?” (KEDDY Meeting, 24-25-27-28:3)

After a lengthy discussion in which no consensus on a final diagnosis was reached, the psychologist and teacher decided to leave the diagnosis open and to discuss it in the next team meeting.

Action: Producing a diagnosis and an educational plan

KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias has established a weekly meeting in which all employees have to participate. During this meeting, the teams present their cases to their colleagues. The aim of the meetings is to *“discuss every team’s case, present points that have not been considered or have been misread, criticise or support opinions and finally produce an accurate diagnosis of the child” (Document, 3:7)*. During these meetings *“although the opinion of the members who examine a child is more important than the others, all the colleagues are encouraged to offer their perspective” (KEDDY Employee, 17:11)*. Following the protocol, at the end of the meeting, all the teams should agree on a final diagnosis and educational plan for their cases. *“As the regulations recommend, the final report is written by the teacher who examined the child. It is then signed by the other team members and the manager... The final reports are usually ready within one week” (KEDDY Employee, 16-19:20)*.

Anna’s case is however an example of these cases which in practice did not follow the normal procedures of the partnership. Namely, during the team meeting the disagreement between the psychologist and the teacher became clearer. *“Here we go again! You [psychologists] think that you are superior because you are psychologists... We [teachers] are the ones with the real experience regarding children’s attitudes and performance in the classroom. Have you ever been in a school to see how children act*

inside and outside their classroom? To understand how they perform? No, you haven't! You only know what is written in the books!" (KEDDY Meeting, 31-34:5). Moreover, "[teacher's name] got involved in the discussion in order to support [teacher's name]'s report... while [psychologist's name] stepped in to support the psychologist's opinion" (KEDDY Meeting, 35-38:6).

Finally, *"the manager had to step in. As they (psychologist and teacher) couldn't reach a decision, he suggested reevaluating the case by also considering the report of Anna's school teacher" (Document, 36:11).* Both the psychologist and teacher claimed that KEDDY employees had experience working with disabled children whilst the school teacher had not. *"I am a teacher too but I have done further studies about disabled children. We can't be treated as equal...The same applies for all KEDDY employees" (KEDDY Employee, 38-41:36).* Another KEDDY employee said that *"I know it sounds selfish, but it's true. We have attended seminars, we have qualifications. Especially when we are talking about issues of special needs education, I accept no other opinion. We know better than the school teachers!" (KEDDY Employee, 10:22).* Finally, the manager agreed with them and the school teacher's report was not considered at this stage. In the end, they all agreed that Anna was both dyslexic and dyspraxic. They therefore suggested that she should be supported in an integration class. Integration classes or units are inside the mainstream school and students attend them with the support of a specialist teacher, but only for a few hours a day. The rest of the day students attend the mainstream classroom with extra support from their teacher. Following the regulations, the KEDDY teacher should produce Anna's final report. As she was on holiday, the report was completed after two weeks and not in one as the protocol recommended.

5.1.3. Negotiation

Once the report was produced, a *Negotiation* period started in which the KEDDY team had to persuade a surprisingly resistant mother to sign the report. Otherwise, KEDDY could not take further action to support Anna. The mother questioned the validity of her daughter's diagnosis and educational plan. The main reason was her fear that Anna

would be stigmatised if she was going to attend a different classroom than that of her classmates. The mother's efforts to negotiate her daughter's report failed. She therefore found herself complying and signing the final report.

Scene: Understanding Anna's diagnosis and educational plan

"Upon producing the report, based on an informal agreement among KEDDY employees, teachers are responsible for meeting with the parents and present their child's report" (Document, 12:28). The aim of the meeting is to help them understand the diagnosis, how it affects the child's education, and what can be done to help the child overcome their educational difficulties. "The protocol is very strict. The content of the report should be presented to the parents in a straightforward and comprehensive way. Parents do not have the knowledge we have. Also, when you tell them something that they don't want to hear, it is even more difficult for them to understand it" (Partners' meeting, 4:2). As such, "employees should engage in informal discussions with the parents using friendly and informal language to help them understand their child's special needs" (KEDDY Employee, 9:13).

Even if some cases follow this protocol, other cases, as for example Anna's, can unfold in a different way. Indeed, the mother could not understand the diagnosis due to her low educational level and the formal/medical language the KEDDY teacher used. *"She [KEDDY teacher] started talking using medical terms that I couldn't understand. She told me something about dyslexia and dyspraxia. How should I know what these mean?... I panicked! I thought that Anna had something serious" (Anna's Mother, 9-11:26). The teacher was used to facing difficulties when presenting reports to parents. "It happens quite often. I try to use simple words but some terms should be still used to make clear that we have done a professional job; we have the necessary knowledge; we know better than them" (KEDDY Employee, 15:21).*

The KEDDY teacher explained that Anna should attend an integration class as well as to receive extra support from the teacher of her mainstream classroom. The teacher's need to use expert knowledge was also shown when she explained to the mother *"not to expect much from Anna's teacher. She didn't have any experience or training working*

with disabled children. So, she wouldn't probably offer much help... Most of the school teachers don't have the training KEDDY teachers have" (KEDDY Employee, 50-51:36).

Agent: KEDDY experts and Anna's mother

After the presentation of the report, the regulatory process states that parents should make two important decisions. Firstly, they need to decide whether they accept their child's report. Although parents' reactions to their child's report may vary, in most of the cases they accept the reports. *"Even if parents' initial reaction is negative, after discussing the report with the teacher and, if necessary, with the psychologist, they accept the diagnosis and educational plan... The protocol is strict. Neither the school nor KEDDY have any authority to support the child if the parents do not sign the report" (Partners' Meeting, 9-12:2).*

Secondly, it is necessary for parents to decide whether they will disclose the report to the child's school. *"It is completely up to the parents whether they will allow us to send the report to the school...I think the protocol should reconsider that... KEDDY should have the authority to discuss the reports with the schools even if parents disagree. This is for the children's benefit" (KEDDY Employee, 3-4-7:2).* On the other hand, *"If the parents sign the report, but they do not allow KEDDY to circulate it to the school, KEDDY can't take further action to help the child. The partnership depends on the parents' decision" (Head Teacher, 17:28).* If the parents sign the report and allow KEDDY to send it to the school, then the collaboration can further support the child.

Although this is the way the collaborative process should ideally work, in practice, it can evolve in a different way. In Anna's case, the mother questioned the value of the KEDDY teacher's diagnosis and asked for a re-evaluation of Anna's case. *"Although the KEDDY handbook does not clearly state that we can't re-evaluate cases, this has never happened so far" (KEDDY Employee, 8:23).* Moreover, the teacher did not take well the mother's request. *"I couldn't accept any accusations about KEDDY employees. We are all professionals. We've all got training and experience working with disabled children. We are not like the school teachers who are allowed to make mistakes since*

they don't have relevant knowledge...We (KEDDY employees) may have our disagreements but we are unified against others" (KEDDY Employee, 29-31:36).

The mother also asked the teacher to reconsider Anna's educational plan because she was concerned about Anna being stigmatised. She thought that if Anna was taught in a separate classroom, school employees, children and parents would start treating Anna differently. *"And different is never good. Different means subordinate!" (Anna's Mother, 18:26).* She was also afraid that the residents of their small village, uneducated people from an agricultural background, would look down on her daughter. On these grounds, the mother refused to sign Anna's report.

Once again, KEDDY employees claimed expert knowledge and that there was a lack of understanding on the part of the uneducated mother. *"She [the mother] was uneducated and couldn't understand Anna's learning difficulties and support plan. ...She wanted to help Anna but she was resisting because she didn't know. She was uneducated"* (KEDDY Employee, 17-19:8). As the official protocol suggested, KEDDY could take no further action to support Anna without her mother's consent. Therefore, the KEDDY teacher and psychologist engaged in meetings and conversations with Anna's mother. Their aim was to help the mother overcome her fear of stigma and understand Anna's need for extra educational support.

Act: Consequences of Anna's evaluation

The regulations are clear. If parents do not accept the report, it remains in KEDDY's files but cannot be disclosed to anyone. This means that the child remains in the mainstream classroom. *"If the school has referred the child to KEDDY, and thus suspects that the child has educational difficulties, the class teacher and the special needs education school consultant support the child. If the parents have referred the child to KEDDY, and therefore the school is not aware of the case, then the child remains in the mainstream classroom without any support"* (Head Teacher, 21:17).

If the parents agree with the disclosure of the report, following the regulatory process, the KEDDY team that examined the child meets and discusses the next steps for the child's educational support. *"The team makes decisions about the sequence of the*

interventions, the people they should contact and how they should contact them” (KEDDY Meeting, 11:2).

Nevertheless, there are some cases where the partners do not follow the regulations of the inter-organisational collaboration. Such an example is Anna’s case. Her mother did not agree with the KEDDY employees’ suggestions, as she was afraid of the consequences the disclosure of the report would have in Anna’s life. After insisting, the mother managed to meet directly with the KEDDY manager to discuss her daughter’s report. *“Our meeting lasted only 15 minutes. During our meeting his telephone was constantly ringing...I know that he wanted to help Anna but he was too busy to spend extra effort on her case...He made it clear I should listen to KEDDY employees’ opinion because they are the experts, and I should sign the report so as for them to be able to follow the regulations and help Anna” (Anna’s Mother, 41-44-49:41).* Again, the KEDDY manager had to refer to the collaboration regulations to convince the mother that there was no point in negotiating Anna’s report. *“It was obvious that they knew and I didn’t... They have studied these issues...I had no other option than to trust them” (Anna’s Mother, 56-57-58:41).* She therefore signed the report.

Although part of KEDDY’s formal responsibilities is to provide parental support, Anna’s mother did not get the help she needed. She struggled to book an appointment with the manager, and most of the discussions took place over the telephone. Finally, her low educational level, in contrast with the formal language that KEDDY employees were using, did not help her feel part of the ‘team’. *“I am dissatisfied with the process. There were too many delays, too much bureaucracy and little personal contact. There were also times where KEDDY employees made me feel stupid because I wasn’t educated and couldn’t understand them” (Anna’s mother, 15:41).*

5.1.4. Intervention

In the *Intervention* period, the partners had to make a joint effort in order to implement KEDDY’s suggestions and support Anna. However, KEDDY employees strove to persuade the head teacher to disclose the report to Anna’s teacher. Moreover, the

government initially rejected KEDDY's request regarding the establishment of an integration unit for Anna. When the integration class was finally created, Anna had been transferred to another school.

Scene: Disclosing Anna's report.

The collaboration protocol recommends that, when the parents agree with the disclosure of their child's diagnosis and educational plan, KEDDY sends the report to the head teacher of the child's school. Following the procedures, the head teacher is responsible for discussing the report with the student's teachers. *"The official regulations specify that the information included in the report is strictly confidential and should only be used for educational purposes and within the school context"* (School Teacher, 9:31).

If KEDDY does not receive a response from the school within two weeks, it assumes that the report has not reached the intended recipients. As the informal protocol implies, the KEDDY teacher who produced the student's report calls the head teacher. If they do not have a valid explanation for not disclosing the report and refuse to do so, first the KEDDY teacher and then the manager call the head teacher and press for the distribution. The regulations do not clearly state the extent to which KEDDY should exert pressure or whether it has authority to force the distribution of the report. However, the informal protocol recommends that when a head teacher does not distribute a report, the KEDDY teacher can directly contact the child's teacher(s) over the telephone and then post them the report.

Although some cases take into account the collaboration protocol, other cases fail to do so in practice. For example, in Anna's case, the KEDDY teacher sent the report to her school and called the head teacher explaining that he was under obligation to disclose the report to Anna's teacher(s). However, the head teacher overrode the official protocol and did not disclose the report. *"I wasn't sure what I had to do with the report. If I had discussed it with Anna's teacher, I knew she would have got stressed and probably would have asked for KEDDY's help. I didn't want that. I didn't want them to intervene at my school. I didn't trust them"* (Head Teacher, 23:39). Therefore, *"many head teachers don't disclose the report because they are afraid that it will cause changes and interventions at 'their' school"* (KEDDY Employee, 11:7).

One week later, the head teacher had not disclosed the report and Anna's mother called KEDDY asking for the employees' intervention. The KEDDY teacher called the head teacher. *"I remembered that he asked me in an indirect way whether he was forced by the protocol to discuss the report... I said to him that he should forget the regulations and pay attention to the child's support...Yes, I didn't know the answer. I guess head teachers are forced by the official protocol to discuss the reports but I am not sure"* (KEDDY Employee, 11-13-15:36). One week later, Anna's teacher had still not been informed about the report. Anna's mother went back to KEDDY and managed to speak in person with the manager who agreed to call the head teacher. The collaborative process was unclear at this stage since the manager was not sure whether he had the authority to force the head teacher to disclose the report. However, he managed to persuade him to do so. *"I pretended that I knew the official protocol and I convinced him it was his responsibility to disclose the report...Yes it was his responsibility, but neither he nor I knew whether he had the flexibility to do otherwise. I therefore took advantage of his lack of knowledge regarding the collaborative process and I achieved my goal. I convinced him to disclose the report"* (KEDDY Manager, 43-44:35).

Agent: Government representatives, school teacher and KEDDY experts

KEDDY's role is limited to making suggestions regarding students' educational plans and support. It does not have the resources and authority to establish school units and order equipment. In contrast, as the official protocol of the partnership clarifies, the realisation of KEDDY's suggestions depends on the decision of the government and, more specifically, on the Central Departmental Council of Primary (CDCPE) or Secondary Education (CDCSE). *"The official regulations of the partnership propose that we make suggestions about the educational support of a child and then the government provides the necessary support"* (Partners' Meeting, 9:3).

When the school teachers receive a report, they usually become stressed since the majority of them does not have experience and training to work with disabled students. As such, the regulatory process suggests that *"teachers should contact KEDDY if they have any questions regarding the reports and especially regarding KEDDY's*

interventions (such as the teaching approach, tasks the child should complete, technical support, etc.)” (Document, 5:18). Although it is not suggested by the official protocol, due to time constraints, KEDDY employees choose to support the teachers over the telephone and send them some further material to read.

As has happened with other children that have requested the partnership help, for Anna the collaboration process was different. Absence of an integration unit at her school forced KEDDY to write an official letter to Aitoloakarnanias CDCPE requesting the establishment of one. ACDCPE responded by letter that *“We do not have the resources to establish a new integration unit. We suggest Anna’s transfer to the 2nd Primary school where there is an integration unit in operation” (Document, 3:15). Since the mother objected to Anna’s transfer, the manager wrote again to ACDCPE. However, the answer remained negative.*

Following discussion, Anna’s mother and the KEDDY team decided that Anna should remain in her current school with her teacher’s support and wait until the government decided to establish the integration unit. However, the school teacher once again refused to support Anna. *“It was too much to ask from me. I couldn’t accept such a responsibility...Maybe KEDDY could never convince the government, or whoever they have to convince, to create the unit. It wasn’t my job to know how to help Anna...I had to attend seminars, organise extra tasks, read books, etc... No I didn’t want this responsibility. It was my right to refuse since I wouldn’t have the support of the specialist teacher from the integration unit” (School Teacher, 35-39-41-45:38).*

As there was no other option, the manager decided to meet directly with the ACDCPE director, with whom he had had several disagreements in the past, in order to discuss the establishment of the unit. *“He is stuck to the old way in which things were done. He thinks that he has authority to decide about a child’s life. He just wants KEDDY to agree with him... He makes it too personal, like it is a fight between KEDDY and the Central Departmental Council of Primary Education. Who is going to retreat?... He doesn’t understand that we fight together!” (KEDDY Manager, 33-35-36:1). The manager knew that “it is us against the Government. They have the power, they make the decisions and therefore they always win” (KEDDY Manager, 47:35) and hence he convinced the mother to transfer Anna to another school.*

Act: Transferring Anna to a new school and establishing an integration unit that was not used afterwards

The Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (YPEPTH) suggests that *“KEDDY’s aim is for children to remain and be taught in mainstream classrooms whenever possible...When an integration unit is not available, the formal process should be followed for its establishment so as to enable the student to remain at the mainstream school”* (Document, 8-12:27). The regulation suggests that government and school representatives should work quickly and efficiently to meet the needs of disabled students. *“The children’s age and their educational level determine whether they will be able to improve their educational performance as well as whether they will overcome their disability”* (Partners' Meeting, 8:4). In fact, *“the sooner they (children) receive the support they need, the more chances they have to overcome their difficulties”* (Head Teacher, 12:30).

The protocol recommends that if the establishment of a new unit (i.e. integration unit, special school or special classroom) or the purchase of educational equipment is approved, depending on the educational level, ACDCPE or ACDCSE is responsible for dealing with the implementation of the request. According to the rules, *“the school for which the resources have been allocated, should collaborate with the local KEDDY and government representatives for the actual establishment of a unit and/or use of the resources available”* (Government Representative, 20:33). In reality, the local government representatives make the decisions and supervise their execution whilst KEDDY and schools are constrained in the realisation of these decisions.

Although this formal pattern is followed in some cases, in other cases, such as Anna’s, it is not. Indeed, Anna was finally transferred to another school where she received support from the teacher of the mainstream classroom. Despite the fact that the teacher did not have any previous experience or knowledge to work with disabled students, she was happy to help Anna. *“I agreed to help Anna because KEDDY promised me its support... However, KEDDY employees were always very busy so couldn’t always help me. I managed to meet only once with a teacher and the rest of the times we only had*

telephone conversations...I didn't have a choice. They were the experts, they made the decisions and I had to wait until they were available to help me" (School Teacher, 5-7-11:40).

In parallel, the KEDDY manager continued his efforts for the establishment of the integration unit so as enable Anna to go back to her old school. He therefore wrote another letter which he sent directly to YPEPTH while he also forwarded it to ACDCPE. After two months, YPEPTH sent a letter to KEDDY announcing the establishment of the integration unit in Anna's old school but on one condition: "*due to the limited budget, the school had to convert one of the existing classrooms into an integration unit" (Document, 4:9).*

Once again the head teacher refused to collaborate. He sent a letter to ACDCPE explaining that all the classrooms were occupied and therefore there was no classroom available to be converted into an integration unit. ACDCPE transferred the request to YPEPTH, which had the authority to respond to the school request. YPEPTH asked the head teacher to convert one of the teacher's offices into an integration unit. It also indicated that this decision had an immediate effect and was not negotiable.

"This is what happens when externals intervene in your space. This was our school and we should have been able to decide about our space...It was KEDDY's fault. Anna had been transferred to another school, why did they keep pushing for the establishment of the integration unit?... And the government's fault! If they don't have money to build a new classroom, why did they approve the establishment?" (Head Teacher, 48-50-53:39).

The head teacher was forced to follow the government decision and the integration unit was established. Although some initial funding was approved for the conversion of the classroom, the school was still awaiting funding to buy educational equipment. Since the head teacher did not support the operation of an integration unit, the KEDDY manager contacted ACDCPE, which was responsible for the operation of the unit. Once again bureaucratic procedures of the collaboration delayed the supportive process. "*I called the ACDCPE director who told me that it wasn't his responsibility and we had to wait for YPEPTH to send the money. However, he agreed to call YPEPTH and ask*

about the funding... YPEPTH suggested he write a formal letter expressing his request. And so he did”(KEDDY Manager, 27-28:6).

Three weeks after making the request the ACDCPE director contacted the KEDDY manager to inform him that the money for the purchase of the equipment had arrived. At the end of the collaborative process, the integration unit was ready for operation one month before the end of the school year. However, it was very late for a new teacher to be hired and for Anna to change school again. Anna therefore completed the fourth grade in her new school with the support of the mainstream and the specialist teacher.

At the end of the school year Anna’s performance showed a small improvement, but she was unable to read and write at the expected level of the children of her age. Anna’s mother decided to leave Anna at her new school where she would repeat the class. In fact, the integration unit at Anna’s old school did not operate afterwards as there was no child to support.

“I guess Anna’s example doesn’t indicate that we are a successful partnership... Following the regulations we lost valuable time in supporting her...Now that I look back at Anna’s case and some other cases we treated, I can say that there are many lessons to be learned; processes that we should follow or ignore, things that we should do differently next time in order to be more effective...I think we all (partners) share the responsibility” (KEDDY Manager, 19-22-24-25:35).

“Anna’s case, similarly to other cases that came to the KEDDY partnership for support, helped me and the partners to learn when we should follow the official protocol and when we should ignore it in order to better support a child...No, I think that we didn’t manage to offer to Anna the full support she needed...Whose fault was it? I couldn’t blame specific people. All the partners were involved in the process and we should share the responsibility” (Government Representative, 38-45:43).

5.2. Discussion

To maintain the narrative flow and allow the ‘hearing’ of the partners’ voice, the whole story has been first presented. In this section, each part of the narrative is discussed separately in terms of the specific practices, spaces, boundaries and identities generated and shared by the partners of the collaborative process (see table 12).

Table 12: Boundary spaces, emergent narratives of belonging and ongoing transformations of the partnership during Anna's engagement in the partnership.

Time Periods	Referral	Diagnosis	Negotiation	Intervention
<i>Physical Space</i>	1st Primary School Ait/nanias	KEDDY Ait/nanias	KEDDY Ait/nanias	Ait/nanias Central Departmental Council of Primary Education (ACDCPE)
<i>Emergent Psychosocial Space and Actions</i>	Institutional Space (mainly regulatory) - Developing and implementing regulations - Fear of intervention - Activation of boundaries	Expert Knowledge Space (both regulatory and exploratory) - Claims of expertise - Disagreements and discussions - Power games	Supportive Space (mainly exploratory) - Stigma - Stereotypes - Insecurity and fears - Expertise exercise	Power Space (both regulatory and exploratory) - Power struggles - Power exercise - Self-reflection on usefulness of partnership
<i>Ways of Collaborating</i>	Enforcing the collaboration rules	Joining efforts	Developing tactics	Coordinating partners and activities
<i>Psychosocial Boundaries Identifying Social Groups</i>	Regulators and users	Experts versus lay people	KEDDY educators and stakeholders	Resource allocators versus collaboration partners
<i>Emergent Identity Conflict</i>	School members vs. External stakeholders	KEDDY experts vs. External experts	KEDDY experts vs. External stakeholders	The partnership vs. The government

5.2.1. Referral

In the Referral period, the interactions and practices displayed by Anna's mother and the school generate a psychosocial space in which regulatory frameworks are used to engage with the other participants through resistance and compliance cycles. The teacher uses regulation to persuade the mother that her child does not have learning difficulties, whilst the head teacher applies the rules in order to protect the teacher who refuses to write the report. Finally, KEDDY uses the official protocol to activate the supporting process as well as to persuade the head teacher to allow government representatives to enter the school. Within this *institutional space*, psychosocial boundaries between the school and the 'others' (KEDDY, government representatives and the mother) are activated in order to overcome the fear of intervention and reinforce the psychosocial space (Hernes, 2004a). The emergent boundaries between the regulators and users create separate possible identities (Haslam et al., 2011). On the one hand, there are the 'school members' (teacher and head teacher) who struggle to maintain authority over their space by refusing to share their knowledge with unknown people. On the other hand, there are 'external stakeholders', namely government representatives (school consultants) and KEDDY, who try to enter in the school and suggest interventions for Anna's support. The school through the teacher and the imposition of an *institutional space* for interaction becomes therefore a key player in allowing the achievement of KEDDY's aim.

In this period, regulation is expressed through the use of the official protocol which recommends that the school identifies a child with learning difficulties and then requests the school consultants' intervention and support. These *spaces of regulation* provide the inter-organisational collaboration with stability as they force the teacher and head teacher to retreat and collaborate with the school consultants (Lefebvre, 1991). At the same time *learning spaces* emerge, providing opportunities for change, exploration and renewal. Through Anna's case, the school learns that a parent can also detect a problem. The psychosocial boundaries hence change and the mother enters the collaborative process as a stakeholder in the collaboration with a different role (Langley and Tsoukas, 2010). Namely, from a parent who only gives her consent for the support of her child, she now becomes a key player in activating the process of Anna's support. In parallel, school consultants find out that sometimes partners have to override

regulations in order to be more effective. The special needs education consultant therefore shifts the boundaries and, instead of suggesting interventions for Anna's support in the school, he refers her directly to KEDDY.

At the end of the Referral period the partners realise that there are *moments of regulation* and *moments of learning*. The official protocol is in place to guide and structure the process of referring a student to KEDDY. Yet, the protocol is also adjustable to the emergent needs of the inter-organisational collaboration in order to assist the partners to overcome delays and initiate the supportive process.

5.2.2. Diagnosis

In the Diagnosis period relationships are mediated by claims of expert knowledge from KEDDY employees who engage in conversations with the manager of KEDDY in order to produce Anna's diagnosis. Partners also try to understand the nature of the different roles in the inter-organisational collaboration. In order to clarify roles and enforce opinions, they draw psychosocial boundaries based on their identification with their fields of expertise (Hernes, 2008). In the emergent *expert knowledge space*, partners identify themselves as 'KEDDY experts' and 'external experts'. KEDDY experts are the partners who have training and knowledge in the field of special needs education. In contrast, external experts are the partners who have knowledge in different fields, i.e. mainstream education. Discussions, disagreements and power games characterise this space where partners try to establish authority and enforce their decisions based on their expert knowledge (Lefebvre, 1991). The diagnosis is used by KEDDY employees as a tool to claim knowledge ownership. Moreover, the production of the final report mediates both collaborative practices and the co-construction of the psychosocial space.

In this period, new *spaces of regulation* and *spaces of learning* emerge to help KEDDY employees establish power and expertise in relation to their partners. Following the regulations, KEDDY employees are the key players in the production of Anna's diagnosis and educational plan. First the psychologist, then the teacher and finally the social worker examine Anna and produce their individual reports. Yet, since the team

cannot decide on a common diagnosis for Anna, the partners learn that they should ignore the protocol and make the final decision about the diagnosis in a weekly team meeting. Hence, by overriding the *space of regulation*, partners discuss and agree on a common diagnosis without taking into consideration the external expert's (teacher) report as indicated by the regulations. In this *learning space*, the KEDDY employees shift the collaborative boundaries and are unified against external experts in order to re-establish their relationships and fulfil their role (Hogg et al., 2012).

Therefore, in the *expert knowledge space* of the Diagnosis period *moments of exploration and regulation* coexist allowing partners to negotiate boundaries, overcome disagreements and organise their activities. *Spaces of regulation* indicate to the partners who they should collaborate with in order to produce a diagnosis and educational plan. *Learning spaces* allow partners to overcome their difficulties and agree on a final report.

5.2.3. Negotiation

During the Negotiation period parents should give their final approval for the implementation of the educational plan. The psychosocial space of this period is framed by the mother's resistance to signing the report due to fear of the stigma, stereotypes and insecurities which a student with special needs may face. In fact, the mother through the imposition of a *supportive space* for interaction, shifts her role in the collaboration and becomes a key player in allowing KEDDY support (Hernes and Maitlis, 2010). In response to the mother's actions the KEDDY experts have to rethink their role and re-establish their responsibilities. They also have to use their expertise in order to redraw the psychosocial boundaries, establish authority, exercise power and finally achieve their aim. In the emergent *supportive space*, the KEDDY team has to support not only Anna but also her mother in dealing with her anxieties. As such, the boundaries of the collaboration space extend to incorporate both the parent and the child. The psychosocial space of the collaboration shifts once again, separating KEDDY employees from the stakeholders (Tsasis, 2009). Indeed, identification between 'KEDDY experts' who are educated and 'external stakeholders' who are to be taught is intense during this period. On the other hand, expert knowledge claims are used to

demarcate territory (between the KEDDY teachers and the school teacher) as well as to exert power.

In the Negotiation period the official protocol suggests that the teacher should present the report to the mother using informal language. Yet, the KEDDY teacher uses formal and medical terms. Since Anna's mother was uneducated, she finds it hard to understand the report. She therefore organises her actions in the given psychosocial space by resisting signing the report and drawing psychosocial boundaries between educated KEDDY experts and uneducated external stakeholders (Paulsen and Hernes, 2003). The partners, however, learn that depending on the parents' educational level they need to adapt their actions and establish different relationships with them. At the same time, the KEDDY employees override the existing *space of regulation* and adapt their role to the needs of the case. As such, they support not only Anna, as the protocol suggests, but also the mother. The partners also discover that sometimes they have to ignore the official rules and use their power and their expertise in order to meet their goals (Prins, 2010).

During the *supportive space* of the Negotiation period *learning spaces and spaces regulation* emerge and interact. *Moments of regulation* allow partners to defend their expertise and create some continuity across the cases they deal with. On the other hand, by using *moments of exploration* the partners can adapt to the current situation and improve their collaborative effort in order to persuade the mother to sign the report.

5.2.4. Intervention

In the Intervention period, through the imposition of a *power space* for action and interaction, government representatives become key players in facilitating the collaborative process. Power games displayed by the government representatives produce a psychosocial space where the partners collaborate through compliance with the rules and relationships mediated by power imbalances (Terry, 2001). Firstly, the director of ACDCPE exerts power to force KEDDY and the mother to transfer Anna to another school. He also uses his authority to persuade the school to establish the

integration unit. Within this *power space* psychosocial boundaries between government representatives and the ‘others’ (KEDDY, the school and the mother) are activated in order to reinforce the psychosocial space and engage partners in the collaboration. The emergent boundaries between the power holders and receivers create separate possible identities (Haslam et al., 2011). On the one hand, there is ‘the government’ who has the authority, makes the decisions and exerts power. On the other hand, there is ‘the partnership’ that can only obey and implement the government’s decisions. The partners engage in conversations with the government representatives to understand the different roles in the collaboration. Moreover, through the process of the establishment of the integration unit, new collaborative practices are expressed in the emergent *power space* (Lefebvre, 1991).

During the Intervention period there are *moments of regulation* and *moments of learning and change*. The regulation suggests that the head teacher is responsible for disclosing Anna’s report and then ensuring that the child is supported within the school context. Yet, at the same time partners find out that a head teacher may refuse to fulfill his role due to fear of intervention and change. The partners are therefore forced to shift the psychosocial boundaries and ‘are taught’ that KEDDY employees have to adjust their role and their practices for the disclosure of the report. The generated *spaces of regulation* also imply that the government needs to provide the appropriate educational unit, tools and equipment for the support of the child. However, once again, during the collaborative process new psychosocial boundaries are drawn and new *spaces of learning* emerge. These teach the partners that they need to act in a different way in the given psychosocial space and therefore invest time and effort in order to convince the government to fulfill its role (Olson et al., 2012). As such, the KEDDY employees coordinate their efforts in order to overcome the resistance of the system and establish the integration unit.

In the Intervention period *moments of regulation* and *moments of exploration and learning* assist the partners in achieving their aims. On the one hand, *spaces of regulation* allow partners to press the government and the school to fulfill their roles: the school to disclose the student’s report and the government to secure funding for the new unit. On the other hand, *spaces of learning* indicate how the partners can overcome the government resistance and establish the integration unit.

5.2.5. Partners' ways of collaborating

Anna's story demonstrates that in the emergent psychosocial spaces the partners selected, developed and expressed different *ways of collaborating* that responded to the new established boundaries and identities. In this way, they acknowledged the needs of the specific case they treated and achieved their aims. Specifically, in the Referral period the partners engaged in an institutional space where, through the *enforcement of the collaboration rules*, they referred Anna to KEDDY. In the expert knowledge space of the Diagnosis period, the partners *joined their forces* to overcome resource shortages and organise team meetings in order to produce Anna's report. In the Negotiation period, the partners *develop tactics* in a supportive space in order to circulate Anna's report. They therefore met with Anna's mother to present the report and overcome her resistance. Finally, in the power space of the Intervention period, the partners *coordinated their activities* to disclose Anna's report and create a new integration unit for her support.

5.3. Summary

This chapter has presented the first part of the empirical findings. The data analysed from a thematic approach was presented in a narrative structure which enabled the recreation of the collaborative process with Anna as the focal actor of the collective story. Anna's story was narrated in four parts: Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention. Through her story, it was possible to explore both how the inter-organisational collaboration should operate ideally and how it operated in practice as the partners adapted to the needs of Anna's case. In this way, an understanding of the emergence of the collaboration space was achieved. In fact, it was demonstrated that the collaboration space consists of both spaces of regulation and spaces of learning which helped the partners to engage in the dynamic nature of the collaborative process and fulfil their goals. In fact, as the collaboration partners engaged in everyday actions, interactions and experiences, they did not follow a linear collaborative process. Rather,

sometimes they followed the protocol and sometimes ignore it in order to deal with their case. Moreover, this chapter has illustrated how in order to engage in everyday practices, the collaboration members not only applied particular rules and processes but also generated and shared different ways of collaborating in order to respond successfully to the needs of a specific case.

However, Anna's story did not enable only the understanding of the emergence of inter-organisational collaboration. This story also provided an initial exploration of the impact of the emergent collaboration space on the construction of the partners' identity. This will be further explored in the next chapter. Chapter 6 will present the voices of individual collaboration partners and will explore how these partners experienced and understood the inter-organisational collaboration. By analysing personal narratives from a performative approach, both the perception of identity as stable and fixed and of collaboration as linear and ordered will be questioned. In fact, by presenting the stories of Maria, George, Rob and Christine the dynamic nature of inter-organisational collaboration and identity construction will be indicated. These stories will also illustrate that the partners of the collaboration constantly engage in loops of identification in order to construct identities that fit a given space and will help them set new psychosocial boundaries and organise their actions.

