2012

Social interactions in adult learning during reading recovery teacher training

Catheryn Margaret Sale
University of Wollongong

Recommended Citation
UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.
Faculty of Education

Social Interactions in Adult Learning During Reading Recovery Teacher Training

Catheryn Margaret Sale
(Dip Tching NZ, B.A. Auckland, M.Ed Wollongong)

"This thesis is presented in fulfilment of the requirements of the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Wollongong"

August 2012
ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to explore the characteristics of social interactions as part of teacher learning in a Reading Recovery (RR) Teacher Training Course. The study involved ten teachers who undertook a RR Teacher Training Course over the duration of one school year. The study was qualitative by nature, seeking to tell the story of Reading Recovery teacher learning through their co-operation and collaborations. The methods of study included observations (audio and video recording), semi-structured interviews with the RR teacher participants, document analysis and self-reflection of the researcher in her role as a RR Tutor. Social constructivist theory was used to inform the study. The data was analysed using thematic analysis and a process of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification. The findings indicated the teachers appreciated that teacher learning through observation and discussion as they learned how to compare and explore their learning of a new teaching skill. The detailed analysis of Reading Recovery observational transcript samples (early, middle and late sessions in the course) allowed following the development of the social interactions of the RR teachers and the tutor over time. A thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews was used to understand the teachers’ perspective of their learning in the various components of the Reading Recovery sessions. This revealed that co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationships, and self-development as result of learning with others on the part of the participants was important to the participants. The study led to the development of a number of key principles for Reading Recovery teacher training based in social constructivist approach.
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Chapter One
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The main focus of my research is to study Reading Recovery (RR) teacher learning in group training sessions through social interactions. RR is an early literacy intervention for six-year-old children after one year’s schooling. RR is designed by Clay (2001, 2005a, 2005b, 2009). The children are taught one-to-one by specially trained RR teachers. The background the teachers bring to RR training is their successful experience teaching five to eight year old children (Kindergarten to Year Two in New South Wales). The aim of RR is to assist approximately twenty per cent of children in the lowest achievement group in their school. Acceleration of the children’s rate of learning, provided by RR teaching that is tailored to the children’s literacy learning needs and delivered as daily thirty minute lessons, allows the children to catch-up with their average achieving child-peers in a short time (16-20 weeks). Clay describes this as a form of diagnostic teaching (Clay, 2005a, p56). RR is practised in many countries across the world including New Zealand, Australia, United States, Grenada, Canada, England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Eire, and Denmark.

RR teacher training is critically important for the success of the program. The children’s successful outcomes are based on teacher professional judgement and skill. The RR Teacher training course was designed by Clay in conjunction with the RR research project at the University of Auckland, New Zealand (1977-1981). RR has been employed successfully internationally for almost thirty years. RR teacher training occurs in group sessions through teacher social interactions, focused on observation and discussion, under the guidance of a RR Tutor, a more experienced RR teacher who has further training to work with teachers as adult learners.
1.2 Background to the Study

The impetus for this study arose from my involvement as a RR teacher, which has continued for a long period of time. My association with RR at the time this study commenced in 2006 was: twenty years as a RR Teacher and twelve years as a RR Tutor. Clay designed the RR early literacy intervention for children to be part of a school’s literacy planning and for children to be taught by teachers who have this special training, in their schools. The responsiveness of the teacher to the child seemed to me to be what was crucial to promote the accelerated learning needed for children to catch-up with their average achieving peers. I understood from Clay that this was based on close and detailed observation, tentative views discussed with others, and flexible ways of working (Clay, 2005b, p2). When I conducted this research I was wondering how the RR Teachers could be so successful, when I knew that both child and teacher learning is dynamic: fluctuating, plateauing, having sudden surges of successful engagement, and always challenged by the new (task, idea or child).

My perspective on RR Teacher learning in RR sessions (classes where teachers observe peer-teachers teaching through a glass-screen and discuss these interactions) was based on experience. The components of the sessions studied in this research were: the introductory discussion, observations and discussion and the follow-up discussion (named thus for this study). I viewed these as interlocking parts in a RR session.

The introductory discussion is when the RR Tutor initiated discussion around session ‘emphases’ (themes or topics) that guide the teachers’ observations in the next component of the session. Emphases provide different ‘frames’ (ways) for viewing and discussing literacy processing. When this study commenced I had designed RR courses to start with the teachers’ prior teaching knowledge and current RR teaching experiences to encourage discussion. The teachers’ contributions during this session component I believed were varied and related to how I chose to introduce an ‘emphasis’, for example: the teachers explained their views, listen, read sections or quotes from the RR course texts, made notes in their course texts, questioned, and confirmed their understandings.
The observation and discussion component of the session at the glass-screen is for viewing demonstration lessons taught by the training teachers. I believed that my role changed from initially explaining some of the activities the teachers were viewing; gently prodding the teachers to talk about what they are observing (to talk aloud); tapping into any prior understanding they may bring to these activities, asking for their first tentative opinions about the observations; and interpreting what was happening for them. I set up the social interaction at the glass screen so teachers could talk with one another while observing. I encouraged them to tune in and out of the direct observation, to face one another and listen and communicate with one another, as the lessons commenced. When the teachers understood the purpose of the literacy activities in a lesson, including features of when the activity was going well, and how the children’s literacy processing changed over time of their interventions, I thought that I encouraged the teachers to initiate talk by describing their observations (a think aloud strategy) rather than always responding to RR Tutor questions, to build on to what their peers said (to agree or have a different view) based on observable evidence, to take turns, to build up a group picture of the child’s literacy processing, and summarise what they were observing, to be able to collectively offer feedback to the teacher who taught about ‘where next?’ for improvements for the teacher’s teaching and child’s learning.

I think I consciously worked to model teacher language so that they could use RR technical language from the beginning of the course, understand its meaning and match it to their observations. I particularly encouraged teachers to be tentative or ‘low-key’ in how they expressed their views about changes they thought could occur in the teaching. When the teachers observed two lessons through the glass-screen during a training session I facilitated their discussion so that it kept pace with the teaching demonstration. This meant that the observer teachers’ conversations moved at a quick pace. It also meant that only certain aspects of the child’s literacy processing or the teaching could be discussed in any training session. I therefore assumed that RR teacher learning was built up over the course of training sessions.

My perspective of the follow-up discussion was twofold. It was to give feedback to the teachers who taught the lessons and bring greater understanding to the teachers
who had observed as a joint activity of sharing main ideas. These were discussed with the teachers who taught. I was aware of the need to develop positive reinforcement in a genuine way for the two teachers who had taught the lessons. I understood that it was important for teachers to briefly reflect on their lessons before the group shared their overall perspectives. The model I had adopted for the main feedback for both lessons in the short time allowable (ten minutes per lesson) was to focus on teacher summarised main areas discussed during the observations for change or improvement. These areas were discussed with the teachers who had taught the lessons with reference to the RR course texts, thus grounding teacher opinions conceptually and practically.

1.3 Purpose of the Study and Research Question

In summary: the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session?
   a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions?
   b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers’ social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

2. What is the teachers’ perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions?
   a) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions?
   b) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?

1.4 Participants and Setting

The ten participants on this RR course were women. There was a diversity in range of teaching experience in the group, with mature-age teachers and teachers early in
their careers (teacher training period: late 1960’s - 1990’s). The teachers all had educational qualification at a Bachelor level; and two teachers held Masters’ degrees. Most of the teachers fulfilled the essential criteria for RR Teacher training: teaching in a school full time (nine), and having recent successful Kindergarten to Year Two teaching experience (eight). Most teachers were qualified primary (elementary) school teachers (nine) or early childhood trained teachers (one). The names used for the teachers in this study are pseudonyms.

The participants in this study were trained in RR by the Diocese of Wollongong, New South Wales. This is a small school system (twenty nine primary schools) in a geographically spread area. It was a favourable setting for the research because RR had been successfully implemented for twelve years as evidenced by presentation of data at the Fifth International RR Institute (NZ) and the Institute of Education Research (University of NSW) in 2004, and a published complimentary reference (Watson & Askew, 2009, p260).

1.5 Methodology

This is a qualitative study. The method was selected to provide access to the essence of RR Teacher training. This approach focuses on the process of learning not the performance outcomes of learning and is in keeping with the theoretical framework of this research: social constructivism.

I am the researcher and the RR Tutor, therefore a participant in this RR Teacher training course. The data collected to answer Research Question One occurred in a RR Centre (the site where RR Teachers are trained). The teachers attended eighteen three hour sessions fortnightly over a year as part of the RR course. The components of the session studied were called: ‘introductory discussion’ (approximately ten minutes), ‘observations and discussion’ of two thirty minute RR lessons taught by the teachers (approximately sixty five minutes), and the ‘follow-up discussion’ (approximately thirty minutes). Data was collected through video and audio recording of the sessions, and five minute written reflections by the teachers.
immediately after the ‘follow-up’ discussion to confirm the teachers’ learning based on what had occurred.

Due to the large amount of data collected it was decided, in collaboration with the university supervisors, to sample the session data as: early (Session Three), middle (Sessions Seven, Eight, Nine), and late (Sixteen) for transcription, in keeping with the theoretical framework that emphasised the development of learning. It was also decided to sample these sessions so the interactions analysed at the glass-screen were of reading activities in the RR lessons in Session Eight and writing in Session Nine.

The data to answer Research Question Two was interview data, collected when each teacher was interviewed at her school or at the RR Centre using the same set of questions but also designed to encourage the participants to elaborate on some of their responses about their learning (semi-structured technique). The researcher transcribed the audio taped interviews and all participants were emailed copies of their interview transcription (member checking). The questions reflected learning during the social interactions in the RR session. These included learning through observation and discussion with others, and reflection on the participants’ personal feelings (affective domain) during their learning. These questions were influenced by RR interest in the affective domain in children’s learning (Lyons, 2003) and reflecting on how that applied to teacher learning.

The methods of analysis were twofold: 1) A method of data reduction was used to analyse the data to answer Question One (See: Chapter Five and Two) a method of thematic analysis was used to answer Question Two (See: Chapter Six). In the former technique conclusions were verified by revisiting the source data and through replicating the findings in other cases of the same social event (RR sessions). The triangulation of the data involved the comparative case by case analysis of the RR sessions and the participants’ immediate written reflections, which were used to illustrate the range of teacher interpretations of their own learning during a RR session and the uniformity of themes that matched the content of the sessions.
1.6 Significance of the Study

RR Tutors lead RR Teacher training based on knowledge gained from observations and discussions of their peers (during a separate one year RR Tutor training course and annually thereafter) supported by RR Trainers (the academic and professional leaders of RR). RR Tutors develop their own ways of working with teachers. ‘RR Tutor Information Guides’ suggest how to develop courses for the first half of the year. These were in a first draft form in 2006, the year the data was collected. RR changed to new RR course texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) in that year. RR is supported by Clay’s theory of early literacy processing for five to eight year olds. Research on teacher training occurred in early adoptions of RR in participating countries (the United States and Australia). The interpretations of the RR teacher learning were based on inquiry, learning through social interactions involving teacher language, and scaffolding RR teacher learning. RR Teacher training has not been fully conceptualised within a written theoretical framework for RR Tutors outside in-house documents, even though it is aligned with Vygotskian theory by RR academics (Lyons, 1993; Moore, 1998). At the time I undertook this research, I believed that RR Teacher training, was strongly based in the Vygotskian approach, and that it would be logical to extend this approach for a conceptualisation of RR teacher training.

Social constructivism is a theoretical perspective about learning that asserts that learning occurs through social interactions and relationships between people (Vygotsky, 1978). In respect to learning in RR this involves the interactions between the peer-teachers (RR trainees) and between the RR Tutor and peer-teachers. Social constructivism provides conceptual constructs that allow for an explanation of the RR teacher training experience. These are: a) the *zone of proximal development* or the gap between what learners can do independently and with collaborative support from peers, and guidance from a more capable or knowledgeable person; b) *intersubjectivity* which refers to shared understandings between people at any point in time, gained through joint references to the observations of RR teaching lessons and social interactions that occur through discussion and giving teachers feedback; and c) *internalisation* or the gradual transformation of shared understandings to internal self-regulatory processes. Neo-Vygotskian conceptual constructs are: a)
scaffolding and fading (Wood, Bruner & Ross 1976, Wood, 1988, Wood 2003) which refers to the changing quality of support offered by the more capable or knowledgeable person to the learners in the social interaction, and includes modelling, directing, highlighting, helping to maintain direction, explaining, clarifying and shaping the learner’s efforts, while gradually withdrawing support as the learner becomes more capable; b) assisted learning (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) which refers to co-operatively achieved success, usually in classes, through supportive social interactions such as scaffolding; and c) cognitive apprenticeship (Rogoff, 1990) or guided participation with companions (older peers) and more expert people (such as parents) who support and stretch one’s understandings in using the tools (language and tasks) of one’s culture.

The significance of this study is that this paradigm (supported by research) can provide RR Tutors with a clear theoretical basis for understanding the assistance they give teachers in RR teacher training. In my experience RR Tutors have backgrounds of classroom teaching expertise, and some leadership experience in primary (or elementary) schools. RR Tutors learn on a course that involves observation of expert RR Tutors, discussion and trialling of tutoring interactions. Working with adult-learners however requires a theoretical framework, just as child-learning in RR is supported by Clay’s research-based theory of literacy development. Moreover, a representative framework needs to consider teachers’ emotions, including those of unease and anxiety, which is referred to in the literature on RR teacher training.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This chapter outlines what RR training involves and why, from its conception as part of an early literacy intervention conceptualised by Clay (1982). The impetus for the research was based on the long-term success of RR and my long association with it as a RR Teacher and RR Tutor. Chapter One provides an introduction to the study outlining: the background to the study, the purpose of the study and the research questions, the participants and setting, the methodology and the significance of the study. Chapter Two outlines the literature available on RR Teacher training in RR sessions, which is not as extensive as the literature on child learning and teacher-
child interactions in RR. Chapter Three outlines the theoretical framework of the study, which is social constructivist, based on the perspective of learning of Vygotsky (1978). Chapter Four outlines the methodology of the research. Chapter Five answers Research Question One (what occurred in the sessions); and Chapter Six Research Question Two (the teachers’ perspective of their learning). Chapter Seven revisits my perspective of RR Teacher training, the impetus for the study, and the teachers’ perspectives together with a Vygotskian perspective on learning and what occurred. Chapter Seven concludes with six guiding principles for RR teacher training, grounded in this research and linked to the future explanations of RR teacher training and learning, within the theoretical framework.
Chapter Two

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This research is based on Reading Recovery (RR) teacher training in sessions that operated for a single group of teachers with one RR Tutor (leader or facilitator) over one year (2006). It is recognised that RR is supported by a considerable literature involving detailed research addressing the topic of child literacy learning because of its primary function as an early literacy intervention. However the literature that is related to the topic of RR teacher training through RR sessions is comparatively less, and comprises essays of interpretation and advice for the RR community. These interpretations, from the 1990’s, have been based on Vygotskian theory of learning through social interactions. Therefore the literature review presented in this chapter merges with the theoretical framework for the research in Chapter Three.

This chapter includes a background of the development of the RR training course in Auckland New Zealand, a short explanation of RR as an educational resolution to a multi-disciplinary concern about child failure in literacy development in schooling from Clay’s perspective. Under the heading “Historical Explanations and Perspectives of the Reading Recovery Community” is a considerable body of research related to the new implementations of RR teacher training in Australia and the United States. This early historical research (1980-1990) is largely available in Australia from secondary sourced material through an analysis by Pinnell (1994). Published in sources that are more widely accessible is the perspective of RR teacher training as tiered scaffolding (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991). Other sources are available through RR network publications and journals that emphasise the importance of language for teacher learning and take up early interpretations of the training based on a Vygotskian understanding (Lyons, 1993, Moore, 1998) influenced by Tharp and Gallimore (1988). As the ‘community of learners’ research (Lave and Wegner, 1991, Wenger, 1998) has become prominent RR has interpreted
RR training from the perspective of being a ‘learning community’ (Schwartz, 2006) and has re-emphasized social-constructivist interpretations (Palincsar, 1997, Rogoff et al 1996). It is important for a review of RR teacher training to place the initiative within its understanding of itself, including outlining coaching principles for tutoring (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009).

Research in the area pertaining to this study, RR teacher training in RR sessions based on social interactions, are few, and mainly from the early implementations, therefore this review includes wider influences on RR teacher training. This chapter includes research in the area of emotion (Hargreaves, 1998, Meyer & Turner, 2007) as the research shows that RR teaching involves more than learning in the cognitive domain but also the affective domain (Barnes, 1996, Compton-Lilly, 2011). This chapter also considers research and explanations in the area of professional development for teachers, including the influence of the social environment, for example group sizes (Rose, 1996, Imel & Tisdell, 1996), examples of teacher learning through collaboration (Dooner et al, 2007, Johnson et al, 2007) and principles learned from the meta-analysis of best evidence research for teacher professional learning (Timperley et al, 2007, Timperley, 2008) that includes research on teacher self-monitoring in a like RR context (Phillips & Smith, 1997), influences on teacher expectations (Timperley & Phillips, 2003), as well as the importance of feedback in RR teacher learning (Timperley & Hattie, 2007).

The gap in the literature is the study of RR teacher training from the perspective of social interactions, and the RR Tutor’s and the RR teachers’ perspectives of those social interactions in RR teacher training sessions in which they are participants, interpreting the social interactions within a social constructivist framework. (See: Chapter Three)

2.2 Background to the Development of the Reading Recovery Course

RR is best known as an early literacy intervention developed by Clay at the University of Auckland in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s (Watson & Askew,
The RR teacher training course was incorporated in the RR research project because additionally trained primary classroom teachers are the practitioners (Clay & Watson, 1982).

This first section of the literature review outlines the historical design of the RR teacher training course in sessions where teachers meet together to observe and discuss their teaching. The setting and structure of these sessions are based around teacher observation and discussion of two lessons taught by peer teachers. This process remains true to its origins after thirty years. Testimony to the efficacy of this approach is its transportation to culturally different education systems, for example, New Zealand, Australia, the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Denmark.

Clay describes RR as “a problem-solving approach to an unstructured problem” (Clay, 2009, p230), which is the teaching of young children (six year olds) who have fallen behind their classmates in literacy learning after one year of instruction. “Theory did not drive practice; rather there was a circle of influence from practice to theory and back to practice, informed and altered by data from day-to-day documentation of changes in children and an imperative that it must be workable in schools.” (Clay, 2009, p230). Therefore teachers are critical in solving the education problem of literacy learning. The following discussion outlines how teachers were progressively involved through the research phases.

The early intervention research began as a small university project in 1976. Clay worked with one Master's student exploring how this experienced teacher could teach individual six year old children. The technique involved Clay observing lessons through a glass-screen and advising through a two way sound system (Ballantyne, 2009, p28). In 1977 Clay formed a team from a wider range of teachers (eight Supervising Teachers of New Zealand Junior Classes - five to eight year olds, Reading Advisors and specialist itinerant Reading Teachers). These teachers taught six year old children two or three times per week behind the glass-screen and discussed child progress once a fortnight.
“Procedures were derived from the practice of experienced teachers using their knowledge of successful processing to work with children finding early literacy learning troublesome, but were rigorously analysed in relation to current theories of the reading process. Thus many [procedures] were discarded.” (Ballantyne, 2009, pp28-29).

This approach was a field trial project (Clay, 1993). One of the research questions for this phase was: Can experienced teachers without specialist training use the procedures effectively? (Clay, 1993, p62). Five teachers in schools who had five to twelve years junior school teaching experience were released to teach six year olds and meet fortnightly.

“The teachers were being trained throughout the year. At first the teachers were encouraged to draw on their past experience. Gradually RR procedures were introduced and demonstrated, and teachers were asked to change their concept of the task. Every two weeks one of the five teachers would demonstrate by teaching one of her pupils while the other teachers observed and discussed the procedures on the other side of a one way screen.” (Clay, 1993, p63).

The next phase (Replication Study, 1979) involved forty-eight teachers in Auckland schools. The research questions for this phase were a) How well could three new groups of teachers perform in comparison with the five field trial teachers? And, b) Could the results of the first year be replicated in a large number of schools? (Clay, 1993, p72-74) These were the origins of the RR teacher training course.

Clay (Clay & Watson, 1982) describes RR teacher training based on observation and discussion having the potential for multilevel observation: “One teacher taught one child. On the other side of a one way screen the teacher’s peers watched intently the child’s behaviours and the teacher’s decisions. When the child struggled the observers anticipated the teacher’s next move. These observing teachers were themselves being tutored, at the same time. Their tutor asked questions about the child’s difficulties, and the teacher’s decisions. That tutor was herself in training and how she ran the session was analysed later with her tutor-trainer who had been
present.” (Clay & Watson, 1982, p192). The culmination of years of working in this way resulted in Clay’s continued advice that RR teachers need “special training to make superbly sensitive decisions about how to interact with the responses of the hard-to-teach child [because] Children are hard to teach for many different reasons.” (Clay, 2005a, pi). The teacher’s responses to child behaviours selecting from many procedures in the course texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) “defies recording in a linear description of words.” (Clay, 2005a, pi). Teacher learning through social interactions, the topic of this research, is essential.

RR teaching training involves teachers in teaching a minimum of four children daily in their schools and coming together at a training site with a glass-screen. Nowadays these sites are attached to schools, for example, in New Zealand and New South Wales, where this research was conducted (Catholic Education Office, Wollongong, 2009).

Demonstrations of RR teaching by teachers other than the peer-group members were kept to a minimum in the original design. The peer-teachers began teaching for each other six weeks into the course (Clay & Watson, 1982, p196), as they did during this study. This means that the teacher learning is based on co-operative learning through the same learning development, rather than being based on expertise, and collaborative discussion of their own teaching under the tutelage of the RR Teacher Leader (North American terminology) or RR Tutor (terminology used in New Zealand and Australia).

New RR teaching procedures are introduced to the teachers with main procedures initially presented in the first third of the course. These are printed in reference books referred to during training sessions. “The book describing these procedures did not provide a simple set of instructions that could be read and then implemented but was a reference source and a basis for the discussion and clarification of concepts” (Clay & Watson, 1982, p198). This original intent is applicable today, although the reference texts have been through successive revisions to include new research that is relevant to Clay’s developing literacy theory (Clay, 2001). The most current editions (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) were used in New Zealand and Australia in 2006 when this study commenced.


The range of references for teachers illustrates that RR is an expression of a developing search to understand literacy processing which in this century is multi-disciplinary. In RR the exploration involves teacher understanding and expression as educators. The following section of this review presents Clay’s view on bringing the fields of her training in developmental psychology and educator’s knowledge into an alignment aimed at improving literacy outcomes for children. In this support of teacher training through observations and discussion, Clay describes the RR Tutor as a key person in the facilitation of the teachers’ learning (Clay & Watson, 1982, p200). The RR Tutor needs an academic background in RR theory, extensive teaching experience in the first two years of schooling, and the ability to analyse any proposals to change Reading Recovery. They also need to “collaborate with teachers whose work they observe and discuss. [and]…They must be skilful in helping teachers to grow and develop and in working supportively with them, even though it...
is their role to also criticise and evaluate the teacher’s performance.” (Clay, 2009, p238).