6. (Re)Constructing identities in the collaboration space

6.0. Introduction

Chapter 5 presented Anna's story which revealed that in order for the partners to achieve the aims of the inter-organisational collaboration they had to operate between the protocol in spaces of regulation and emergent practices in spaces of learning. However, the enacted ways of collaborating that the previous chapter revealed also indicated that within the shifting spaces different identities emerged. These identities helped the partners make sense of their space and organise their actions. As presented in chapter 2, the way partners produce and reproduce their identity within the collaboration space is important for the achievement of the collaboration's aims. This is because collaborative identification provides the basis for collaborative action and attitudes. In fact, the more partners identify with the collaboration, the more likely it is for them to adopt the collaboration's standpoint and act in the collaboration's best interest. It therefore appears important to explore the process of identity formation.

The aim of this chapter is to focus on the participants' personal narratives in order to understand both the way they experience the collaboration space they inhabit and the relationship of the emergent identities in the collaboration space and the collaboration itself. The participants' identities emerge from the stories they told as protagonists taking part in and shaping the collective process. These stories present how partners demarcate the psychosocial boundaries and dynamically switch between identities in order to act appropriately in different spaces.

As pointed out in the second chapter, the identification process does not take place in an abstract space but in relation to a specific psychosocial space where experiences, interactions and actions construct and describe ongoing identifications. In a specific space, the way others support or not these identification processes is important for the construction of the partners' identity. In particular, the stories in this chapter indicate how, before the participants act in a given space, they identify themselves and others. They do so through the production and reproduction of psychosocial boundaries that draw distinctions between those who are collaboration partners and those who are not, between what are appropriate practices in a given space and what are not. The emergent

identities guide the narrators' actions, interactions and experiences, and vice versa. Identity formation therefore appears as an interactive process which incorporates different actors with different skills, experiences and backgrounds.

The first section of this chapter will present the way in which the personal interviews were organised into narratives. The next four sections will introduce Maria, George, Christine and Rob's personal narratives of contradiction, compromise, manipulation and persuasion. These narratives will illustrate how the storytellers activated psychosocial boundaries in emergent spaces in order to identify themselves and organise their actions. The last section of this chapter will discuss the narratives presented based on the framework developed in the second chapter.

6.1. Performing personal narratives

Chapter 3 presented how the analysis was carried out in order to construct the narratives that explore the ways collaboration partners form their identities. In particular, the performative approach to narrative analysis was adopted (Riessman 2008). The selected interviews were analysed in terms of stanzas (series of lines on a single topic), scenes (grouped stanzas that refer to the same topic) and parts (larger units that build the story as a whole). Then main images (frames that provide the narratives tone), turning points (moments that fundamentally shift the course of the narratives) and narrative spaces (contexts where the narratives unfold) were identified to organise participants' self-understanding and sense of belonging to the inter-organisational collaboration (see section 3.3.2.4. for the analysis of personal interviews). The table below provides the key aspects for each narrative presented in this chapter.

Table 13: Narrators' expressed images, lived spaces, boundaries and turning points in constructing identities and organising identity narratives.

Story teller	Main driving theme of personal narrative	Narrative space	Turning point in the narrative	Self-identification	Boundary work	Emerging narrative of identity
Maria KEDDY centre member	"The power of collaboration is in working together"	Competitive	Disagreement with teacher about diagnosis	Refusal (new comer, learner, colleague, expert, psychologist)	Accepting competition within the partnership	Contradiction : Conflict is part of the collaborative process
George Parent of disabled child	"I will do everything for my son"	Defensive	Social worker's diagnosis	Resistance (frustrated father, supportive father, member of the collaboration)	Learning to work with others to support children	Compromise : Compromise is necessary to collaborate
Christine Primary school teacher	"If there is no trust, there are no results"	Exploitable	Discussion with colleagues about integration unit	Naivety (naive and inexperienced teacher, uneducated partners)	Tension between developing trust and achieving the rules	Manipulation : Ambiguity and complexity characterise the collaboration
Rob Government Representative	"Every rule in the collaboration protocol needs its exceptions"	Contrasted	Special consultant's delays in evaluating a student	Ambiguity (father, colleague, government representative, rebel against the system)	Between following the protocol and breaking it	Persuasion : What matters are the children not the rules

The use of a performative framework enables the exploration of how the partners form their identities. By arranging the events of the story "in temporal order and relating them to other events, a unified context is constructed and coherence is established" (Hydén, 1997: 56). The performance is enacted in the parts of the story that indicate the ways narrators identify themselves and others when they present specific cases, situations and actors in their personal stories. As indicated in chapter 3, the way this research follows the performative approach is different from Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical approach which suggests that participants stage identities. In contrast,

here the performative element indicates the dynamic process of identity construction which takes place in relation to an audience (see subsection 3.2.2.3. for a detailed explanation). While inhabiting a particular space, partners switched between identities in their accounts of shared practice and individual experience while they tried to construct a particular self in the presence of an audience (partners, clients, the researcher etc.). In this way, it was possible to examine how identities were (re)constructed in the presence of an audience and in relation to the dynamic context of the inter-organisational collaboration.

The next section presents the four emergent identity narratives (see subsection 3.3.2.2. for the selection of the four personal interviews). Maria engages in a narrative of contradiction where she refuses accepting that the KEDDY employees are separated into groups based on their field of expertise. On the other hand, although George initially resists accepting his child's disability and the social worker's diagnosis, he decides to compromise. Christine's naivety does not allow her to understand that her colleagues and the KEDDY employees manipulate her decisions and actions. Finally, Rob tries to persuade the audience that he is not between two identities; that of the government and the rebel against the system. The participants describe themselves based on different situations they experienced personally as: psychologists and helpful colleagues; victims and collaborative teachers; government representatives and rebels against the system; frustrated and supportive fathers.

6.2. Engaging in loops of identification in the psychosocial space of the collaboration

6.2.1. Narrative of contradiction

Maria has been working as a psychologist in KEDDY for two years. The main image of her narrative presents her view that only if the partners collaborate will the partnership achieve its aims. Maria expresses this view throughout the whole interview. She does not initially admit that some of KEDDY's employees are divided into teachers and

psychologists because this contradicts the ideal view of the collaboration she has constructed. However, her disagreement with KEDDY teachers over a child's diagnosis offers the turning point in the narrative. This disagreement shifts the boundaries that fitted all of her colleagues, and Maria identifies herself as a psychologist.

Maria's narrative is divided into four parts. By presenting Maria's first days in KEDDY, the first part introduces the physical space and the main characters in the story. The next part describes the case of a child who went to KEDDY for support. The third part presents the main tension in the narrative; the disagreement between KEDDY's teachers and Maria regarding a child's diagnosis. In the final part of the story, disappointed about the lack of collaboration between colleagues, Maria turns to the psychologists' group for support.

Maria (KEDDY employee): The ideal and its contradictions

Maria carefully introduces the researcher into her story which is a complex performance presented in four parts. The narrative was prompted by the researcher's question "Do you enjoy working for the collaboration?" which aimed at positioning Maria in the collaboration's life. Maria refers to her arrival in KEDDY and how her colleagues welcomed her as a new member in their team. She provides narrative detail and therefore the audience should not infer a great deal.

In the following segment Maria introduces the main challenge she experiences as a member of the collaboration, namely, the lack of collaboration between the KEDDY members. This challenge is also the main image of her narrative. Maria also introduces herself as a *newcomer* to the collaboration who is excited about her new job.

Working for KEDDY's collaboration creates mixed feelings. Do I enjoy it? I am not sure. Sometimes yes, sometimes no. To be honest, when I arrived in KEDDY two years ago, I was very excited. It was a new challenge for me. I was aware, in broad lines, of KEDDY's role and aim. That is the reason I applied for this position. I found fascinating the fact that the partners have to overcome so many difficulties in order to support disabled children. You know this is a closed society with many stereotypes. [She

talks about the negative image the society has about disabled children]. I can still remember the excitement of my first day at work. I was naive back then. I thought that the power of collaboration was in acting as one unit to achieve our aims. I couldn't see any other way to make it work. However, I didn't know much about the collaboration, I had to learn how it works.

In this *welcoming space* Maria frames herself as a *newcomer* willing to collaborate. She then enters the first part of her narrative and presents her first days at work. In this way she introduces the physical space of the narrative, KEDDY, and the main characters. Maria constructs the first scene of her story with only one character besides herself. This scene refers to her arrival in KEDDY and more particularly to her meeting with the manager. It is clear that Maria likes her manager although it seems that some of the KEDDY employees do not share her feelings.

I met the manager while I was waiting outside KEDDY. It was the first day you see, and I had arrived quite early. He invited me into his office and offered me a coffee. (Manager's name) is a really nice person, everyone likes him. Well, not everyone exactly but everyone should like him. Anyway, he told me about KEDDY [Maria presents the general information that she exchanged with the manager about KEDDY]. From what I understood, employees were expected to work in teams for the production of diagnoses and educational plans. He told me that KEDDY's employees are like a family and I could always ask for their advice. Yet, he made it clear to me that he should be informed about everything and that all reports should be signed by him.

In the second and third scenes of the first part, Maria presents many characters in an effort to introduce the researcher to Kate, the other main actor of her narrative, with whom she had to collaborate later for the production of a diagnosis.

In the second scene Maria explains her first meeting with her colleagues, her anxiety and her positive first impression. By positioning the KEDDY employees as social and helpful, she expands the boundaries to include all her colleagues as well as constructing her identity as a *friendly employee*. At the end of the segment she very briefly presents for the first time the main narrative context.

Then he introduced me to the rest of the team. He asked everyone to come to his office, which is also our conference room. Everyone was nice. I guess they were truly nice, they didn't pretend then. -- Oh, actually apart from (employee's name) who wasn't very sociable, everyone else was. But that's his style, not that he doesn't like me. I was very nervous and I think they could see that. It is a bit stressful to meet fourteen people in one day! But when I saw how nice they were to me, I relaxed and became friendly. (secretary's name) gave me a tour of KEDDY and he also showed me my office. (physiologists' and social workers' names) explained to me the main rules of the collaboration and their role in KEDDY. They also offered me their help. Kate (KEDDY primary teacher who will later be a main actor in the narrative) explained to me how the production of the reports works. At the time, I didn't realise that she was actually trying to show me the boundaries between my work and hers. I thought she was trying to help me.

Through the description of her first meeting with KEDDY's staff, in the third and last scene of the first part Maria constructs a twofold identity. On the one hand, she restates her identity as an excited *newcomer* which she had presented at the start of her narrative. She also explains that she is a newcomer willing to cooperate, offer and share with her colleagues. On the other hand, Maria is also a *learner* who tries to adapt to a new working environment and respond to her job responsibilities. In restating herself, she gets the chance to expand the psychosocial boundaries of the context so as to become a more active participant in her story. In this segment Maria returns briefly to the main image projected in her narrative.

Actually, this was my perspective when I started working in KEDDY. KEDDY's role is very important for our society. [she explains that it is very important to support children with disabilities]. Although I was new in KEDDY, I could see that the obstacles against our aim are many and only if we collaborate, can we achieve our aim. I made it clear to my colleagues that I wanted to work hard, learn my job well and help. I participated in discussions, I asked questions - perhaps too many questions -, I offered my perspective, I read books. I was so excited about my new job at first. I wanted to carry out my role as soon as possible. So I did my best to learn quickly.

Although the first part of the narrative was not initiated by the researcher, the second part of the story was prompted by the researcher's question "What made you change your attitude towards your job and your colleagues?" The second part of the narrative takes a different direction and in it Maria constructs a different identity.

More particularly, in the first scene Maria shifts topics, from her first days at work to a particular day, two months later. She constructs a scene where she is the main actor. This scene can be perceived as Maria's effort to convince the researcher that she, and not the KEDDY teacher, was right regarding a child's diagnosis.

It was long time ago, I was in KEDDY only for two months. I had a case with Kate (KEDDY's primary teacher) and we disagreed on the diagnosis. In particular, the school teacher referred (child's name) to KEDDY. The school teacher mentioned in her report that the child was lacking basic grammar and spelling skills, she was writing inappropriate sized and spaced letters but she was very sociable with the other children. When I read the report, I thought that the child had dysgraphia. [She talks about a course she took when she was studying indicating that she knew what are the basic characteristics of people with dysgraphia]. When I later examined (child's name) using the proper psycho-metric tools, I concluded that my initial evaluation was correct and that the child specifically had dyslexic dysgraphia.

In the next scene Maria introduces Kate as a main character and presents her diagnosis concerning the child. The scene describes Kate's diagnosis through the eyes of Maria who does not have a role in this segment. However, verbs frame Maria's intentions to indicate that Kate's diagnosis was invalid and to position Kate as a colleague who lacks appropriate training. In fact, Maria locates the scene in the broader educational context of KEDDY employees in order to show that the teacher did not have the necessary educational background and, for that reason, her diagnosis was not accurate.

Kate's diagnosis, however, was different from mine. After evaluating the child, she concluded that the child was dyslexic. She supported her diagnosis by saying that the child could not spell words, was not efficient in learning new words and had difficulty learning the order of the letters. If she had taken a course on disabilities and their characteristics, she would have known that the symptoms she described were symptoms

of dyslexic dysgraphia. However, she never took any course on special needs education, like many other employees here. She attended some related seminars when she started working in KEDDY but she doesn't have an appropriate educational background. Yet, she thinks that because she has been working in KEDDY for four years, she knows everything. But she can't know better than those who have studied the needs of disabled people for years.

Maria shared a common ground with the researcher since both of them are psychologists. Therefore, in scene three Maria brings the researcher into her narrative and uses her as a medium for the co-construction of the interview. She does that not only to see whether the researcher agrees with her perspective but also in order to validate her diagnosis. In the following segment she also tries to justify the identity (*an employee with no experience*) she will construct in the next part of her story. Maria also unconsciously presents the employees' split between teachers and psychologists. This split plays a central role in Maria's narrative and affects the final identity she will construct at the end of her story.

Don't you agree that we (psychologists) have an appropriate background for complicated cases like this one even if we don't have working experience? From what I have told you so far don't you think that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia? - The researcher made a face that indicated she did not know the answer - You have completed your degree years ago so it is hard to remember. [Maria presents again the main characteristics that the child had]. I am sure that if you go back to your university books, you would definitely say that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia. Teachers have experience because they have worked in schools and they are familiar with the school environment, as well as with the children's attitude inside the classroom. So they are good at the production of the educational plans. Look, as a psychologist, I know more about disabilities and their characteristics because I have studied these issues.

The next part introduces the main tension of the narrative, the disagreement between the teacher and the psychologist. It also offers the turning point and the main narrative space in Maria's story. Maria also indicates how she rethinks her identity based on new events and experiences that blur the psychosocial boundaries of the *competitive space* she now experiences. In particular, Maria presents the view that she does not feel a

member of a unified team and that KEDDY's employees are split into two teams: employees with no experience and employees with experience.

In the first scene of the third part, Maria leaves the researcher out and returns the narrative to herself, describing the first time she disagreed with the teacher about this case. This event offers the shift to a *competitive space* that Maria did not know existed and demarcates the psychosocial boundaries of her established *newcomer* identity.

All the team members (psychologist, teacher and social worker) met to discuss their evaluation and diagnosis. The social worker didn't have any significant comments regarding the child's family and home environment. The teacher presented her evaluation suggesting that the child was dyslexic and I presented mine claiming that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia. I am not even sure that she (teacher) had heard this term before. -- Anyway, she tried to convince me about the validity of her diagnosis. When she realised that she couldn't change my mind, she became more aggressive. I didn't expect that. She used her working experience in KEDDY and teaching experience in schools. She actually told me that we should go with her diagnosis because I had been in KEDDY only for two months and I didn't have experience. Since when does a teacher with no relevant training have more experience than a psychologist with years of studies?

The teacher's reaction makes Maria aware that the boundaries have been shifted and the way she has perceived herself so far does not correspond to the current *competitive space*. However, Maria is not sure how she should place herself to make sense of the given context and related events. The next scene helps Maria re-position herself in the story. Maria now introduces a new character, another KEDDY teacher. In the following lengthy segment she is not the main character. In contrast, she has a relatively minor role while the teachers are the agents of action. In forming the teachers' identities as employees with experience who try to force their opinion onto *those who have no experience* (like Maria), the narrator finds the opportunity to briefly express again the main tension in the narrative: the disagreements between teachers and psychologists.

Yes, Kate became aggressive. When she realised that I wasn't changing my mind, she asked Lisa (primary teacher) to join our discussion. [Maria provides some information

about Lisa]. Kate presented her arguments and my arguments. She didn't even ask me to present my case! Lisa then took a couple of minutes to think about it. She then turned to me and said (Maria speaks in an ironic voice): "I am afraid that Kate is right. Based on the symptoms of the child, she should be diagnosed as dyslexic. You know, when you are not sure about a diagnosis, you should trust Kate's experience." I didn't want to be disrespectful as I knew that both teachers were old and had many years of experience. Was this enough though? I tried to defend myself but soon Kate interrupted me. She explained that she could understand that I was frustrated but there were two employees supporting the same diagnosis. She also claimed that based on my minor experience it was expected that I might make a mistake. Then she said something that I didn't get in the first place: "It happens with psychologists. You study many years and you confuse what the books write with real life. There is a difference between reading about students and having to deal with them".

In the next and final part of the narrative Maria realises that there is a distinction between teachers and psychologists. Within this *competitive space* Maria draws new psychosocial boundaries between herself and her colleagues and sees herself as a *psychologist*. Although Maria's self-identification as a psychologist appears implicitly throughout the whole narrative, Maria accepts this identity only in the last scene of the narrative.

In the first scene, where Maria is the only character, the salience of the events changes and the main topic is not the disagreement about the diagnosis rather it is Maria's feelings and surprise at her colleagues' reactions. In this scene, Maria perceives herself as the *vulnerable member* of the team.

I was quite surprised. How can they say that because I don't have experience my diagnosis was not accurate? Yes, I was a new member of the team and I didn't have the experience they (teachers) had. But this doesn't mean that I was lacking knowledge. I worked very hard to carry out my role, to learn how the collaboration works. I was new but capable and willing to learn. Why would they treat me in that way? They should have tried to make me understand their perspective and not to force over their opinion. Because this is actually what they did (she laughs ironically).

In the next scene Maria introduces a new character (Nick) in order to further support her constructed identity as a *vulnerable employee*. She also returns to the narrative frame explaining that, based on KEDDY's aim, partners should collaborate and not be divided.

I went to talk to Nick (KEDDY's social worker). He was new in KEDDY back then, like me. I explained to him the events and I asked for his advice. He told me that he thought there was a hidden antipathy or maybe antagonism between teachers and psychologists. I don't think that this should be the case when everyone needs to work together to support the children. He told me that Kate and Lisa can be a bit aggressive sometimes. I saw from his face that he felt sorry for me.

The researcher's question (“Why do you think Kate said that about psychologists?”) provides the ground for the last scene of this narrative. In this scene, Maria presents her explanation regarding the teachers’ reactions to her diagnosis. It is the first time that Maria explicitly presents herself as a *psychologist*. In fact, she returns to the turning point of the narrative (her disagreement with the teacher) that has shifted the boundaries of her role in the collaboration. In the emergent competitive space she constructs a new identity to organise her actions. This is clear when Maria describes herself as a member of the psychologists' group.

This is a good question. The teachers were in KEDDY for more than two years so they had experience. And in the end, it was proved that my diagnosis was correct, not theirs. I guess Nick was right. There is competition between teachers and psychologists. I can see this now. But the teachers started it, at least in my case. Actually, after this case and for pretty much every case during the first year, I asked the other psychologists' advice when I wasn't sure about my diagnosis. They were always happy to help the new member of their team and they didn't make me feel that I was lacking knowledge or experience. Actually, I still go to them if I have any questions. We are friends now. This doesn't mean that I am not close to other employees, but I spend more time with the psychologists.

In the last segment of the narrative, Maria returns to the issue of lack of collaboration that she had raised throughout her interview. She makes it clear how important collaboration between partners is for her and for the success of the partnership. She

therefore refuses to identify herself as a psychologist. The narrator concludes the narrative on a positive tone indicating that the collaboration generally overcomes the obstacles and achieves its aims.

The KEDDY partnership will achieve its aims only if the partners actually collaborate. You know, it is very difficult and admirable what we do here. We have to face a society with stereotypes, parents unwilling to accept their children's problems, partners unable or unwilling to fulfil their promises. I don't see myself just as one of KEDDY psychologists. We are here to support children who need us. I have to admit that I think we are quite successful at what we do.

6.2.1.1. Narrative Summary

Maria presents a narrative of contradiction. On the one hand, she enters the inter-organisational collaboration as a newcomer who is excited, friendly and willing to learn. Within this context she realises it is very important to collaborate with her colleagues in order to fulfil the goals of the partnership. However, her disagreement with two teachers regarding a child's diagnosis places Maria in a *competitive space*. Now that teachers have crossed the boundaries Maria has to adapt to the emergent context, change her identity and organise her actions accordingly. Maria hence states herself as a psychologist and asks for support from the group of psychologists. However, this new identity contradicts the view she has about KEDDY and her role in the inter-organisational collaboration. As a result, Maria refuses to negotiate with herself the initial concept of an ideal partnership where all the partners collaborate for the support of disabled children, with an organisation where employees team up by giving priority to personal motives.

6.2.2. Narrative of compromise

George is the parent of a child with dyslexia. Three years ago he entered the inter-organisational collaboration in order to help his child (Mike) overcome his disability. In his interview, George redirects the conversation towards the topic most salient to him: his son's disability and his efforts to support him. With his story, George explains how he became a member of the collaboration, his child diagnosis, his frustration from his meeting with KEDDY's social worker and his struggle to overcome the stereotypes and help his son. George's story is very honest and emotional.

This narrative consists of three parts. In the first part the narrator describes how he learnt about his son's disability, his initial reaction and how this reaction changed later. In the second part, George introduces the other main character of his narrative, KEDDY's social worker. He also explains how the social worker offered through his diagnosis the main tension and image in his story. In the final part, the space changes and George compromises, redrafts the psychosocial boundaries of his identity, and therefore he rethinks who he is and his role in the partnership in order to help his son overcome his learning disability.

George (parent of a disabled child): Who helps my son?

The researcher's question "How did you get involved with the collaboration?" provided the opportunity for George to redirect the discussion and tell his story. In the first part of his narrative, George is the protagonist. Firstly, he explains how Mike's teacher presented her report, his negative feelings about his son's disability and how he later changed his perception. In the third scene of this part, when George has finally come to terms with his son's disability, he introduces the main image of the narrative. This image will also appear in the second and last part of the narrative.

The first scene is an introductory one. Although, apart from himself, George uses another character (his son's teacher), he is the main character and agent. Here, George explains how the teacher told him that Mike had learning difficulties while he also

briefly introduces the KEDDY centre. In the following segment George does not express any perceptions regarding his son's disability.

It was three years ago. My son is dyslexic [George explains to the researcher what the term dyslexic means]. The school teacher asked me to meet in order to discuss my son's progress or actually lack of progress. I knew that Mike wasn't the best student. He always preferred playing to studying but all children do, don't they? (the researcher nods her head providing a positive answer). The teacher told me that he was behind his classmates despite her efforts to help him. She is a good teacher and has worked in the school for many years. She had experience. She told me that she had sent her report to KEDDY. -- I didn't even know what she meant by report. She told me that she had written down her observations about Mike and sent it to KEDDY. But again, I didn't know what KEDDY is. The funny thing is that KEDDY is just 5 minutes' away from my home. I see it every day when I go to work (he smiles ironically) [George explains what the teacher told him about KEDDY].

The next scene is full of emotions. George explains his surprise, anxiety, anger, disappointment, sadness and shame about his son's disability. He tries to find the balance in an *uncertain and unknown space* where the psychosocial boundaries that define appropriate action are blurred. He therefore becomes a *frustrated father* who is trying to cope with an unpleasant situation. In fact, because George cannot cope with this situation, he tries to escape from it by assigning responsibilities to others.

It took me some time to realise that the teacher was actually saying that my child had a problem, that he was sick, that he was not 'normal'. It's not only that it took me by surprise. I feel ashamed of myself now but I was disappointed and angry with my son. I thought it was his fault because he wasn't trying hard. Maybe the teacher wasn't doing her job well and it was her fault too. Although I asked for details, the teacher couldn't give me many answers. I didn't know what the case was but I knew that my child had a problem. And this was very stressful for me. I was thinking that if my son had a disability, it meant that he was not 'normal'. I was sure that when the neighbours learned about it, they would say the same. -- Oh! I feel so ashamed of myself that I was so frustrated then, but this was my first reaction (his eyes are on the floor and the expression on his face indicates shame).

In the third scene, George's attitude is very different and his opinion regarding his son's disability changes completely. He now enters an *optimistic space* where the boundaries expand in order to help him compromise with the situation and understand his son's disability. George recognises that his son is not responsible for being dyslexic and he repositions himself as an *open-minded father*. He also introduces the main image of the narrative: that he will do anything to help his son. In this scene George engages the researcher. He does so, in order to explain to her his initial frustration and indicate his change of attitude.

I didn't discuss it with my son. I wanted to wait for our meeting with KEDDY. However, I met with a friend who has a child with physical disabilities. [He speaks about his friend and his child's disability]. I was surprised about his positive attitude. He didn't feel ashamed of his son, whose disability was obvious to anyone (he was in a wheelchair). He was proud of him. When I went home I thought of our discussion. I realised that whatever Mike's problem was it wasn't his fault. I had to be open to his disability. After all, there are no limits to helping my son. But I guess my first reaction was quite normal. Doesn't this happen most of the times? (The researcher explains that from her previous interviews with the partners she knew that some parents react initially in a similar way) (George looked satisfied with the researcher's answer). So you can understand my disappointment at first.

The second part of the narrative takes place in KEDDY. Now, apart from George, there is another main character and agent, KEDDY's social worker. The actions of the social worker shift George's identity once again and the events radically change. In fact, this part stresses the main tension of the narrative, namely George's surprise and frustration at the diagnosis of the social worker. This tension will offer the turning point in the narrative that will force George to restate the psychosocial boundaries between him and the social worker in order to make sense of the emergent *defensive space*.

In the first scene, George describes his first visit to KEDDY where the process for his son's diagnosis started. Through this scene he presents several characters before introducing the other main actor of this part (the social worker) to the researcher.

Our appointment with KEDDY was two weeks later. I went there with Mike. We first spoke to the secretary to confirm our appointment. He was nice but not very friendly. He didn't provide me with too much information, instead he asked me to wait for the psychologist who would be able to answer my questions. We then went to the waiting room. After a while the psychologist came. [George explains that the psychologist went through the process of diagnosis and answered his questions]. Mike went with her and I waited. Then the teacher came and she also explained to me how the process works. Next, the social worker came to introduce himself. He didn't explain to me what the next step in the process was, instead he asked me to go to his office.

The next scene provides the basis for the development of the main tension of the narrative which will appear in the last scene of this part. George explains his dissatisfaction with the approach of the social worker and categorises him as an insensitive person. In order to make sense of the current *unwelcoming space* that blurs the boundaries for action, George identifies himself as someone in *need of understanding and compassion*. In re-identifying himself, he switches to a more passive participant whilst the social worker becomes the main character.

I have to admit that we didn't start well. He wasn't as friendly as the psychologist and the teacher. He made me feel a bit uncomfortable and I avoided asking too many questions. It's not that he said something to me, the opposite. It is the fact that he didn't say very much. He went straight to the point. [George goes through some of the questions the social worker asked him]. I would expect to be treated with more understanding. After all it was obvious that I cared about my son.

The third scene is very informative. The social worker remains the main character. George communicates a one way conversation where he does not have a speaking role, instead he positions himself as the object of the social worker's speech. George relates the following segment with no pauses or hesitations. This indicates how angry he still is with the social worker.

He then presented me his diagnosis. He said that Mike's home environment was not appropriate. He told me that because I was raising him alone, he wasn't getting the necessary support. He told me that I wasn't spending enough time with my son because

of my work and that I wasn't helping him enough with his studies. He also said that my educational level didn't allow me to satisfactorily help Mike with his studies.

When the researcher asked George what he thought about the social worker's diagnosis, the narrative takes a more personal tone. The next scene is again filled with emotions that move the focus of the story from the insensitive employee (social worker) to the *resistant father*. George rejects the social worker's diagnosis and refuses to accept that he is responsible for his son's disability. Trapped in an *unwelcoming space*, he tries to escape by redrafting the psychosocial boundaries of his identity as a father and returning to the main image of the narrative.

I was shocked about his diagnosis. I was doing my best to support my child. How could he say that Mike's home environment was not appropriate? How could he claim that it was my fault? I was so disappointed and sad. -- No, I knew that it couldn't be my fault. I was sure that I was doing everything I could for Mike. Yes, I was working hard but only because I wanted to provide the best to my son. I would do everything for my son!

After this segment, the researcher tries to calm the narrator down with a question ("What did you decide to do afterwards?"). This question indicates the start of the final part of the narrative. After reconstructing himself as a *supportive father* and the social worker an expert who is trying to help his son, he returns to the main image of the story clarifying that he will do whatever he can to support his child. He therefore decides to forget what happened with the social worker and compromise in order to help his son overcome his learning difficulties.

In the first scene of this part, George once again engages the researcher into his narrative in order to find comfort and understanding. The position of the characters and the choice of verbs in the first scene indicate that the narrator exits the previous *unfamiliar and unfriendly space* and enters a *defensive space*. Into this space the previous unclear psychosocial boundaries are now redrawn to support George's self-identification as a *supportive parent*. This identity helps him overcome the social worker's accusations and stay focused on his aim which is the support of his son.

To be honest I took a cigarette break. I needed some time to think. While I was smoking outside KEDDY, I spoke with a teacher (a KEDDY teacher he met for the first time). She told me that the social worker is not very sociable in general but his intentions are good. She also told me that they had had similar cases to mine in the past and they know that the parents are not responsible for their child's disability. However, she said that although parents could offer more help, they don't always do so. I understood what she meant. She wanted to say that, despite the fact that I was helping my child, there were more things I could do. Don't you agree with this perspective? [The researcher explains her agreement with George's point]. I decided that I had to explain or, to be precise, defend myself to the social worker. I should make clear that I was there to support my son.

In the final scene, George returns to the main image of his story. Once again he states himself to be a *supportive father* ready to act accordingly. George also represents the social worker as an expert who is just trying to help his child. The newly established psychosocial boundaries between the social worker and the father indicate that in this *defensive space* the best way for George to act is to compromise in order to achieve his goal.

And so I did make it clear. I tried to defend myself saying that although I was trying, maybe it was not enough. I made clear that I was happy to follow the social worker's suggestions in order to improve the home environment for Mike. He still wasn't friendly but I could see that he understood that I wanted to help my son. Of course I would do whatever I could for my child. And he could see that. So, he made some suggestions. [George explains the suggestions the social worker made and the plan for their realisation].

6.2.2.1 Narrative Summary

George's story is told around the main image that he will do anything to help his son. This image offers a narrative of compromise. Indeed, George initially did not accept his child's disability and tried to cope with the 'bad' news by assigning responsibilities for

his son's disability to others. Yet, soon he realised that he had to compromise and accept his child's learning difficulties. George therefore expanded the psychosocial boundaries of his identity in order to abandon his previous established identity as a frustrated father and present himself to be a parent that sought ways to support his son. However, George had to compromise again in order to overcome his frustration at the social worker's diagnosis. Under these circumstances, George found himself engaged in an unknown space. In order to organise his actions within the blurred boundaries of this space, he presented himself as a resistant father who had to deal with an insensitive employee. He however restated this identity when he entered a defensive space that redrew the psychosocial boundaries between himself and the social worker. George now perceived himself as a supportive father who does not resist, but instead compromises in order to collaborate with an expert employee and to help his child.

6.2.3. Narrative of manipulation

Christine narrates a story from her first year as a primary school teacher. Her narrative commences when she refers to the lack of trust between the partners. This theme provides the space in the interview for her to tell her narrative. It also offers the main image of her story. Christine's narrative is a complex performance that includes many agents from all partner-organisations. Some of them play more central roles in her story (i.e. KEDDY psychologist and teacher) and some others minor roles (i.e. a school teacher). However, all the characters are very important for the narrative of manipulation that Christine gives in her interaction with the researcher.

The first part of the story unfolds in Christine's school where she asks for her colleague and head teacher's advice in order to deal with a student with learning disabilities. The next part describes how Christine was manipulated by a KEDDY employee in order to write the report for her student. The third part of the narrative describes Christine's difficulty in deciding whether she will support her student or not. This tension is resolved in the last part of the story where Christine presents and justifies her final decision not to support the child.