2.3 Preliminary Theoretical Underpinnings of Reading Recovery

Clay positioned RR in relation to discourse involving the aims of disciplines such as psychology and the needs of educators, the importance of the social interactions in learning for children and between the teachers, as well as promoting RR teacher disposition as being one of articulate problem-solving where assumptions are discussed in training sessions. This is highly relevant as background to this study on RR teacher learning in the RR training course because it is designed for teachers to learn through social interactions.

Clay was elected president of the “International Reading Association”, the largest international organisation of teachers, located in the United States, in the early 1990’s. In this capacity Clay wrote in the foreword for the fourth edition of “Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading” (1994), “Over the years, much effort has been spent at the dissecting table as researchers tried to discover the nature of the variables that contribute to literacy learning... which can be studied using the lenses of different disciplines, and explored through a range of theoretical models within each discipline (px)... my integrating theory about literacy learning was developmental psychology...” (pxi) Clay positions her work that includes RR when she writes: “…my thoughts are with the practitioners who must teach today’s children today, no matter how inexplicit or conflicting our formulations are. Their need is immediate, a matter of what this child will learn today, whereas the model builders are explorers oriented toward the future. Our conversations with teachers should be crafted with care in the interests of the children we teach.” (pxiii).

Clay (1991b) discusses her discipline of developmental psychology and education, working towards the same goals. “While developmental psychology must take time to pose its questions and systematically test its explanations in a scientific way, education must act on today’s best available knowledge for current programs... Teachers need answers to build into practice: psychologists want questions that lead to breakthroughs in understanding. Researchers in both disciplines will be problem-
solving in similar areas but with different goals.’ (Clay, 1991b, p43). In this article Clay states the importance of social interaction research in child learning because instruction involves reciprocal responding between adults and children. Clay (1991) writes:

“Vygotsky’s theories (1962, Wertsch, 1985) of support systems provided by others for the learner at the growing edge of their competence (Bruner, 1986) come almost as confirmation of recent developments (Au & Kawami, 1984; Clay, 1985; Palincsar & Brown, 1984) and adults have been shown to work in this way tutoring preschool children (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976). ‘Teachers scaffold budding reading skills through prompts and examples and then foster individual control of reading by gradually removing social supports’ (Pintrich et al., 1986). There is more than a scaffold involved, however, because the learning in the language and cognitive areas leaves the learner not only with the production of performance but with the inner structures and functions capable of generating these (Karmiloff-Smith, 1986).” (Clay, 1991b, p44).

The above view is aligned with RR teacher training, whereby the teachers have the structures, learned through their social interactions to generate further RR independent teaching and discussion of many child cases.

Clay writes that the teacher training is for problem-solving, and that “change during the year is a unit of learning in itself” which she notes (Clay, 2009, p234). Geekie (1992, cited in Clay 2009) reports change from scepticism at the beginning to obvious commitment (Clay, 2009, p234). “Teachers in Reading Recovery are trained to make effective decisions on the evidence of the child’s responses during the individual teaching sessions. They decide where to direct the child’s attention next to further his particular cluster of abilities. They initiate and design the lessons and there is no package of teaching materials.” (Clay, 2009, p234).

Problem solving and information sharing on the RR teacher training course is acknowledged by Clay as requiring peer support, and trust, in the adoption of new
teaching practices. (Clay, 2009, p234). Clay explains, “To minimise feelings of insecurity the teachers might initially feel about changing their teaching patterns they are invited to teach according to their best judgement. They are reminded that they are experienced teachers and urged to draw on their experiences of working with children. It is considered economical [reasonable] to move teachers from the full strength of their present competencies rather than demand at the outset new behaviours that might cause confusion and disrupt established and efficient responses.” (Clay, 2009, p235).

In teacher training Clay writes that each teacher knows that she is a learner and so are her peers. “If the demonstration child of the day ‘plays up’ and makes the teacher’s task harder, the audience of peers are the most sympathetic a teacher could have. By the end of the training year…they are able to question, challenge, discuss, work out a course of action, and explain their decisions in ways they can all understand because these new ideas are shared and explicit…” (Clay, 2009, p235). Thus, peer teaching is the most supportive arrangement for training RR teachers because the teachers have similar experiences. Whilst the year of RR teacher training supports social relationships that allow the teachers to critically discuss their teaching.

Clay stresses that as problem-solvers teachers need to a) become more flexible and tentative (Clay, 2005a, p2), to observe constantly and closely and adjust their assumptions based on evidence they record working with children, b) view their differences in the initial stages of their training as a strength in their shared discussions because child learning is complex and RR teachers work with an “incomplete theory”, and c) critically make the implicit explicit. “Bringing the implicit, whether observed or assumed, into verbal form that allows discussion and revision is an essential part of training in each country.” (Clay, 2009, p237).
2.4 Historical Foundations and Perspectives of the Reading Recovery Community

2.4.1 Early Research and Explanations

This second section describes early research in the area of RR teacher training. It is mainly available in a collated form in Pinnell (1994), and pertinent to the United States (Lyons, 1992, 1993; Elliott, 1994; Pinnell and Woolsy, 1985; Rentel & Pinnell 1987; Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, cited in Pinnell 1994) with two references to Australia (Geekie, 1988; and Power and Sawkins, 1991, cited in Pinnell 1994). The research by these authors involves transcribing and analysing aspects of the RR training sessions (observing two lessons at the glass-screen and the follow-up discussions); interviewing teachers; and studying RR training teacher learning in schools. These research investigations have relevance to this study because they are illustrative of teacher change over the time of the training course from initial implementations to current implementations, such as the setting for this research study on teacher learning through social interactions.

Research in the State of Victoria, Australia, (Geekie, 1998, cited in Pinnell, 1994) and in New South Wales (Power & Sawkins, 1991, cited in Pinnell, 1994) is based on interviews at the onset of RR implementations. Pinnell notes that the findings confirmed United States (US) findings as RR was introduced to new countries (Pinnell, 1994, p16). “Like the U.S. teachers, Australian Reading Recovery teachers expressed discomfort with the intensity and demands of the in-service program, particularly the behind-the-glass experience; yet they indicated that they strongly valued the experiences and that learning occurred” (Pinnell, 1994, p15). In these implementations teachers report that the learning was ‘intense’, ‘exhausting’, ‘stressful’ and most voiced concerns about their workloads and teaching schedules (Pinnell, 1994, p16). It is almost thirty years since these views were expressed but Pinnell writes that these examples are representative of that time (Pinnell, 1994, pp15-16): “I don’t know about anyone else…I wish that I’d had a lot more answers or a lot more direction…If I was doing something wrong to be just told straight out
‘look you did this, this was wrong, try this way.’” (Power & Sawkins, 1991, p91, cited in Pinnell, 1994). Whereas the RR Tutor interview revealed, “They’ve got to work through these things in their mind and I’m not always going to be beside them so it’s that independence again. They have to know how to go about solving their own problems.” (Power & Sawkins, 1991, p90, cited in Pinnell, 1994).

These quotes reflect a tension between the design/goals of the program and the experiences of the participants. It is to be noted that this style of teacher training was new to teachers in the early 1980’s (the Geekie report was a Reading Recovery field-trial in Central Victoria in 1984); the course involved more paper-work than teachers were used to (pre and post assessment data, recording and analysing in conjunction with teaching), and teachers taught a minimum of four thirty-minute RR lessons daily as part of their workload, teaching on-class in the rest of their teaching time in conjunction with attending fortnightly RR sessions. This dual role of being a RR teacher and at the same time a classroom teacher was difficult in terms of transition from one role to another in a short period of time.

Pinnell (1994) writes that the emphasis in the teacher learning was on fast analysis of the live lessons that “go by rapidly and cannot be retrieved.” (Pinnell, 1994, p11). Therefore, the teachers are required to concentrate and respond quickly at the glass-screen, which sharpens their ability to observe. The RR Tutor guides the teachers “to state their observations and make inferences about the internal processing that behaviours might signal.” (Pinnell, 1994, pp11-12). At first the teachers are described as taking on the logistics of applying the RR procedures and that, “As they participate in the experience and learn to drop their defences with their peers, they begin to analyse child behaviours and teacher decisions and teacher impact on learning.” (Pinnell, 1994, p12). The follow-up discussion is described as a social construction of knowledge while consulting references (the RR course texts). The teachers reconstruct examples from the lessons and relate those to theoretical concepts (Pinnell, 1994, p12).

Pinnell and Woolsey (1985, cited in Pinnell, 1994) examined RR teacher learning over one training year. They transcribe discussions between the teachers that occur ‘after’ the sessions. The process of change involves: teachers wanting to be told how
to do it, how to use the procedures and organise materials, and get the right answer from their trainers, to shifts in describing and then interpreting child behaviour. This process is described as taking a long period of time and it is only near the end of the training year that the teachers make theoretical statements (Pinnell, 1994, p14).

Rentel and Pinnell (1987, cited in Pinnell, 1994) examine the follow-up discussions in the RR session. “They recorded discussions near the beginning of the training and several months later. The results showed that [at the end of six months] teachers could produce statements that were more grounded in behavioural evidence with experience in the social setting.” (Pinnell, 1994, p16).

Pinnell, Fried and Estice (1990) write that the lessons behind the glass-screen are not a demonstration of how to do procedures. They are authentic experiences for teacher learning through social interaction. The lessons to help the teachers understand the RR procedures, observe the effect of teacher’s decisions on the child, analyse what might be happening, gather evidence to support their assumptions, and relate what they are learning and observing to their own teaching. (Pinnell, Fried & Estice, 1990, p289).

In Pinnell, Fried and Estice (1990, p287) a RR teacher, Rosemary, reflects on the influence of her learning in RR. The impact of RR teacher training was change in views about reading, and instruction. Rosemary felt RR gave her professional independence, because she could plan appropriate instruction, and was not reliant on anyone’s ideas of what her children needed to learn.

How RR teachers change during the sessions of observation and discussion of peer-teachers’ RR lessons is presented in the following research. Gaffney and Anderson (1991) use language data transcriptions to describe RR as a two-tiered scaffolding model in which teaching and learning are corresponding processes. They write that, “The metaphor of ‘scaffolding’ has been used to describe the support that enables a learner to complete a task or achieve a goal that would have been unattainable without assistance (Wood, Bruner, Ross, 1976)” (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p184), which is implicit in Vygotsky’s theory (1978) of learning through social interaction in the ‘zone of proximal development.’ This is described by the authors as a ‘zone’
of learning capability and optimal learning as a gap or “distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.” (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p186).

The first tier of scaffolding in the RR session is described by Gaffney and Anderson as the teacher working with the child. They explain that in a Vygotskian model “a high-craft teacher provides the minimal support necessary to assist a learner to operate at the upper limits of competence.” (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p185).

Gaffney and Anderson extend the model to encompass the role of the RR Tutor working with the teachers, describing the discussions during the observations of lessons at the glass-screen as “intense, challenging and synergistic.” (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p191). These researchers show with language data that the role of the RR Tutor changes over a year from describing behaviour to challenging teachers to think about the purpose of the task, and the teachers’ responses change from shorter to longer comments, and runs of commentary (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p193).

Gaffney and Anderson describe both tiers of scaffolding in RR as ‘child-driven’. On one tier the teacher responds to the child behaviour (behind the glass-screen), and on the second tier the teachers and the RR Tutor respond to child and teacher behaviours (at the glass-screen) (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991, p196). It is to be noted that this model is in keeping with Clay’s description of the training as offering multiple levels of observation (Clay & Watson, 1982). It is relevant to this study in understanding the complexity of social interactions during the social interaction at the glass-screen.

The research of Lyons (1992, cited in Pinnell, 1994) is not specifically related to RR training in sessions, but it involves the RR teacher training. Lyons (1992, cited in Pinnell, 1994) considers six training teachers throughout a RR course. The teachers collected and analysed lesson observational notes, running records (miscue behavioural records of reading), writing samples (from the writing activity in every lesson), and kept personal journals of their reflections about child learning and their teaching, as well as tape-recorded, analysed and evaluated their teaching of lessons.
The teachers and the researcher met weekly to analyse and evaluate the outcomes of their teaching. The researcher’s analysis of the teachers’ data suggests that RR teachers become more sensitive to child learning when they modify their actions to the child’s behaviour. What is important about the research for this study is that it related to social interactions in two ways: (1) “conversation has an important role in teacher learning; on-going discussions provide a scaffold for the growth of understandings and provide a way to mediate performance…between what the teacher already knows and what the teacher needs to teach” and, (2) the crucial shifts in teacher theory improvement are highly influenced by social interactions in the RR course. Lyons thus concludes that learning is socially constructed for the adult learners in RR (Lyons, 1992, cited in Pinnell, 1994, p16).

The following study confirms that multiple levels of learning in RR are influenced by social interactions. Pinnell, Lyons, Constable, and Jennings (1994, cited in Pinnell, 1994) review the results of a large survey of 205 RR Tutors to study their views on their own training, which involves the same emphasis on observation and discussion through social interactions, as well as teaching RR children when they are involved in training and advising RR teachers. In this survey the significance of conversation with peers is determined by the RR Tutors as the crucial element in their learning. “During the first year of training, they reported that reflection, dialogue and opportunity to articulate new understandings increased learning.” (Pinnell, 1994, p17).

This research, limited to the 1980’s and early 1990’s, is the extent of the published and accessible literature relevant to RR teacher learning in RR sessions that reports on what actually happens in sessions and how learning develops over the training year based on social interactions. It is illustrative of the interest in RR teacher learning when RR was new to Australia and the United States.

Clay and Watson (cited in Jongsma, 1990) respond to the author’s questions about RR teacher training at this time. Clay affirms that RR success depends on the decision-making of the teachers and this in turn depends on the quality of the teacher training. Clay writes that, “Teachers learn in an apprenticeship type program, for they are teaching and learning at the same time.” (cited in Jongsma, 1990, p 272).
Furthermore Clay writes, “There are new things for the most experienced reading teachers to think about and new ways of working to learn to maximise what children are trying to do. Rethinking and changing what they do has proved challenging to many experienced professionals.” (Jongsma, 1990, p272). Therefore, the year-long course was designed because it takes time for teachers’ practices to adjust to their shifts in understandings.

2.4.2 Learning Through Language

RR teacher learning since the early 1990’s grounded in a social-constructivist explanation of learning in which university-based researchers (RR Trainers who are academic leaders in RR) describe language as fundamental to teacher learning. This includes: explanations of RR teacher learning (Pinnell, 1991), research that has been highly influential for RR Tutors (Lyons, 1994), the principles for constructive pedagogical dialogue in RR as explained by Forbes and Briggs (2006), the setting in RR sessions designed to promote language interactions (Rodgers, 2000), and the conversational interactions of teachers and RR Tutors on school visits (Anderson, 2011). The latter does not specifically relate to RR sessions but it does support the evidence that teacher learning occurs through their conversations.

Pinnell (1991) writes that RR is a learning theory based action facilitated by language. “As teachers struggle to express their ideas and theories in language, they refine and make them more explicit. Group support is important. Reading Recovery teachers work together to construct a language that can in turn be used as a tool for learning” (Pinnell, 1991, p174-175). Pinnell writes as early as 1991 that a social constructivist approach is important for understanding child and teacher learning. Conceptually the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD) is seen as important for learners by this RR researcher. Teachers receive scaffolding from the RR Tutor to make their ideas explicit, and the goal for both teachers and children is independence. (Pinnell, 1991, p185).
Lyons’ (1994) research “Constructing Chains of Reasoning in Reading Recovery Demonstration Lessons” is seminal in the field of RR tutoring because it provides evidence of developing independence in RR training teacher learning. Lyons draws inspiration from Schön’s important work “The Reflective Practitioner – How Professionals Think and Learn” (1983), when she writes: “When people learn, they build tentative theories to explain what is happening. They come to know by constructing understandings, a process that involves prior knowledge with the experience of the moment. Direct experience and the gradual accumulation of knowledge from reflection on the experience over time are critical processes and are supported by conversations with others.” (Lyons, 1994, p276). This reference is significant in appreciating how learning occurs over time in RR teacher training and therefore relevant to introducing this study.

Lyon’s research involves thirteen training teachers. The teachers’ talk during observations of lessons at the glass-screen was audio-taped over six months. One randomly selected lesson sample was transcribed after three and six months to document changes in what Lyons describes as ‘chains of reasoning’. The language data was divided into meaningful units aligned to the RR lesson activities (five literacy activities). Ten transcripts were thus analysed showing the teacher-child interaction (behind the glass-screen) and the Tutor-Teacher interaction (at the glass-screen) in parallel. Coding resulted in four emergent themes related to literacy processing: self-monitoring, visual discrimination, searching, and self-correction. A teacher ‘chain’ of talk is described as two or more teacher contributions to a discussion around one theme.

Close examination of turn-taking between the teachers and the RR Tutor shows that the RR Tutor “initiated conversation, constructed the links between the teacher’s comments, extended teacher’s responses and sustained the interaction.” (Lyons, 1994, p281). The RR Tutor did this by “asking questions, restating or clarifying hypotheses, asking colleagues to support, expand, or challenge inferences made.” (Lyons, 1994, p282). After three months (the first set of analyses) the RR Tutor initiates conversation during each lesson activity and contributes up to fifty per cent
of the conversation. After six months of weekly meetings the teachers contribute to ninety five per cent of the conversation at the glass-screen. It is important to note that in this research the teachers meet at fortnightly sessions, not weekly, which is consistent with RR teacher training in New Zealand and Australia, so this rapid change in teacher contributions compared to the RR Tutor’s cannot be inferred from this research.

Lyons determines that her research on ‘chains of reasoning’ gives a better understanding of how teachers learn as they build on to the ideas of their peers in reasoned dialogue based on simultaneous and joint observations. “By collectively constructing chains of reasoning while observing … teachers refine what they know, and in the process develop a more coherent theory of learning and teaching.” (Lyons, 1994, p286).

Forbes and Briggs (2006) explain that RR teachers learn both through their daily experiences observing and teaching children in their own schools, and through discussion with their peer teachers during training, in what is described as a ‘community of practice’. This is defined in the following way: “Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavour” (Wenger, 2006). The three features of a community of practice are that: the community is committed to a field in which they have shared capability; members participate in activities involving sharing and discussion during which they form relationships with one another; and the members are practitioners of a shared profession or vocation (Wenger, 2006).

Forbes and Briggs (2006) maintain that RR teacher training is extremely successful in this context because the community (all the members) believe in constructive and interactive discussion for learning (Forbes & Briggs, 2006, p47). The authors cite Burbule (1993, cited in Forbes & Briggs, 2006) to describe the parameters of teacher professional discussions in RR sessions. These are guarantees to share thinking; to commit to the process; and to work on the basis of mutual respect as group trust is established. Mutual respect between the members is needed for the constructive
discussion and requires a realisation by the group that “the person teaching for the group is offering a gift that will enable those observing to gain greater understanding about how to teach” (Forbes & Briggs, 2006, p.43) and the teachers cannot expect to achieve clarity on an issue in one session.

On the importance of language in RR teacher training Rodgers (2000) quotes Wells (2000, p.73, cited in Rodgers, 2000, p.6), “Language is the essential condition of knowing, the process by which experience becomes knowledge.” Rodgers emphasises Vygotskian (1978) theory asserting that RR professionals acknowledge the power of language to scaffold and lift learning, thereby making it possible for RR teachers to learn more with the assistance of others than they would be capable of learning if they acted alone. Rodgers writes that RR teachers are encouraged to do the following: “say what you are thinking”, “share a thought with the whole group”, and “say more about that”, contrasting with learning where participants "sit quietly and thoughtfully". Citing Lyons’ chains of reasoning, Rodgers explains that several RR teacher contributions, building on to the ideas of each other, can lift the whole group to new levels of understanding (Rodgers, 2000, p.6).

Rodgers (2000) described the organisation of RR sessions, where teachers sit in a circle with a small coffee table in the middle with their RR books on their laps, as a physical arrangement that accentuates the importance of language in the teachers’ learning. The RR teachers cannot just ‘sit and listen’ as they face each other (Rodgers, 2000, p.6).

Rodgers explains that the follow-up discussion, where teachers sit in a circle, is very similar to what Lindfors (1999) describes as “collaborative inquiry”. Lindfors describes inquiry as “a language act in which one attempts to elicit another’s help in going beyond his or her present understandings.” (Lindfors, 1999, pix). In this setting, “each person has a responsibility to articulate ideas, to try to understand each other, to follow a line of inquiry started by someone else and stay with it.” (Rodgers, 2000, p.6). “Collaborative inquiry cannot occur if each participant pursues her own ideas, ignoring the questions and comments of others. Nor does it work if some
participants do not take part at all.” (Rodgers, 2000, p6). Thus, RR sessions depend on all the teachers contributing to discussions. The collaborative nature of inquiry in RR cannot be achieved if some teachers do not express their opinions, and remain passive recipients of the opinions of the RR Tutor and other teachers in their group.

The seating in a circle organisation is associated with power in relationships, which influence social interactions. Rodgers compares the arrangement of the contributors to other examples of talk arrangements that have the potential to limit discussions, such as who sits at the head of the table and who is elevated above the others. Rodgers claims that interactions between people who face each other are equal, and a circle offers the most equal rights to talk (Rodgers, 2000, p7).

The following research outside the RR session (during the RR Tutor school visit) is included in this review because it confirms the importance of conversation in teacher learning in RR, and thus learning through social relationships, which is pertinent to this study. Additionally it compares the RR style of language interaction to coaching, and it offers support for the understanding the social characteristics of the RR Tutor in the relationship with RR teachers. The structure of the hour long school visit around one thirty minute lesson is similar to the core structure of RR sessions involving introductory discussion, observation, and follow-up discussion. Anderson (2011) investigates coaching in the RR school visit, with the guiding research question: How do RR Tutors talk during coaching events? (Anderson, 2011, p43). The research involves conversational analyses of exchanges between four RR Tutors and seven RR training teachers, to answer this research question, aimed at reviewing the structure of the RR conversations, because: a) language shapes thinking, and b) close analyses of coaching conversations in the RR literature were sparse (Anderson, 2011, p44).

Anderson differentiates RR school visit conversations from coaching. “Contrary to many coaching models, Reading Recovery teacher leaders (RR Tutors) do not use published sets of procedures or scripts consisting of questions aimed at specific outcomes…the structure and talk of the visits may vary according to teachers’
concerns, children’s needs, and the teacher leader’s observations. The general guidelines…consist of a preconference focused on the child’s data; observation of the teaching; and a post-conference to problem-solve together how to help the child.” (Anderson, 2011, p44-45).