Christine (primary school teacher): Trust and manipulation

Christine's narrative is developed when she first speaks about the lack of trust between the partners. In order to support this opinion she introduces a case she had to deal with. This case not only offers her the space to direct the interview and tell her story but also is the central event of her narrative. Early in her narration, Christine offers an identification of herself as an *unselfish teacher*.

I think that the biggest problem of the collaboration is lack of trust. You can't trust people who are not honest and try to hide things from you. Without trust there is no collaboration! If there isn't trust, there are no results! Let me give you an example to make it a bit clearer. One year ago, I had in my class a disabled child. Although I was willing to follow KEDDY's suggestions and support the child, the government delayed the establishment of the integration unit that KEDDY had suggested. As a result, I couldn't help the child. Actually, I didn't agree to help the child. It was too much from KEDDY to ask me to help a child without the support of the integration unit. Oh! I think this didn't come across in the way I wanted it to. I am not that selfish! -- Let me give you the background of this example so as to provide a complete picture.

The first part of Christine's story takes place in her primary school. Christine refers to the disabled student she had in her classroom, her first diagnosis and her discussions with another teacher and the head teacher. Christine is a new employee who has to explore her space before she decides how to act. The first scene introduces Jenifer a 'unique' protagonist in the story. The case of Jenifer, a disabled child, offers the theme of the story. However, she is only a passive character, the object of others' discussions, and doesn't have a speaking role in the narrative.

In the following scene, Christine presents herself in a twofold way. She is a *newly employed teacher* without experience and a *person who lacks confidence*. Despite the *uncertain space* she engages in, she decides to help Jenifer.

One year ago -my first year as a teacher- I had a student, Jenifer, who seemed to face learning difficulties. Since the first day, I realised that Jenifer's behaviour was

abnormal. [Christine presents her first observations which made her think that Jenifer was disabled]. Yet, I was new, inexperienced and I thought my judgement was wrong. But one month later, Jenifer had little progress in comparison to her classmates. Again, I hesitated to discuss her case with my colleagues because I didn't have experience and didn't want them to think that I was trying too hard to make a good impression. I decided to pay more attention to her and observe her progress until the end of the term. [She described her efforts to support the student]. However, at the end of the term, the picture hadn't changed. Jenifer had made no progress.

In the second scene, Christine remains trapped in an *uncertain space* where she is not confident about her judgement and she does not know what to do next. She therefore decides to ask for advice from one of her colleagues who she is close to and perceives as a helpful colleague. Although Christine had observed and supported the student for three months, she is not sure whether her diagnosis was right. Yet, her colleague easily persuades her to overcome her hesitations and talk to the head teacher. This could be considered as an indication that Christine is naive and easily manipulated.

I went to talk to Charles. We were close and he has been working at the school for several years. So he had experience and I knew that he had taught disabled children before. Charles is always happy to offer his help. [She presents some details about Charles and her discussion with him about Jenifer]. He told me that I should go and talk to the head teacher as he too thought that the child was disabled. And if this was the case, he told me that the head teacher should definitely know. After Charles' advice, I didn't hesitate. I went to see the head teacher.

In the next scene, the position of characters indicates that Christine has a minor role whilst the head teacher is the main character and agent of action. Here, Christine enters a *power space* where the head teacher holds the authority and establishes the psychosocial boundaries of action. Christine regrets not speaking earlier to her head teacher and presents herself as a *stupid person* who has to apologise to the wise head teacher.

Oh! This meeting was very awkward; for me of course, not for the head teacher. He was right; I should have talked to him earlier. [Christine presents some details regarding

their discussion about Jenifer's case]. He was angry with me because I hadn't gone to see him when I first noticed that Jenifer had learning difficulties. He told me something I should have considered: the earlier we identify that a child has learning difficulties, the better the support we can offer. That made sense! (ironic laugh) The head teacher knows all these issues. He has attended relevant seminars and he also has experience. I realised my mistake but I couldn't tell him that I had been afraid of talking to him.

The next long scene is introduced by Christine in order to familiarise the researcher with the new characters of the story, namely KEDDY's employees. This is Christine's first contact with KEDDY. Despite the fact that she enters an *unfamiliar space*, she quickly perceives KEDDY's employees as friendly and helpful. As a result, she expands the boundaries of her identity constructing herself as a *collaborative partner*. However, the next segment also indicates how Christine was manipulated by KEDDY's employees since KEDDY's teacher raised the bar regarding the production of the report. Although Christine failed to see that when it happened, she does so later. Moreover, the researcher, who has talked with the partners about the reports that school teachers produce, is also aware that the KEDDY employee requested extra work for her report.

The head teacher told me that I had to write a report with my observations for KEDDY. He directed me to KEDDY in case I had any questions. Of course I had! Many questions actually! I didn't know what I had to do. Uhm, to be honest I only had a rough idea about KEDDY and its role. I had only heard of it. The first time I called them I spoke with the secretary. He passed me on to a primary teacher. [Christine briefly mentions their conversation]. He was very informative and didn't seem to get annoyed by my questions. He explained to me what I should include in the report. He also suggested reading some books in order to provide a more accurate and complete report. I also had to include detailed descriptions of Jenifer's activities in and out of the classroom. So, I followed his (KEDDY's teacher) advice step by step. Yet, I wasn't sure if I was doing the right thing. I therefore called KEDDY again. This time I spoke with one of the psychologists. Despite the fact that she was using some terms that I didn't quite understand [she gives examples of these terms], she was friendly and gave me the answers I needed. I really appreciated the way the KEDDY employees treated me and I tried to write a good report to help them as well. I sent them the report one week later.

The third part of the narrative is initiated by a question from the researcher who asked Christine “What happened next?” In this part, Christine makes her story very intriguing by bringing in many characters and presenting different arguments between herself and the KEDDY employees. She also presents the turning point of her story.

The next scene introduces the context of the main tension of the narrative, KEDDY's educational plan, while the tension itself is presented in following scene. The main actor is a KEDDY employee who does not have a direct role, instead Christine reports his speech. Yet, the fact that Christine does not provide information about the employee with whom she engages in an extensive conversation indicates that she is trying to minimise his role in the segment. Christine closes the scene with an ironic expression as, when she tells her story, she knows that an integration unit cannot be established in the timeframe that the KEDDY employee told her.

When KEDDY sent me Jenifer's educational plan, I called them to ask for some clarifications. An employee explained to me what I had to do. -- In short, I had to support the student with extracurricular activities. He (the employee) told me that I could organise my teaching activities with the help of the specialised teacher from the integration unit. This teacher would be someone with knowledge of special educational needs and in particular of Jenifer's needs. However, the employee told me that it will take some time for the establishment of the integration unit, and therefore for the arrival of the specialised teacher. He actually told that it usually takes one-two months. Uhm! [Christine makes an ironic face]

In the next segment, Christine is trapped in a dilemma regarding the way she has to position herself in order to act in the emergent *stressful space* she experiences. On the one hand, Christine is an *uneducated and inexperienced partner* who does not have relevant experience and training to respond successfully to Jenifer's needs. Yet, this new perception of herself contradicts her established identity as a *collaborative teacher* who understands how important her role is and who wants to support Jenifer. In the following scene Christine also returns briefly to the main image of her narrative.

Oh! That was a very difficult position to be in. -- On the one hand, how could I refuse my help? KEDDY's employee had made it clear that my participation was vital for the

supportive process. On the other hand, I had never taught children with disabilities. I didn't even have any relevant training. I was afraid that I wouldn't be good at my job. Yet, I wanted to collaborate. [She provides examples from her personal life to indicate that she is a person who wants to help others]. Actually, the only reason that was holding me back was the timeframe for the establishment of the integration unit. I wasn't sure if one-two months were enough for everything to be in place.

In the next scene, the KEDDY employees offer to Christine the reassurance she needs in order to agree to help the student. She therefore resolves the tension she is engaged in by restating her identity as a *collaborative teacher* who acts in a *supportive space*. In reality, however, Christine is engaged in an *exploitable space* since KEDDY's employees were not honest regarding the timeframe for the creation of the unit. This space will become apparent in the next scene where Christine decides not to support the student.

I went to KEDDY and I met with the manager and the primary teacher who produced Jenifer's report. They told me that in the past the establishment of an integration unit could take several months. However, they explained to me that the process is now standardised and it shouldn't take more than two months. The manager reassured me that he will speak directly to the director of primary education in order to move the process forward more quickly. The KEDDY teacher told me that she would help me until the specialised teacher arrived. They had satisfactorily answered all of my questions. How could I say no? -- I just couldn't! [She smiles sympathetically]

The final scene of the third part provides the turning point of the narrative. Christine announced to the head teacher and her colleagues her decision to help the student. However, their advice was not to accept the challenge. They also provided arguments to indicate to her that the KEDDY employees were not honest regarding the establishment of the integration unit. Christine realises that she has entered an *exploitable space*. The psychosocial boundaries change and she presents herself as the *victim* who now seeks support and help from her trustworthy colleagues. Yet, she cannot realise that she is experiencing a twofold manipulation; from the KEDDY employees and from her colleagues. Christine closes the third part of her narrative by returning to the main image of her story.

I couldn't understand their reaction at first. [She talks about the discussion she had with her colleagues and the head teacher] [She then apologises to the researcher as she thinks that her story is very long]. One of my colleagues and the head teacher had collaborated with KEDDY for another case and KEDDY didn't fulfil its promises. They also told me something that I hadn't even considered; KEDDY only makes the suggestions. The government will decide the establishment or not of the integration unit. What if the government doesn't approve the findings? They (KEDDY's employees) weren't honest with me. How can we work together if we do not trust each other?

The last part of the narrative presents Christine's final decision and rationale for deciding not to support Jenifer. In the next scene, Christine remains in the *exploitable space* and restates the identity of the *victim* she established at the end of the third part. In this way, she justifies her final decision not to accept KEDDY's request. Christine also tries to use the researcher in order to defend her decision. In reality, however, she seeks comfort from the researcher because she feels guilty about her decision which is in contradiction with her stand in favour of helping others.

I decided not to accept the responsibility. It was too much to ask from me. I didn't mind that I had to work extra hours. But it wasn't fair to ask me do something beyond my responsibilities without having the appropriate support. I like to help other people but this case was different. Don't you think that this wasn't fair? -- Wouldn't you have done the same? [The researcher avoids answering the question presenting another case that reminded her of Christine's case]. So, afterwards I was more careful when I had to work with KEDDY employees.

In the last scene Christine finds the balance in the *exploitable space* by drawing new boundaries that allow her to identify herself as a *new employee* who needed guidance. In this way, she frees herself from the guilt she felt in the previous scene. However, this scene is in reality much more informative for the researcher than it is for Christine, who seems to be very naive in realising her colleagues' hidden motives and their manipulation.

My colleagues were happy about my decision. They told me that if I had accepted the challenge and the integration unit was not established, all the colleagues would have to suffer the consequences [she explains that in this case they would have to work together to organise Jenifer's curriculum]. They also told me that if an integration unit were established, more disabled children would come to our school. But this is a good thing of course. Who doesn't want to offer help to students who need it? Ha! Ha! Ha! (she laughs) I know it sounds ironic but this is what I believe. -- I was lucky to have such supportive colleagues. They just wanted to protect me from committing myself to a role that I couldn't satisfactorily fulfil. I was new and I didn't know how KEDDY works. I therefore could not really appreciate my options. The only thing I am sad about is that I didn't ask to support the child as soon as the integration unit were established. I remember that one of my colleagues offered this option, but I don't know why the others disagreed.

In the last segment of her narrative, Christine comes back to the frame of her story which also provided the ground for the unfolding of her narrative.

If KEDDY employees had been honest with me and had explained to me the process for the establishment of the integration unit, I would have accepted to support the student. If only I could have trusted them! You can't work with someone you don't trust!

6.2.3.1. Narrative Summary

Christine's story was about a disabled student that she had in her classroom and needed extra support. Confusion and tension followed when KEDDY suggested to Christine (an inexperienced teacher with no knowledge on special needs education) that she support her student. Many actors from her school and KEDDY participated actively and passively in her narrative of manipulation. Despite the fact that Christine was engaged in an exploitable space, she fails to see how others manipulated her for their benefit. In fact, through games of manipulation directed by KEDDY employees, Christine firstly identified herself as a collaborative teacher and decided to accept KEDDY's request. Yet, after the direction of her school colleagues, Christine thought she had not been

treated with honesty by the KEDDY employees. She therefore perceived herself as a victim and refused to help her student.

6.2.4. Narrative of persuasion

Rob is a government representative who works as a school consultant for KYSPE. His interview took place after a partners' meeting in which he participated. During that meeting the partners discussed several cases. One of these cases was Marina's case which KEDDY's manager used as an example in order to indicate that the collaborative process should be flexible to the needs of each case. The manager also pointed out how Rob ignored the protocol in order to overcome the obstacles and speed up the supportive process.

After an introductory discussion with the researcher, Rob takes the first chance he finds in order to return to Marina's case which was discussed during the partners' meeting. Rob gives a narrative of persuasion in an effort to regain his identity as a government representative. In his narrative he switches between ambiguous identities while he tries to persuade the researcher that he is a good and trustworthy partner who obeys the rules and follows the collaborative protocol. His narrative is very informative and to the point.

Rob's narrative of persuasion is divided into three parts. In the first part, Rob describes how he was invited to Marina's school to assess her performance and write a report on her. In the second part, the narrator introduces the main tension in his story, namely the special consultant's delays in examining Marina's case so as to refer her to KEDDY. In the last part of the narrative, the tension is resolved when Rob decides to overcome the delays by referring Marina to KEDDY himself.

Rob (school consultant): Ambiguity and persuasion

While Rob answers the question “How many years have you worked for the partnership?”, he finds the opportunity to introduce his narrative by turning the discussion to Marina’s case. In the following segment, the storyteller provides some background information in order to clarify the point that the KEDDY manager had raised during the partners’ meeting, namely Rob’s disobedience with regard to the collaboration protocol. Rob is the only character in this segment which takes place in a *defensive space* in which he has to justify his different approach to Marina's case. It is his first attempt to persuade the researcher that, although he did not follow the protocol in Marina’s case, this was only an exception to his overall working practice. In this way he also introduces the main image of his narrative. Rob tries quickly to set the psychosocial boundaries in order to identify himself as a *school consultant and follower of the partnership rules*.

I have been working as a school consultant for eleven years and I have been working with KEDDY collaboration since its establishment. Throughout all these years I have dealt with many cases. Marina’s case was an exception to the way I usually work. -- You know, we have to follow the rules of the collaboration. Otherwise it will be hard to achieve our aims. You see, there are too many partners involved and we need to have continuity in the way we deal with our cases. Marina’s case was an exception. – Every rule in the collaboration protocol needs its exceptions!

At the researcher's encouragement, Rob presents the first part of his story by describing the details of the case under discussion and his diagnosis. In the first scene, Rob describes how he became involved with the case and re-states himself as a *follower of the collaboration rules*.

Marina was a disabled child who attended the second grade of the primary school. Her teacher had produced a report that indicated her learning difficulties and the head teacher had sent this report to me. Following the rules of the partnership, I had to go to the school and evaluate the child to see whether she was indeed disabled or not.

In the second scene Rob describes his arrival at Marina's school. Before introducing Marina to the researcher, Rob takes the chance to introduce her teacher and head teacher. These characters will later help him built his argument in favour of his decision to make an exception and ignore the collaboration rules. Rob categorises the teacher as helpful and the head teacher as friendly while he also explains that they both cared about Marina. This identification of the characters, in addition to the way he perceives Marina, will help him expand the boundaries of his identity in the next scene.

Two weeks later, I went to the school. My aim is to visit the schools as quickly as I can but this is not always possible. You see there are only two school consultants in this large prefecture. We are therefore very busy. Before meeting Marina, I met the head teacher. [He presents the profile of the head teacher and provides some details from their meeting]. He was very friendly and seemed to care a lot about Marina. This is not always the case. Some head teachers don't like it when they have disabled children in their school. They don't like the fact that people outside the school, like me and the KEDDY employees, intervene in their school. He also introduced me to her teacher. She had been working at the school for years and she had experience with disabled children. She provided me with all the necessary background information and she said that she would be happy to help me in any way. They both cared about Marina. [He smiles].

After introducing the school representatives, Rob describes his meeting with Marina. He presents Marina as a fragile girl who did not follow the flow in the classroom. In a *space of compassion*, Rob realises that the boundaries that he had previous established as a *professional who follows the rules* do not correspond to the given situation. He therefore draws new boundaries of action by dropping this identity and perceiving himself as a *father*. In this way, he gets closer to the girl (and the school representatives) and appreciates the importance of the situation.

I met Marina during the break, before my observation in the classroom. She was a fragile little girl. [He describes how and where he met Marina] -- She was sitting alone and she hesitated to speak to me. She looked very sad. I could see that she was depressed. Oh! The poor little girl! The picture was the same inside the classroom. The teacher tried to engage her in discussions but she refused to talk and participate in any

activities. She was just sitting alone looking outside out of the window. -- Of course the teacher and the head teacher cared about her. How could anyone not care? I have children. This could have been my daughter!

In the last scene of the first part, Rob produces his diagnosis about Marina.

It wasn't hard to conclude that Marina was depressed. Her teacher was right. It was so obvious! I wrote my report. It usually takes me one week, but in this case the problem was clear and it indicated an urgent case. --

The first part of the narrative was not initiated by the researcher. In contrast, Rob directed the discussion to talk about an issue salient to him. However, the second part was prompted by the researcher who asked "What was the next step of the supportive process?" This part takes a different direction and has a very different tone to that of the first part. Now, feelings of compassion and understanding have been replaced by negative emotions evolving from a new character.

In the first scene of the second part the storyteller introduces the other main character, besides himself, of his narrative; Andy, the special educational needs school consultant (or special consultant). Continuing to adhere to the protocol, Rob describes the role of the special consultant and how he becomes involved in the collaboration process. In reality, the way that Rob narrates the following segment indicates his efforts to convince the researcher that he acted as a government representative in Marina's case.

I sent it (the diagnosis) to the head teacher and the special educational needs school consultant, Andy. As the process suggests, Andy had to observe Marina and produce his own report. A child can't be referred to KEDDY if the special consultant doesn't observe the child first. Actually, the protocol suggests that the special consultant has to provide a plan for the child's support inside the school. Then if the special consultant's program was not effective, he would refer the child to KEDDY.

In the first scene, Rob introduced the special consultant without presenting any characteristics of his personality. In contrast, he only talked about his job responsibilities. In the second scene, the narrator starts to unfold Andy's personality. He

perceives him as a professional who is very busy as he is the only special consultant in the prefecture. In the current *thoughtful space* the expanded psychosocial boundaries help Rob to identify himself as a *colleague* who understands the reason for the special consultant's delay in examining Marina. Yet, Rob's understanding is not justified based on the following segment. In contrast, Andy can be perceived as an apathetic employee who does not care about the children he deals with.

I sent my report to Andy and I called him four days later, as I usually do, to make sure he had received the report and had planned his visit to Marina's school. He confirmed that he had received the report but he told me he hadn't found time to read it. That was usual as he is generally very busy. You see, there is only one special consultant for the whole prefecture. [He objects to the fact that there is only one special consultant]. The unusual thing thought was that he hadn't scheduled a visit yet. I asked him why and he told me that he was very busy as it was this was the period of the year when he had to re-evaluate previous cases.

As the previous activated psychosocial boundaries correspond to the *thoughtful space* that Rob is engaged in, in the next scene, he restates the identity of himself as a *colleague*. He therefore once again indicates his understanding towards his very busy colleague and politely asks the special consultant to speed up the process. Yet, it seems that Rob is very easily convinced that Andy shares his concerns about Marina.

I described the case to him so as to save him some time. I asked him to speed up the process and go to Marina's school as soon as possible. It seemed that he recognised the necessity since he told me that he would do his best. -- I trusted his word.

In the following scene Rob enters a *contrasted space*. This space requires Rob to restate the psychosocial boundaries of his identity in order to change his attitude towards the special consultant. Now, Rob appears more active and dynamic trying to pass on his opinion to Andy. In reality, he perceives himself in a twofold way. On the one hand, Rob is still a *government representative* who understands that the protocol needs to be followed. On the other hand, he is a *compassionate person* who wants to help a child. This conflict provides the turning point in Rob's narrative of persuasion.

Two weeks after my call to Andy, and pretty much four weeks after my visit to Marina's school, I called her teacher to see how the meeting with the special consultant had gone. I was very surprised to hear that the consultant hadn't been to the school yet. Neither had he notified them about a future visit. I have to admit that I wasn't pleased with the news. I called Andy again to see what had happened. He told me that he was still very busy and he was planning to go to Marina's school at the end of the term. This meant one month later. That was too long. The child had to be referred to KEDDY as soon as possible. -- In reality, I knew that Andy would not be able to support Marina and he would eventually ask for KEDDY's help. Still we had to follow the process but waiting one month was too much! I tried to explain that it would then be very late for the student to overcome her difficulties.

Part three consists of two scenes that describe how Rob decided to ignore the collaboration rules and refer the child to KEDDY himself. The first scene seems similar to the last scene of part two. The narrator remains trapped in a *contrasted space* where he perceives himself both as *a government representative* and as *a compassionate person*. The psychosocial boundaries are not clear, and Rob finds it hard to organise his actions. He therefore has to resolve the conflict and re-establish the boundaries in order to make sense of the situation and decide how to act. It seems from the last phrase of the segment that the narrator will eventually decide to give up his identity as a government representative. Yet, he returns quickly to the main image of his narrative in order to persuade the researcher that the way Marina's case was dealt with was just an exception.

No, he didn't understand my arguments. He told me that even if he skipped the re-evaluation of the cases he had, there were other cases that had priority over Marina's case. -- Priority in terms of sequence not of emergency. [He explains the re-evaluation process and how the cases are prioritised based on their assignment date]. I know that this is what the protocol recommends. Yet, I thought that if we prioritised just one case, it wouldn't mean that we were not following the protocol, rather that it was an urgent case, an exception.

The special consultant's reaction seems to make Rob aware that the boundaries he tries to keep between his *professional* and his *personal identity* do not respond to the given situation. In the next scene, Rob realises that the special consultant will only act

following the rules. As he is now engaged in a *caring space* where priority is the support of a child, Rob decides to work across psychosocial boundaries and positions himself on the other side, as a *rebel against the system*. The response of the KEDDY manager, teacher and head teacher supports this identification. As such, it is the only scene in his narrative where Rob presents himself in contradiction to his desired identity as a government representative, and he does not try to persuade the researcher of the opposite.

He didn't agree to prioritise Marina's case. I had run out of reasons to convince him. I had to see what other options I had. I called the KEDDY manager and explained to him Marina's case. He was very understanding and compassionate. It seemed that he shared the same anxieties as me. He therefore told me that he would make an exception and would accept a student in KEDDY with the school consultant's referral and not the special consultant's referral. I didn't think about it. I told him straightaway that I would send him Marina's report if her parents and head teacher give their permission. As the parents and head teacher agreed to override the protocol, the next day I sent my report to KEDDY.

In the next segment, the narrator returns to the main frame and conflict of the narrative. He is again between two identities (*government representative vs. rebel against the system*). However, he engages the researcher in order to find the opportunity to convince her that he categorises himself only as a *school consultant who follows the rules*.

You are probably wondering why I told you about this case. [The researcher responds positively]. I just wanted to state that I believe that in some cases partners have to ignore the protocol and adapt to the specific needs of the cases they have to deal with. We need to be flexible as every time we deal with very different cases. -- However, this doesn't mean that we have to underestimate the rules. Rules are there to help the partners achieve their aims; to help us collaborate and know the boundaries of our roles. They should be broken only in 'special' cases. But I think I have said enough about Marina's case.

6.2.4.1 Narrative's Summary

In his narrative Rob was trapped in a difficult situation. On the one hand, he was a government representative who should follow the protocol. On the other hand, there was Marina (a child who needed his help) who could only be supported by ignoring the rules of the partnership. This tension prompted Rob to give his narrative of persuasion. In fact, Rob told a story in his effort to persuade the researcher that despite the fact that he ignored the protocol in one case, he remained a committed government representative. With this aim Rob presented an ambiguous self. He constructed his identity as a follower of the rules and an understanding colleague, namely as a government representative. However, he also presented himself as a compassion person and father, identities that made him override the regulations and become a rebel against the system.

6.3. Discussion

6.3.1. Maria's narrative of contradiction

Although the researcher's question "Do you enjoy working for the collaboration?" could have been directly answered with a "yes-no" answer, Maria chooses to provide a complex narrative. She talks about her first days at work, her colleagues, a difficult case she had to deal with, her disagreements with some of her colleagues and her need for support. In her narrative, Maria expresses emotions such as her excitement when she started working in KEDDY, her surprise at the teachers' reactions to a disagreement and her disappointment at the lack of collaboration from her colleagues. Maria carefully positions various characters in her story which is presented in four parts. The boundaries of her story are clear since its start and finish are similar to the beginning and ending of the interview which are signalled by the researcher's questions.

Although Maria's narrative is a progressive narrative developed from past to future, it is not a coherent one. Maria shows a fluid identification of herself and her partners who shift among different identities in order to organise their actions across scenes that take

place in different psychosocial spaces (Haslam, et al, 2011). Firstly, when Maria enters *the welcoming space* of KEDDY, she identifies herself in a twofold way. On the one hand, she is *an excited and friendly newcomer* working with sociable and helpful colleagues. On the other hand, she is a *learner* who has to adapt to a new working environment and learn her job responsibilities. However, in the second part of her story, which takes place two months after her first day in KEDDY, Maria's narrative takes a different course. The psychosocial boundaries between herself and her colleagues change and Maria differentiates herself, as someone who has a degree on issues related to disabilities, from the uneducated teachers. In the third part, the disagreement between Maria and the teachers provides the turning point in the narrative. Here, the teachers, who have experience, try to force their opinion onto a colleague who has no experience. As a result, *a competitive space* emerges and the boundaries change to help Maria organise her actions in order to support her diagnosis. The newly drawn psychosocial boundaries also enable her to express her feelings of frustration and identify herself as the *vulnerable member* of the team.

Maria's personal narrative suggests that she wants to be known as a *newcomer* who, despite the fact that she lacks experience, is excited, friendly as well as willing to learn and collaborate. This identity is put forward by the way she organises scenes in her narrative and the presentation of her actions (Riessman, 2008). For example, she presents her arrival in KEDDY and her positive first impression for her colleagues. She then uses the case that caused a disagreement between herself and the teachers in order to indicate that as a newcomer she felt vulnerable and inexperienced.

In reality, Maria tells a narrative of contradiction that is framed by her refusal to accept that she is not a newcomer (who lacks experience, although she is happy to collaborate and learn) but a psychologist (who has a suitable educational background and can produce an accurate diagnosis). Maria refuses to admit that the KEDDY employees are divided into teams and tries to justify her colleagues' actions by putting forward the newcomer's identity who is not sure regarding the way the collaborative process works. This identity helps her support her belief that only through collaboration will KEDDY deal with its cases successfully. Moreover, it does not contradict the idea of the perfect partnership she has constructed in her mind. Yet, at the end of her story Maria overcomes her refusal and gives in to the implicit contradiction. As such, in the

emergent competitive space, she draws new boundaries between herself and her colleagues and identifies herself as a psychologist. She therefore organises her actions accordingly by asking for support from the psychologists' group.

6.3.2. George's narrative of compromise

By taking control of the interview, George takes the opportunity to tell a story about the issue that is most salient to him, his child's disability. The whole narrative is organised around this main theme, while the way that George identifies himself and others is based on his perception about his son's disability. Being the protagonist of the narrative, George gives himself a variety of roles. For example, in some scenes he has an active or passive role, in others he has a minor or central role, whilst in one scene he is the object of someone else's speech. The main image emerging from the story is George's willingness to do anything to help his child. Although this image is present throughout the whole interview, the social worker's diagnosis brings it clearly to the centre of the events. This diagnosis also offers the turning point of George's story.

Through a journey of self-discovery George firstly resists and then compromises in order to achieve his aim. He therefore draws and redraws the psychosocial boundaries in order to identify himself and others, make sense of emergent psychosocial spaces and organise his actions. Firstly, he engages in an *uncertain and unknown* space in which he first discovers his son's disability. In order to cope with this space, George identifies himself as a *frustrated father* who has to deal with the 'bad' news of his son's disability. In this way George shrinks the boundaries and rejects any responsibility for his child's disability. However, he soon has to change the way he perceives himself as he enters an *optimistic space* that requires him to compromise in order to help his child. George now realises that his son is not responsible for his disability and he thinks of him as an innocent child. In parallel, he understands that the only way to help him is by *being open-minded*.

When George enters KEDDY, he has to engage in new identification loops (Beech and Huxham, 2003) in order to re-establish the psychosocial boundaries and ascribe

meaning to his actions in different psychosocial spaces. In an *unwelcoming space* George comes across an insensitive employee who does not understand that George is worried about his son's disability. As such, George presents himself *in need of understanding and compassion* while he tries to set boundaries in relation to the social worker. In his effort to exit the unwelcoming space George once again resists taking responsibility for his son's disability. He therefore identifies himself as a *resistant father* who has to deal with an insensitive employee. In this way George distances himself from the social worker and forgets his accusations that he was not supporting his son.

Even though the main image of George's narrative is that there is nothing he would not do to help his son, the fact that George is involuntarily engaged in a resistance-compromise game does not allow him to construct his identity as a *supportive father* before the third part of the narrative. By activating new boundaries of action (Hernes and Maitlis, 2010) in a *defensive space*, George understands both the way that the social worker behaves and how George can ensure that his own actions and behaviour are in accordance with this space. He therefore presents himself as a *supportive father* ready to do anything to help his child. He also identifies the social worker as a professional who can assist him towards the achievement of his aim. In this way, George decides to compromise and resolves the main tension of the narrative by exiting the resistance-compromise conflict.

6.3.3. Christine's narrative of manipulation

Christine tells a narrative of manipulation. She describes the case of a disabled student she had to support during her first year as a teacher together with the related events that made her decide against supporting this student. Her narrative is organised progressively (Riessman, 2008). It starts by presenting how she first identified that one of her students was disabled and describes her initial decision to help the student. Then she explains what made her change her mind and announce to KEDDY that she could not support the child. Her complex narrative includes many characters (some with minor and some with major roles) who act in the physical space of a primary school and KEDDY.

The starting point of the narrative was clearly provided by Christine when she said to the researcher “*Let me give you the background of this example so as to provide a complete picture*”. This phrase indicated the start of Christine’s narrative. However, the allocation of the end point was not an easy endeavour. Initially, a decision was made to end the presentation of the narrative with what seemed like a coda at the end of the second scene in part four: “*So, afterwards I was more careful when I had to work with KEDDY employees*”. This utterance ends the sequence about the case Christine had to deal with. However, ultimately a decision was made to also include in the narrative the next scene (last scene of the fourth part). This scene presents various colleagues, their identification, and how they reacted to Christine’s decision. It concludes with a feeling of regret on Christine's behalf for not exploring all the available options in order to support the student.

The shift in the decision regarding the boundaries of the narrative coincided with a shift in perspective regarding Christine’s identity. In fact, Christine initially presented herself as a *new, friendly and collaborative employee* who got trapped in a complicated situation in which she eventually became the *victim*. Yet, the last scene changes the way the researcher has perceived Christine so far. In this scene it appears that Christine's decisions have been manipulated by other actors. School colleagues and KEDDY employees influence the way she perceives her space and, as a result, the way she identifies herself and acts in the context of the collaboration. It was crucial therefore to include the last scene in order to explore Christine’s identity construction.

Christine’s narrative presents different identification loops (Beech and Huxham, 2003) that are generated by tensions, confusions and difficult decisions. Christine’s identity is constructed on a game of manipulation which aimed at influencing her opinion regarding the case she had to deal with. Her narrative tells mainly of her need to cope with the negative feelings of remorse she has for the final decision she made. In fact, Christine feels guilty for not supporting the student and she uses her narrative in order to convince the researcher that her decision was justified. She does that through a sequence of identifications of herself and others (Haslam et al., 2011).

The way Christine perceives her colleagues is consistent throughout her narrative. In fact, although she moves into different psychosocial spaces over time, Christine has constructed a positive identity about her colleagues who she presents as wise, friendly, helpful, trustful and supportive colleagues. This identity consistency provides Christine with a sense of security to overcome her lack of confidence and feelings of insecurity. As she enters into different spaces (i.e. *unknown, powerful, stressful, exploitable spaces*), she constantly has to re-construct her identity. She firstly presents herself as an *inexperienced, new, stupid, uneducated employee* who, despite the difficulties of adjusting to her new role, is happy to collaborate with the KEDDY employees in order to help her student overcome her disability. The psychosocial boundaries are therefore expanded in order to fit the KEDDY employees who are not her colleagues, but also are friendly and helpful as her colleagues. The turning point in the narrative (her discussion with her colleagues regarding the support of the student) introduces the main narrative space of the story (the *exploitable space*) and demarcates the boundaries of Christine's identity. Now the KEDDY employees have been identified as mistrustful and dishonest since they crossed the boundaries by lying to her about the establishment of the integration unit. Therefore, Christine has to activate new psychosocial boundaries that exclude them (Hogg et al., 2012). She therefore categorises herself as a *victim* who has been tricked by untruthful externals.