In this research four RR Tutors, described as successful instructors based on university course evaluations, volunteered to audio-tape at least two pre and post lesson conferences with training teacher volunteers in the second half of the training year and seven audio-taped visits. The researcher, a research assistant and a former RR Tutor used a form of conversational analysis to analyse the language data (Anderson, 2011, p45). Three detailed readings of the transcripts were conducted: a) identifying turn taking and content (coded); b) identifying shifts in topics as a move in the conversation, and c) coding the moves. “After data reduction, or the combining of like codes, the patterns in the data revealed four categories labelled data, theory, teaching, and directives.” (Anderson, 2011, p46). The following are examples from Anderson’s paper. “Data moves” were actions related to what could be seen or heard by the teacher, for example, “the child is pointing to each word”, or “the child is articulating /b/ and then saying the word.” “Theory moves” were personally formed theory or hypotheses, for example, “the child is searching for meaning.” “Teaching moves” focused on acts or procedures described in the RR course text (Clay, 2005b), for example, “I need to demonstrate fluent reading behaviour with masking cards”.

“Directives” were moves where RR Tutor power was used, for example, “please go and get the child so we can observe a lesson”, or “what can you do differently tomorrow in your teaching?”

In this study ninety-four per cent of the talk involves data, theory and teaching moves and the visits are characterised by give and take conversations. “The conversations illustrate how the teachers asserted theoretical explanations that were flexible, dynamic, professional, and were supported by data and centred on children” (Anderson, 2011, p46).
In RR school visits it is shown that RR teachers arrive at solutions through conversations (Anderson, 2011, p48). Anderson concludes that this research suggests that, “time building shared understandings and shared language would be helpful for coaches wishing to focus on how language supports and shifts teacher learning over time… [and that without this] … coaches may unknowingly engage in a display of knowledge or expertise thus employing a transmission mode of support for teacher’s teaching.” (Anderson, 2011, p49).

2.4.3 Teacher Community Centred Learning

The mode of instruction in RR teacher learning is discussed by Moore (1997, 1998) differentiating instructor-centred learning (a transmission of knowledge model), student-centred learning (through conversations and activities between peers) and a community-centred learning (involving peer learners and a more knowledgeable leader). Moore describes RR as community centred inquiry-based learning as the process of learning in RR teacher training. (Moore, 1998, p1)

Moore incorporates Vygotskian explanations for teacher learning in her discussion. She writes that in psychology topics like learning and problem-solving are typically described in the cognitive domain and are studied through clinical experimentation. Vygotsky (1962, 1978, cited in Moore 1998), however, proposes an “alternative psychological theory that treats knowledge as something that is socially constructed…through conversation and shared activity” (Moore, 1998, p2) which is relevant to teacher learning through social interactions in RR sessions, the topic of this study.

As in the previous section of this review Moore explains that ‘language’ (spoken and written) is central to learning and development in RR. Moore’s essay is a Vygotskian interpretation of RR teacher learning through language. Moore writes that in a Vygotskian framework language is both a psychological tool, to make sense of experience; and a cultural tool, to share experience and collectively make sense of it, that enables RR teachers to think and learn together. In the RR sessions the
participants are the RR teachers and the RR Tutor (more knowledgeable other). Moore states that the RR Tutor “uses language to guide the teacher’s construction of knowledge, teachers use language to question and challenge, and teachers gradually come to shift their thinking as they learn to use new language to describe learning and teaching.” (Moore, 1998, p2).

RR teacher learning is described by Moore as a process of transformation through social involvement. Moore writes that in RR “as the learner appropriates the [RR] knowledge and procedures encountered in interactions with others, he or she transforms them, constructing his or her own version… [and]… in this process, he or she is also transformed: by taking over the culture’s artefacts and practices, and their organising cognitive structure, the learner modifies his or her own cognitive structures through which he or she perceives, interprets and organises the world.” (Moore, 1998, p2). This clearly aligns with a Vygotskian interpretation of learning.

In RR Moore says that these transformations may be described as ‘shifts’ (Moore, 1998, p3). Moore explains that there are specific shifts described and looked for by RR Tutors in teacher learning, for example: the teacher’s shift in how he or she interacts with children responding to the child’s actions in prompting and questioning (Lyons, 1993, cited in Moore, 1998); or the teachers’ shifts in their interactions at the glass-screen from talking about item knowledge to talking about strategic activities involved in literacy processing (Clay & Watson, 1982, 198-199).

Moore’s explanation of RR teacher training as a ‘community of learners’ approach is that it requires communal social interactions and relationships. This means that all of the members of the group must be active (not just the instructor or the students), thereby distinguishing the community - based model from instructor – based and student – based models. In this learning approach the teachers need to be self-motivated to take responsibility for their own learning, and the group members. Thus, every teacher is a resource for all the other teachers.

The language used in the approach is conversational. However, discussion is guided by a leader (the RR Tutor). The leader can provide extensive explanations for the teachers’ learning when required. The social relationships in a community–based
model of learning involves collaboration and co-operation and not competition. It is the social relationships between the peer-teachers over the year that is critical in the development of “…an atmosphere of trust that allows colleagues to challenge and tussle with ideas.” (Moore, 1998, p3).

Throughout explanations that refer to RR professional’s practices by RR-based academics like Moore (1998) and Pinnell (1994) (who are both university based RR Trainers at the time of writing), RR teacher training is viewed as a process of collective inquiry. “Each teaching session is an inquiry into how the child is learning and an exploration of what teaching moves might be made in order to foster the child’s further learning.” (Moore, 1998, p3). This also applies to Anderson (2011), a RR academic, in her study of RR Tutor’s and training teachers’ social interactions on school visits, where teachers learn through unscripted and complex conversations, structured by the organisation of the activity which as previously noted mirrors RR sessions.

Schwartz (2006) describes RR teacher training as a ‘community of practice’. A community of practice is defined as a setting in which “learning and development occur as individuals participate in the socio-cultural activities of a community, transforming their understanding, roles and responsibilities as they collaborate with knowledgeable others in carrying out activities that are explicitly connected with the practices of the community.” (Palincsar et al, 1997).

Schwartz (also an RR academic) discusses the ‘tensions’ within a ‘community of practice’ model from RR’s perspective under the headings: the nature of professionalism; the nature of teaching; and the nature of knowledge. It is to be noted that ‘tensions’ refer to apparent opposing positions. For example, an individual can be professional (making self-determined decisions) and have fidelity to a community of practice (under theoretical principles and ways of working). An individual can be trained (become skilled and qualified) in a community of practice and pursue this through inquiry-based learning if this is the mode of learning of the community. An individual can base their RR knowledge on factual material (the RR course texts) and be transformed through interpreting, and reinterpreting that material in relation to
experiential knowledge of individual child cases in collaboration with others, just as the individual can pose questions and search for answers in the same texts.

Schwartz’s essay develops this reasoning with illustrations to support the propositions. For example, in RR teaching there is a set lesson framework and perspective of the need for adherence to procedural fidelity (actions and language explained in the RR course text, 2005b), however “Decisions about teaching points and examples can’t be specified in advance and depend on the knowledgeable teacher.” (Schwartz, 2006, p50). This means that social interactions within the lesson framework and all decisions about tasks (books read, stories written, demonstrations and language prompts) are either decided by the teacher or determined by the social interaction between the teacher and the child. RR lessons therefore like RR teacher training sessions are not scripted or pre-planned because of the responsive nature of teaching and learning.

Schwartz writes that RR teacher training involves a period of socialisation (how to act in the community) initially based on comparable skills as classroom teachers. New teachers become familiar with the community’s standards, theory, and rationales for practices in collaboration with peers by teaching individual child cases and refining understandings in subsequent years as they continue to teach individual cases and engage in conversations in the community of practice (Schwartz, 2006, p51). Teachers meet eight times in subsequent years of practice (two planning meetings beginning and end of year, and six sessions) (Catholic Education Office, 2009, p11).

The nature of RR teaching poses two tensions according to Schwartz, between training and inquiry, and conversation and interrogation. According to Schwartz (2006, p51-52) the training RR teacher works with two “tentative” theories which it is noted could be equally described as ‘incomplete’, one theory of the child as a literacy learner based on what the child can do and one of instruction.
Teacher inquiry during training involves collaborative discussions of lesson observations, under the guidance of the RR Tutor who can support the teachers by focusing attention, drawing relationships, modelling reasoning processes, clarifying constructs and procedures, and encouraging the teachers to take on an inquiry approach (Schwartz, 2006, p52). Inquiry implies that there is no known answers at the onset of these discussions therefore the social interactions are intended to be conversational rather than interrogational (question and answer). Developing a collaborative inquiring community in RR or any other area of practice is asserted by Schwartz to depend on the recruitment process (why teachers have joined the community) and the process of socialisation (how they have been included in the community). (Schwartz, 2006, p53).

Under the nature of knowledge Schwartz describes tensions between problems and answers, and facts and transformations. RR discussions are conducted with reference to RR course texts. The current editions are 2005a and 2005b. Schwartz explains that these references are read, re-read and referred to in RR conversations because they contain information that is valued by the RR community. The contents are interpreted and reinterpreted, and occasionally as Schwartz writes, “probably misinterpreted,” as well as linked to interrelated sources by RR Tutors in particular. Over time RR tutors have referred to a number of Clay's texts (Clay, 1979, 1982, 1991a, 1998, 2001, 2002) when considering child cases in a RR session and on school visits. The books that teachers refer to today (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) play a central role in grounding RR teacher discussions to maintain the integrity of the teaching (conceptually and procedurally).

In terms of change, Schwartz explains that quality development is integral to the RR community of practice. The practices (in the books) are not changed often because “a community of practice that changes too quickly becomes unrecognisable” (Schwartz, 2006, p53) and may not remain true to the intent or maintain integrity. Schwartz writes that, “[RR] Teachers can and should innovate around these [RR] procedures to achieve a particular type of processing shift if their best efforts to apply the procedures are not fostering progress for a particular child…[However]… The
danger in this type of innovation is that a procedure developed for, and successful with, a particular child should not then replace procedures that have worked for thousands of other children. Eventually such a decision may be warranted, but the process by which such changes are instituted is a complex part of the culture” (Schwartz, 2006, p54).

In his explanation Schwartz (2006) describes becoming a RR teacher over the training year as a process of individual ‘transformation’ through participation in collaborative learning, whereby language, practices and conceptual understandings are appropriated (Schwartz, 2006, p54). Within this conceptualisation of learning, according to Schwartz, “Telling teachers what to do is not sufficient, as a simple transmission model of teaching and learning.” Schwartz’s explanation is that the RR teachers in training “have to be ready to hear the answer in a way that fit[s] with their developing knowledge” (Schwartz, 2006, p55).

Schwartz is included in this review to add to the reader’s understanding of how RR teacher learning in their year of training operates, which is the topic of this study. In this article change and transformation is explained as occurring over the training year. The teachers learn through their conversations and inquiry with reference to their course texts. RR is therefore described as a ‘community of practice’, which has the hallmarks of a developing, continuing and sustaining community.

The influence of RR teacher training has a strong connection to learning through social interactions between teachers with their children, which the teachers write about from a social constructivist perspective. The following research and publications give an indication of what the RR approach to training teachers does for their practices.

Borka explains the independence of the child in his RR lesson series was when the teacher becomes invisible. He wrote “The thought of JP turning me invisible does not bother me anymore. In fact I have come to welcome this invisibility because it
suggests that an essential, instructional vanishing act has occurred” (Borka, 2010, p47). It is a feature of scaffolded support that it fades over time to allow for independence (when the child increasingly performs the task alone). Self-inhibition is one of the most difficult things for teachers and Tutors to do. Wood (2003) writes that teachers need to deliberately dismantle the scaffold in learning interactions (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) going from social interactive support that involves doing (modelling or demonstrating), to guiding (scaffolding through prompting, hinting, suggesting and so on), to fading (letting the child go alone) which is related to the least level of support in contingent teaching (Wood, 2003).