By carefully examining the organisation of the narrative as well as the positioning of the characters and the spaces they inhabit (Riessman, 2008), it appears that Christine's narrative is a narrative of manipulation; not the narrative of a victim, as Christine wants to present it. Despite the fact that Christine has good intentions and motivations, she is naive and is dragged into a conflict of manipulation-gain that both the KEDDY employees and her colleagues engage her in. Yet, she fails to see that. On the one hand, the KEDDY employees, guided by their personal motives, hide information and do not present the actual process for the establishment of the integration unit. They do that because they want to avoid the trouble of replacing Christine with another teacher. They also tricked Christine into putting more effort in writing the student's report in order to make the job of the KEDDY's teacher easier. On the other hand, her colleagues, also driven by personal motives, present the process for the establishment of the integration unit differently and highlight only the difficulties in helping a disabled child. They therefore convince Christine not to support her student. They do that in order to avoid

the extra workload required for the support of disabled students. In fact, her colleagues are very keen to conceal the more feasible option which Christine had; to agree to support the student as soon as the integration unit was established. Despite all this, Christine has failed to understand the conflict that others have placed her into for their benefit. She therefore appears as a naive character engaged in a game of manipulation.

6.3.4: Rob's narrative of persuasion

Rob introduces his narrative in three parts. Each part presents different opportunities for action located in a different time and different psychosocial spaces. The first part of his story is located in Marina's primary school. Yet, the narrator does not specify the physical space where the other two parts of his narrative unfold. Rob carefully positions the characters in his complex performance. KEDDY's manager, head teacher and teacher have relatively minor acting roles in the narrative. However, in terms of their contribution to the narrative, their role is major since they support Rob's identification as a rebel against the system. The special consultant, on the other hand, is a main character and agent of action. He participates actively in the narrative and in parallel he affects the way George perceives himself.

George is trapped between two identities and he experiences the emotional consequences of this conflict (Tajfel, 1982). Although he explicitly expresses his feelings only in one scene of his narrative (the third scene of part three) where he shows his compassion for Marina, Rob's story is full of emotions. He implicitly shows his feelings of compassion and anxiety about Marina, of appreciation for her teacher, head teacher, and the KEDDY manager as well as feelings of understanding, disappointment and anger towards the special consultant. These contrasting feelings are related to the ambiguous self which Rob presents in his narrative.

The boundaries of the narrative are clear. Although Rob's interview has started some while earlier, his story begins when he finds the opportunity to turn the discussion to the issue most salient to him, namely Marina's case. Rob finishes his story when he justifies the action he took in order to support Marina and restates his identity as government

representative. After this, the interview continues by discussing issues irrelevant to Marina's case.

Although throughout his story Rob presents himself and others in various ways, after a careful exploration of the narrative, it seems that these identities can be grouped under two main identities. More specifically, Rob identifies himself as a *school consultant, follower of the system and understanding colleague*. The special consultant is presented in a similar way, namely as a busy professional and follower of the system. It can therefore be concluded that both of the main actors are presented as government representatives. On the other hand, Rob also identifies himself as a *father and compassionate person*, while the other characters (teacher, head teacher and KEDDY manager) are perceived as helpful, friendly and understanding. They are all ready to overcome the protocol to achieve their aim. It therefore appears that both Rob and the secondary characters of the story share the same identity as *rebels against the system*.

In reality, Rob moves in a *contrasted space* where he tells a story of persuasion that unfolds from his effort to convince the researcher that he remains a loyal government representative who respects the protocol and follows the rules of the inter-organisational collaboration. In particular, Rob starts his story by making it clear that partners should follow the collaboration rules and ignore them only in exceptional cases. Moreover, every time that he constructs an identity different from that of the government representative, he finds the opportunity to support the fact that he follows the rules. The only exception comes in the last scene of his narrative where he identifies himself as *a rebel against the system* and he does not provide any arguments to support his identity as a *government representative*. Finally, Rob ends his narrative by making it clear once again that Marina's case was an exception among the cases he had dealt with. He also restates his identity as a government representative who follows the partnership's protocol.

This effort to convince the researcher that he remains a government representative comes from the conflict that Rob is trapped in (Turner et al., 1987). In fact, the narrative is framed by the ambiguous feelings Rob experiences about being both a rebel against the system and a government representative. This conflict remains unresolved despite Rob's efforts to establish an identity as a government representative. Indeed, the way he

presents himself is highly ambiguous, since in some scenes he appears as a follower of the system and in others as a compassionate person. Since Rob cannot resolve this identity conflict throughout his narrative, he decides to confront it by opposing it. As such, at the end of the narrative he suggests that he wants to be known as a government representative who obeys the rules.

6.4. Summary

This chapter has provided a description of the voices of individual collaboration partners in order to present how they experienced and perceived the dynamic collaboration they inhabited. The analysis of personal stories enabled the researcher to examine how the participants “continually restory our pasts, shifting the relative significance of different events for whom we have become, discovering connections we have previously been aware of, repositioning ourselves and others in our networks of relationships” (Mishler, 1995: 5). In fact, personal narratives were works of history located in specific times and psychosocial spaces. They presented how storytellers identified themselves and others, how they experienced and acted in the spaces they inhabited as well as how they perceived the broader context they lived in.

The four emergent narratives allowed the exploration of how partners constructed and reconstructed their identities in the dynamic and emergent collaboration space. Through their narratives, the participants themselves became narrators that constructed and presented different identities in social interaction with the researcher. For example, among many identities, George introduced himself as a frustrated and supportive father; Maria as a psychologist and helpful colleague; Rob as a government representative and rebel against the system; and Christine as a victim and collaborative teacher. The narratives of identity that were presented fundamentally questioned the notion of inter-organisational collaboration as a linear and ordered process, as well as of identity as stable and fixed. The constructed identities emerged from the narratives of the participants who, as the protagonists, took part in and shaped the collaborative process. The personal narratives indicated that the partners of the collaboration engaged constantly in loops of identification in order to adapt to the shifting psychosocial

boundaries of the inter-organisational collaboration, make sense of given psychosocial spaces and organise their actions. In fact, the storytellers formed and reformed their identities based on the support or lack of support they received from other characters (Haslam et al., 2011). The emergent identities affected and were affected by the collaboration space while they also had an impact on the collaboration itself.

The last chapter will conclude this thesis. Firstly, the conceptual framework that summarises the concepts, underlying theory and research questions explored in this study will be presented. Then the main insights gained from this thesis will be introduced in relation to the emergence of inter-organisational collaboration, identity construction and unfolding ways of collaborating. Finally, the suggestions for further research will be presented.

7. Conclusions

7.0. Introduction

This research was conducted in order to explore how inter-organisational collaborations emerge in dynamic contexts and how partners construct their identities in collaborative settings. This final chapter brings together the data analysis presented in previous chapters and reflects on the extent to which these questions have been answered. The first section of the chapter reviews the main theoretical approach of this thesis. The next sections focus on the insights gained from the case study, placing it in a wider theoretical context regarding practices of collaboration and the (re)construction of identity. Then, the practical implications of this thesis are presented. The chapter concludes with some suggestions for further research that will assist in understanding better collaboration's practices in today's drifting and demanding contexts.

7.1. Generating collaboration spaces

Inter-organisational collaborations in their many forms (i.e. alliances, cooperations, partnerships, joint ventures, etc.) have played an increasingly significant role in the change and development of organisations (Zhang and Huxham, 2009). Through collaborative arrangements organisations attempt to respond variously to a demanding and unstable environment, achieve their aims, innovate, expand and become competitive (Prins, 2010). Given its prominence, it is not surprising that inter-organisational collaboration has become a focus of extensive organisational research (Hibbert and Huxham, 2010). This research has studied a range of aspects: the identification of the success and failure factors in the collaboration (Beck, 2006; Olson et al. 2012); the stages in the collaboration life-cycle (Kanter, 1994); the typologies and characteristics of collaborations (Tsasis, 2009); the types of competencies, behaviours and tasks needed in a collaborative project (Gray, 1996); the guidelines and steps for managing collaborations (Ray, 2002); and the development of tools and techniques to enable collaborative projects (Crosby and Bryson, 2004).

The commonality in these studies is the search for the components that will provide stability and certainty to the inter-organisational collaboration by offering specific stages, tools or factors that can produce regularity within the context of collaboration (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). The assumption underlying these studies is that collaboration is a linear and ordered process. Furthermore, despite acknowledging inter-organisational collaboration as a situated process, in their attempt to eliminate contingencies, establish definitive meanings and consistent efficient action researchers tend to forget the dynamic nature of collaboration (Prins, 2010). Less attention has therefore been paid to understanding the emergent aspects of the collaborative process which this study explores.

The main declaration of this thesis is that inter-organisational collaboration emerges over time through particular engagement in collaborative work and participation in daily working relationships and interactions with others. This perspective has theoretical and methodological implications for the way inter-organisational collaboration was researched in this study. Theoretically, the emphasis was placed on looking at the day to day of a collaborative relationship: the practices of collaboration. In order to achieve that, the researcher followed the collaboration over different periods of time collecting field notes, documents and interviews.

Regarding the concept of practice, in this study practices were taken as dynamic, temporal and social processes (such as the collective production of a student's diagnosis) that both sustain routines and open possibilities for creative action (Simpson, 2009; Sandberg and Dall'Alba, 2009; Schatzki, 2001). These processes transcend the traditional boundaries between the social and the individual by involving experience and action, as well as human conduct and the exercise of embodied social agency (Eikland and Nicolini, 2011).

The empirical material in this case study has illustrated how collaborative practices (such as the implementation of a support programme or the disclosure of a report to a head teacher) came into being partly as the result of conscious design efforts by the collaborative partners and partly emerging from interactions between actors facing unexpected events. Examining particular collaborative practices emerging over time from the point of view of the stakeholders made it possible to understand the process of

collaboration itself (especially in conditions of uncertainty) as a psychosocial space of action.

Looking at the emergence of inter-organisational collaboration through social practices involved understanding the space in which those social practices were created, developed, expressed and framed. In fact, as partners engaged in activities during the collaborative process, they were also involved in the process of producing and reproducing working spaces that generated different kinds of experiences and agencies over time. These interwoven spaces constituted the emergent collaboration space. The implication is that inter-organisational collaboration, as a space for action, is not there, available a-priori. On the contrary, it unfolds, is always in motion and it is simultaneously “perceived, conceived and lived” (Lefebvre, 1991: 33). The emergent collaboration space consists of interrelated physical spaces (i.e. tangible structures that aim at regulating work and interaction) and psychosocial spaces (i.e. spaces of thought that accommodate the sphere of theory and meaning, and consist of social relations and action) (Lefebvre, 1991).

In trying to understand better the collaboration space, the research paid particular attention to boundaries and their dynamics. This has helped to make sense of a particular space and distinguish it from other spaces (Hernes, 2004a). It was shown how activating psychosocial boundaries enabled the conditions for participants in the inter-organisational collaboration to enter and leave particular spaces. It has also indicated how those spaces were produced, defined and integrated. For example, in the Negotiation period, in order for partners to leave the expert knowledge space they inhabited, they shifted the boundaries and therefore produced a supportive space. This new space included the mother and therefore assisted partners in convincing her to sign her child's diagnosis.

The formation of social identities is an essential part of this boundary development process. In fact, only through a process of identification can partners adjust to the changing boundaries of the emergent psychosocial spaces, and therefore understand these spaces and organise their own practices. For example, as it was illustrated in the narrative of contradiction (second analysis), it was only when Maria abandoned her identity as a colleague and identified herself as a psychologist, that she was able to

make sense of the competitive space she inhabited. She therefore took control of her case and produced the student's diagnosis by herself. This contradicted the usual collaborative practices and forced her colleagues (teachers) to reconsider their identities. From cooperative partners, they became competitive teachers, and they organised their actions accordingly by doubting Maria's diagnosis. This example illustrates the way partners changed their identity as a response to the psychosocial space and how in doing so they understood this space better and contributed to reshape it. Thus, it is important to explore how the partners (re)construct their identities within the different spaces of the collaboration in order to understand how the inter-organisational collaboration emerges over time.

When exploring identity formation, this research focused on psychosocial spaces since being part of this space implies a certain identity and patterns of action (Haslam, 2001; Brewer, 2009). In order for partners to decide the best way to act in a given space, they have to redraw the psychosocial boundaries and reconstruct their identities. Practice, identity and boundary development are therefore intimately related as mutually constituted processes (Simpson, 2009).

Although many studies have explored the factors that affect collaborative identification, only limited attention has been placed on the process of identification per se (Simon, 2009). With notable exceptions (see Beech and Huxham, 2003) it is difficult to find an in-depth examination of the ways in which personal and social identities are formed in collaborative settings. This is an area that this research has intended to contribute to.

This research has suggested that both personal and social identity remains relatively stable (Brown and Humphreys, 2002; Haslam et al., 2011), which allows for its development as a platform to understand partners' practices. Yet, it is also dynamic and fluid (Hosking and McNamee, 2006), which has allowed an exploration of how partners adapted their identities to emergent psychosocial spaces and boundaries. Using the concept of loops of identification (Beech and Huxham, 2003), which treat identity as both relatively stable and dynamic, this research has explored how organisational members re-produce particular personal and social identities appropriate to the situation they live through. For instance, in the narrative of manipulation Christine initially identified herself as an inexperienced teacher in an unfamiliar space. Yet, at the end of

her narrative when she entered an exploitable space she constructed the identity of the victim. Identification loops have captured this dynamic nature of the collaborative process where partners' actions, interactions and experiences were central for the understanding not only of the emergence of identities and boundaries, but also of the working spaces of action.

7.1.1. Opening up the exploration of the collaboration space

By emphasising the physical and psychosocial nature of space (Lefebvre, 1991), this research has illustrated that organisational working spaces emerge and evolve through the interaction of actors, objects and physical environment. The thesis has therefore expanded the concept of organisational space to incorporate aspects beyond its geometrical meaning. In doing so, it has gone beyond the dominant organisational perspective where space becomes defined by inside and outside characteristics.

This study has also widened the current organisational perspectives on boundaries and shown that boundaries are not simply established; rather they are produced through a dynamic, ongoing and possibly contested process that excludes and includes (Barth, 1969). Through social interaction and action produced in socially meaningful contexts, psychosocial boundaries are actively (re)created and maintained.

It has also been emphasised that the available psychosocial space is a determining factor in partners' continuous redrafting of boundaries, organisation of practices and formation of different identities. The thesis has therefore contributed to discussions on the development of identity, while it has also widened the perspective and shown how identity formation is linked to specific psychosocial spaces determined by specific boundaries and actions.

Finally, the majority of identity theories does not deal with ongoing practices; rather, they consider practice and identity as separate sub-fields (Simpson, 2009). This research has attempted to go beyond this separation by explaining the impact of the emergent psychosocial space in the construction of partners' identities. It has done so firstly by

exploring how partners engaged in loops of identifications (Beech and Huxham, 2003) in order to construct and reconstruct their identities in drifting spaces. Secondly, it has examined how actors generated meaning, significance and sense through their engagements and social conduct in relation to the collaboration space.

7.2. Between planned and emergent collaboration

In the exploration of collaboration practices, the first empirical chapter (chapter 5) progressed from the ways in which partners, as a collective, gave significance to particular experiences, events and actions, to the description of the day to day of the collaborative relationship. The emergent collective narrative presented KEDDY's collaborative process. Through this narrative, partners' efforts to follow the design of the collaborative arrangements have been presented. Yet, it has also been shown how partners were forced to change their plans in order to respond to the dynamic nature of the inter-organisational collaboration and to practices which emerged in specific spaces of action. It has therefore been possible to explore how partners co-constructed and made sense of their space of action and their identities.

In particular, the journey of the collaborative process was constructed in four parts (Referral, Diagnosis, Negotiation and Intervention) representing four different periods of time in the collaboration process. In order to illustrate the emergent process of collaboration, the research presented the story of Anna. Anna's story brought to life the partnership's difficulties, challenges and practices. Moreover, when grounding their reflections about the partnership in this particular case, the tension which partners felt between the guidelines suggested by the official collaboration protocol (planned collaboration) and what actually happened in practice (emergent collaboration) was presented.

In the first part of the narrative (Referral), partners were trapped in a regulatory space where they tried to convince each other to comply with the collaboration rules in order to refer Anna to KEDDY. This space was influenced by specific psychosocial characteristics, such as reinforcement of the rules, fear of intervention and resistance to

externals, and physical characteristics (the dominant school). These features generated more obstacles rather than helping achieve the collaborative aims. The partners co-constructed a space of action framed by psychosocial boundaries that separated the government who made the rules and schools, KEDDY, parents who had to follow them (Hernes, 2003). In the given space actors identified themselves either as school members (head teachers and school teachers) or as external stakeholders (KEDDY, parents and government representatives). Based on these identities, partners decided that the best way to act was to follow the protocol (Haslam and Schultz, 1997). As such, the main collaborative practices of this period came into being: the school's engagement through regulation, the negotiation of formal procedures between KEDDY and teachers, as well as the acceptance of interventions on behalf of the school. These practices were the result of dynamic and temporal relationships among collaboration partners and also of their actions and behaviours expressed in the regulatory space (Nicolini, 2009).

Diagnosis, the second part of the narrative, also indicated the emergent nature of inter-organisational collaborations. This story unfolded in KEDDY where claims of expertise between teachers and psychologists, KEDDY employees' disputes, as well as power games between KEDDY and the school, characterised the psychosocial space. As partners co-constructed an expert knowledge space, they engaged in practices that both sustained routines of expertise but also allowed possibilities for creative action (Simpson, 2009). Indeed, while KEDDY representatives stayed focused on the protocol, delays, confusions and obstacles appeared. These did not allow KEDDY's team to produce a diagnosis on time. A new working space was required if the collaboration was to become productive. Through an interplay between emergent (i.e. disregard of school teacher's report) and designed practices, such as the presentation of the case at the team meeting, psychosocial boundaries were actively created. These helped KEDDY employees organise their relationship and overcome the obstacles created by an expert knowledge space that was too constraining (Haynes, 2012). These boundaries also helped partners re-consider and re-establish their identities as KEDDY or external experts. This resulted from how different actors (i.e. psychologists and teachers) interacted in relation to the current space (Hosking and McNamee, 2006). In this cooperative space collaborative practices were generated through KEDDY's efforts to overcome resource shortages, make decisions in diagnostic team meetings and eventually co-produce Anna's report.

In the third part of the narrative (Negotiation), which took place in the physical space of KEDDY, partners had to comply with the collaboration rules in order to announce Anna's report to her mother. Yet, they soon realised the need to adapt their practices to the dynamic nature of the collaboration space (Prins, 2010). As such, KEDDY representatives changed their daily working relationships and, instead of supporting only the client (Anna) as the protocol indicates, they supported externals too (i.e. her mother). The collaborative process emerged as partners co-constructed the supportive psychosocial space which was defined by social stigma, stereotypes, mother's insecurity and fears as well as KEDDY's employees' expertise exercise. As the partners demarcated the collaboration boundaries to include KEDDY educators and exclude stakeholders (government, parents and school representatives), they also tried to adjust to these changing boundaries (Hernes and Paulsen, 2003). They therefore identified themselves either as KEDDY experts or external stakeholders (parents, government representatives and schools) and organised their actions accordingly (van Rekom, 2002). Namely, partners arranged several meetings in order to provide support to Anna and overcome her mother's resistance as well as in order to send Anna's report to the school concluding this part of the narrative.

The emergent aspects of inter-organisational collaboration are also apparent in Intervention, the fourth part of the narrative. The three-fold nature of the space (Lefebvre, 1991) defines the collaborative process of this narrative part which evolved through the interaction of actors with the physical space (Dale and Burrell, 2008). The narrative showed how the power space unfolded in Aitoloakarnanias Central Departmental Council of Primary Education. Power struggles between government representatives and KEDDY, authority exercised from the government as well as self-reflection on the part of all partners on the usefulness of the partnership defined the existing psychosocial space. Following the protocol KEDDY organised meetings with Anna's head teacher and government representatives in order to discuss the necessary interventions for Anna's support. However, due to the government representative and her school's resistance to assisting KEDDY, KEDDY had to change its standard practices. It therefore produced official documents asking the head teacher to disclose Anna's report to her teachers and the government representative of primary education to provide the funding for the purchase of educational equipment. It was only through the

interplay between regulation and emergence, between planned (i.e. government's approval for the establishment of a school unit) and emergent practices, such as Anna's transfer to a different school, that partners managed to provide the necessary educational support to Anna. Psychosocial boundaries, which included government representatives who allocated resources and excluded the other partners (KEDDY, schools and parents), forced the partners to redefine their identities in order to understand a shifting working space (Paulsen, 2003). In fact, in reacting to the emergent needs of Anna's case the partners identified themselves either as collaboration partners (KEDDY, schools and parents) or as government representatives.

The results show that two types of working spaces were constructed and interacted in producing both stability and renewal in the collaboration space. First, 'spaces of regulation' acted to achieve some degree of stability. These refer to the official regulation that defined the structure of the inter-organisational collaboration and the relationships between partners. At the same time 'spaces of exploration and learning' were being developed among partners. These are spaces where new collaborative actions were conceived and interpreted and a new meaning about the partnership was collectively developed. The collaboration space was therefore transformed and emerged as designed and emergent practices interacted, generating new spaces for action that shifted identities and boundaries.

The first analysis has therefore illustrated how partners' engagement in everyday working relationships and practices demarcates the psychosocial boundaries of the collaborative process and produces new spaces where action is possible. These new working spaces, which consist of interrelated physical and psychosocial spaces, provide further contexts for new relationships, actions and experiences. The results of this analysis point to the fact that, in order to consider inter-organisational collaboration as an unfolding process, focus should be placed on both the emergent (practices in situ) and planned (collaborative protocol) aspects of collaboration. By examining how these can be different yet interrelated, not only the dynamic nature of inter-organisational collaborations is acknowledged but also a deeper understanding of how collaboration is actually achieved.

7.3. Making the unfamiliar space familiar by engaging in loops of identification

The enacted ways of collaborating that the first analysis revealed were not only about shared practices and processes in the collaboration space. They also showed that within the shifting spaces different identities and boundaries were established in order to help partners understand the emergent spaces and organise their practices.

In order to explore how partners' identities were (re)constructed, the second analysis (chapter 6) has focused on personal stories. By exploring personal narratives, it was possible to examine how partners “continually restory [their] pasts, shifting the relative significance of different events for whom [they] have become, discovering connections (they) have previously been aware of, repositioning (themselves) and others in (their) networks of relationships” (Mishler, 1995: 5). In fact, personal narratives were used as works of history located in specific time and space that helped explore how participants experienced and acted in the psychosocial spaces they inhabited, as well as how they perceived the broader context they lived in (Riessman, 2002). Personal narratives helped reveal the link between personal and social identities as well as the shaping of the collaborative space. As such, the second analysis illustrated how in different spaces partners (re)construct their and others' identity through loops of identification. It also explained how participants' identifications were affected by the way they perceived the partnership and organised their ways of collaborating.

Participants' personal stories contained many performative characteristics that enabled a “local achievement of identity” (Cussins, 1998). Each story has invoked a different construction of identity through processes of for example, contradiction, compromise, manipulation and persuasion. In fact, the protagonists have not held a fixed role in their stories rather they have “consider(ed) themselves in terms of multiple overlapping or cross-cutting group memberships” (van Knippenberg and Ellemers, 2003: 34). For example, Christine (school representative) identified herself as a new employee, a stupid person and as a cooperative teacher all in one single narrative. Maria (KEDDY employee) reconstructed her identity variously as a newcomer to a group, a learner, a friendly colleague and a psychologist. In fact, in the four narratives presented in chapter

6 “identity is mobile, a process not a thing, a becoming not a being”, constantly shifting in response to the given space (Frith, 1996: 109).

Indeed, while partners told their stories to a particular audience, identities were redeveloped and changed based on the specific space the actors inhabited (Ellemers et al., 2003). As such, when Rob (government representative) followed the collaborative rules despite the delays they caused to the supportive process, he identified himself as a compliant government representative in an autocratic space. Later, when the psychosocial space shifted, Rob entered a contrasted space since he had to ignore the protocol in order to refer a student to KEDDY. He therefore identified himself as a rebel against the system. On the other hand, the school representative (Christine) perceived herself as a victim in an exploitable space when she was tricked by KEDDY employees in order to accept supporting a student. However, she became a cooperative teacher in a supportive space when she decided to support her student even though she did not have knowledge on issues of special education. Maria (KEDDY employee) put forward her professional identity as a psychologist in a competitive space when she had to compete with other KEDDY colleagues in order to prove that her diagnosis was accurate. Yet, in a welcoming space, when arriving as a newcomer to the KEDDY group, she defined herself as a friendly colleague. Finally, Rob (parent of a disabled child) constructed the identity of a supportive father in a defensive space when he had to prove to KEDDY employees that he was a good father. However, when he first learnt about his son's disability, he entered an unknown space where he identified himself as frustrated father who did not know how to help his disabled son. Therefore, it is not possible to refer to partners based on a single stable identity since the relative standing of their identities is subject to change based on the particular spaces they inhabit at particular times (Ellemers and Barreto, 2000; Brewer, 2009).

In fact, every time that the narrators have entered a particular psychosocial space, they have experienced an interaction between identities that had prior meaning and so were accessible and available, and potentially new identities that fitted a given space (Haslam et al., 2011; Haynes, 2012). The participants tend to choose one identity that responds best to their space (Simon, 2009). This identity becomes salient when they are committed to it (Turner, 1999; Sani, 2012). This means that the partners organised their actions based on their identity while their actions affected the way they and others

perceived their identities. For example, Rob (government representative) chose to identify himself as a government representative in an autocratic space. Yet, he failed to commit to this identity when he decided to go beyond the regulations of the inter-organisational collaboration, becoming a rebel. His identity as government representative, instead of becoming salient, therefore shifted and Rob presented himself as a rebel against the system. Identity and action have been involved in a constant interdependent relationship where they have mutually influenced each other (Goffman, 1959; Simon, 2009). As such, when the government representative identified himself as a rebel against the system, this identification influenced his actions. He therefore ignored the protocol and sent his report directly to KEDDY. Identity and practice were therefore closely related and affected the shape of the inter-organisational collaboration.

A vital step in the identification process is the development of boundaries (Hernes, 2004a). Psychosocial boundaries have helped the understanding of the conditions under which participants have entered and left a particular space. They have also affected the way partners identified themselves and others. They have therefore influenced the interaction between the partners (Olson, 2008). For instance, when George (parent of a disabled child) entered KEDDY, he engaged in an unfamiliar space where the rules were given by others and the parent did not feel entitled to act. He therefore had to establish the psychosocial boundaries in order to organise his actions. The new boundaries that he activated contributed to his new emergent identity as a frustrated father who did not know how to help his son. These boundaries also led the parent to identify the social worker as an distant and unfriendly employee who did not understand George's concerns about his son. However, when the social worker passed responsibility for the child's disability to George, the boundaries of the unknown space were crossed and the parent realised that he had to defend himself against the social worker's accusations that he was a bad father. George therefore generated a defensive space where new psychosocial boundaries had to be set in order to help him protect himself against the allegations of the social worker. Within this new space the parent could present himself as a supportive father and the social worker could be redrafted as a professional who was there to help.

The findings of the second analysis have therefore stressed that identification processes in inter-organisational collaborations are a sequence of interdependent and interwoven

loops (Beech and Huxham, 2003) that are composed of psychosocial spaces, multiple foci of identification, salient identities and actions (Kourti and Garcia-Lorenzo, 2012d). As the second analysis has indicated, the partners of the collaboration were constantly engaged in loops of identification that allowed them to accommodate the changing collaborative boundaries by (re)producing identities that fitted the conditions they experienced. These relational processes have contributed to the redrafting of partnership boundaries and have affected the unfolding of the inter-organisational collaboration. Identification processes were therefore central in this research which has aimed to explore collaboration practices and the emergence of collaborations.

7.4. Traveling in between spaces: Activating psychosocial boundaries and identities in order to adjust to emergent patterns of collaborating

Following a narrative analysis (see section 3.3.2. for a description of the narrative analysis) this research has avoided addressing identity with a narrow view of pre-defined affiliations, attachments and identifications (Haslam et al., 1998). Rather the narratives of the second analysis have revealed the different possible identities a partner can construct based on particular psychosocial spaces. However, the emergent narratives of manipulation, compromise, persuasion and contradiction of the second analysis have also demonstrated that even though it is better for the partners to follow the rules, they sometimes need to break them. As such, they engage in the inter-organisational collaboration having an ideal way of collaborating in their mind but they have learned to adjust to emergent patterns of collaborating in order to achieve the partnership's aims (see table 14).

Table 14: Emergent patterns of collaborating based on the rising themes, activated psychosocial boundaries, dimensions and emergent identities in particular collaborative spaces

Narrative of identity and Emergent psycho social Space	Aspects of collaboration	Perspective on collaboration	Development of psycho social boundaries	Ideal ways of collaborating	Emergent patterns of collaborating
Contradiction in a Competitive Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being clear about the partners and their roles - Representing the collaboration - Shifting membership and purposes 	Coping with ambiguity and complexity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Abandoning collaborative identity - Lacking coherence 	Coalition	<i>While cooperation is ideal confrontation is also necessary</i>
Compromising in a Defensive Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Distinguishing between collaborative, organisational and individual aims - Having clear and common aims - Having different routes to aim achievement 	Managing aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resisting the diagnosis - Negotiating roles 	Compromise	<i>Resistance is necessary for achieving a compromise</i>
Manipulation in an Exploitable Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting expectations - Communicating and sharing information - Overcoming ambiguity and complexity - Being clear 	Dealing with lack of trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denying support to student - Failing to achieve collaboration aims 	Honesty	<i>Lack of trust is a necessary starting point in the collaboration . Honesty might be a gain after a long process</i>
Persuasion in a Contrasted Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not taking-for-granted assumptions - Being accountable to the collaboration - Managing motivations -Discussing issues 	Negotiating purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusing to negotiate collaborative processes and purposes - Changing roles 	Adaptation	<i>Discussions and disagreement s seem necessary before any adaptation or agreement is reached</i>

Christine (school representative) pointed out that honesty is necessary to make the collaboration work. She explained how important it is for partners to meet expectations, share information and communicate effectively, be clear regarding the collaborative process as well as resolving issues that cause ambiguity and complexity in the inter-organisational collaboration. For example, in her narrative of manipulation, Christine talked about early expectations regarding the collaboration such as quick establishment of the integration unit. She also illustrated how expectations regarding partners' behaviour, for example KEDDY support for the realisation of the educational program, were not met (Hibbert and Huxham, 2010). Christine also emphasised the importance of communication and the need to share information (Tsasis, 2009), since KEDDY employees hid information and lied about the process of establishing an integration unit. Moreover, Christine showed her frustration about the lack of clarity regarding the collaborative processes and, more specifically, the allocation of the resources and the protocol for the establishment of new school units (Prins, 2010). Finally, Christine indicated feelings of disappointment when she realised that ambiguity and complexity characterised the inter-organisational collaboration (i.e. the time-consuming bureaucratic process for hiring specialised teachers) and did not allow her partners to keep their promises (Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

These aspects that Christine highlighted in her narrative indicate that for her trust is one of the main themes needed to achieve the collaboration goals. As such, she entered the collaboration as a collaborative partner who engaged in a supportive space where she received help from KEDDY employees. Yet, soon she realised that she had to adjust to an exploitable space where KEDDY employees had not been honest regarding the collaborative process. She therefore identified herself as a victim and ended up doing something different from what she had initially thought of as an ideal way of collaborating. In fact, she refused participate in the supportive process because she did not believe KEDDY employees who had promised to support her in helping her student. As such, although she stated that trust may be a necessary starting point in the inter-organisational collaboration, it appeared that honesty might be gained only after a long process.

On the other hand, Maria (KEDDY employee) raised the issue of ambiguity and complexity in collaboration and stated that, for her, the ideal way to collaborate was through coalition. She therefore emphasised the role of collaborative aspects such as clarity of roles, flexibility and collaborative spirit for the success of the inter-organisational collaboration. In her narrative of contradiction, for example, Maria stressed the need to be clear about who the partners were and what their roles were in the collaborative process (Olson et al. 2012). She therefore explained that teachers should not become involved in the diagnostic process since they did not have the necessary educational background. Maria also explained that partners should work together representing the partnership and not KEDDY (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). In this sense, she thought it was important for the partners to abandon their identification based on their field of expertise (i.e. psychologists, teachers) and act as a team in order to deal with their cases successfully. Finally, Maria requested that her partners be flexible so as to be able to shift membership when new members, like herself, arrive in the collaboration (Tsisis, 2009).

Maria therefore presented in her narrative her view that only if partners were united, could the collaboration succeed. She therefore identified herself as a friendly colleague in a welcoming space where she received support to adjust to her new role at KEDDY. However, she learned that this ideal way of collaborating was not always effective in practice. In fact, when she entered a competitive space, she formed a professional identity as a psychologist in order to demarcate the psychosocial boundaries between herself and the teachers. She therefore decided to take control of the situation and act individually in order to produce the diagnosis of the student by herself. This indicates that while coalition is ideal, confrontation is also necessary when collaborating.