Pressley and Roehrig (2005) write about the benefits of RR teacher training through social interactions to their classroom teaching. In Roehrig, Pressley and Sloup (2001) evidence showed that RR teachers use many RR teaching strategies in their classrooms that makes for exemplary teaching which included: making teaching decisions on the basis of their observations of children’s reading and writing, scaffolding literacy learning to independence, and encouraging children to be self-regulated in their literacy processing. The professional learning that this style of teaching arises from is heavily focused on teacher learning through their social interactions of observing, discussing and giving each other supportive feedback, while highly valuing independent self-regulation on the part of children.

Gibson (2010) provides insight into RR teachers’ development of their teaching expertise. Gibson’s examined the quality and characteristics of twenty RR teachers’ expertise in phonological awareness, strategies for word identification, and comprehension grounded in their knowledge of their children, based on interview. The results indicate that RR teachers, on the basis of the RR approach to training teachers based on social interactions, can articulate complex and integrated expertise supported by their detailed observations and theorising on individual students’ literacy learning. This indicates that from a socio-cultural perspective the teachers take on the language and the practices of this specialist group as mediated by their RR Tutors.
Elliott (1996) provides insight into how one experienced RR teacher, made these teaching decisions using audio-taped think aloud protocols and reflective journaling. The results show that teacher decision making in RR is complex and supported by pedagogical reasoning, which is developed through social interactions during teacher training. RR teachers have multiple sources of knowledge gained from RR teacher training: detailed knowledge of child literacy processing based on research (Clay, 1991, 2001), the domain (content) (Clay, 2005a, 2005b), and pedagogy involving modelling, and scaffolding which is grounded in the social constructivist paradigm.

In conclusion, a community-centred model of teacher education treats knowledge as being socially constructed. Moore (1998) explains that language is central to learning through social interactions in this type of learning model which is diametrically opposed to education by transmission. Knowledge is formed through interactions on the social plane and becomes internalised into self-regulatory practices by the teachers. The teachers therefore appropriate RR knowledge and procedures encountered in peer-interactions at their RR sessions. Moore (1998) describes the features of this approach that distinguishes it from instructor-centred and student centred models of education, and stresses that the approach involves collaborative group inquiry into how children learn and teachers teach within a RR framework (Moore, 1998, Pinnell, 1994).

Schwartz (2006) explains the tensions that can arise in this approach called a ‘community of practice’. The tensions are in the nature of professionalism between teachers making adaptions for their own use and fidelity to a set of RR procedures. A further tension lies in the nature of teaching for professional learning, which was founded in a modern paradigm of ‘training’ teachers (Clay & Watson, 1982), and been re-defined in a post-modern paradigm as ‘inquiry-based’ teacher learning (Pinnell, 1994), and further metamorphosed into teacher learning through social collaboration (Schwartz, 2006). This forty years of change since the initial research projects that established RR though the University of Auckland in the late 1970’s illustrate how professional learning has basically not changed, teacher learning through observation of two peer-taught lessons, for purposes of comparison and
discussion, can be explained in evolving terminology keeping up with current research interests. ‘Inquiry’ is retained in the latest explanation as processes in conversations teachers have with one another as guided by their Tutors in their social interactions.

A further tension according to Schwartz (2006) is one about the nature of knowledge. Schwartz’s interpretation is that the conflict is between problems and answers, and facts and transformations. The texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) are a resource for interpretation, problem-solving, posing and seeking answers to questions about teaching in the RR framework rather than the ‘bible’, and over the training year teachers’ learning through social interaction transforms their domain knowledge and their teaching.

Moore (1998) and Schwartz’s (2006) explanations of this approach to teacher education, are exemplified in some examples of RR teaching, separate from child learning, in the literature. Borka (2010) writes about his experience as a ‘vanishing teacher’ understanding the aim of scaffolding a child’s learning is to promote child independence. Pressley and Roehrig (2005) explain that RR teachers transfer RR teaching to the classroom fit with their hallmarks of exemplary classroom practice. Gibson (2010) indicates that RR teachers can articulate complex and integrated expertise through this method of training. Elliott (1996) provides insight into how one experienced RR teacher makes daily decisions based on RR training through think aloud procedures. These skills are indicative of the RR teacher training that is based on social interaction through joint observation and discussions.

### 2.4.4 Reading Recovery as ‘Coaching’

The article by Fountas and Pinnell (2009) is relevant to this study on the social characteristics of RR Tutors and teachers. These authors have a longstanding association with RR in the United States; for example, Pinnell is an emeritus RR Trainer. On this basis these authors produced twelve key principles of ‘effective
coaching’ with the intention of supporting RR Tutors in their role. A few of the principles relate to administrative considerations, but most refer to the role of RR Tutor and social interactions in the one to one setting of school visits, some of which can apply to RR sessions. This article is strongly aligned with Hargreaves (2003, cited in Fountas & Pinnell, 2009), professional learning communities in schools (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39), and supports the role of the coach entering schools to assist teachers.

The following outlines principles that relate to this study. The authors’ principle number five for instance, “Work to establish trust, open lines of communication, and cultivate an atmosphere of collegial collaboration and problem solving” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39), refers to coaching occurring within trusting relationships. By way of advice RR Tutors are encouraged to “Take time to get to know the teacher as a person and a professional colleague and let her know you” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p43) because “A teacher will take risks and grow when she trusts her coach to support her, and will resist the support when she has no confidence in the collegial nature of the relationship” (Rainville & Jones, 2008, cited in Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p43), as well as be “a model of how to treat colleagues sensitively and respectfully in their presence and absence.” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p44) Principle six, “Help your colleagues develop their understandings of how children build a reading and writing process over time” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39) refers to the goal of the RR Tutor, which is to assist teachers to learn through close observations and systematic collection of evidence of individual learning to make helpful teaching decisions. Principle seven, “Ground your coaching conversations in behavioural evidence and root all decisions in rationales”, (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39) extends the role of the RR Tutor as assisting colleagues to become better observers in order to develop sound rationales for their decisions through asking ‘why’ questions.

Principle eight, “Listen attentively to your colleagues and use language that communicates respect, opens conversation, and facilitates genuine inquiry in your coaching conversations”, (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39) specifically relates to the one-to-one relationship. However, in terms of a process of inquiry the following recommendation of goal orientation can relate to RR sessions. “Your goal…is to bring your experience and knowledge together with the teachers’ experience and
knowledge, using language that opens conversation and facilitates inquiry”. (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p45). What is applicable to sessions includes guidance to have an exploratory inquiring stance, make points using concrete examples, offer rationales and useful information, paraphrase and extend teachers’ comments, and help the teacher/s to reflect on their decisions to promote their self-analysis and independence (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p45).

Principle nine, “Combine the teacher’s agenda with your expertise to lift her understanding”, refers to incorporating the teacher’s agenda in observations and discussions, as opposed to attempting to ‘fix lessons’ the teacher has already taught, which Fountas and Pinnell claim leads to ‘generative learning’ (learning of new insights to inform practices). (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p45). Principle eleven, “Build your expertise but don’t present yourself as ‘the expert’” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p39) is a recommendation for RR Tutors to think of themselves as learners in their coaching role and to let RR teachers know that “As you observe their teaching it expands your thinking” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p46) because this presentation of oneself as a learner is a model of the reflective practitioner. The authors explain the disposition of the RR Tutor in collaborative learning thus, “Your colleagues expect the coach to bring lots of expertise to the conversation, but you make tentative statements rather than declarations, and if you don’t make judgments about right or wrong, then they will be less likely to be dependent on you as the expert and will focus on rationales for the decisions they make in teaching.” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p46). Keeping in mind all their interrelated principles Fountas and Pinnell claim within a coaching role mainly in the school setting “you will find that your learning community develops a synergy of movement … [where]… everyone contributes to the goals that are held in common…” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009, p47).

Even though the above professional principles on coaching articulate what is valued in the RR community in the United States, they can be equally applied to RR in general, and to RR teacher training sessions during the training year in particular. The importance of ‘trust’ and ‘relationship’ in RR teacher training is a focus of this study.
2.4.5 Reading Recovery Tutor Work

This section outlines the role and characteristics of RR teacher-leaders (RR Tutors) in the implementation of RR. Rinehart and Short (2010) view RR as a restructuring phenomenon in the design of teacher work and empowerment. Empowerment, according to these researchers, involves elevated status and decision-making opportunities (Maeroff, 1988, cited in Rinehart & Short, 2010), when people can act with autonomy without someone telling them what to do (Jenkins, 1988, cited in Rinehart & Short, 2010). Rinehart and Short’s research involves 61 RR teacher-leaders (RR Tutors) across 33 RR training sites in the US and Canada, with a 70% response rate, through questionnaire. RR teacher-leaders have a great sense of autonomy and responsibility in their work and most are involved in decision-making involving: curriculum, scheduling, and hiring RR teachers. 86% of the teacher leaders felt supported by their superiors and well-respected in schools.

In an earlier study Bussell (2001) researched the role of the RR teacher-leader (RR Tutor) in education reform aimed at increasing school participation in RR, through the use of questionnaire and in-depth interviews. At the time the total RR teacher-leader population in the United States was 756. The 262 teacher-leaders who responded were predominantly white women with English as their native language, educated to post-masters’ degree level, with many years of experience in education (over 21 years), extensive experience in RR (over five years) and 40% had been involved in establishing RR and the RR training site. A further 45 RR teacher-leaders were selected based on university RR Trainer recommendations to examine the relationship of education reform theory and the RR teacher-leader’s experiences, to ground the data analysis.

RR teacher-leaders (Tutor) role additional to training RR teachers, involves multiple relationships and obligations in school systems connecting to children, teachers, being a spokesperson for RR, and obligations to the school system (data analysis district teams, school teams, compliance), and engagement in personal and professional development. (Bussell, 2001, p75). Bussell writes:
“The role involves operating as a change agent within an environment of multiple schools and frequently multiple school districts. The role involves operating in a limbo status generally without administrative authority but always with educational responsibility. The role is dependent upon many different relationships to ensure the quality of the implementation through teaching teachers, teaching children, and getting results.” (Bussell, 2001, p67-68).

The above quote is relevant to my study because it defines the role of the RR Tutor which is dependent on many different social relationships in the workplace, including working with children (the RR Tutor teaches a minimum of two RR children daily), training new RR teachers, supporting trained RR teachers, and supporting the RR early intervention in schools.

### 2.5 Emotion and Relationships in Adult Learning

This section illustrates the feelings of the teachers towards their RR teacher training, the literature of emotion in work generally and emotion in teaching. The section is important for this study because it investigates the teacher perspective of their RR training and their emotional response is in the literature. The meaning of emotion in the workplace from a social constructivist view and research related to teacher involvement in education change (reform agendas) is also relevant in understanding teacher emotions.

The meaning of emotion in the workplace from a social constructivist view and research related to teacher involvement in education change (reform agendas) is also relevant in understanding teacher emotions.

#### 2.5.1 Emotion and Reading Recovery Teacher Training

In spite of RR being a respected early intervention teacher feelings of anxiety and unease teaching behind the glass-screen during RR teacher training, has been
commented on since the conception of RR (for example, Clay & Watson, 1982, Power & Sawkins, 1991).

Barnes (1996-7) reflects on uneasy feelings in RR training. Barnes acknowledges that she learned about literacy learning and teaching in RR training. However, she believes that there was no trust in the relationships between people in her training group. Barnes (1996-7) quotes Vygotsky to express her views on the effect of the experience, “The ways in which we talk and interact with other people become internalised and change the ways we think.” (Vygotsky, 1978, cited in Barnes, 1996-7, p286). Thus, the interactions of learners are paramount for learning and significance should be put on how those interactions are supported in learning communities such as the RR training group.

Barnes (1996-97) critiques RR teacher training saying that it is consistent with a ‘skill-based’ training model where RR teachers were trained alike and not as individuals. Barnes explains that, “The diverse talents, experiences, and perspectives of the groups [should] expand the resources that the group brings to learning…” (Barnes, 1996-97, p287). Barnes’ felt a lack of recognition of her prior teaching experience and expertise in her RR teacher training and said that this showed a lack of respect which made her feel angry (Barnes, 1996-97, p287). In particular, Barnes (1996-97) maintained that the behind the glass-screen experience in RR teacher training in her opinion created distrust in the group and was not conducive to risk-taking in learning. This view relates to recognition of individual voices of teachers in group-learning and how social interaction occurs.

Five teachers publically responded to Barnes’ (1996-97) article stating that their experience was different. (Browne et al., 1996-97). They explain that they brought their individual styles to their RR teaching, and did not feel unsafe behind the glass-screen. These teachers wrote, “The teacher-leader [RR Tutor] guides us with challenging questions, and we talk aloud, describing what we see and what we think it means. The questions stimulate discussion, but we dialogue ourselves rather than just answering questions.” (Browne et al., 1996-97, p297-298). However, Browne (et
al., 1996-97) acknowledged that like Australian RR teachers (cited in Power & Sawkins, 1991) they felt anxiety when they demonstrated their teaching behind the glass-screen, even though they learned from this experience.

This discussion between RR teachers about their training experiences indicates that the emotional climate of the group is important for training. However, in different group settings this emotional climate can develop in different ways and perhaps this can be accounted for by the way the RR Tutor frames the teachers’ learning experiences. However, there are some indications in the literature that this issue has not been sufficiently addressed in RR teacher training.

Fifteen years after the Barnes discussion was published Compton-Lilly reported that RR teachers still have these feelings about their learning. Compton-Lilly (2011) interviewed sixteen RR training teachers (two from every training site in a mid-western state in the United States). Fourteen of the sixteen teachers expressed discomfort teaching behind the glass-screen, “…they described themselves as ‘nervous’, and the situation as ‘nerve-wracking’, ‘sleep-depriving’, ‘terrifying’, ‘intimidating’, ‘awful’, ‘scary’, and ‘humiliating’.” (Compton-Lilly, 2011, p432). These are strong emotions in reaction to the RR teacher training technique.

Compton-Lilly (2011) writes that the behind the glass-screen is an essential feature of RR teacher training, which makes it unique compared to other educational programs. It provides strong ground for the development of teachers’ self-regulation. However, she also points out issues, which are associated to this approach of observing teachers. Looking at the issue from the perspective of Foucault she compares the observation to surveillance and talks about power relationships. Compton-Lilly (2011) argues that the demonstration lessons behind the glass-screen, and the RR texts that prescribe acceptable RR teaching procedures, signify expected performance and indicators of competence in RR teaching. Compton-Lilly draws on Foucault’s description of a panopticon (1977, p201, cited in Compton-Lilly, 2011, p436) to explain the influence of the behind the glass-screen teaching experience. A panopticon is “…a tower constructed in the centre of a penal institution that allowed
the observations of prisoners at any time” (Compton-Lilly, 2011, p436). Observation from the panopticon does not occur all the time, but it has permanent effects on behaviour. Compton-Lilly maintains that this understanding of teacher self-regulation “…can be applied to many instructional programs that require adherence to particular practices, consistency across sites, and teacher self-regulation.” (Compton-Lilly, 2011, p437)

Compton-Lilly’s argument expresses one opinion, however the problem appears to be established, that is, the teaching behind the glass-screen will always bring problems and be prone to negative emotions in teachers. Therefore, the RR Tutor might expect that this teaching technique will bring out anxiety in teachers when they perceive that their teaching is being evaluated. However, it is the role of the RR Tutor to frame those experiences in a way that teachers do not come away from the RR training course with a high level of negativity about this aspect of RR teacher training.

2.5.2 Emotion and Social Relationships at Work

The role of emotions in learning has been acknowledged in educational literature for some time. (Goleman, 1996). Manning (2007) writes that emotions in learning matter, for example instance, the challenges of work-based tasks must be attainable. If the challenges in work are greater than the learners’ skill-set this can cause anxiety (Manning, 2007, p27). Furthermore, people remember their positive and negative experiences. Negative emotions of fear and humiliation in early learning experiences can develop into misconceptions in the learner about the learning. (Manning, 2007, p28). This has relevance to RR teacher training because the RR teachers start their training with a general teaching skill-set but no RR skill-set in a learning situation requiring them to change their teaching to RR teaching.

Social constructivist views of emotion in work and organisations are that emotions are intersubjective (Fineman, 2000, p2) and reflect the emotional rules of the society
they are a part of (shame, pity, embarrassment, kindness), or they represent the power and status relationships between social groups. (Barbalet, 1991, cited in Fineman, 2000, p2) Fineman writes that distress at work is often supressed in the workplace. (Fineman, 2000, p2)

In this literature ‘emotional labour’ is an important concept. ‘Emotional labour’ described by Hochschild (1993, cited in Fineman, 2000, p5, Hargreaves, 1998, p840) is labour that requires the worker to induce or supress feelings in order to sustain an appearance that gives ‘a proper state of mind’ to others. Managing emotions is a feature of the face-to-face work of teachers (Fineman, 2000, p5). This means that how teachers appear may not be how they are feeling in RR teacher training.

Barbalet (2006) writes that our emotions are always physical, always social structural (relating to power), and always cultural. The cultural aspect of emotion reflects the values and expectations of the surrounding culture. For example, “…fear makes us sweat and feel weak in the knees…results from our powerlessness; and what we fear…comes from the culture in which we live.” (Barbalet, 2006, p52) This means that understanding of the reported physical reactions teachers have to behind the glass-screen teaching in RR training is a broader investigation which is beyond the focus of this research.

Brown and Brooks (2002) write that any study of emotion will be complex and can only be done by using interview data. Brown and Brooks used a questionnaire approach of emotional categories to research emotional climate dimensions among night nurses in a general hospital in the UK and found this to be unsatisfactory. Emotional climate is reportedly involved in RR teacher learning and the relationships between participants (Barnes, 1996).


2.5.3 Emotion and Social Relationships in Teaching

Schutz and Pekrun (2007) explain that until recently very little was known about teacher emotions in education and argue that a multi-disciplinary approach is needed (Schutz & Pekrun, 2007, p321).

Hargreaves (1998) researches emotion in relation to education reform agendas. Hargreaves writes emotion is at the heart of teaching in teachers’ relationships with students (Hargreaves, 1998, p838), teaching being emotional labour (Hargreaves, 1998, p840) and that teachers’ emotions are attached to their sense of purpose. If the teacher’s purpose cannot be achieved Hargreaves writes anxiety, frustration, anger and guilt can arise, and if teachers lose their sense of purpose they can become demoralised. (Hargreaves, 1998, p841)

Empirically, Hargreaves’ 1998 paper “The Emotional Practice of Teaching” examines aspects of emotion and education change among 32 Grade 7 and 8 teachers in four school boards (districts) close to Toronto, Canada. Hargreaves’ conclusions include: teacher emotion cannot be separated from change agendas; there needs to be pride in existing achievements; emotional support is an essential part of teaching and learning; and any change needs to engage peoples’ purposes. The relevance of emotion and change agendas to this study is that RR teachers are participating in personal change of their teaching practices.

Hargreaves’ (2001) outlines the ‘emotional geographies’ involved in teachers’ social relationships with their colleagues. ‘Emotional geographies’ refer to proximity (emotional closeness or distance) related to aspects of social relationships (personal, cultural, moral, professional, political, physical). Hargreaves interviewed a representative sample (53 teachers) from 15 schools of varying sizes and communities. The teachers were asked about their emotional relationships to: their work, their professional development and educational change (Hargreaves, 2001, p507). Four broad responses characterised teachers’ relationships with each other: appreciation and acknowledgement (people like to have their moral purposes and accomplishments acknowledged); personal support and social acceptance (in relation to professional interactions rather than friendship); emotional support (which
Hargreaves writes is of little professional value unless it improves the work of teaching; and positive interaction with colleagues.

Hargreaves explains, “Conflict was the strongest source of negative emotion among teachers…and was repeatedly seen as a problem, not an opportunity.” (Hargreaves, 2001, p524) When conflicts occur “…its wounds can be deep and lasting.” (Hargreaves, 2001, p522) In response to conflict teachers mask their emotions (Hargreaves, 2001, p523), keep their distance from one another, avoid interactions and engage in superficial politeness (Hargreaves, 2001, p523). Close friendship between teachers (not the norm in this study) did not support professional discussions that involved disagreement and critique, but rather promoted like-mindedness (Hargreaves, 2001, p523). These findings have relevance to teacher perspectives on their learning through social interaction involving discussions in this study.

The view that emotions matter in teaching is taken up by Yin and Lee (2011) in relation to education reform in mainland China (2001). These researchers use Hargreaves construct of ‘emotional geographies’ (Hargreaves, 2001) in a three year qualitative research study (2005-2008) focused on teacher emotion (13 teachers) in relation to teacher trainers in two schools. The researchers used semi-structured interviews and asked what made the teachers joyful (happy/excited) or sad (anxious/worried) in their interactions with teacher trainers and why they had these emotions.

Yin and Lee’s (2011) findings were that teachers feel many mixed emotions (joy, envy, confusion, anger) in their interactions with trainers as a consequence of the interplay between ‘emotional geographies’ (Hargreaves, 2001, p507). Yin and Lee conclude that only when three conditions (emotional geographies) were present did positive feelings develop between teachers and trainers. These were: some desirable professional orientation of the trainer (professional geography); the equal power relationship between the teachers and the trainer (political geography); and the consensus on moral purpose between the teachers and the trainer (moral geography) where people pursue common purposes and feel a sense of accomplishment together. (Yin & Lee, 2011, p94)
Meyer and Turner (2007) maintain that emotions are largely ignored in education research with growing interest developing over the last decade (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p243). These researchers explore ‘emotional scaffolding’ (See: Chapter Three) in the way teachers sustain and enhance students’ understanding, motivation, engagement, collaboration, participation and emotional well-being (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p244). They claim that scaffolding is more easily established in one-to-one social interactions than in groups. Meyer and Turner’s question is: how do teachers develop values and pedagogies needed for emotional scaffolding? To answer this they maintain that the following needs to be understood: a) why understanding emotion is essential for effective pedagogy and learning, and b) how emotions are defined and experienced, not only in the classroom but in the broader profession. (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p255)

Ingleton (1999) studies confidence in learning through Memory-work. Memory-work is based on the premise that memories are subjectively significant events that play an important part in the construction of self. Memory-work requires: the collection of written memories, a creative analysis of these, and reappraisal of the analysis in the context of theory. The context in this research is how confidence is constructed in mathematics classrooms. The participants wrote a memory related to strong negative emotions. Shame and pride (reported powerful emotions in learning) are the focus of Ingleton’s analysis. Ingleton writes that individuals work hard at minimising or avoiding risk, to avoid shame and the lowering of their self-esteem (Ingleton, 1999, p9). According to Ingleton, “… [emotions] play a powerful role in learning in any subject, at any age and ability level, and for any learner.” (Ingleton, 1999, p9) Thus memories associated with shame or pride impact on self-esteem and engagement in group learning.