In contrast, George (parent of a disabled child) stated the importance of distinguishing between collaborative and individual aims, of being flexible and having common aims. Using these collaborative aspects, he indicated his view that only if the partners compromised would the collaboration fulfil its aims. For example, in his narrative of compromise, George stated that for him the distinction between collaborative, organisational and individual aims was very important in order for the partnership to progress (Olson et al., 2012). He therefore gave up previously established identities (i.e. frustrated father, external) and perceived himself as a supportive father, and the social

worker as a professional, who were both working towards a shared goal. This also indicated that George's perception of partners was that they should have clear and common aims (Hibbert and Huxham, 2010). In fact, only when George realised that he and the social worker shared the aim to help his son, did he compromise and facilitate the collaborative process. Finally, in his story George showed that partners should be able to adapt and follow appropriate pathways to achieve their aim (Gray, 2008). As such, when he realised that his resistance did not assist the collaborative process, he acted as a supportive father and cooperated with the social worker.

George therefore entered the inter-organisational collaboration believing that the ideal way of collaborating is by compromising. However, in the initial unfamiliar space where he did not know how the collaborative process worked, he identified himself as a frustrated father who could not accept the social worker's diagnosis and he tried to establish the boundaries between himself and the other partners. On the other hand, when he entered a defensive space where he had to justify himself as a good father, his identity as a supportive father became salient and George overcame his initial resistance and compromised in order to support his son. His narrative therefore indicates that despite the fact that George thought that the ideal way of collaborating was by compromising, partners do not always do that in practice. As such, partners have to adapt to the emergent patterns of the collaboration and accept that resistance is sometimes necessary for achieving compromise.

Finally, Rob (government representative) explained that only if partners could adapt to the emergent needs of their work, would the partnership survive. He therefore presented dialogue, motivation and responsibility as necessary aspects for collaborating. In his story of persuasion Rob indicated that partners should not take-for-granted collaboration assumptions (Huxham and Vangen, 2001). In contrast, they should be flexible because there may be exceptions in the cases they deal with. Rob also stated that it is important for partners to be accountable to the collaboration and not their organisation (Tsasis, 2009). In fact, in order to decide the best course of action for his case, he separated himself from his organisation (Council for primary education) and asked permission from the other partners (school and KEDDY) in order to send his report directly to KEDDY. Moreover, George realised that, in order to help the collaboration fulfil its role, he had to align his motives to the partnership motives (Prins, 2010). He therefore

decided to leave behind personal and professional aspirations related to his role as a government representative, such as to be a committed employee, and aligned his interests to those of the other partners by overcoming the protocol. Finally, Rob understood the importance of discussing with the partners before making decisions and acting (Cullen et al., 2000). As such, he engaged in several discussions with the government representative and KEDDY employees before he decided to override the rules.

The aspects that Rob emphasised in his narrative indicated his ideal way of collaborating: adaptation to the emergent need of the cases. In practice, this ideal formed a contradiction with the autocratic space he initially inhabited where he identified himself as a follower of the system. However, when he entered a contrasted space, he realised that the rules caused disagreements and delayed the support of the student. He therefore crossed the initially established psychosocial boundaries between himself and the other partners and identified himself as a rebel against the system. As such, his narrative illustrates that in practice discussions and disagreements are necessary before adaptation or agreement is reached.

The second analysis therefore showed how the partners through their narratives have expressed not only their ideal way of collaborating but also how they ended up doing something else in order to achieve their aims. In fact, collaboration space, identity construction, boundary activation and social practices are integrated in order to indicate how the partners can benefit from the inter-organisational collaboration.

7.5. Practical contributions

Despite the fact that this thesis primarily aims to advance the theoretical discussions on inter-organisational collaborations, it also has practical implications. As described in the first chapter, despite the fact that many organisations form inter-organisational collaborations in order to survive in today's complex environments, many of these collaborations fail. The biggest part of the collaboration literature looks for stability and certainty by offering specific structures, factors, tools and techniques that will help

collaborations succeed. However, this thesis illustrates empirically the emergent nature of collaborations which could be explored by placing at the center collaborative processes and practices that are expressed, framed and developed in specific spaces.

This thesis shows that as inter-organisational collaborations emerge in complex environments, it is hard to predict their outcome since a specific space, time and circumstances will affect how a collaboration unfolds. As such, not only the physical but also the psychosocial space of the collaboration should be taken into account when exploring collaborations. This space will provide the platform for the development and shaping of the partners' practices and relations. As such, what the collaboration becomes depends on the (re)construction of its space by the partners' actions, interactions and experiences.

This research also illustrates empirically that partners enter the collaboration having an ideal way of collaborating and specific rules they should follow. However, they will also have to adapt to emergent collaborative patterns and practices in order to make sure they will achieve the aims of the collaboration. As such, although some practices may be crystallised for a while, through the partners' interactions new spaces will emerge that require new practices. This indicates that inter-organisational collaborations should recognise the problem of implementing formal structures and protocols while they should also appreciate and welcome unfolding practices. By being open to both emergent and established patterns of collaborating, the unfolding and complex nature of collaborations is accepted while the partners are able to respond to the evolving needs of the collaborative process.

The problem of implementing formal practices and rules is especially true in governmental collaborations that can bring involuntarily public organisations to work together. These organisations, which may come from different disciplines, have to achieve both the aims of their organisation and of the partnership. If they are not flexible, they will not be able to move between established and emergent practices. It will therefore be difficult for them to be successful.

This thesis also demonstrates that boundaries are inherent to the collaborative process since inter-organisational collaborations develop through processes of boundary setting.

In fact, physical and psychosocial boundaries will help partners make sense of their space and will influence how they act in relation to this space. Moreover, boundaries will help partners distinguish themselves from non-collaboration partners by constructing a collaborative identity. This research therefore suggests that when exploring inter-organisational collaborations, it is important to examine how based on a specific context, partners form new identities that help them activate new boundaries, understand the space they are engaged in and organise their actions.

7.6. Further research and limitations of the study

Following this research, several aspects for further investigation may be raised. The first area for further research is theoretical. This research has explored inter-organisational collaboration from a practice-based perspective showing how the partners organise their actions, engage in interactions and perceive their relationships with partners. These practices of collaboration are less explored in organisational studies and further research will shed more light to the emergence of inter-organisational collaboration. Furthermore, this research has emphasised that collaborative rules can either help the partners achieve the collaborative aims or obstruct them and distract them from these aims. It has also indicated how an inter-organisational collaboration can benefit through evolving practices. Further research needs to be conducted in order to understand and value the collaborative processes and practices, as well as the role of the protocol and emergent practices, in the achievement of collaborative aims.

In this thesis the role of identification has been placed at the centre of the research as a process that helped partners fulfil their goals. It has also allowed the researcher to explore in depth the collaboration practice. Identification processes have been less developed in collaboration studies and further research will allow the exploration not only of how partners form their collaborative identities but also of how partnerships can benefit more by fostering collaborative identifications.

This research has followed a longitudinal study for the exploration of the emergence of inter-organisational collaboration. It would be interesting to have more than one in-depth longitudinal study in settings with not only similar but also different

characteristics. In this way, comparisons among collaborative arrangements in different settings could be achieved. However, this research has been based on a particular combination of theoretical and methodological approaches in an effort to understand KEDDY's collaborative processes as well as KEDDY partners' practices and identities. This makes systematic comparisons difficult. Yet this does not mean that this research cannot share many concerns with other qualitative research studies such as those with public or educational partnerships.

A methodological limitation is related to the sample of the study. Participants were selected from all four partner-organisations (KEDDY, schools, parents with disabled children and government representatives). However, Aitolokarnanias is one of the largest prefectures in Greece and has 72 special and mainstream nursery, primary and secondary schools. Partners of four schools participated in the research, assuring that schools from every educational level in the mainstream and special needs education were represented in the research. Despite that, the study could have benefitted from the participation of more school representatives. Nevertheless, due to access, financial and time constraints this was not possible. Moreover, the participation of more school representatives would not necessary have assisted in the further exploration of the research aims. However, since the role of the partnership under research is to improve the educational services provided to students with special needs, a future research study aiming at exploring public educational services could surely benefit from a larger school sample. It has to be noted that, although this thesis has provided some insights into this area, the in-depth exploration of the partnership as a public educational service was beyond the scope of this research.

Overall, it is hoped that this thesis has offered a conceptualisation of inter-organisational collaboration that suggests better ways to collaborate in unstable and demanding environments. In these contexts social practices, identities and boundaries are processes that help partners balance plans and designs with the emerging needs of the collaboration. This research opens up new challenges but also opportunities for conversation about partnerships and their practices in today's organisational worlds. However, despite the insights that this research offers, further studies would contribute more to the exploration of the issues raised in this research.

8. Bibliography

- Abbott, A. (1995). Things of boundaries. *Social Research*, 62(4): 857-882.
- Abrams, D. and Hogg, M.A. (2001). Collective identity, group membership and self-conception. In M.A. Hogg and R.S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 425-460.
- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, NJ: Sage, pp. 377-392.
- Albert, S.A. and Whetten, D.A. (1985). Organizational Identity. In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Straw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. London: JAI Press, pp. 263-295.
- Alle-Corliss, A. and Alle-Corliss, R. (2009). *Group work: A practical guide to developing groups in agency settings*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other authoritarian personality. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30: 47-92.
- Alter, C. and Hage, J. (1993). *Organizations working together*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (2002). Identity Regulation as Organizational Control: Producing the Appropriate Individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39 (5): 619-644.
- Anderson, E. and Gatignon, H. (1986). Modes of foreign entry: A transaction cost analysis proposition. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 17(3): 1-26.

- Ashforth, B.E. and Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 20-39.
- Ashkenas, R., Ulrich, D., Todd, J. and Kerr, S. (1995). *The boundaryless organization: Breaking the chains of organizational structure*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bamberg, M.G.W. and McCabe, A. (1998). Editorial. *Narrative Inquiry*, 8(1): iii-v.
- Barbour, R.S. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research: a student's guide to the craft of doing qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Barnes, B. (2001). Practice as collective action. In T.R. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina and E. Von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 17-28.
- Barnes, J. (1954). Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish. *Human Relations*, (7): 39-58.
- Barney, J.B., Bunderson, S., Foreman, P., Gustafson, L.T., Huff, A.S., Martins, L.L., Reger, R.K., Sarason, Y. and Stimpert J.L. (1998). A Strategy Conversation on the topic of Organization Identity. In A.D. Whetten and P.C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations*. United States of America: Sage Publications, pp. 99–168.
- Barth, F. (1969). Introduction. In F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 9-38.
- Beatrice, D. (1990). Interagency coordination: A practitioner's guide to a strategy for effective social policy. *Administration in Social Work*, 14(4): 45-59.
- Bechky, B.A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3): 312-330.

- Beck, C.S. (2006). *Communication yearbook 30*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beech, N. and Huxham, C. (2003). Cycles of identity formation in collaboration. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 33(3): 28-52.
- Beyerlein, M., Freedman, S., McGee, G. and Moran, L. (2002). *Beyond Teams: Building the Collaborative Organization*. Wiley: The Collaborative Work Systems series.
- Blackler, F., Crump, N. and McDonald, S. (2000). Organizing processes in complex activity networks. *Organization*, 7(2): 277–300.
- Bold, C. (2012). *Using narrative in research*. London: Sage.
- Borgmann, A. (2006). Technology as a Cultural Force: For Alena and Griffin. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 31(3): 351–360.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). The three forms of theoretical knowledge. *Social Science Information*, 12: 53-80.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). Habitus. In J. Hilller and E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place*. England: Ashgate, pp. 43-49.
- Bourdieu, P., Accardo, A., Balazs, G., Beaud, S. et. al. (1993). *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Translated by P.P. Ferguson et al. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Bouwen, R. (2003). Relational knowledge and north-south discourses on development projects. In C.M. Scott and W.E. Thurston (Eds.), *Collaboration in context*. Alberta, Canada: Institute for Gender Research and the Health Promotion Research Group, pp. 339-347.

Bouwen, R. and Hovelynck, J. (2006). The group-in-the-making: From 'group dynamics' to 'relational practices'. In D.M. Hosking and S. McNamee (Eds.), *The social construction of organization*. Ljubljana, Slovenien: Liber and Copenhagen Business School Press, pp. 128-151.

Bouwen, R. and Taillieu, T. (2004). Multi-party collaboration as social learning for interdependence: developing relational knowing for sustainable natural resource management. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 14: 137–153.

Bouzakis, S. (2002). *Modern Greek education (1821-1998)*. Athens: Gutenberg.

Bouzakis, S. and Berdousi, E. (2008). The educational argumentation of the Hellenic political forces on special education in the 1913, 1929, 1964, and 1985 reforms. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(2): 94-100.

Brewer, M.B. (2003). *Intergroup relations*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brewer, M.B. (2009). Motivations underlying ingroup identification. Optimal distinctiveness and beyond. In S. Otten, K. Sassenberg and T. Kessler (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: The role of motivation and emotion*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 3-23.

Brewer, M.B. and Brown, R.J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske and G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*, New York, McGraw Hill, pp. 554-594.

Brickson, S.L. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 82-101.

- Brown, A.D. and Humphreys, M. (2002). Nostalgia and the Narrativization of Identity: A Turkish Case Study. *British Journal of Management*, 13: 141–159.
- Browning, L.D., Beyer, J.M. and Shetler, J.C. (1995). Building cooperation in a competitive industry: SEMATECH and the semiconductor industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38:113–151.
- Bruce, L., Hilvert, J. and Bruce, J. (2005). *How does it work? Space technology*. Australia, Macmillan Education.
- Bruner, J.S. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. London: Routledge.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, D.A. and Badha, R.J. (2008). *Power, politics and organisational change*. London: Sage.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Carlisle, S. (1992). Taming the sauvage: French greenery and French values. *Landscape*, 31(2): 39-45.
- Checkland, P. (1991). From framework through experience to learning: the essential nature of action research. In H.E. Nissen, H.K. Klein and R.A. Hirschheim (Eds.), *Information Systems Research: Contemporary Approaches and Emergent Traditions*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 397-403.
- Chia, R. (1999). A rhizomic model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change. *British Journal of Management*, 10: 209-227.

- Chia, R. (2004). Strategy-as-Practice: Reflections on the research agenda. *European Management Review*, 1: 1-6.
- Child, J. and Faulkner, D. (1999). *Strategies of co-operation: Management alliances, networks and joint ventures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, R. and Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction. *Organization Studies*, 9: 91-112.
- Corey, M.S., Corey, G. and Corey, C. (2010). *Group processes and practice*. Canada: Cengage Learning.
- Cropper, S. (1996). Collaborative working and the issue of sustainability. In C. Huxham (Ed.) *Creating collaborative advantage*, London: Sage, pp. 80-100.
- Crosby, B. and Bryson, J. (2004). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cullen, J., Johnson, J. and Sakano, T. (2000). Success through commitment and trust: The soft side of strategic alliance management. *Journal of World Business*, 35(3): 223-240.
- Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C.G. (2005). *Organization Development and Change*. USA: Thomson South-Western.
- Currie, C. (2010). *Narratives and narrators: a philosophy of stories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cussins, C.M. (1998). Ontological Choreography: Agency for Women Patients in an Infertility Clinic. In M. Berg and S. Mol. (Eds.), *Differences in Medicine: Unravelling Practices, Techniques, and Bodies*. Durham NC: Duke University Press, pp. 166-201.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Narrating the organisation: Dramas of institutional identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2008). *A theory of organizing*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Czarniawska, B. (2012). Accounting and detective stories: an excursion to the USA in the 1940s. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 25(4): 659-672.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1992). *Exploring complex organisations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). *The spaces of organisation and the organisation of space: Power, identity and materiality at work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Darra, M., Ifanti, A., Prokopiadou, G. and Saitis, C. (2010). Basic skills, staffing of school units and training of educators. *Nea Paidia*, 134: 44-68 (in Greek).

Das, T. and Teng, B. (1997). Sustaining alliances: Options and guidelines. *Journal of General Management*, 22(4): 49-63.

Deaux, K. (1996). Social identification. In E. Tory Higgins and A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.) *Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford, pp. 777-798.

De Certeau, M. (1988). *The practice of everyday life*. London: University of California Press.

Deetz, S.A. (1994). The micro-politics of identity formation in the workplace: The case of a knowledge intensive firm. *Human Studies*, 17: 23-44.

De Rond, M. and Bouchikhi, H. (2004). On the dialectics of strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, 15: 56-69.

De Zeeuw, G. (1995). Values, Science and the Quest for Demarcation. *Systems Research*, 12(1): 15-24.

De Zeeuw, G. (2001). Interaction of Actors Theory. *Kybernetes*, 30(7-8): 971-983, draft paper.

Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M. and Harquail, C.V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 239-263.

Eden, C. and Huxham, C. (2001). The Negotiation of Purpose in Multi-organizational Collaborative Groups. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(3): 351–369.

Eikland, O. and Nicolini, D. (2011). Turning practically: Broadening the horizon. Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24: 164-174.

Ellemers, N. (1993). The influence of socio-structural variables on identity management strategies. *European review of social psychology*, 4: 27-57.

Ellemers, N. and Barreto, M. (2000). The impact of relative group status: Affective, perceptual and behavioural consequences. In R. Brown and S. Gaertner (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Vol. 4. Intergroup processes*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 324-343.

Ellemers, N., Haslam, S.A., Platow, M.J. and van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity at work: Developments, debates, directions. In S.A. Haslam, D. van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow and N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 3-26.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I. and Shaw, L.L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

EURYDICE (2009a). *Organisation of the education system in Greece*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

EURYDICE (2009b). *National summary sheets on education systems in Europe and ongoing reforms. Greece*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

EURYDICE (2012). *Key data on education in Europe: Funding and the social dimension*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Faerman, S.R., McCaffrey, D.P. and Van Slyke, D.M. (2001). Understanding interorganizational cooperation: Public-private collaboration in regulating financial market innovation. *Organization Science*, 12: 372–391.

Farmakopoulou, N. (2002). What lies underneath? An inter-organizational analysis of collaboration between education and social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, 32: 1051-1066.

Farr, R. (1984). Interviewing: The social psychology of the inter-view. In C. Cooper and P. Mankin (Eds.), *Psychology for managers*. London: McMillan, pp. 12-32.

Faulkner, D. (1995). *International strategic alliances: Co-operating to compete*. Maidenhead: MCGraw-Hill.

Feldman, M. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization Science*, 11(6): 611-629.

Felstead, A., Jewson, N. and Walters, S. (2005). *Changing places of work*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes, *Human Relations*, 7: 117-140.

Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Oxford, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp. 201-316.

- Ford, J.D. and Ford, L.W. (1994). Logics of Identity, Contradiction and Attraction in Change. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4): 756–786.
- Forster, N. (1994). The analysis of company documentation. In C. Cassel and G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organisational research. A practical guide*. London: Sage, pp. 147-166.
- Forsyth, D.R. (2010). *Group dynamics*. Wadsworth: Gengade Learning.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Friend, J. (1990). Handling organisational complexity in group decision support. In C. Eden and J. Radford (Eds.), *Tackling strategic problems*. London: Sage, 18-28.
- Frith, S. (1996). Music and identity. In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage, pp. 108-127.
- Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2008). Storying collective decision-making: Supporting collective action after a major organisational change. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 17 (3and4): 63-78.
- Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2010). Framing uncertainty: narratives, change and digital technologies. *Social science information*, 49(3): 329-350.
- Garcia-Lorenzo, L., Nolas, M. and de Zeeuw, G. (2008). Telling stories and the practice of collaboration. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 28(1and2): 9-19.
- Gardner, R. (2003). Working together to improve children's life chances: The challenge of inter-agency collaboration. In J. Weinstein, C. Whittington, and T. Leiba (Eds.), *Collaboration in social work practice*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 13-38.

Gaskell, G. (2000). Individual and group interviewing. In M. Bauer and G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*. London: Sage, pp. 38-56,

Gaskell, G. and Bauer, M. (2000). Towards public accountability: Beyond sampling, reliability and validity. In M. Bauer and G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*. London: Sage, pp. 336-350.

Gee, J.P. (1986). Units in the Production of Narrative Discourse. *Discourse Processes*. 9: 391-422.

Gee, J.P. (1991). A Linguistic Approach to Narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*. 1: 15-39.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretative theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 3-30.

Gergen, K. (1999). *An Invitation to Social Construction*. London: Sage.

Gergen, K. (2001). *Social Construction in Context*. London: Sage.

Gerson, J.M. and Peiss, K. (1985). Boundaries, negotiation, consciousness: Reconceptualising gender relations. *Social Problems*, 32: 317-331.

Gherardi, S. (2000). Practice-based theorising on learning and knowing in organizations: An introduction. *Organization*, 7(2): 211-223.

Gherardi, S. (2004). Knowing as desire: Dante's Ulysses at the end of the known world. In Y. Gabriel (Ed.), *Myths, stories and organizations. Premodern narratives for our times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 32-48.

Gherardi, S. (2012). Why do practices change and why do they persist? Models of explanations. In P. Hager, A.A. Lee and Reich (Eds.), *Practice, Learning and Change: practice-theory perspectives on professional learning*. New York: Springer International, pp. 217-232.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of a theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (2006). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gill, J. and Butler, R. (1996). Cycles of trust and distrust in joint-ventures. *European Management Journal*, 14: 81 - 89.

Glisson, C. and Hemmelgarn, A. (1998). The effects of organizational climate and interorganizational coordination on the quality of outcomes of children's service systems. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 22(5): 401-421.

Glynn, M.A. and Abzug, R. (2002). Institutionalizing Identity: Symbolic Isomorphism and Organizational Names. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 267–280.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Penguin.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (2003). *Stigma*. Cheltenham, UK: Nelson Thornes Ltd.

Goodsell, C.T. (1993). Architecture as a setting for governance, Theme issue. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 10(4) (Winter).

Gorman, G.E. and Clayton, P. (1997). *Qualitative research for the information professional: A practical handbook*. London: Facet Publishing.

Granitz, N.A. and Ward, J.C. (2001). Actual and Perceived Sharing of Ethical Reasoning and Moral Intent among In-group and Out-group Members. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 33: 299–322.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganisational collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10): 911-936.

Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, B. (1996). Cross-sectoral partners: collaborative alliances among business, government and communities. In C. Huxham (Ed.), *Creating collaborative advantage*. London: Sage, pp. 57-79.

Gray, B. (2008). Intervening to improve inter-organizational partnerships. . In M. Cropper, C. Ebers and C. Huxham and P. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interorganizational relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 664-690.

Gray, B. and Wood, D.J. (1991). Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory. *Journal of applied behavioural science*, 27(1): 3-22.

Greek Government (2000). *Official Journal, No 2817/2000, FEK 78/14-3-2000*. Athens: Ethniko Typografeio (in Greek).

Greenberg, L., Solomon S. and Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, pp. 61-139.

Gregson, N., Crewe, L. and Brooks, K. (2002). Shopping, space, and practice, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20: 597-617.

Grey, C. and Willmott, H.C. (2005). *Critical Management Studies: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Groenewegen, P. (2011). Introduction to Part III: Exploring the logic of organizational boundaries. In K.J. McCarthy, M. Fiolet and W. Dolfsma (Eds.), *The nature of the new*

firm: Beyond the boundaries of organisations and institutions. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 157-159.

Grossberg, L. (1996). Identity and cultural studies: Is that all there is? In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage, pp. 87-107.

Gulati, R. (1995). Does familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1): 85-112.

Guo, C. and Acar, M. (2005). Understanding collaboration among non-profit organizations: Combining resource dependency, institutional and network perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(3): 340-361.

Hagedoorn, J. (1993). Understanding the rationale of strategic technology partnering: interorganisational modes of co-operation and sectoral differences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14: 371-385.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'Identity'? In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.) *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage, pp. 1-17.

Hamera, J. (2011). Performance ethnography. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp. 317-330.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.

Harbert, A.S., Finnegan, D. and Tyler, N. (1997). Collaboration: A study of a children's initiative. *Administration in Social Work*, 21(3/4): 83-107.

Harper, C. (1993). *Exploring social change*. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey.

Hartley, J.F. (1994). Case studies in organisational research. In C. Cassel, and G. Symon, (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organisational research. A practical guide*. London: Sage, pp. 208-229.

- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haslam, A.S. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.
- Haslam, S.A., Reicher, S.D. and Platow, M.J. (2011). *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence and power*. London: Psychology Press.
- Haslam, A.S., Turner, J.C., Oakes, P.J., McGarty, C. and Reynolds, K.J. (1998). The group as a basis for emergent stereotype consensus. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 9: 203-239.
- Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5): 356-365.
- Haynes, N.M. (2012). *Group dynamics: Basics pragmatics for practitioners*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I. and Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. London: Sage.
- Hergert, M. and Morris, D. (1988). Trends in international collaborative agreements. In F.J. Contractor and P. Lorange (Eds.), *Cooperative strategies in international business*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp. 99-110.
- Hernes, T. (2003). Enabling and constraining properties of organizational boundaries. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-13.
- Hernes, T. (2004a). *The spatial construction of organization*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hernes, T. (2004b). Studying composite boundaries: A framework of analysis. *Human Relations*, 57(1): 9-29.

Hernes, T. (2008). *Understanding organization as process. Theory for a tangled world*. London: Routledge.

Hernes, T. and Maitlis, S. (2010). Process, sensemaking and organising. In T. Hernes and S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking and organizing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-37.

Hernes, T. and Paulsen, N. (2003). Introduction: Boundaries and organisation. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes, (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-13.

Hewstone, M. and Jaspars, J.M.F. (1982). Intergroup relations and attribution processes. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-133.

Hibbert, P. and Huxham, C. (2010). The Past in Play: Tradition in the structures of collaboration. *Organization Studies*, 31(5): 525-554.

Hillier, J. and Rooksby, E. (2005a). Introduction to first edition. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place*. England: Ashgate, pp. 19-42.

Hillier, J. and Rooksby, E. (2005b). Conclusions. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place*. England: Ashgate, pp. 395-408.

Hinchman, L.P. and Hinchman, S.K. (1997). Introduction. In L.P. Hinchman and S.K. Hinchman, (Eds), *Memory, Identity, Community: The Idea of Narrative in the Human Sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press. pp. xiii-1.

Hirschorn, L. and Gilmore, T. (1992). The new boundaries of the 'boundaryless' organization. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: 104-15.

- Hoel, J.L. (1998). *Cross-system collaboration: Tools that work*. Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America.
- Hogg, A.M. and Abrams, D. (1995). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.
- Hogg, M.A. and Abrams, D. (2001). Intergroup relations: An overview. In M.A. Hogg, and D. Abrams (Eds.). *Intergroup relations: Essential readings*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press, pp. 1-14.
- Hogg, M.A. and Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of management review*, 25(1): 121-140.
- Hogg, M.A., van Knippenberg, D. and Rast, D.E. (2012). Intergroup Leadership in Organizations: Leading Across Group and Organizational Boundaries. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2): 232-255.
- Hogg, M.A. and Vaughan, G.M. (2008). *Social Psychology*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Hogg, M.A. and Vaughan, G.M. (2010). *Essentials of social Psychology*. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Hopf, T. (2000). Constructionism all the way down. *International Politics*, 37(3): 369-378.
- Hosking, D.M. and McNamee, S. (2006). *The social construction of organization*. Slovenia: Liber and Copenhagen School Press.
- Hosking, D.M. and Morley, I.E. (1991). *A social psychology of organising: People, processes and contexts*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hutchins, E. (1993). Learning to navigate. In S. Chaicklin and J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press, pp. 35—63.

Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (2001). What makes practitioners tick?: Understanding collaboration practice and practicing collaboration understanding. In G. Genefke and F. McDonald (2001), *Effective collaboration: managing the obstacles to success*. New York: Palgrave, pp. 1-16.

Huxham, C, and Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. New York: Routledge.

Hydén, L.C. (1997). Illness and Narrative. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 19: 48-69.

Hyvärinen, M. (2008). Analyzing narratives and story-telling. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman and J. Brannen (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 447-460.

Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: Recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in-use. *Organization, Studies*, 25(4): 529–560.

Johnson, G, Melin, L. and Whittington, R. (2003). Micro strategy and strategizing: Towards an activity-based view. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1): 3–22.

Kamensky, J.M. and Burlin, T.J. (2004). *Collaboration: Using networks and partnerships*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kanter, R. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4): 96-108.

Kärreman, D. and Alvesson, M. (2001). Making newsmakers: Conversational identity at work. *Organization Studies*, 22(1): 59–89.

Katsaros, I. (2008). Decentralization: Critical consideration of the general framework and the relevant tendency in the field of education. *Epistimoniko Vima tou Daskalou*, 9: 88-108 (in Greek).

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley.

Katz, J.S. and Martin, B.R. (1997). What is Research Collaboration?. *Research Policy*, 26: 1-18.

Kavafis, K.P. (1911). Ithaka. In G. Savidis. (Ed)(1992), *Cavafy, Collected Poems* Princeton: Princeton University Press. Translated by E. Keeley and P. Sherrard.

Kearney, R. (2002). *On stories. Thinking in action series*. London: Routledge.

Kelle, U., Prein, G. and Birb, K. (1995). *Computer-aided qualitative data analysis: theory, methods and practice*. London: Sage.

Kessler, T. and Harth, N. (2009). Change in intergroup relations: Psychological processes accompanying, determining and determined by social change. In S. Otten, K. Sassenberg and T. Kessler (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: the role of motivation and emotion*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 243-261.

Keyton, J. and Stallworth, V. (2003). On the verge of collaboration: Interaction processes versus group outcomes. In L.R. Frey (Ed.), *Group communication in context: Studies of bona fide groups*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 235-260.

Kourti, I. and Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2012a). Partnership Strategies to Support Children with Special Educational Needs in Greece: The KDAY Challenge. In T. Patelis (Ed.), *Research Studies and Perspectives in Psychological Science*. Athens: Athens Institute for Education and Research, pp. 81-95.

Kourti, I. and Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2012b). Collaboration as an emergent space of practice: Activating boundaries in a Greek educational partnership. *28th European Group of Organizational Studies Colloquium*, Helsinki.

Kourti, I. and Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2012c). Developing collaborative working spaces: Boundary and identity in a Greek Educational partnership. *7th Organization Studies Workshop*, Rhodes.

Kourti, I. and Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2012d). Traveling in between spaces: Boundary and identity development in a Greek Educational partnership. *30th Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism*, Barcelona.

Kourti, I. and Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2012e). Exploring the collaboration space: A boundary and identity approach for handling ambiguity in a Greek educational partnership. *19th Multi-Organisational Partnerships, Alliances and Networks conference*, Wageningen.

Kyriazis, A. and Asderaki, F. (2008). *Monographs on higher education: Higher education in Greece*. European Centre for Higher Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Lackoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

Langley, A. and Tsoukas, H. (2010). Introducing perspectives on process organization studies. In T. Hernes and S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking and organizing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-26.

Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1987). *The end of organised capitalism*. Polity, Cambridge.

Laslett, B. (1999). Personal Narratives as Sociology. Featured essay, *Contemporary Sociology*. 28(4):391-401.

Lawler, S. (2002) Narrative in Social Research. In T. May (Ed), *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: Sage, pp. 242-258.

Lawrence, R. (1990). Public collective and private space: A study of urban housing in Switzerland. In S. Kent (Ed.), *Domestic architecture and the use of space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, pp. 73-91.

Lebra, T.S. (1993). *Above the clouds: Status culture of the modern Japanese nobility*. Los Angeles: Berkeley and University of California press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Leyens, J-P., Paladino, P.M., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A. and Gaunt. R. (2000). The Emotional Side of Prejudice: The Attribution of Secondary Emotions to Ingroups and Outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(2): 186–197.

Linden, R.M. (2003). *Working Across Boundaries: Making Collaboration Work in Government and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Linehan, C. and Kavanagh, D. (2004). *Contrasting project ontologies*. Paper presented at the 2nd workshop Making Projects Critical: Projectification and its Discontents. 13th-14th December, St Matthias Campus, Bristol Business School. University of the West of England.

Linstead, S. (2002). Organization as reply: Henri Bergson and casual organization theory. *Organization*, 9(1): 95–111.

Lorange, P. and Roos, J. (1992). *Strategic alliances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mael, F. and Ashforth, B.E. (1995). Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 309-333.

Marshall, C. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Marshall, N. (2003). Identity and difference in complex projects: Why boundaries still matter in the “Boundaryless” organization. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes, (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 55-75.

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. Oxford: University Press.

McCann, J.E. (1983). Design guidelines for social problem-solving interventions, *Journal of applied behavioural science*, 19: 177-189.

Miettinen, R., Samra-Fredericks, D. and Yanow, D. (2009). Re-turn to practice: An introductory essay. *Organization studies*, 30(12): 1309-1327.

Migdal, J.S. (2003). *Boundaries and belonging: States and societies in the struggle to shape identities and local practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Miles M.B., and Huberman A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, D.T. and Prentice, D.A. (1999). Some consequences of a belief in group essence: The category divide hypothesis. In D.A. Prentice and D.T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 213-238.

Miller, E.J. and Rice, A.K. (1967). *Systems of organization -The control of task and sentient boundaries*. London: Tavistock.

Mills, C.W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Mishler, E.G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Mishler, E.G. (1995). Models of Narrative Analysis: A Typology. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 5(2): 87-123.
- Mishler, E.G. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' Narratives of Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Moreland, R.L., Hogg, M.A. and Hains, S.C. (1994). Back to the future: Social psychological research on groups. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 30: 527-555.
- Morgan, G. (1988). *Riding the waves of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moscovici, S. (1980). *Toward a theory of conversion behaviour*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 209-239.
- Muhr, T. and Friese, S. (2004). *User's Manual for ATLAS.ti 5.0*. Berlin: Visual Qualitative Data Analysis and Knowledge Management in Education. Berlin: Business, Administration and Research.
- Murray, V. V. (1998). Interorganizational collaborations in the nonprofit sector. In J. M. Shafirtz (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of public policy and administration* (Vol. 2). Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 1192-1196
- Nemeth, C.J. and Rogers, J. (1996). Dissent and the search for information. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35: 67-76.
- Nicolini, D. (2009). Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections. *Organization studies*, 30(12): 1391-1418.
- Nooteboom, B. (1989). Paradox, Identity and Change in Management. *Human Systems Management*, 8: 291-300.
- Oakes, P.J. and Turner, J.C. (1990). Is limited information processing the cause of social stereotyping. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 49: 65-85.

O'Connor, E.S. (1995). Paradoxes of participation: Textual analysis and organisational change. *Organization Studies*, 16(5): 769-803.

O'Donovan, G. (2006). *The Corporate Culture Handbook: How to Plan, Implement and Measure a Successful Culture Change Programme*. Ireland: The Liffey Press.

O'Looney, J. (1997). Marking progress toward service integration: A single state's experience with developmental and non-developmental models. *Administration in Social Work*, 18(1): 61-86.

Olson, C.A., Balmer, J.T. and Mejicano, G.C. (2012). Factors contributing to successful interorganizational collaboration: The case of CS2day. *Journal of Continuing education in the Health Professions*, 31(S1): 3-12.

Olson, J.G. (2008). Co-development. Collaborating across boundaries on joint strike fighter. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham and P.S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-58.

Ortner, S. (1984). Theory in anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26(1): 126-166.

Ortner, S. (1994). Theory in anthropology since the sixties. In N.B. Dirks, G. Eley and S. Ortner (Eds.), *Culture/power/history: A reader in contemporary social theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University press. pp. 372-411.

Otten, S., Mummendey, A. and Blanz, M. (1996). Intergroup discrimination in positive and negative outcome allocations: Impact of stimulus valence, relative group status, and relative group size. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22: 568-581.

Paasi, A. (1999). Boundaries as social processes: Territoriality in the world of flows. *Geopolitics*, 3(1): 69-88.

Parker, I. (2003). Psychoanalytic narratives: Writing the self into contemporary cultural phenomena. *Narrative Inquiry*, 13: 301-315.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Paulsen, N. (2003). Who are we now? Group identity, boundaries and the (re)organizing process. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-13.

Paulsen, N. and Hernes, T. (2003). A reflection and future directions. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 302-308.

Pearce, R. (1997). Toward understanding joint venture performance and survival: A bargaining and influence approach to transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1): 203-225.

Pellow, D. (1996). Intimate boundaries: A Chinese puzzle. In D. Pellow (Ed.), *Setting boundaries: The anthropology of spatial and social organization*. London: Bergin and Garvey, pp. 111-136.

Perlow, L. (1999). The time famine. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44 (1): 57-81.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1958). Personality and sociocultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of conflict Resolution*, 2: 29-42.

Pettigrew, T.F. (2008). Reflections on core themes in intergroup research. In U. Wanger, L. Tropp, G. Finchilescu and C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving Intergroup Relations: Building on the Legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew (Social Issues and Interventions)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 283-303.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: politics and influence in organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pickering, A. (1992). From science as knowledge to science as practice. In A. Pickering (Ed.), *Science as practice and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 1-28.
- Pratt, M.G. (1998). To be or not to be? Central questions in organizational identification. In D.A. Whetten and P.C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 171-207.
- Prins, S. (2010). From competition to collaboration: Critical challenges and dynamics in multiparty collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 46(3): 281-312.
- Pruitt, D.G. and Kim, S.H. (2004). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Purmessur, R.D. and Boodhoo, R. (2008). Qualitative Research in Organisations: A New Perspective. *The Journal of Online Education*, 1-6.
- Ravasi, D. and Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3): 433–458.
- Ray, K. (2002). *The nimble collaboration: Fine-tuning your collaboration for lasting success*. St Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in cultural theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2): 243–263.
- Riessman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. Qualitative Research Methods Series, No. 30. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riessman, C.K. (2002). Analysis of personal narratives. In J.F. Gubrium and J.A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 695-710.

Riessman, C.K. (2003). Performing identities in illness narrative: masculinity and multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Research*, 3(5): 5-32.

Riessman, C.K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. London: Sage.

Ring, P. (1997). Processes facilitating reliance on trust in inter-organizational networks. In M. Ebers (Ed.), *The formation of inter-organizational networks*. Oxford: Oxford university press, pp. 114-145.

Rock, K.W. and Pratt, M.G. (2002). Where do we go from here? Predicting identification among dispread employees. In B. Moingeon and G. Soenen (Eds.) *Corporate and organizational identities: Integrating strategy, marketing, communication and organizational perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 51-71.

Rodman, M. and Cooper, M. (1996). Boundaries of home in Toronto housing cooperatives. In D. Pellow (Ed.), *Setting boundaries: The anthropology of spatial and social organization*. London: Bergin and Garvey, pp. 91-110.

Rosenthal, B. and Mizrahi, T. (1994). *Strategic partnerships: How to create and maintain organizational collaboration and coalitions*. New York: Education Center for Community Organizing.

Rosenwald, G. and Ochberg, R. (1992). Introduction: Life stories, cultural politics and self-understanding. In Rosenwald, G. and R. Ochberg, (Eds.), *Storied Lives: Cultural politics of self understanding*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, pp. 1-19.

Saiti, A. (2009). The Development and Reform of School Administration in Greece: A Primary School Perspective. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 37(3): 378-403.

Saiti, A. (2012). Learning and quality management: An analysis of three key features of the Greek education system. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 20(2): 32-71.

- Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003). Strategizing as lived experience and strategists' everyday efforts to shape strategic direction. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1): 141–174.
- Sandberg, J. and Dall'Alba, G. (2009). Returning to practice anew: A life-world perspective. *Organization studies*, 30(12): 1349-1368.
- Sani, F. (2012). Group identification, social relationships and health. In J. Jetten, C. Haslam and A.S. Haslam (Eds.), *The Social Cure: Identity, Health and Well-Being*. Hove: Psychology Press, pp. 21-38.
- Savage, G.T., Burn, M.D., Gray, B., Xiao, Q., Want, S., Wilson, E.J. and Williams, E.S. (2012). Stakeholder collaboration: Implications for stakeholder theory and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96: 21-26.
- Sawyer, K.R. (2003). *Group creativity: Music, theater, collaboration*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schatzki, T.R. (1996). *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Schatzki, T.R. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T.R. Schatzki, K.K. Cetina, and E. von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. London: Routledge, pp.1-14.
- Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schrage, M. (1990). *Shared minds: The new technologies of collaboration*. New York: Random House.
- Schrujfer, S.G.L. (2008). The social psychology of inter-organizational relations. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham and P.S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 417-440.

- Schultz, D.P. and Schultz, S.E. (2004). *A history of modern psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Schutz. A. (1964). *Collected Papers II: Studies in social theory*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Scott, W.R. (1998). *Organizations -Rational, natural and open systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Scott, W.R. (2004). Institutional theory. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 408-414.
- Shafritz, J.M. (1997). *The international encyclopedia of public policy administration*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Shamir, B. and Melnik, Y. (2003). Some organizational consequences of cultural differences in boundary permeability. In N. Paulsen and T. Hernes, (Eds.), *Managing boundaries in organizations: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 281-301.
- Shapiro, I. and Hacker-Cordón, C. (1999). Outer edges and inner edges. In I. Shapiro and C. Hacker-Cordón (Eds.), *Democracy's edges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, pp. 1-15.
- Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflicts. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63: 349-356.
- Sidanius, J. and Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook*. London: Sage.

- Simon, B. (2009). To be is to do is to be. In S. Otten, K. Sassenberg and T. Kessler (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: The role of motivation and emotion*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 223-242.
- Simpson, B. (2009). Pragmatism, Mead and the practice turn. *Organization studies*, 30(12): 1329-1347.
- Simpson, B., and Carroll, B. (2008). Re-viewing “role” in processes of identity construction. *Organization*, 15(1): 29–50.
- Soenen, G. and Moingeon, B. (2002). The five facets of collective identities: Integrating corporate and organizational identity. In B. Moingeon and G. Soenen (Eds.), *Corporate and organizational identities: Integrating strategy, marketing, communication and organizational perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 13-34.
- Sowa, J. (2008). Implementing interagency collaborations: Exploring variation in collaborative ventures in human service organizations. *Administration and society*, 40(3): 298-323.
- Spinthourakis, J.A., Karatzia-Stavlioti, E., Lempesi, G.E. and Papadimitriou, I. (2008). *Educational policies that address social inequality: Country report: Greece*. Patras: Department of Elementary Education, University of Patras.
- Stake, R.E. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage, pp. 435-454.
- Stake, R.E. (2011). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage, pp. 443-466.
- Stefa, A. (2001). Practices of inclusion and integration in mainstream schools: A critical approach. *Topics in Special Education*, 15: 70-74.

- Steyaert, C. and Bouwen, R. (2004). Group methods in organizational analysis. In C. Cassell and G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*. London: Sage, pp. 140-153.
- Stohl, C. and Walker, K. (2002). A bona fide perspective for the future of groups: Understanding collaborating groups. In L.R. Frey (Ed.), *New directions in group communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 237–252.
- Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Development and extensions. In K. Yardley and T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychological perspectives*. Wiley, New York, pp. 89-103.
- Suchman, L.A. (1987). *Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J.C. Turner and H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 144-167.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole, pp. 33-47.
- Taket, A. and White, L. (2000). *Partnerships and participation: Decision-making in the multi agency setting*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Taylor, S. and Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource*. USE: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, NJ: Sage, pp. 455-486.

Terry, D.J. (2001). Intergroup relations and organizational mergers. In M.A. Hogg and D.J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press, pp. 229-247

Terry, D.J. (2003). A social identity perspective on organizational mergers: The role of group status, permeability, and similarity. In S.A. Haslam, D. van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow and N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 223-240.

Terzis, N. (2010). *Educational policy and educational reform: Historical and Social framework and case studies*. Athens: Kyriakides publications (in Greek).

Trist, E.L. (1983). Referent organizations and the development of interorganizational domains. *Human Relations*, 36(3): 247-268.

Tsasis, P. (2009). The social processes of inteorganizational collaboration and conflict in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 20(1): 5-21.

Tsoukas, H. and Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13(5): 567–582.

Tuomela, R. (2002). *The philosophy of social practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J.C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears and B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 6-34.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D. and Wetherell, M.S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, S. (1994). *The social theory of practices: Tradition, tacit knowledge, and presuppositions*. Cambridge: Polity press.

van Knippenberg, D. and Ellemers, N. (2003). Social identity and group performance: Identification as the key to group-oriented effort. In S.A. Haslam, D. van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow and N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 29-42.

Van Knippenberg, D. and van Schie, E.C.M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73: 137-147.

Van Maanen, J. (1998). *Qualitative studies in organizations*. London: Sage.

Van Maanen, J. and Schein, E.H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 209–64.

Van Marrewijk, A. (2009). Corporate headquarters as physical embodiments of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(3): 290-306.

Van Marrewijk, A. and Yanow, D. (2010). The spatial turn in organizational studies. In, A. Van Marrewijk and D. Yanow (Eds.), *Organisational spaces: Rematerializing the workaday world*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishers. 1-18.

Van Rekom, J. (2002). Manifestations in behavior versus perceptions of identity: Convergence or not?. In B. Moingeon and G. Soenen (Eds.), *Corporate and organizational identities: Integrating strategy, marketing, communication and organizational perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 91-114.

Vislie, L. (2003). From integration to inclusion: Focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 18(1): 17-35.

- Wacquant, L. (1992). Toward a social praxeology: The structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology. In P.P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant, (Eds.), *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity press, pp. 1-59.
- Walsh, J.P., and Maloney, N.G. (2007). Collaboration structure, communication media, and problems in scientific work teams. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(2): 712-732.
- Webb, J. (2004). Organizations, Self-identities and the New Economy. *Sociology*. 38(4): 719–738.
- Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weisbord, M. and Janoff, S. (1995). *Future research: An actionguide to finding common ground in organizations and communities*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wells, K. (2011). *Narrative inquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems'. *Organization Science*, 7(2): 225–246.
- White, H. (1987). *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1929) *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. Corrected edition, D.R. Griffin and D. W. Sherburne (Eds.). New York: Free Press, 1978.
- Whittington, C. (2003). Collaboration and partnership in context. In J. Weinstein, C. Whittington and T. Leiba (Eds.), *Collaboration in social work practice*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 13-38.

- Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, 27(5): 613–634.
- Widdershoven, G.A.M. (1993). The story of life. Hermeneutic perspectives on the relationship between narrative and life history. In R. Josselson and A. Lieblich (Eds.), *The Narrative Study of Lives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp.1-20.
- Williamson, O.E. (1981). The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3): 538-577.
- Wilson, B. (2000). The Lone Ranger is dead: Success today demands collaboration. *College and Research Libraries News*, 161(8): 698–701.
- Wilson, D.S. and Wilson, E.O. (2007). Rethinking the Theoretical Foundations of Sociobiology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 82 (4): 327-348.
- Wolfinger, N.H. (2002). On writing fieldnotes: Collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1): 85-95.
- Yanow, D. (2000). Seeing organizational learning: A “cultural” view. *Organization*, 7(2): 247–268.
- Yanow, D. (2005). Studying physical artifacts: An interpretive approach. In A. Rafaeli and M. Pratt (Eds.), *Artifacts and organizations*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 41-60.
- Yanow, D. (2006). How built spaces mean: A semiotics of space. In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea (Eds.), *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*, Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe, pp. 349-66.
- Yin, R.K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London Sage.

Young, K. (2000). Gesture and the Phenomenology of Emotion in Narrative. *Semiotica*. 131(1/2): 79–112.

Zajac, E.J. and D'Aunno, T.A. (1993). Managing strategic alliances. In S.M. Shortell and A.D. Kaluzny (Eds.), *Health care management: Organization design and behaviour*. Albany, NY: Delmar, pp. 274-293.

Zhang, Y. and Huxham, C. (2009). Identity construction and trust building in developing international collaborations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45(2): 186-211.

Zoniou-Sideri, A., Karagianni, PP., Deropoulou-Derou, E. and Spandagou, I. (2005). *Inclusive classes in Greece: New names, old institutions*. Paper presented at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress (ISEC), 1-4- August, 2005, Glasgow. Available online at http://www.isec2005.org/isec/abstracts/papers_z/zoniou-Sideri_a.shtml (accessed 2 February, 2010).

9. Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview topic guide

1. Background information

- Name, age, place of residence
- Reasons for choosing to work for the partnership
- Previous training (or studies) and work experience with disabled children

2. Individual roles in the partnership

- Description of their organisation
- Individual job and responsibilities
- Number of years/months working for the partnership
- Their role before and now

3. Individual and collaborative action

- Interactions with other partners
- Relevance of individual actions and collaborative actions
- Meaning attributed to those actions
- Partners previous and present collaborative actions
- Potential changes in collaborative actions

4. Other partners

- Identification of partners and their roles
- Interactions between partners
- Evaluation of their impact on the partnership
- Relationships with other partners

5. The partnership

- Changes in the partnership since the establishment
- Partners' own views of the current partnership situation
- Past and present assumptions about the partnership

6. The future of the partnership

- Aspirations for the future
- Ideas for future development

Appendix 2: Description of the meetings observed

First Phase (July 2008)					
Nr.	Type of Meeting	Place	Number of participants	Description of participants	Duration
1	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	7	KEDDY Employees	93'
1(a)	Partners' Meeting	KEDDY	4	2 KEDDY Employees, School Consultant, Head Teacher	35'

Second Phase (November 2008)					
Nr.	Type of Meeting	Place	Number of participants	Description of participants	Duration
2	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY Employees	180'
3	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY Employees	150'
4	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY Employees	170'
2(a)	Partners' Meeting	KEDDY	5	2 KEDDY Employees, School Teacher, Head Teacher, School Consultant	57'
3(a)	Partners' Meeting	KEDDY	6	KEDDY Employee, School Teacher, Head Teacher, KYSPE Director, School Consultant, Parent	87'

Third Phase (January 2009)					
Nr.	Type of Meeting	Place	Number of participants	Description of participants	Duration
5	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY employees	187'
6	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY employees	176'
7	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	15	KEDDY employees	190'
8	KEDDY Meeting	KEDDY	14	KEDDY employees	182'
4(a)	Partners' Meeting	KEDDY	6	KEDDY Employees, School Teacher, Head Teacher, KYSPE Director, School Consultant, Parent	78'
5(a)	Partners' Meeting	KEDDY	4	KEDDY Employees, Head Teacher, School Teacher, Parent	43'

Appendix 3: Description of the interview participants and interviews

First Phase (July 2008)							
N r.	Participa nt	Partner- Organisat ion	Gender	Age*	Number of years in the Partner ship*	Type of interview	Durati on
1	Manager/ Primary Teacher	KEDDY	Male	52	8	Face-to-face	Audio/ 58'
2	Nursery Teacher (1)	KEDDY	Female	43	5	Face-to-face	Audio/ 56'
3	Primary Teacher (1)	KEDDY	Male	46	4	Face-to-face	Audio/ 75'
4	Primary School Head Teacher	Primary School	Male	57	4	Face-to-face	Audio/ 51'
5	School Consultant	KYSPE	Male	48	7	Face-to-face	Audio/ 44'

Second Phase (November 2008)							
N r.	Participa nt	Partner - Orga nisation	Gender	Age*	Number of years in the Partnersh ip*	Type of interview	Durati on
6	Manager/ Primary Teacher	KEDDY	Male	52	8	Face-to-face	Audio/ 56'
7	Nursery Teacher (1)	KEDDY	Female	43	5	Face-to-face	Audio/ 74'
8	Primary Teacher (1)	KEDDY	Male	46	4	Face-to-face	Audio/ 54'
9	Secondary Teacher (1)	KEDDY	Male	33	1	Face-to-face	Audio/ 50'
10	Psycholog ist (1)	KEDDY	Female	30	1	Face-to-face	Audio/ 57'
11	Social Worker (1)	KEDDY	Male	37	8	Face-to-face	Audio/ 66'
12	Social Worker (2)	KEDDY	Female	41	3	Face-to-face	Audio/ 59'

13	Secretary	KEDDY	Male	51	2	Face-to-face	Audio/37'
14	Parent (1)	Parent Association	Male	45	1	Face-to-face	Audio/43'
15	Parent (2)	Parent Association	Female	43	2	Face-to-face	Audio/52'
16	Primary School Teacher (1)	Primary School	Female	37	3	Face-to-face	Audio/74'
17	Primary School Head Teacher	Primary School	Male	57	4	Face-to-face	Audio/52'
18	Director	KYSDE	Male	53	5	Face-to-face	Audio/49'

Third Phase (January 2009)							
Nr.	Participant	Partner-Organisation	Gender	Age*	Number of years in the Partnership*	Type of interview	Duration
19	Nursery Teacher (2)	KEDDY	Female	34	2	Face-to-face	Audio/80'
20	Primary Teacher (2)	KEDDY	Female	51	6	Face-to-face	Audio/49'
21	Primary Teacher (3)	KEDDY	Female	55	6	Face-to-face	Audio/44'
22	Secondary Teacher (2)	KEDDY	Female	51	8	Face-to-face	Audio/73'
23	Psychologist (2)	KEDDY	Female	37	4	Face-to-face	Audio/43'
24	Psychologist (3)	KEDDY	Female	39	8	Face-to-face	Audio/59'
25	Speech Therapist	KEDDY	Female	32	1	Face-to-face	Audio/42'
26	Parent (3)	Parent Association	Male	47	1	Face-to-face	Audio/53'

27	Nursery School Teacher	Nursery School	Female	29	1	Face-to-face	Audio/46'
28	Nursery School Head Teacher	Nursery School	Female	58	3	Face-to-face	Notes
29	Primary Special School Teacher	Primary Special School	Female	36	4	Face-to-face	Audio/68'
30	Primary Special School Head Teacher	Primary Special School	Male	57	1	Face-to-face	Audio/55'
31	Secondary Special School Teacher	Secondary Special School	Male	3	3	Face-to-face	Audio/68'
32	Secondary Special School Director	Secondary Special School	Male	51	8	Face-to-face	Audio/50'
33	Director	KYSPE	Male	56	4	Face-to-face	Audio/36'
34	School Consultant	KYSPE	Male	48	7	Face-to-face	Audio/41'

Fourth Phase (September 2009)							
N r.	Participa nt	Partner-Organisat ion	Gender	Age*	Number of years in the partnersh ip*	Type of interview	Durati on
35	Manager/ Primary Teacher	KEDDY	Male	52	8	Phone	Audio/41'
36	Primary Teacher (2)	KEDDY	Female	51	6	Phone	Audio/32'
37	Psycholog ist (2)	KEDDY	Female	37	4	Phone	Audio/25'
38	Primary School Teacher (1)	Primary School	Female	37	3	Phone	Audio/35'

39	Primary School Head Teacher	Primary School	Male	57	4	Phone	Audio/19'
40	Primary School Teacher (2)	Primary School	Female	32	2	Phone	Audio/21'
41	Parent (2)	Parent Association	Female	43	2	Phone	Audio/43'
42	Director	KYSPE	Male	56	4	Phone	Audio/18'
43	School Consultant	KYSPE	Male	48	7	Phone	Audio/21'

*Age and number of years in the partnership at the time the first interview was conducted

Appendix 4: Description of the documents gathered

Before the First Field Visit				
Number	Type	Year	Origin	General Description
1	Government Document	2000	KEDDY	Description of the establishment of the partnership
2	Government Document	2000	KEDDY	Description of the rules, aims and partners of the collaboration
3	Government Document	2000	KEDDY	Establishment of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias
4	Government Document	2000	KEDDY	Description of the operation of KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias
5	Government Document	2008	KEDDY	New law renames KDAYs to KEDDYs
6	Government Document	2008	KEDDY	Implementation of changes in KEDDY's operations according to the new law
7	Government Document	2008	KEDDY	Changes in KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias according to the new law

First Phase (July 2008)				
Number	Type	Year	Origin	General Description
1	Government Document	2008	KEDDY	Description of the seminars and training required from KEDDY employees
2	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Example of diagnosis and educational plan
3	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Example of teachers' evaluation
4	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Example of social workers' evaluation
5	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Example of psychologists' evaluation
6	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Example of school teachers' evaluation
7	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Information pack that KEDDY sends to schools
8	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Information pack KEDDY sends to school teachers in order to write the report for KEDDY
9	Annual Report	2007	KEDDY	Official report sent to the government at the end of the year
10	Annual Report	2008	KEDDY	Official report sent to the government at the end of the year
11-13	KEDDY Meetings Minutes	2008	KEDDY	Minutes from the last three KEDDY meetings

Second Phase (November 2008)				
Number	Type	Year	Origin	General Description
1-4	Partners' Meetings Minutes	2008	KEDDY	Minutes from the last four Partners meetings
5	Government Document	2008	KYSPE	KEDDY formal letter sent to KYSPE for the establishment of an integration unit
6	KEDDY Document	2008	KYSPE	Informal document sent to KYSPE requesting funding
7	KEDDY Document	2008	KESDE	Informal letter sent to KESDE requesting the establishment of an integration unit
8	Public Document	2008	KEDDY	Article in local newspaper regarding KEDDY contribution
9	Public Document	2007	KYSPE	Article in local newspaper regarding KEDDY problems

Third Phase (January 2009)				
Number	Type	Year	Origin	General Description
1-3	KEDDY Meetings Minutes	2009	KEDDY	Minutes from the last three KEDDY meetings
4	Government Document	2009	KEDDY	Introduction of changes regarding KEDDY operation
5	Public Document	2008	KYSPE	Article in local newspaper regarding KEDDY problems
6-8	Partners Meetings Minutes	2008	KEDDY	Minutes from the last three partners' meetings
9	KEDDY Document	2008	KEDDY	Informal letter sent to a school asking for its collaboration
10	Government Document	2008	Special Primary School	KYSPE reply to a school request for funding

Fourth Phase (September 2009)				
Number	Type	Year	Origin	General Description
1	Government Document	2009	KYSPE	KEDDY request for the establishment of an integration unit in Anna's school
2	Government Document	2009	KYSPE	KYSPE negative reply to KEDDY regarding the establishment of the integration unit in Anna's school
3	KEDDY Document	2009	KEDDY	Informal letter sent to KESDE for the establishment of the

				integration unit in Anna's school
4	KEDDY Document	2009	Primary School	Informal letter sent to the head teacher for the production of Anna's report
5	KEDDY Document	2009	Primary School	Informal letter sent to the head teacher for the disclosure of Anna's report
6	Government Document	2009	KYSPE	KYSPE reply to KEDDY regarding the establishment of the integration unit in Anna's school
7-8	KEDDY Meetings Minutes	2009	KEDDY	Minutes from two KEDDY meetings regarding Anna's case
9	Partners Meeting Minutes	2008	KEDDY	Minutes from the partners meeting regarding Anna's case

Appendix 5: Code/text occurrences for the Referral period

Codes-Primary Documents Table: Crosstabulation of primary documents (columns) and the codes (lines). Each cell calculates the frequency of the code in each document and the sum presents the total for each row and column.

HU Analysis 2

Referral

CODES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	T o t
allocating resou	0	7	2	3	0	4	2	1	1	0	8	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	5	7	2	3	1	9	1	3	1	2	1	0	6
being caut	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	3	1	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	
clarifying collab	4	5	2	1	3	9	6	1	5	6	0	6	1	0	0	2	6	7	0	1	4	2	3	5	6	4	2	9	1		
clarifying rol	2	3	8	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	0	2	1	1	3	1	2	3	0	4	2	7	5	1	0	1	2	5	9		
communicati ng	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	1	2	5	0	4	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	2	3	5	1	0	4	0		
complaining ab	0	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	4	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3	3	1		
criticising part	3	5	4	2	1	3	5	6	0	7	4	3	1	2	1	0	5	3	8	9	2	0	4	2	4	6	1	9	1		
drawing boundar	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	4	2	1	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	7	4	1	2	3	4	1	5	1		
Excluding part	3	1	2	4	0	5	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	2	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3		
facing partners	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	0		
identifying obsta	2	2	1	3	2	4	0	1	2	1	0	3	3	2	1	0	7	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	2		
intervening on	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	5	0	1	2	2	3	0	4	1	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3	4		
lacking commit	3	5	3	1	2	6	8	5	2	0	6	4	2	1	0	1	3	1	2	7	1	2	2	0	0	4	1	7	2		
losing the cont	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3		
managing boun	5	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	3	6	1	2	1	0	4	0	0	2	2	1	1	3	0	1	1	2	4	4	6		
needing role clar	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	3	3	2	3	1	4	0	2	2	0	3	0	2	3	9		
negotiating roles	1	0	7	2	0	1	0	2	0	5	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	3	3	5		
opening a case	3	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4	1	0	3	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	0		
Overcoming pa	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	2	5	1	0	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	2	4	4		
partners expecta	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	3	5		
planning collab	3	2	5	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	5	1	4	4		
pushing commn	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	1	2	1	3	4	0	2	6	1	3	4	2	1	0	3	0	4	0		
questioning auth	1	2	1	0	5	4	2	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	

Appendix 6: Code/text occurrences for the Diagnosis period

Codes-Primary Documents Table: Crosstabulation of primary documents (columns) and the codes (lines). Each cell calculates the frequency of the code in each document and the sum presents the total for each row and column.

HU Analysis 2

Diagnosis

Codes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Total	
complaining about in	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	18
co-ordinating action	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	20
criticising collaborati	3	1	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	26
evaluating collaborati	6	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	28
evaluating roles	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	11
evaluating team meet	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	6	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	26
facilitating communic	3	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	19
having the control	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	7	6	5	4	0	0	3	44
identifying partners	4	3	5	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	1	3	2	4	1	41
integrating efforts	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	19
justifying decisions	2	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	1	3	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
lacking motivation	6	0	0	8	0	1	3	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	2	0	4	0	5	4	6	46
lacking shared un	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	4	5	1	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	3	2	4	0	40
managing the collab	3	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	3	4	0	1	3	0	30
motivating partners	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	28
negotiating aims	6	5	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	41
organising priorities	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	4	2	0	1	2	3	33
producing students re	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	20
postponing decisions	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	1	1	19
pushing for progr	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	22
questioning motives	3	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	9	2	7	0	0	6	0	0	3	8	38
recognising roles	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	19
redefining the collab	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	16

reflecting collaborat	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	
reflecting partners r	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	9
reframing responsibil itie	3	1	3	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	
regaining the contro	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	
reinforcing collabor	3	4	2	0	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	7	
reviewing cases	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	8		
reviewing decisions	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	6	
searching for altern	4	1	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	
shifting boundarie	3	1	2	1	3	1	4	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	
team meetings	1	1	2	6	1	5	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	0	
Totals	5	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	4	2	3	8	8	
	9	7	4	1	5	2	2	8	8	4	3	8	1	2	9	7	8	6	7	6	5	6	0	0	8	

Appendix 7: Code/text occurrences for the Negotiation period

Codes-Primary Documents Table: Crosstabulation of primary documents (columns) and the codes (lines). Each cell calculates the frequency of the code in each document and the sum presents the total for each row and column.

HU Analysis 2

Negotiation

Codes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Tot	
adapting work e	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	28
being adaptabl e	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	15
being disappoin ted	4	3	1	1	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	34	
being self-respon	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	14
belonging	6	5	4	0	1	3	2	3	4	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	48	
changing staff	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
connectin g with	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	21
continuit y	3	2	4	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	1	35	
disregard ing partne	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	1	0	3	5	6	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	5	6	7	2	3	54	
establishi ng person	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	17	
feeling isolate	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	16	
feeling secure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	14	
getting frustrate d	4	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	5	0	1	3	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	31
improvin g net	2	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	26	
influenci ng on partne	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	2	1	1	29	
lacking informati on	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	25	
lacking trust	3	1	4	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	1	2	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	1	1	2	2	43
making sense of coll	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	34	
offering guida	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	23
ongoing learn	6	1	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	31	
overcomi ng stereo	0	0	6	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	38
partners nterv	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	6	1	1	2	0	38	
providing info	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	21

Redrawing bounda	2	3	4	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	3
reviewing deci	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	1	3	3	1	1	1	2
taking chances	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
unexpected resistan	3	2	0	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	4	3
working with a fragil	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	1
Totals	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	7
Codes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	T o t
adapting work e	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2
being adaptabl e	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	1
being disappoin ted	4	3	1	1	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	3
being self-respon	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	1
belonging	6	5	4	0	1	3	2	3	4	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	4
changing staff	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
connectin g with	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
continuit y	3	2	4	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	1	3
disregard ing partne	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	1	0	3	5	6	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	5	6	7	2	3	5
establishi ng person	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1
feeling isolate	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
feeling secure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	1
getting frustrate d	4	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	5	0	1	3	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
improvin g net	2	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
influenci ng on partne	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	2	1	1	2
lacking informati on	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	2
lacking trust	3	1	4	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	1	2	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	1	2	2	4
making sense of coll	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	3
offering guida	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
ongoing learn	6	1	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	3
overcomi ng stereo	0	0	6	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	3
partners nterv	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	6	1	1	2	0	3
providing info	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	2
Redrawi ng bounda	2	3	4	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	3

reviewing deci	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	
taking chances	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	
unexpected resistan	3	2	0	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	
working with a fragil	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	4	
Totals	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	7	7	4

Appendix 8: Code/text occurrences for the Intervention period

Codes-Primary Documents Table: Crosstabulation of primary documents (columns) and the codes (lines). Each cell calculates the frequency of the code in each document and the sum presents the total for each row and column.

HU Analysis 2

Intervention

Codes																																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	T o t	
Accepting limitations																																		
	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	6	5	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2
adapting to work environm																																		
	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	0
assessing partners contribu																																		
	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	9
assessing value of collabor																																		
	5	2	1	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	7
being competitive																																		
	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	2	4
being dependent																																		
	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	2	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	5	1	1	4	6
being disorganised																																		
	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
being passive																																		
	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	
changing the collaborative																																		
	3	4	3	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	4	4
closing a case																																		
	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	1	2	0	4	2	0	0	2	7
controlling resources																																		
	0	1	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	5	4	3	3	2	1	4	9
disclosing students report																																		
	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	1	2	2	9
disregarding the collaborat																																		
	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	2	2	2

1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	5			
reflecting on collaboration																																			
0	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	5		
reflecting on partners parti																																			
1	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6		
reflecting on unsuccessful c																																			
0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	4	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	9		
struggling with governmen																																			
0	0	1	2	4	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	4	5	0	0	7	2	8	5	2		
struggling with resource li																																			
1	1	2	1	3	5	9	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	9	8	6	4	0	1	7	0		
supporting a student																																			
3	4	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	0	0	8	0	0	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	5	0		
Totals																																			
5	4	2	3	4	5	2	3	3	5	2	3	4	3	2	4	6	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	6	6	4	5	4	5	1	3	9	8
4	9	7	8	9	5	7	2	4	0	8	5	2	3	4	0	1	5	9	1	0	0	3	3	5	3	5	2	8	8	3	5	5	3	5	8

Appendix 9: Coding scheme with topic areas and description of basic area codes

Topic Areas	Basic area codes	Description
<p>Partnership's scope and conditions Description of the requirements defining the nature and objectives of the partnership</p>	<p>Aims Structure</p>	<p>Description of the aims agreed between the partners Description of the structure of the collaboration and the partners' exchanges</p>
<p>Network of relationships between partners Description of the partners' relationships according to the partner(s) they have to collaborate with for the achievement of aims</p>	<p>School Government Representatives Parents KEDDY</p>	<p>Description of relationships with the school (teachers and head teachers) Description of relationships with government representatives (KESPE, KYSDE and school consultants) Description of relationships with parents of disabled children Description of relationships with KEDDY employees</p>
<p>Collaborative arrangements Description of collaborative processes, actions and procedures as well as of the outcome of collaborative efforts</p>	<p>Actions Procedures Outcome</p>	<p>Description of partners' interactions and actions for the achievement of aims Description of roles, membership dynamics among partners and co-ordination of collaborative efforts Description of the final outcome of the collaborative activities</p>

Appendix 10: Final codes and their description for each period

Topic Areas	Partners' interplay (Codes)	Code-description for the Referral period
<i>Partnership's scope and conditions</i>	Produce report Refer the child to KEDDY	Refers to the evaluation report that the school teacher has to provide for the disabled child Refers to the child's referral from the school to KEDDY
<i>Network of relationships between partners</i>	Resistance Fear of intervention	Refers to the teacher's resistance to writing the report Refers to the head teacher's fear that KEDDY will intervene and implement changes
<i>Collaborative arrangements</i>	Presenting arguments Following the procedure Engagement through regulation	Refers to the arguments the teacher and head teacher use in order to validate refusal to provide the report Refers to the teacher's decision to write the report and follow the rules Refers to the production of the report as a result of engagement with the partnership rules

Topic Areas	Partners' interplay (Codes)	Code-description for the Referral period
<i>Partnership's scope and conditions</i>	Produce a diagnosis and educational plan	Refers to the production of an individualised diagnosis and educational plan from KEDDY
<i>Network of relationships between partners</i>	Disagreements Discussions Power games	Refers to the disagreements between KEDDY teacher and psychologist regarding the child's diagnosis Refers to the discussions between the KEDDY psychologist and teacher in order to decide on the diagnosis Refers to the KEDDY psychologist's and teacher's efforts to exert power from their educational and training background
<i>Collaborative arrangements</i>	Diagnostic team meetings Manager's intervention Co-production of the report	Refers to the KEDDY meeting where the teacher and psychologist present their different diagnoses Refers to the intervention of KEDDY manager for the production of the diagnosis Refers to the final decision on the diagnosis and the co-production of the report

Topic Areas	Partners' interplay (Codes)	Code-description for the <i>Negotiation period</i>
<i>Partnership's scope and conditions</i>	Present the report to the mother Acceptance of the report	Refers to the presentation of the final diagnosis and educational plan to the child's mother Refers to the mother's acceptance of the report
<i>Network of relationships between partners</i>	Stereotypes Fears Dispute	Refers to the mother's hesitation to sign the report due to fear of stigma Refers to the mother's fears regarding her child's future Refers to the mother's request for KEDDY to reexamine her child
<i>Collaborative arrangements</i>	Meetings with the mother Explaining the procedures Persuading the mother	Refers to the meetings between the mother and KEDDY employees so as to convince her to sign the report Refers to KEDDY's efforts to convince the mother by presenting the formal collaborative processes Refers to the mother's decision to sign the report

Topic Areas	Partners' interplay (Codes)	Code-description for the <i>Intervention period</i>
<i>Partnership's scope and conditions</i>	Disclosing the report Establishing integration unit	Refers to the disclosure of the child's report to her school Refers to the establishment of the integration unit at the child's school
<i>Network of relationships between partners</i>	Fear of intervention Power exercise Persistence	Refers to the head teacher's denial to disclose the report due to fear of intervention Refers to the power that KYSPE exercised so as not to establish the integration unit Refers to the efforts of KEDDY manager to convince KYSPE to approve the establishment of the integration unit
<i>Collaborative arrangements</i>	Following the regulations Communicating requests Achieving the establishment	Refers to the head teacher's decision to disclose the report in compliance with the regulations Refers to KEDDY letters and telephone conversations to convince the government to establish the unit Refers to the government's decision to establish the integration unit

Appendix 11: Thematic codes and their description for each period

Thematic codes and their description for the Referral period

Partners' interplay (Codes)	Practices (Thematic Codes)	Thematic code- description
<i>Produce report</i> <i>Refer the child to KEDDY</i>	Making sense of the process	Refers to the understanding of the role and aims of the partnership
<i>Resistance</i> <i>Fear of intervention</i>	Dealing with resistance	Refers to regulatory tactics adopted to face teacher's resistance
<i>Presenting arguments</i> <i>Following the procedure</i> <i>Engagement through regulation</i>	Following the regulations	Refers to the achievement of aims through compliance with the partnership's regulations

Thematic codes and their description for the Diagnosis period

Partners' interplay (Codes)	Practices (Thematic Codes)	Thematic code- description
<i>Produce a diagnosis and educational plan</i>	Clarifying roles	Refers to having a clear distinction of roles and responsibilities
<i>Disagreements</i> <i>Discussions</i> <i>Power games</i>	Overcoming power games	Refers to the need to deal with disagreements and power games
<i>Diagnostic team meetings</i> <i>Manager's intervention</i> <i>Co-production of the report</i>	Developing team spirit	Refers to the need for the partners to overcome their expert role/profession and act as a team in order to achieve their aim

Thematic codes and their description for the Negotiation period

Partners' interplay (Codes)	Practices (Thematic Codes)	Thematic code- description
<i>Present the report to the mother</i> <i>Acceptance of the report</i>	Developing solutions	Refers to looking for alternatives to support the partners
<i>Stereotypes</i> <i>Fears</i> <i>Dispute</i>	Coping with fears	Refers to searching for ways to overcome partners' fears and anxieties
<i>Meetings with the mother</i> <i>Explaining the procedures</i> <i>Persuading the mother</i>	Realising expectations	Refers to tactics in convincing the partners' to support the collaboration aim

Thematic codes and their description for the Intervention period

Partners' interplay (Codes)	Practices (Thematic Codes)	Thematic code- description
<i>Disclosing the report</i> <i>Establishing the integration unit</i>	Assessing commitments	Refers to overcoming power imbalances and sacrificing personal interests for the benefit of the collaboration
<i>Fear of intervention</i> <i>Power exercise</i> <i>Persistence</i>	Abandoning power games	Refers to the need to discard power games and start collaborating
<i>Following the regulations</i> <i>Communicating requests</i> <i>Achieving the establishment</i>	Setting criteria for support	Refers to the search of ways to overcome lack of commitment and power inequalities in order to achieve the partnership aims

Appendix 12: Emergent spaces and their description for each period

Thematic codes (Practices)	Emergent psychosocial space (category)	Space description
<p><i>Making sense of the process</i></p> <p><i>Dealing with resistance</i></p> <p><i>Following the regulations</i></p>	Institutional (Referral period)	<p>Psychosocial space: enforcement of the collaborative rules characterises this space. Partners explain, remind or reinforce the rules in order to organise their practices and achieve their aims</p> <p>Physical space: Primary School</p>
<p><i>Clarifying roles</i></p> <p><i>Overcoming power games</i></p> <p><i>Developing team spirit</i></p>	Expert Knowledge (Diagnosis period)	<p>Psychosocial space: partners' expert knowledge is the main feature of this space. Partners use their training, studies and knowledge on issues regarding disabled children in order to overcome obstacles and fulfill their role</p> <p>Physical space: KEDDY</p>
<p><i>Developing solutions</i></p> <p><i>Coping with fears</i></p> <p><i>Realising expectations</i></p>	Supportive (Negotiation period)	<p>Psychosocial space: providing support to the partners is the central characteristic of this space. Partners have to support not only those partners the procedure specifies but also other partners in order to realise their goals</p> <p>Physical space: KEDDY</p>
<p><i>Assessing commitments</i></p> <p><i>Abandoning power games</i></p> <p><i>Setting criteria for support</i></p>	Power (Intervention period)	<p>Psychosocial space: the emergence of power games characterises this space. Partners have to use power in order to organise their activities, clarify their roles and accomplish their aims</p> <p>Physical space: Government Organisation</p>

Appendix 13: Category-description for each part of Anna's narrative

Category-description for Referral

Partners' ways of collaborating in the <i>Institutional space</i> (category)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)
Enforcing collaboration rules Partners collaborate enforcing and following the collaborative protocol in order to fulfil their responsibilities	Making sense of the process	Produce report Refer the child to KEDDY
	Dealing with resistance	Resistance Fear of intervention
	Following the regulations	Presenting arguments Following the procedure Engagement through regulation

Category-description for Diagnosis

Partners' ways of collaborating in the <i>Expert Knowledge space</i> (category)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)
Joining efforts Partners collaborate putting aside personal interests and joining their efforts	Making sense of the roles	Produce a diagnosis and educational plan
	Coping with power games	Disagreements Discussions Power games
	Developing team spirit	Diagnostic team meetings Manager's intervention Co-production of the report

Category-description for Negotiation

Partners' ways of collaborating in the <i>Supportive space</i> (category)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)
Developing tactics Partners collaborate by being flexible and developing alternative tactics	Developing solutions	Present the report to the mother Acceptance of the report
	Coping with fears	Stereotypes Fears Dispute
	Dealing with expectations	Meetings with the mother Explaining the procedures Persuading the mother

Category-description for Intervention

Partners' ways of collaborating in the <i>Power space</i> (category)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Codes (Partners' interplay)
Coordinating partners and activities Partners collaborate synchronising their activities, priorities and aims	Assessing commitments	Disclosing the report Establishing integration unit
	Abandoning power games	Fear of intervention Power exercise Persistence
	Setting criteria for support	Following the regulations Communicating requests Achieving the establishment

Appendix 14: Overview of the ways of collaborating in all the periods of the enacted story

Narrative parts	Partners' ways of collaborating (Category)	Description
Referral	Enforcing collaboration rules <i>(Institutional Space)</i>	Partners collaborate enforcing and following the collaborative protocol in order to fulfil their responsibilities
Diagnosis	Joining efforts <i>(Expert Knowledge space)</i>	Partners collaborate putting aside personal interests and joining their efforts
Negotiation	Developing tactics <i>(Supportive space)</i>	Partners collaborate by being flexible and developing alternative tactics
Intervention	Coordinating partners and activities <i>(Power space)</i>	Partners collaborate synchronising their activities, priorities and aims

Appendix 15: Categories of collaborating, practices and main themes for each part of the narrative

Narrative parts	Category (Way of collaborating)	Thematic codes (Practices)	Main themes
<i>Referral</i>	Enforcing collaboration rules <i>(Institutional space)</i>	Making sense of the process Dealing with resistance Following the regulations	“Although parents should be informed about KEDDY and its role, I was not... I had to learn how it works” “I refused to contact the primary education consultant. Why should I allow people outside the school to intervene?” “The collaboration had to follow the official process... it was necessary in order to support Anna”
<i>Diagnosis</i>	Joining efforts <i>(Expert knowledge)</i>	Making sense of the roles Coping with power games Developing team spirit	“I had to make sure that I wouldn’t do something wrong... I didn’t know what my role required exactly” “Psychologists believe their evaluations are more valid than ours because we lack relevant training. But we have years of working experience in the field of special education” “All the colleagues offer their opinion for the production of the final diagnosis”
<i>Negotiation</i>	Developing tactics <i>(Supportive space)</i>	Developing solutions Coping with fears Dealing with expectations	“Employees engage in informal discussions with the parents using friendly and informal language to help them understand their child’s disability” “My child is different... different means subordinate” “I am dissatisfied with the process. There were too many delays, too much bureaucracy and little personal contact”
<i>Intervention</i>	Coordinating partners and activities <i>(Power space)</i>	Assessing commitments Abandoning power games Setting criteria for support	“I said to him that he should forget the regulations and pay attention to the child’s support” “We only make suggestions ... the government provides the necessary resources” “I called the ACDCPE director who told me that it was not his responsibility... He agreed to call YPEPTH to ask about the funding”

Appendix 16: Extract of interview transcript prepared for narrative analysis

It was three years ago. My son is dyslexic [George explains to the researcher what the term dyslexic means].

//

The school teacher asked me to meet in order to discuss my son's progress or actually lack of progress. I knew that Mike wasn't the best student. He always preferred playing to studying but all children do, don't they? (the researcher nods her head providing a positive answer).

//

The teacher told me that he was behind his classmates despite her efforts to help him. She is a good teacher and has worked in the school for many years. She had experience. She told me that she had sent her report to KEDDY. -- I didn't even know what she meant by report. She told me that she had written down her observations about Mike and sent it to KEDDY. But again, I didn't know what KEDDY is.

//

The funny thing is that KEDDY is just 5 minutes' away from my home. I see it every day when I go to work (he smiles ironically) [George explains what the teacher told him about KEDDY].

//

It took me some time to realise that the teacher was actually saying that my child had a problem, that he was sick, that he was not 'normal'.

//

It's not only that it took me by surprise. I feel ashamed of myself now but I was disappointed and angry with my son. I thought it was his fault because he wasn't trying hard. Maybe the teacher wasn't doing her job well and it was her fault too.

//

Although I asked for details, the teacher couldn't give me many answers. I didn't know what the case was but I knew that my child had a problem. And this was very stressful for me. I was thinking that if my son had a disability, it meant that he was not 'normal'. I was sure that when the neighbours learned about it, they would say the same. -- Oh! I feel so ashamed of myself that I was so frustrated then, but this was my first reaction (his eyes are on the floor and the expression on his face indicates shame).

//

I didn't discuss it with my son. I wanted to wait for our meeting with KEDDY. However, I met with a friend who has a child with physical disabilities. [He speaks about his friend and his child's disability]. I was surprised about his positive attitude. He didn't feel ashamed of his son, whose disability was obvious to anyone (he was in a wheelchair). He was proud of him. When I went home I thought of our discussion. I realised that whatever Mike's problem was it wasn't his fault. I had to be open to his disability. After all, there are no limits to helping my son. But I guess my first reaction was quite normal. Doesn't this happen most of the times? (The researcher explains that from her previous interviews with the partners she knew that some parents react initially in a similar way) (George looked satisfied with the researcher's answer).

//

So you can understand my disappointment at first.

//

Our appointment with KEDDY was two weeks later. I went there with Mike. We first spoke to the secretary to confirm our appointment. He was nice but not very friendly. He didn't provide me with too much information, instead he asked me to wait for the psychologist who would be able to answer my questions.

//

We then went to the waiting room. After a while the psychologist came. [George explains that the psychologist went through the process of diagnosis and answered his questions]. Mike went with her and I waited. Then the teacher came and she also explained to me how the process

works. Next, the social worker came to introduce himself. He didn't explain to me what the next step in the process was, instead he asked me to go to his office.

//

I have to admit that we didn't start well. He wasn't as friendly as the psychologist and the teacher. He made me feel a bit uncomfortable and I avoided asking too many questions.

//

It's not that he said something to me, the opposite. It is the fact that he didn't say very much. He went straight to the point. [George goes through some of the questions the social worker asked him]. I would expect to be treated with more understanding. After all it was obvious that I cared about my son.

//

He then presented me his diagnosis.

//

He said that Mike's home environment was not appropriate. He told me that because I was raising him alone, he wasn't getting the necessary support. He told me that I wasn't spending enough time with my son because of my work and that I wasn't helping him enough with his studies. He also said that my educational level didn't allow me to satisfactorily help Mike with his studies.

//

I was shocked about his diagnosis. I was doing my best to support my child. How could he say that Mike's home environment was not appropriate? How could he claim that it was my fault? I was so disappointed and sad. --

//

No, I knew that it couldn't be my fault. I was sure that I was doing everything I could for Mike. Yes, I was working hard but only because I wanted to provide the best to my son. I would do everything for my son!

//

To be honest I took a cigarette break. I needed some time to think. While I was smoking outside KEDDY, I spoke with a teacher (a KEDDY teacher he met for the first time). She told me that the social worker is not very sociable in general but his intentions are good. She also told me that they had had similar cases to mine in the past and they know that the parents are not responsible for their child's disability. However, she said that although parents could offer more help, they don't always do so.

//

I understood what she meant. She wanted to say that, despite the fact that I was helping my child, there were more things I could do.

//

Don't you agree with this perspective? [The researcher explains her agreement with George's point].

//

I decided that I had to explain or, to be precise, defend myself to the social worker. I should make clear that I was there to support my son.

//

And so I did make it clear. I tried to defend myself saying that although I was trying, maybe it was not enough. I made clear that I was happy to follow the social worker's suggestions in order to improve the home environment for Mike.

//

He still wasn't friendly but I could see that he understood that I wanted to help my son. Of course I would do whatever I could for my child. And he could see that.

//

So, he made some suggestions. [George explains the suggestions the social worker made and the plan for their realisation].

Appendix 17: Analysis of Maria's narrative of contradiction

Frame: lack of cooperation

Working for KEDDY's collaboration creates mixed feelings. Do I enjoy it? I am not sure. Sometimes yes, sometimes no. To be honest, when I arrived in KEDDY two years ago, I was very excited. It was a new challenge for me. I was aware, in broad lines, of KEDDY's role and aim. That is the reason I applied for this position. I found fascinating the fact that the partners have to overcome so many difficulties in order to support disabled children. You know this is a closed society with many stereotypes. [She talks about the negative image the society has about disabled children]. I can still remember the excitement of my first day at work. I was naive back then. I thought that the power of collaboration was in acting as one unit to achieve our aims. I couldn't see any other way to make it work. However, I didn't know much about the collaboration, I had to learn how it works.

Part 1: Entering KEDDY

Scene 1: Meeting the nice manager

I met the manager while I was waiting outside KEDDY. It was the first day you see, and I had arrived quite early. He invited me into his office and offered me a coffee. (Manager's name) is a really nice person, everyone likes him. Well, not everyone exactly but everyone should like him. Anyway, he told me about KEDDY [Maria presents the general information that she exchanged with the manager about KEDDY]. From what I understood, employees were expected to work in teams for the production of diagnoses and educational plans. He told me that KEDDY's employees are like a family and I could always ask for their advice. Yet, he made it clear to me that he should be informed about everything and that all reports should be signed by him.

Scene 2: Meeting the helpful colleagues

Stanza: 1) Then he introduced me to the rest of the team. **2)** He asked everyone to come to his office, which is also our conference room. **3)** Everyone was nice. **4)** I guess they were truly nice, they didn't pretend then. -- **5)** Oh, actually apart from (employee's name) who wasn't very sociable, everyone else was. But that's his style, not that he doesn't like me. **6)** I was very nervous and I think they could see that. It is a bit stressful to meet fourteen people in one day! **7)** But when I saw how nice they were to me, I relaxed and became friendly. **8)** (secretary's name) gave me a tour of KEDDY and he also showed me my office. **9)** (physiologists' and social workers' names) explained to me the main rules of the collaboration and their role in KEDDY. They also offered me their help. **10)** Kate (KEDDY primary teacher who will later be a main actor in the narrative) explained to me how the production of the reports works. **11)** At the time, I didn't realise that she was actually trying to show me the boundaries between my work and hers. **12)** I thought she was trying to help me.

Scene 3: Good start

Stanza: 1) Actually, this was my perspective when I started working in KEDDY. KEDDY's role is very important for our society. [she explains that it is very important to support children with disabilities]. **2)** Although I was new in KEDDY, I could see that the obstacles against our aim are many and only if we collaborate, can we achieve our aim. **3)** I made it clear to my colleagues that I wanted to work hard, learn my job well and help. **4)** I participated in discussions, I asked questions - perhaps too many questions -, I offered my perspective, I read books. **5)** I was so excited about my new job at first. **6)** I wanted to carry out my role as soon as possible. So I did my best to learn quickly.

Part 2: One case, two diagnoses

Scene 1: The case and Maria's diagnosis

Stanza: 1) It was long time ago, I was in KEDDY only for two months. **2)** I had a case with Kate (KEDDY's primary teacher) and we disagreed on the diagnosis. **3)** In particular, the school teacher referred (child's name) to KEDDY. **4)** The school teacher mentioned in her report that the child was lacking basic grammar and spelling skills, she was writing inappropriate sized and spaced letters but she was very sociable with the other children. **5)** When I read the report, I thought that the child had dysgraphia. [She talks about a course she took when she was studying indicating that she knew what are the basic characteristics of people with dysgraphia]. **6)** When I later examined (child's name) using the proper psycho-metric tools, I concluded that my initial evaluation was correct and that the child specifically had dyslexic dysgraphia.

Scene 2: Teacher's diagnosis

Kate's diagnosis, however, was different from mine. After evaluating the child, she concluded that the child was dyslexic. She supported her diagnosis by saying that the child could not spell words, was not efficient in learning new words and had difficulty learning the order of the letters. If she had taken a course on disabilities and their characteristics, she would have known that the symptoms she described were symptoms of dyslexic dysgraphia. However, she never took any course on special needs education, like many other employees here. She attended some related seminars when she started working in KEDDY but she doesn't have an appropriate educational background. Yet, she thinks that because she has been working in KEDDY for four years, she knows everything. But she can't know better than those who have studied the needs of disabled people for years.

Scene 3: Asking confirmation

Stanza: 1) Don't you agree that we (psychologists) have an appropriate background for complicated cases like this one even if we don't have working experience? **2)** From what I have told you so far don't you think that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia? - The researcher made a face that indicated she did not know the answer -- **3)** You have completed your degree years ago so it is hard to remember. [Maria presents again the main characteristics that the child had]. I am sure that if you go back to your university books, you would definitely say that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia. **4)** Teachers have experience because they have worked in schools and they are familiar with the school environment, as well as with the children's attitude inside the classroom. So they are good at the production of the educational plans. **5)** Look, as a psychologist, I know more about disabilities and their characteristics because I have studied these issues.

Part 3 Experienced vs. inexperienced staff

Scene 1: First disagreement

Stanza: 1) All the team members (psychologist, teacher and social worker) met to discuss their evaluation and diagnosis. **2)** The social worker didn't have any significant comments regarding the child's family and home environment. **3)** The teacher presented her evaluation suggesting that the child was dyslexic and I presented mine claiming that the child had dyslexic dysgraphia. **4)** I am not even sure that she (teacher) had heard this term before. -- **5)** Anyway, she tried to convince me about the validity of her diagnosis. **6)** When she realised that she couldn't change my mind, she became more aggressive. **7)** I didn't expect that. **8)** She used her working experience in KEDDY and teaching experience in schools. **9)** She actually told me that we should go with her diagnosis because I had been in KEDDY only for two months and I didn't have experience. **10)** Since when does a teacher with no relevant training have more experience than a psychologist with years of studies?

Scene 2: Bringing forward experiences

Yes, Kate became aggressive. When she realised that I wasn't changing my mind, she asked Lisa (primary teacher) to join our discussion. [Maria provides some information about Lisa].

Kate presented her arguments and my arguments. She didn't even ask me to present my case! Lisa then took a couple of minutes to think about it. She then turned to me and said (Maria speaks in an ironic voice): "I am afraid that Kate is right. Based on the symptoms of the child, she should be diagnosed as dyslexic. You know, when you are not sure about a diagnosis, you should trust Kate's experience." I didn't want to be disrespectful as I knew that both teachers were old and had many years of experience. Was this enough though? I tried to defend myself but soon Kate interrupted me. She explained that she could understand that I was frustrated but there were two employees supporting the same diagnosis. She also claimed that based on my minor experience it was expected that I might make a mistake. Then she said something that I didn't get in the first place: "It happens with psychologists. You study many years and you confuse what the books write with real life. There is a difference between reading about students and having to deal with them".

Part 4: Being a psychologist

Scene 1: Enforcing ideas

Stanza: 1) I was quite surprised. **2)** How can they say that because I don't have experience my diagnosis was not accurate? **3)** Yes, I was a new member of the team and I didn't have the experience they (teachers) had. But this doesn't mean that I was lacking knowledge. **4)** I worked very hard to carry out my role, to learn how the collaboration works. **5)** I was new but capable and willing to learn. **6)** Why would they treat me in that way? **7)** They should have tried to make me understand their perspective and not to force over their opinion. Because this is actually what they did (she laughs ironically).

Scene 2: Need for support

Stanza: 1) I went to talk to Nick (KEDDY's social worker). **2)** He was new in KEDDY back then, like me. **3)** I explained to him the events and I asked for his advice. **4)** He told me that he thought there was a hidden antipathy or maybe antagonism between teachers and psychologists. **5)** I don't think that this should be the case when everyone needs to work together to support the children. **6)** He told me that Kate and Lisa can be a bit aggressive sometimes. I saw from his face that he felt sorry for me.

Scene 3: Becoming a member of a team

Stanza: 1) This is a good question. **2)** The teachers were in KEDDY for more than two years so they had experience. **3)** And in the end, it was proved that my diagnosis was correct, not theirs. **4)** I guess Nick was right. There is competition between teachers and psychologists. **5)** I can see this now. **6)** But the teachers started it, at least in my case. **7)** Actually, after this case and for pretty much every case during the first year, I asked the other psychologists' advice when I wasn't sure about my diagnosis. They were always happy to help the new member of their team and they didn't make me feel that I was lacking knowledge or experience. **8)** Actually, I still go to them if I have any questions. **9)** We are friends now. **10)** This doesn't mean that I am not close to other employees, but I spend more time with the psychologists.

Back to Frame: Lack of cooperation

Stanza: 1) The KEDDY partnership will achieve its aims only if the partners actually collaborate. **2)** You know, it is very difficult and admirable what we do here. We have to face a society with stereotypes, parents unwilling to accept their children's problems, partners unable or unwilling to fulfil their promises. **3)** I don't see myself just as one of KEDDY psychologists. **4)** We are here to support children who need us. **5)** I have to admit that I think we are quite successful at what we do.

Appendix 18: Analysis of George's narrative of compromise

Part 1: Dealing with Mike's disability

Scene 1: Introducing Mike's disability

Stanza: 1) It was three years ago. **2)** My son is dyslexic [George explains to the researcher what the term dyslexic means]. **3)** The school teacher asked me to meet in order to discuss my son's progress or actually lack of progress. **4)** I knew that Mike wasn't the best student. **5)** He always preferred playing to studying but all children do, don't they? (the researcher nods her head providing a positive answer). **6)** The teacher told me that he was behind his classmates despite her efforts to help him. **7)** She is a good teacher and has worked in the school for many years. She had experience. **8)** She told me that she had sent her report to KEDDY. -- **9)** I didn't even know what she meant by report. She told me that she had written down her observations about Mike and sent it to KEDDY. **10)** But again, I didn't know what KEDDY is. The funny thing is that KEDDY is just 5 minutes' away from my home. I see it every day when I go to work (he smiles ironically) [George explains what the teacher told him about KEDDY].

Scene 2: First thoughts about Mike's disability

Stanza: 1) It took me some time to realise that the teacher was actually saying that my child had a problem, that he was sick, that he was not 'normal'. **2)** It's not only that it took me by surprise. I feel ashamed of myself now but I was disappointed and angry with my son. I thought it was his fault because he wasn't trying hard. Maybe the teacher wasn't doing her job well and it was her fault too. **3)** Although I asked for details, the teacher couldn't give me many answers. **4)** I didn't know what the case was but I knew that my child had a problem. And this was very stressful for me. **5)** I was thinking that if my son had a disability, it meant that he was not 'normal'. **6)** I was sure that when the neighbours learned about it, they would say the same. -- **7)** Oh! I feel so ashamed of myself that I was so frustrated then, but this was my first reaction (his eyes are on the floor and the expression on his face indicates shame).

Scene 3: Coping with Mike's disability

I didn't discuss it with my son. I wanted to wait for our meeting with KEDDY. However, I met with a friend who has a child with physical disabilities. [He speaks about his friend and his child's disability]. I was surprised about his positive attitude. He didn't feel ashamed of his son, whose disability was obvious to anyone (he was in a wheelchair). He was proud of him. When I went home I thought of our discussion. I realised that whatever Mike's problem was it wasn't his fault. I had to be open to his disability. After all, there are no limits to helping my son. But I guess my first reaction was quite normal. Doesn't this happen most of the times? (The researcher explains that from her previous interviews with the partners she knew that some parents react initially in a similar way) (George looked satisfied with the researcher's answer). So you can understand my disappointment at first.

Part 2: Visiting KEDDY

Scene 1: First visit

Our appointment with KEDDY was two weeks later. I went there with Mike. We first spoke to the secretary to confirm our appointment. He was nice but not very friendly. He didn't provide me with too much information, instead he asked me to wait for the psychologist who would be able to answer my questions. We then went to the waiting room. After a while the psychologist came. [George explains that the psychologist went through the process of diagnosis and answered his questions]. Mike went with her and I waited. Then the teacher came and she also explained to me how the process works. Next, the social worker came to introduce himself. He

didn't explain to me what the next step in the process was, instead he asked me to go to his office.

Scene 2: Meeting the social worker

I have to admit that we didn't start well. He wasn't as friendly as the psychologist and the teacher. He made me feel a bit uncomfortable and I avoided asking too many questions. It's not that he said something to me, the opposite. It is the fact that he didn't say very much. He went straight to the point. [George goes through some of the questions the social worker asked him]. I would expect to be treated with more understanding. After all it was obvious that I cared about my son.

Scene 3: Social worker's diagnosis

Stanza: 1) He then presented me his diagnosis. **2)** He said that Mike's home environment was not appropriate. **3)** He told me that because I was raising him alone, he wasn't getting the necessary support. **4)** He told me that I wasn't spending enough time with my son because of my work and that I wasn't helping him enough with his studies. **5)** He also said that my educational level didn't allow me to satisfactorily help Mike with his studies.

Scene 4: George's reaction to the social worker's diagnosis

Stanza: 1) I was shocked about his diagnosis. **2)** I was doing my best to support my child. **3)** How could he say that Mike's home environment was not appropriate? How could he claim that it was my fault? **4)** I was so disappointed and sad. -- **5)** No, I knew that it couldn't be my fault. I was sure that I was doing everything I could for Mike. **6)** Yes, I was working hard but only because I wanted to provide the best to my son. **7)** I would do everything for my son!

Part 3: Compromising

Scene 1: Ready to help

To be honest I took a cigarette break. I needed some time to think. While I was smoking outside KEDDY, I spoke with a teacher (a KEDDY teacher he met for the first time). She told me that the social worker is not very sociable in general but his intentions are good. She also told me that they had had similar cases to mine in the past and they know that the parents are not responsible for their child's disability. However, she said that although parents could offer more help, they don't always do so. I understood what she meant. She wanted to say that, despite the fact that I was helping my child, there were more things I could do. Don't you agree with this perspective? [The researcher explains her agreement with George's point]. I decided that I had to explain or, to be precise, defend myself to the social worker. I should make clear that I was there to support my son.

Scene 2: Helping the child

Stanza: 1) And so I did make it clear. **2)** I tried to defend myself saying that although I was trying, maybe it was not enough. **3)** I made clear that I was happy to follow the social worker's suggestions in order to improve the home environment for Mike. **4)** He still wasn't friendly but I could see that he understood that I wanted to help my son. **5)** Of course I would do whatever I could for my child. **6)** And he could see that. So, he made some suggestions. [George explains the suggestions the social worker made and the plan for their realisation].

Appendix 19: Analysis of Christine's narrative of manipulation

Frame: Lack of trust

I think that the biggest problem of the collaboration is lack of trust. You can't trust people who are not honest and try to hide things from you. Without trust there is no collaboration! If there isn't trust, there are no results! Let me give you an example to make it a bit clearer. One year ago, I had in my class a disabled child. Although I was willing to follow KEDDY's suggestions and support the child, the government delayed the establishment of the integration unit that KEDDY had suggested. As a result, I couldn't help the child. Actually, I didn't agree to help the child. It was too much from KEDDY to ask me to help a child without the support of the integration unit. Oh! I think this didn't come across in the way I wanted it to. I am not that selfish! -- Let me give you the background of this example so as to provide a complete picture.

Part 1: Exploring the case

Scene 1: Identifying a child with disability

One year ago -my first year as a teacher- I had a student, Jenifer, who seemed to face learning difficulties. Since the first day, I realised that Jenifer's behaviour was abnormal. [Christine presents her first observations which made her think that Jenifer was disabled]. Yet, I was new, inexperienced and I thought my judgement was wrong. But one month later, Jenifer had little progress in comparison to her classmates. Again, I hesitated to discuss her case with my colleagues because I didn't have experience and didn't want them to think that I was trying too hard to make a good impression. I decided to pay more attention to her and observe her progress until the end of the term. [She described her efforts to support the student]. However, at the end of the term, the picture hadn't changed. Jenifer had made no progress.

Scene 2: Seeking advice

I went to talk to Charles. We were close and he has been working at the school for several years. So he had experience and I knew that he had taught disabled children before. Charles is always happy to offer his help. [She presents some details about Charles and her discussion with him about Jenifer]. He told me that I should go and talk to the head teacher as he too thought that the child was disabled. And if this was the case, he told me that the head teacher should definitely know. After Charles' advice, I didn't hesitate. I went to see the head teacher.

Scene 3: Talking to the head teacher

Stanza: 1) Oh! This meeting was very awkward. For me of course, not for the head teacher. **2)** He was right; I should have talked to him earlier. [Christine presents some details regarding their discussion about Jenifer's case]. **3)** He was angry with me because I hadn't gone to see him when I first noticed that Jenifer had learning difficulties. **4)** He told me something I should have considered: the earlier we identify that a child has learning difficulties, the better the support we can offer. That made sense! (ironic laugh) **5)** The head teacher knows all these issues. He has attended relevant seminars and he also has experience. **6)** I realised my mistake but I couldn't tell him that I had been afraid of talking to him.

Part 2: Writing the report

Scene 1: Following KEDDY advice

Stanza: 1) The head teacher told me that I had to write a report with my observations for KEDDY. **2)** He directed me to KEDDY in case I had any questions. **3)** Of course I had! Many questions actually! **4)** I didn't know what I had to do. **5)** Uhm, to be honest I only had a rough idea about KEDDY and its role. **6)** I had only heard of it. The first time I called them I spoke with the secretary. **7)** He passed me on to a primary teacher. [Christine briefly mentions their

conversation]. **8)** He was very informative and didn't seem to get annoyed by my questions. He explained to me what I should include in the report. **9)** He also suggested reading some books in order to provide a more accurate and complete report. **10)** I also had to include detailed descriptions of Jenifer's activities in and out of the classroom. **11)** So, I followed his (KEDDY's teacher) advice step by step. **12)** Yet, I wasn't sure if I was doing the right thing. I therefore called KEDDY again. **13)** This time I spoke with one of the psychologists. **14)** Despite the fact that she was using some terms that I didn't quite understand [she gives examples of these terms], she was friendly and gave me the answers I needed. **15)** I really appreciated the way the KEDDY employees treated me and I tried to write a good report to help them as well. **16)** I sent them the report one week later.

Part 3: Trying to make a decision

Scene 1: Implementing the educational plan

When KEDDY sent me Jenifer's educational plan, I called them to ask for some clarifications. An employee explained to me what I had to do. -- In short, I had to support the student with extracurricular activities. He (the employee) told me that I could organise my teaching activities with the help of the specialised teacher from the integration unit. This teacher would be someone with knowledge of special educational needs and in particular of Jenifer's needs. However, the employee told me that it will take some time for the establishment of the integration unit, and therefore for the arrival of the specialised teacher. He actually told that it usually takes one-two months. Uhm! [Christine makes an ironic face]

Scene 2: Dilemma

Stanza: 1) Oh! That was a very difficult position to be in. -- **2)** On the one hand, how could I refuse my help? KEDDY's employee had made it clear that my participation was vital for the supportive process. **3)** On the other hand, I had never taught children with disabilities. **4)** I didn't even have any relevant training. **5)** I was afraid that I wouldn't be good at my job. **6)** Yet, I wanted to collaborate. [She provides examples from her personal life to indicate that she is a person who wants to help others]. **7)** Actually, the only reason that was holding me back was the timeframe for the establishment of the integration unit. I wasn't sure if one-two months were enough for everything to be in place.

Scene 3: Resolving the tension

I went to KEDDY and I met with the manager and the primary teacher who produced Jenifer's report. They told me that in the past the establishment of an integration unit could take several months. However, they explained to me that the process is now standardised and it shouldn't take more than two months. The manager reassured me that he will speak directly to the director of primary education in order to move the process forward more quickly. The KEDDY teacher told me that she would help me until the specialised teacher arrived. They had satisfactorily answered all of my questions. How could I say no? -- I just couldn't! [She smiles sympathetically]

Scene 4: Re-examining the case

Stanza: 1) I couldn't understand their reaction at first. [She talks about the discussion she had with her colleagues and the head teacher] [She then apologises to the researcher as she thinks that her story is very long]. **2)** One of my colleagues and the head teacher had collaborated with KEDDY for another case and KEDDY didn't fulfil its promises. **3)** They also told me something that I hadn't even considered; KEDDY only makes the suggestions. **4)** The government will decide the establishment or not of the integration unit. **5)** What if the government doesn't approve the findings? **6)** They (KEDDY's employees) weren't honest with me. **7)** How can we work together if we do not trust each other?

Part 4: Rejecting challenge

Scene 1: Final decision

Stanza: 1) I decided not to accept the responsibility. It was too much to ask from me. **2)** I didn't mind that I had to work extra hours. **3)** But it wasn't fair to ask me do something beyond my responsibilities without having the appropriate support. **4)** I like to help other people but this case was different. **5)** Don't you think that this wasn't fair? -- **6)** Wouldn't you have done the same? [The researcher avoids answering the question presenting another case that reminded her of Christine's case]. **7)** So, afterwards I was more careful when I had to work with KEDDY employees.

Scene 2: Rationale behind the final decision

My colleagues were happy about my decision. They told me that if I had accepted the challenge and the integration unit was not established, all the colleagues would have to suffer the consequences [she explains that in this case they would have to work together to organise Jenifer's curriculum]. They also told me that if an integration unit were established, more disabled children would come to our school. But this is a good thing of course. Who doesn't want to offer help to students who need it? Ha! Ha! Ha! (she laughs) I know it sounds ironic but this is what I believe. -- I was lucky to have such supportive colleagues. They just wanted to protect me from committing myself to a role that I couldn't satisfactorily fulfil. I was new and I didn't know how KEDDY works. I therefore could not really appreciate my options. The only thing I am sad about is that I didn't ask to support the child as soon as the integration unit were established. I remember that one of my colleagues offered this option, but I don't know why the others disagreed.

Return to frame: Lack of trust

If KEDDY employees had been honest with me and had explained to me the process for the establishment of the integration unit, I would have accepted to support the student. If only I could have trusted them! You can't work with someone you don't trust!

Appendix 20: Analysis of Rob's narrative of persuasion

Frame: Following the rules

I have been working as a school consultant for eleven years and I have been working with KEDDY collaboration since its establishment. Throughout all these years I have dealt with many cases. Marina's case was an exception to the way I usually work. -- You know, we have to follow the rules of the collaboration. Otherwise it will be hard to achieve our aims. You see, there are too many partners involved and we need to have continuity in the way we deal with our cases. Marina's case was an exception. -- Every rule in the collaboration protocol needs its exceptions!

Part 1: Producing report

Scene 1: Marina's case

Marina was a disabled child who attended the second grade of the primary school. Her teacher had produced a report that indicated her learning difficulties and the head teacher had sent this report to me. Following the rules of the partnership, I had to go to the school and evaluate the child to see whether she was indeed disabled or not.

Scene 2: Meeting the teacher and head teacher

Two weeks later, I went to the school. My aim is to visit the schools as quickly as I can but this is not always possible. You see there are only two school consultants in this large prefecture. We are therefore very busy. Before meeting Marina, I met the head teacher. [He presents the profile of the head teacher and provides some details from their meeting]. He was very friendly and seemed to care a lot about Marina. This is not always the case. Some head teachers don't like it when they have disabled children in their school. They don't like the fact that people outside the school, like me and the KEDDY employees, intervene in their school. He also introduced me to her teacher. She had been working at the school for years and she had experience with disabled children. She provided me with all the necessary background information and she said that she would be happy to help me in any way. They both cared about Marina. [He smiles].

Scene 3: Observing Marina

I met Marina during the break, before my observation in the classroom. She was a fragile little girl. [He describes how and where he met Marina] -- She was sitting alone and she hesitated to speak to me. She looked very sad. I could see that she was depressed. Oh! The poor little girl! The picture was the same inside the classroom. The teacher tried to engage her in discussions but she refused to talk and participate in any activities. She was just sitting alone looking outside out of the window. -- Of course the teacher and the head teacher cared about her. How could anyone not care? I have children. This could have been my daughter!

Scene 4: Producing Marina's diagnosis

Stanza: 1) It wasn't hard to conclude that Marina was depressed. **2)** Her teacher was right. **3)** It was so obvious! I wrote my report. **4)** It usually takes me one week, but in this case the problem was clear and it indicated an urgent case. --

Part 2: Delays in the supportive process

Scene 1: Special consultant's responsibilities

Stanza: 1) I sent it (the diagnosis) to the head teacher and the special educational needs school consultant, Andy. **2)** As the process suggests, Andy had to observe Marina and produce his own report. **3)** A child can't be referred to KEDDY if the special consultant doesn't observe the child first. **4)** Actually, the protocol suggests that the special consultant has to provide a plan for the child's support inside the school. **5)** Then if the special consultant's program was not effective, he would refer the child to KEDDY.

Scene 2: The busy consultant

I sent my report to Andy and I called him four days later, as I usually do, to make sure he had received the report and had planned his visit to Marina's school. He confirmed that he had received the report but he told me he hadn't found time to read it. That was usual as he is generally very busy. You see, there is only one special consultant for the whole prefecture. [He objects to the fact that there is only one special consultant]. The unusual thing thought was that he hadn't scheduled a visit yet. I asked him why and he told me that he was very busy as it was this was the period of the year when he had to re-evaluate previous cases.

Scene 3: Presenting Marina's case to the special consultant

I described the case to him so as to save him some time. I asked him to speed up the process and go to Marina's school as soon as possible. It seemed that he recognised the necessity since he told me that he would do his best. -- I trusted his word.

Scene 4: The special consultant's lack of commitment

Two weeks after my call to Andy, and pretty much four weeks after my visit to Marina's school, I called her teacher to see how the meeting with the special consultant had gone. I was very surprised to hear that the consultant hadn't been to the school yet. Neither had he notified them about a future visit. I have to admit that I wasn't pleased with the news. I called Andy again to see what had happened. He told me that he was still very busy and he was planning to go to Marina's school at the end of the term. This meant one month later. That was too long. The child had to be referred to KEDDY as soon as possible. -- In reality, I knew that Andy would not be able to support Marina and he would eventually ask for KEDDY's help. Still we had to follow the process but waiting one month was too much! I tried to explain that it would then be very late for the student to overcome her difficulties.

Part 3: Overriding the protocol

Scene 1: Prioritising cases

Stanza: 1) No, he didn't understand my arguments. **2)** He told me that even if he skipped the re-evaluation of the cases he had, there were other cases that had priority over Marina's case. -- **3)** Priority in terms of sequence not of emergency. [He explains the re-evaluation process and how the cases are prioritised based on their assignment date]. **4)** I know that this is what the protocol recommends. **5)** Yet, I thought that if we prioritised just one case, it wouldn't mean that we were not following the protocol, rather that it was an urgent case, an exception.

Scene 2: Sending Marina's report to KEDDY

He didn't agree to prioritise Marina's case. I had run out of reasons to convince him. I had to see what other options I had. I called the KEDDY manager and explained to him Marina's case. He was very understanding and compassionate. It seemed that he shared the same anxieties as me. He therefore told me that he would make an exception and would accept a student in KEDDY with the school consultant's referral and not the special consultant's referral. I didn't think about it. I told him straightaway that I would send him Marina's report if her parents and head teacher give their permission. As the parents and head teacher agreed to override the protocol, the next day I sent my report to KEDDY.

Return to Frame: Following the rules

Stanza: 1) You are probably wondering why I told you about this case. [The researcher responds positively]. 2) I just wanted to state that I believe that in some cases partners have to ignore the protocol and adapt to the specific needs of the cases they have to deal with. 3) We need to be flexible as every time we deal with very different cases. -- 4) However, this doesn't mean that we have to underestimate the rules. 5) Rules are there to help the partners achieve their aims; to help us collaborate and know the boundaries of our roles. 6) They should be broken only in 'special' cases. 7) But I think I have said enough about Marina's case.

Appendix 21: KEDDY collaborative arrangements

Shared and different perspectives regarding the collaborative process are here brought together in order to identify the formal and informal collaborative arrangements and give meaning to experienced events and shared practices. The main collaborative arrangements identified are presented grouped in three categories.

Referring a child to KEDDY

In this category fit the collaborative arrangements that refer to the transfer of a student to KEDDY by the school or parents. The school teachers refer most of the cases to KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias. In particular, when a school teacher thinks that a child has learning difficulties, she discusses her concerns with the head teacher. *“We should always ask the head teacher’s advice. He is responsible for the school... He should know everything”* (School Teacher, 16: 27) Then, the head teacher examines the child. If the head teachers believes that the child has special needs, he arranges a meeting with the child’s parents. During the meeting the teacher and head teacher present their assessments about the student. If the parents allow the further exploration of the case, the head teacher asks the teacher to write a full report assessing the student’s performance.

The head teacher sends this report to the school consultant of mainstream education who also examines the child. If the evaluation of the school consultant suggests that the child has special needs, the consultant organises a plan with specific school activities and tasks. The teacher should follow this plan to help the student overcome his difficulties. *“We (teachers) rely on the suggestions of the school consultants who usually have some experience and training regarding children with special needs.”* (School Teacher, 19: 31) If, despite these interventions, the student’s performance is not improved, the consultant requests the help of the school special educational needs consultant. The special consultant examines the child in order to produce a diagnosis and suggests further interventions for the support of the student. Then, *“he monitors the child progress with the help of the teacher, who reports over the telephone once or twice a month.”* (Partners' meeting, 8:1) If the special consultant decides that the current interventions are not helping the student overcome his difficulties, they request the parents’ permission and refer the child to KEDDY.

“In some rare cases, less than 10% of the cases KEDDY has treated, the parents, not the teacher, identify their children’s educational difficulties” (KEDDY Manager, 23:1). In these cases, the parents should go to the school and discuss their concerns with the head teacher who then initiates the supportive process. If the parents go directly to KEDDY, KEDDY has to comply with the rules of the collaboration and hence asks the school to refer the student. Only when the school refuses to start the process, can the parents. go directly to KEDDY. *“Unfortunately, it is not clear what we have to do if the head teacher refuses to collaborate... I guess we try to persuade him. The manager will decide that...”*(KEDDY Employee, 21-25: 7).

Producing and presenting the report

Usually there is a waiting list in order to book an appointment with KEDDY. The waiting depends on the number of employees available (i.e. temporary staff working from October to June) and the school period (i.e. September to December is the busiest period). When an appointment is made, the official protocol suggests that the child is examined by a teacher of his educational level and a psychologist. The parents meet with a social worker. *“There isn’t a standard sequence based on which the specialists examine the child”* (KEDDY Employee, 6:13). However, KEDDY Aitoloakarnanias has established an unofficial rule that the psychologist examines the child first. The team members who examined the child meet in order to present their individual reports and agree on a common diagnosis. *“The collaborative process*

indicates that the team should meet within one week after the production of the individual reports” (KEDDY Employee, 31-32: 12).

When the team members agree on a diagnosis, they present their case and evaluation at the next weekly team meeting. Then a discussion between all KEDDY employees follows. *“The aim is to produce an accurate diagnosis and educational plan for every child” (KEDDY Meeting, 21:8)* by allowing all the employees to present their arguments regarding a specific case. At the end of the meeting, every team has a final diagnosis. Next, as an informal rule requires, the final report is produced by the teachers and then is approved by the manager. *“The official collaborative protocol recommends that the final report should be ready one week after the weekly meeting”(KEDDY meeting, 4:7).*

Following an unofficial rule, when the child’s report is ready, KEDDY teachers meet with the parents to present the report. Psychologists may also present the report when a child faces serious psychological problems and needs to be referred to an external specialist. In addition, *“social workers can discuss the report with the parents when the child’s special needs are linked to his home environment”(KEDDY Manager, 19:1).* After the presentation of the report parents decide whether they accept the report or not, as well as if they want KEDDY to circulate the report to the child’s school. If the parents agree with the circulation of the report, the KEDDY team that examined the child meets and discusses the steps (i.e. educational aims, sequence of interventions, partner’s involvement etc.) that should be taken towards the support of the child. *“This meeting should take place within one week. The manager has to approve the recommendations of the team” (KEDDY Employee, 31-33:21).*

Circulating the report and implementing interventions

The final report with the diagnosis and educational interventions is sent to the head teacher. A formal letter is also attached to instruct the head teacher to circulate the report to the child’s teachers and clarify that *“the report is strictly confidential” (Partners’ meeting, 27-29: 1).* The letter also explains that the head teacher should confirm he has received the report and should contact KEDDY if he has any questions. An informal agreement between KEDDY employees suggests that when the head teacher does not confirm within two weeks that he has received the report, the KEDDY teacher who produced the report telephones him. If the head teacher has valid reasons for not disclosing the report, the KEDDY teacher advises him to do so as soon as possible. However, if he does not offer a valid explanation, the teacher emphasises the necessity for the report to be circulated. The KEDDY manager may also call the head teacher. If the manager’s efforts are not successful, he sends the report directly to the child’s school teachers.

KEDDY’s role is also to make suggestions for the educational support of the students. If any of these suggestions requires resources (i.e. establishment of a new school unit, purchase of school equipment, appointment of staff etc), KEDDY sends a formal letter to ACDCPE (Aitoloakarnanias Central Departmental Council of Primary Education) or ACDCSE (Aitoloakarnanias Central Departmental Council of Secondary Education), depending on the educational level these requests refer to. ACDCDE or ACDCSE examine the requests and pass them to YPEPTH (Ministry of National Education) which will decide whether it will provide the necessary resources. Then an official letter is sent to KEDDY with YPEPTH answer. If the resources have been approved, ACDCDE or ACDCSE supervise the implementation of the requests. If the resources are not approved, the informal process recommends that the KEDDY manager writes another official letter to ACDCDE or ACDCSE and YPEPTH. If the requests are again rejected, the KEDDY manager waits until the next academic year when he follows the same procedure to place the requests

Appendix 22: Summaries of the stories the initial analysis has revealed

The first findings chapter follows a particular case (Anna's story) in order to explore the collaborative practices. This case was used as an example of the cases KEDDY has treated in order to illustrate the process and practices of the collaboration and show its challenges, frustrations, successes and achievements. However, the initial analysis reveals several cases that KEDDY has dealt with. Some of these cases indicate that the partners collaborate successfully and achieve the partnership's goals. Other cases indicate the challenges of the collaboration. All the cases show different types of stories that describe the collaboration's practices and processes under different circumstances, contexts and actors. A summary of the emergent cases is provided below.

1) **Kostas** was the child of a KEDDY employee. The collaborative process worked quite differently for Kostas since his parent took over the case and managed to deal with this case in a very efficient way. Support was therefore offered to Kostas without finding any obstacles. KEDDY manager presents the story as a successful collaboration example but he also explains that those who have the right contacts can overcome the difficulties of the collaborative process easier than others (*success-gossip story*).

KEDDY employee [PT (1)] provides her personal experience with KEDDY when she asked her colleagues' help in supporting a child (*personal story*).

2) **Dimitris** had a serious illness which affected his mental and physical ability. His parents kept him inside his home because of his poor health. KEDDY employees learnt from an outsider that the child did not go to the school. Indeed, Dimitris was 11 years old and had never been to the school, could not write or read and did not have any friends. KEDDY employees knew that his condition was critical. Nevertheless, they fought to improve his life. Firstly, they had to face his parents and convince them to send Dimitris to the special school. They also had to persuade government representatives to provide funding in order to hire a specialised staff, and buy special equipment for the school and for Dimitris home. At the end, KEDDY employees managed to overcome all the obstacles and Dimitris went to the school. Unfortunately, he died a few months later.

The partners [KEDDY manager, PrimT(2), Psych(2), SW(2), DKYSPE, PSSHT, PSST] present this story as a *tragic story*.

3) **Nikos** did not manage to get the support he needed. This happened because KEDDY employees did not overcome the resistance of his mother who did not accept KEDDY's diagnosis. As such, KEDDY could not take further action to support Nikos.

KEDDY manager presents this story to indicate that there are some cases where the collaborative process is not completed because of other partners' resistance (*unfulfilled story*).

KEDDY employee [PrimT (1)] provides this case as an example to indicate what she has learnt from her working experience. She learnt that parents may also refuse to help their children (*knowledge story*).

Another KEDDY employee [SecT (2)] provides this case to present how ironic it is when KEDDY tries its best to support a child but the collaborative process fail because just one partner is not willing to collaborate (*ironic story*).

4) **Marina** was a blind child. KEDDY helped her by providing the necessary educational equipment for her school and home. However, Marina broke by accident the computer she was using at home. Marina's parents asked from KEDDY to request funding for a new computer. The government rejected KEDDY's requests explaining that Marina would have to wait for another term before she could apply for extra funding.

KEDDY manager provides this story to indicate how ironic it is when KEDDY tries hard to help a child and government representatives do not support their efforts (*ironic story*).

A parent [P(1)] presents his personal experience when he went to KEDDY in order to ask support for his child (*personal story*).

A head Teacher [PSSHT] provides this example to indicate the irony when KEDDY tries to help a student and has to confront government's lack of cooperation (*ironic story*).

5) **Mary** had learning difficulties and her teacher requested KEDDY's help. Since it was a busy period for KEDDY, Mary was examined by KEDDY employees after several delays. Although KEDDY requested the establishment of an integration unit at Mary's school, KYSPE rejected KEDDY's request.

KEDDY employee [PT (1)] remembers this story and tries to find out what went wrong in this case (*reflective story*).

A government representative (DKYSPE) explains how he tried to support a child but he failed because of his colleagues' refusal to help (*reflective story*).

6) **Maria** was referred to KEDDY in the middle of the school year by her school teacher. She did not face any delays in her diagnosis and the production of her educational plan. Since her school had an integration unit, she received support without any delays.

KEDDY employee [PreIT(1)] uses this case to show that the collaboration can be very effective (*success story*).

7) **Andreas** was referred to KEDDY by his mother who was a teacher and identified quickly that he had learning difficulties. The mother had a close relationship with the KEDDY manager and Andreas was quickly examined and appropriate action for his support was taken.

Two KEDDY employees [PrimT (3) and SecT (2)] present this case to indicate that the collaborative process does not work in a similar way in all cases. They suggest that if parents have the right contacts, many difficulties can be overcome (*gossip story*).

8) **Mario** had an illness which affected his physical and mental ability. Although he attended a special school, he had to go to KEDDY for a re-evaluation of his educational plan. KEDDY employees, school employees and his parents fought unified in order to improve his educational experience (extra teaching support, individualised equipment, ramps at his house etc).

A head teacher [SSSHT] uses this case to indicate that there are some cases where all partners come together in order to overcome obstacles and struggles, and achieve the partnership's aim (*epic story*).

9) **George** was a child with learning difficulties due to inadequate home environment. The school teacher referred him to KEDDY. Despite the fact that KEDDY took proper action to help him, George did not manage to overcome his learning difficulties because he did not receive the necessary support from his parents.

KEDDY employee [Psyc (1)] uses this example to indicate that working in KEDDY has increased her knowledge on educational issues. For example, she has understood that a child's home environment is very important to help them overcome learning difficulties (*knowledge story*).

Another KEDDY employee [SW (2)] provides this story as an example which indicates the importance of the home environment for the improvement of the education of children with special needs (*knowledge story*).

10) **Pavlos** was a child with depression. He was referred to KEDDY by his parents. However, due to the urgent nature of his case, KEDDY psychologist referred him to a hospital. As such, the collaborative process did not continue to the next stage.

KEDDY Employee [Psyc (1)] uses this case to indicate that sometimes it is not in KEDDY's authority or ability to help a child (*unfulfilled story*).

11) **Joanna** was referred to KEDDY by her teacher. Since KEDDY was understaffed during this period, KEDDY delayed Joanna's diagnosis. The mother decided to ask help from a private organisation.

A teacher [PST] explains that it is ironic when KEDDY, due to lack of commitment, forces parents to go to private organisations for help (*ironic story*).

12) **Helen** was referred to KEDDY by her teacher. Although KEDDY examined the child within one week, it took a lot of time for KYSDE to approve the funding for the necessary school equipment for Anna's support.

A parent [P(3)] tells her experience with KEDDY and explains the achievements and delays in the collaborative process (*personal story*).

13) **Giannis** went to KEDDY with his mother's initiative. KEDDY produced the diagnosis and educational plan but Giannis's school teacher refused to collaborate with KEDDY. The school teacher did not want to spend extra time to support him. The head teacher approved the teacher's decision not to support Giannis.

A government representative (SC) provides this story to indicate that partners' personal motives can obstruct the collaborative process (*ironic-gossip story*)

A teacher and head teacher [PST and PSHT] use this story to justify the teacher's resistance to help a child. They also make it clear that they do not want other people to intervene at their work (*warning story*).

14) **Katerina** was an autistic child. She had just moved to Mesologi and she went to KEDDY in order to be placed to a special secondary school. As her condition was very critical, the school teacher who was allocated for her support refused to follow KEDDY guidelines. The school teacher was a new member of the school and with her story she tries to explain and apologise for her decision. Her colleagues understood her decision.

KEDDY employee [Psych (3)] explains that even if partners want to help a child they cannot always do so because of lack of relevant experience and knowledge (*dramatic story*).

A head teacher [SSSHT] uses this story to indicate that due to the multidisciplinary nature of the collaborative process, not all partners have the proper training to respond successfully to their roles (*reflective story*).

15) **Olga** was a child with visual disability and bipolar disorder. She attended a special primary school and went to KEDDY for a re-evaluation. KEDDY psychologist had to work together with a team from the local hospital in order to help her with her diagnosis. The collaboration process was completed without delays and problems.

A teacher [PSST] uses this case as an example of successful cases KEDDY has dealt with (*success story*).

Appendix 23: Table indicating the type, theme, main actors, reasons for presenting a story, level of description and collaborative outcome of the stories the initial analysis has revealed

Partner and partner-organisation	Type of story	Story Theme	Main Actors	Reason for mentioning	Level of Description	Collaborative result
Manager/Primary Teacher <i>KEDDY</i>	Kostas: Success-Gossip	KEDDY supports a colleague's child with learning difficulties	KEDDY Employees	Provides an example of a successful case	Brief	Successful
	Dimitris: Tragic	Child with serious illness who dies after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Detailed	Successful
	Nikos Unfulfilled	KEDDY fails to overcome mother's resistance	KEDDY Employees, Parent	Indicates that the collaborative process is not always completed	Brief	Unsuccessful
	Marina: Ironic	KEDDY fails to overcome funding issues raised by the government	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Indicates government's unwillingness to help.	Brief	Unsuccessful
Nursery Teacher (1) <i>KEDDY</i>	Maria: Success	KEDDY provides quick and successful support	KEDDY Employees, School Teacher	Provides an example of a successful case	Brief	Successful
Nursery teacher (2) <i>KEDDY</i>	Kostas: Personal	KEDDY supports a colleague's child with learning difficulties	KEDDY Employees	Provides his child's story	Detailed	Successful
Primary Teacher (1) <i>KEDDY</i>	Nikos: Knowledge	KEDDY fails to overcome mother's resistance	KEDDY Employees, Parent	Indicates that parents can also provide obstacles to the collaborative process	Brief	Unsuccessful
	Mary: Reflective	KEDDY produces Mary's report after delays. Yet KYSPE refuses to establish an integration unit to support her	KEDDY Employees, School Teacher, Government Representatives	Indicates KEDDY's and government's inability	Brief	Unsuccessful
Primary Teacher (2) <i>KEDDY</i>	Dimitris: Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who dies after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Detailed	Successful
Primary Teacher (3) <i>KEDDY</i>	Andreas: Gossip	Friendship with KEDDY's manager speeds up the support process	KEDDY Employees, Parent	Indicates unfairness in the treatment of cases	Brief	Successful
Secondary Teacher (1) <i>KEDDY</i>	(he refers to many cases but without offering details)					
Secondary Teacher (2) <i>KEDDY</i>	Nikos: Ironic	KEDDY fails to overcome mother's resistance	KEDDY Employees, Parent	Supports the view that the success of the collaboration depends on all partners	Brief	Unsuccessful
	Andreas: Gossip	Friendship with KEDDY's manager speeds up the support process	KEDDY Employees, Parent	Indicates unfairness in the treatment of cases	Brief	Successful
Psychologist (1) <i>KEDDY</i>	George: Knowledge	Some parents are unable to support their child	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Parents	Explains the importance of the home environment to overcome learning difficulties	Detailed	Successful and Unsuccessful

	Pavlos: Unfulfilled	The collaborative process was not completed	KEDDY Employees, Parents	Indicates that KEDDY cannot handle all cases	Brief	Unsuccessful
Psychologist (2) <i>KEDDY</i>	Dimitris: Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who dies after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Brief	Successful
Psychologist (3) <i>KEDDY</i>	Katerina: Dramatic	School teacher refuses to support the child	School teacher, KEDDY Employees	Justifies school teacher's resistance	Brief	Unsuccessful
Social Worker (1) <i>KEDDY</i>	Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who passed away after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Detailed	Successful
Social Worker (2) <i>KEDDY</i>	George: Knowledge	Some parents are unable to support their child	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Parents	Explains the importance of the home environment to overcome learning difficulties	Detailed	Successful and Unsuccessful
Speech Therapist <i>KEDDY</i>	(no reference to child cases)					
Secretary <i>KEDDY</i>	(no reference to child cases)					
Parent (1) <i>Parent</i>	Marina: Personal	KEDDY fails to overcome funding issues raised by the government	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides her child's story	Detailed	Successful and Unsuccessful
Parent (2) <i>Parent</i>	(Anna's case)					
Parent (3) <i>Parent</i>	Helen: Personal	The government delays the support process	KEDDY Employees, Government Representatives, School Teacher	Provides her child's story	Detailed	Unsuccessful
School Consultant <i>KYSPE</i>	Giannis Ironic-Gossip	School teacher refuses to collaborate with KEDDY	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Head Teacher, Parents	Indicates school teacher's resistance	Brief	Unsuccessful
Director <i>KYSPE</i>	Dimitris: Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who passed away after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Brief	Successful
	Mary: Reflective	KYSPE cannot establish an integration unit due to financial restrictions	KEDDY Employees, Government Representatives	Indicates government's inability	Brief	Unsuccessful
Director <i>KYSDE</i>	(he refers to many cases but without offering details)					
Nursery School Head Teacher <i>Nursery School</i>	(she refers to 2 cases but without offering details)					
Nursery School Teacher <i>Nursery School</i>	Joanna: Ironic	Parents seek help outside KEDDY	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Parent	Indicates KEDDY inability	Brief	Unsuccessful

Primary School Head Teacher <i>Primary School</i>	Giannis: Warning	School teacher refuses to collaborate with KEDDY	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Head Teacher, Parents	Justifies school teacher's resistance against external interventions	Brief	Unsuccessful
Primary School Teacher <i>Primary School</i>	Giannis: Warning	School teacher refuses to collaborate with KEDDY	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Head Teacher, Parents	Justifies school teacher's resistance against external interventions	Brief	Unsuccessful
Primary Special School Head Teacher <i>Primary Special School</i>	Dimitris: Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who died after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Brief	Successful
	Marina: Ironic	KEDDY fails to overcome funding issues raised by the government	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Indicates government's unwillingness to help	Brief	Successful and Unsuccessful
Primary Special School Teacher <i>Primary Special School</i>	Dimitris: Tragic	KEDDY supports a child with serious illness who died after he got help	KEDDY Employees, Parents, Government Representatives	Provides a memorable example	Detailed	Successful
	Olga: Success	KEDDY psychologist collaborates with government representatives	KEDDY Employees, Government Representative	Provides an example of a successful case	Brief	Successful
Secondary Special School Head Teacher <i>Secondary Special School</i>	Mario: Epic	All the partners collaborate to support a child	KEDDY Employees, School teacher, Head Teacher, Parents, Governments Representatives	Provides an example where all partners unite to help a child	Detailed	Successful
	Katerina: Reflective	School teacher refuses to support the child	School Teacher, KEDDY employees	Explains that even if partners want to help, they cannot always do so	Detailed	Unsuccessful
Secondary Special School Teacher <i>Secondary Special School</i>	(he refers to many cases but without offering details)					