Schuck, Aubusson and Buchanan (2008) discuss the value of peer observation followed by professional learning conversations for the professional development of a trio of teacher educators at the University of Technology, Sydney, Australia. The context of trust and professional relationship are essential parts of this learning process. Schuck, Aubusson and Buchanan report from the literature that professional observation falls into three categories: judgemental (where management instigates
observation to evaluate the quality of teaching); developmental (where senior staff observe others to give advice on how to improve); and equal-mutual or reciprocal reflective (where peers observe each other over long periods of time and engage in learning conversations). In this research it was found that trust, openness, friendship the challenges they face in their teaching, and that peer observation is a shared experience that is a springboard for professional conversation.

Brookfield (1995) poses questions that have relevance to the structures of RR teacher training, the ‘circle’ in which teachers hold their discussions (Rodgers, 2000). Brookfield writes that what one may think are democratic, respectful ways of treating people can be experienced by people as oppressive and constraining, because learning is complex and involves cultural, psychological and political factors. Brookfield writes that the circle arrangement, viewed as a display of democracy where peers face each other as respectful equals is ambiguous. For students who are self-assured, talkative, and used to university circles, the circle poses no fear. For students who are shy, aware of their differences, unfamiliar with intellectual discussion or intimidated by technical language, the circle can be an overwhelming and embarrassing experience. The reason is that a circle can prevent trusting relationships when people feel pressured to perform. (Brookfield, 1995, p7-8) Brookfield advocates the management of social interactions within structures by teachers.

Brookfield (1995) reports through data from student interview, the development of trust between students and teachers depends on teacher ability to make it clear what she stands for and why she believes this is important, to establish credibility with students (Brookfield, 1995, p17). Coming to trust another person, according to Brookfield requires knowing someone for a period of time and seeing their honesty modelled in their actions (Brookfield, 1995, p19-20). Therefore, Brookfield states that teachers who are reflective find out how students are experiencing their classes, and ground their actions in the student’s experiences of learning. This measure of reflection is relevant to RR teacher learning through social interactions that is shown in the literature to involve teacher emotion.
2.6 Adult Learning

2.6.1 Adult Learning in Groups

Rose (1996) writes that learning in groups has become inseparable to adult education and the process involved is taken for granted. Furthermore confusion exists in the field of adult education that simultaneously pursues individualisation through distance learning and the use of technology while maintaining the importance of the group. (Rose, 1996, p11) The problem with group learning according to Rose is that central questions have not been answered: is adult group learning an ideological position, a method of learning, or a tool for affective change? In the RR literature an ideological position for adult group learning is expressed by Rodgers (2000) in relation to social structure (the circle). A “community–based instructional model” (Moore, 1997, 1998) and “community of practice” (Schwartz, 2006) relates to the group approach being a method of learning. The adult group arrangement of observation and discussion is reported as being for instigating change in teaching practice and understandings. (Clay &Watson’s interview, cited in Jongsma, 1990)

The development of the group, the role of the facilitator and the size of the group are relevant factors in adult learning according to Imel and Tisdell (1996). These researchers write that group theorists classify the work of adult groups into two functions: maintenance and task (Cragan & Wright, 1991, Jaques, 1991, cited in Imel & Tisdell, 1996, p17). Group maintenance functions (sometimes referred to as social-emotion functions) contribute to building and sustaining relationships such as encouraging, mediating, gatekeeping, following and relieving tension. Task functions are those that help the group do its work, including initiating, information seeking, information giving, clarifying, elaborating and summarising. The ‘group development’ depends on these two functions. This is “the maturity and degree of cohesion that a group achieves over time as members interact, learn about one another, and structure relationships and roles in the group.” (Mennecke, Hoffer, & Wynne, 1992, p526, cited in Imel and Tisdell, 1996, p17)

The role of the facilitator of the group according to Imel and Tisdell (1996, p18-19) is preparing the group members for group work and helping the members process their group experience, however citing Knights (1993) and Foley (1992) Imel and
Tisdell (1996, p18-19) warn against facilitators taking on group maintenance functions (the social-emotional dimension) because by being overly supportive and assuming the role of caretaker, facilitators can fail to challenge learners to take responsibility for their own learning.

The facilitator of an adult group is faced with a number of questions such as the size of the group and whether learners should select their own groups (Imel & Tisdell (1996, p 19). Imel and Tisdell (1996, p19) cite Levine and Moreland (1990, p596), Jaques (1991), and Zander (1994), in discussing group size. They report that studies in this area suggest that people strongly prefer smaller groups, groups of six or less tend to be more cohesive than larger groups, and it is more productive to form smaller groups out of groups of eight or twelve learners (referred to as large groups). In this study of adult learning in RR teacher training the group has ten members.

Group conflict (related to power relationships) has been addressed in the field of adult education from the position of how the facilitator can be supportive of individuals and thus the group as a whole. (Imel & Tisdell, 1996, p20) This is in order to resolve conflict, move beyond it and address task functions. The view of conflict in adult groups according to group processing theory is that it is generated by personality factors and differing life experiences among members. However, in their conclusion Imel and Tisdell (1996, p22) write that the relationship between group process theory and learning theory needs further exploration. This research is an example of how individuals in one adult group learn through social interaction.

A recent study about adult learning, (Gravani 2012) addresses adult learning principles in designing activities for teacher development. Gravani’s (2012) writes that the features of practical and useful programs in adult education take into account principles of adult learning. These include: voluntary participation, mutual respect, collaborative spirit, action and reflection, and self-direction (Gravani, 2012, p420-421). Gravani (2012, p421) cites Jarvis (2006) and Gravani (2007) in stating that a climate that is conducive to learning is a prerequisite for effective adult learning. “Both physical and psychological environment should provide adults with comfort as well as a caring, accepting, respecting, supportive, and helping social atmosphere.” (Gravani, 2012, p421)
The above examples of adult education are relevant to this study because RR teacher training involves group processes of learning. RR teacher training addresses Rose’s (1996) questions about adult learning in groups as an ideological position about teacher learning, a method of learning, and a tool for affective change. Group process theory acknowledges the importance of the facilitator in adult group learning, including making decisions about the formation of the group (for example, size), and addressing both the social and emotional and task functions in the operation of groups. (Imel & Tisdell, 1996) Finally, the literature of adult education (Gravani, 2012) is relevant to RR teacher learning.

2.6.2 Adult Learning and Collaboration

Current trends in teacher professional development focus on school-based learning communities that emphasise collaboration. Chan & Pang (2006) suggest that there is a need to prepare teachers for the challenges involved in how teachers co-construct their knowledge in groups (Chan & Pang, 2006, p2) and a need for increased research on collaboration in learning communities to improve teacher knowledge and practice (Chan & Pang, 2006, p3). Significant theoretical work exists on the design of learning communities however, little is understood about how they progress, are continued and negotiate inquiry processes (Dooner, et al, 2008). Research shows that interpersonal tension is typical in group work when members do not appreciate the difficulties involved in a collaborative process. The types of conflict that occur can be “cognitive” associated with problem-solving, deliberation of critical feedback and different viewpoints, or “affective” when teachers describe themselves emotionally as feeling “‘devastated’”, “personally attacked”, and “‘angry’”. (Hargreaves 2001, Dooner et al, 2008)

Dooner et al (2008) use Weick’s (1979) four developmental stages of collaboration to provide an understanding of the balance and conflicts that occur in groups. This research involved seven middle-years teachers, the principal and the researcher (Dooner), ten participants, in over two years of collaborative inquiry (2003-2005)
into how to achieve more creative teaching practices, unlike the ten participants over one year in this RR study, who work through social interaction to learn new teaching practices. This example shows how a collaborative group did not work well without leadership and clearly defined outcomes. (Timperley, 2008).

In Weick’s (1979) model, professional learning communities form around coinciding interests or beliefs. Initially people converge to find out whether they share sufficient mutual pursuits to possibly work together, although their personal expectations of group membership can remain private. These initially variant personal motivations for being in the group could be for example: to further leadership ambitions, a desire to develop a school support system, expectations of reduction in personal workloads, and so on, and can impact on the group’s collaborations. Interpersonal relationship is a variable in forming collaborative groups. The teachers in this study initially wished to establish whether they liked the other participants before they committed to the project, with one member commenting on the collaboration having the potential for conflict despite displays of friendliness (Dooner et al, 2008).

After a group is formed members’ collaboration becomes focused on common means or practices in the next stage of Weick’s model. In this study there was a group agreement that collaboration meant an equal voice for all members and that everyone would be supported through any challenges. Common points of reference were professional readings to explore the theoretical concepts of the nature of imagination and creativity. However, in this group there were teachers with diverse teaching beliefs, so in the spirit of collaboration, the group devised practice of a rotating chair to allow each member to take ownership of their discussion meetings (Dooner et al, 2008).

In the first year of collaboration social events such as informal dinner parties, were important in developing trusting relationships, and group members admitted that it took about six months before they could risk being forthcoming about their own teaching struggles to the group, for example: “… in time, I felt that I could really share my thoughts and what I believe and that it would be respected” (Dooner et al,
2008, p569). However, according to Weick’s (1979) model whilst there may be collaboration to improve practices, if personal intentions and expectations remain disconnected these are a source of potential conflict.

As unfulfilled personal expectations arise interpersonal tensions follow and change occurs whereby group members begin to contemplate the group’s continuation and focus on ways to create group stability. In this study the catalyst to challenge the group’s continuation was having a Vygotskian scholar visit the group after a conference. This produced anxiety and stress around preparation for the visit (additional readings). Furthermore, the fact that there was no leader in the group, meant the teachers found it exceedingly challenging to take direction from each other (Dooner et al, 2008). At this juncture a focus-group discussion format helped them discuss their different points of view.

In Weick’s (1979) model these changes may ultimately re-energize the group or simply drain it of its energy, whereby the group’s practice breaks down, individuals pursue various pursuits, and at this point, communities often split into sub-groups, or simply ‘‘fade away’’. By February of the second year this group had broken into smaller groups. Members commented for example, that participation was wearying with the added demands of teaching, that critical dialogue could become personal, and there was the issue of when does a professional relationship becomes a social relationship. Furthermore, Dooner et al (2008) noted that the teachers dealt with conflict by “avoiding interactions” or engaging in “social politeness” (Hargreaves, 2001, Timperley, 2008).

This example from the literature on collaboration suggests that when teachers find collaboration unexpectedly demanding they are advised to engage respectfully and to put conflicts aside or decide by consensus (Dooner et al, 2008). However, when cognitive and affective tensions surface, teacher reactions can significantly limit their ability to benefit professionally from collaborative work as conflict is inherently embedded in the collaborative process.
On the other hand, collaborative learning is seen as a highly successful pedagogical approach in tertiary education, over the past two decades (Verenikina, 2012). Johnson et al (2007) suggest that the reason for its success is the close link between research, theory and practice. Johnson et al (2007) refer to over 300 research studies that have been conducted on co-operation in college and adult learning to support why collaborative learning is a pedagogical approach of choice. Co-operation compared to individual and competitive efforts results in higher student individual achievement, longer-term retention of learning, higher level reasoning (critical thinking), more creative problem-solving, more willingness to take on tasks and persist at them when working towards goal, more intrinsic motivation, and greater transfer of learning between situations, among its benefits (Johnson et al, 2007).

These are two perspectives of collaboration in different contexts: in pre-service teacher education (highly successful) and in-service teacher education (possibly involving conflict). RR is an example of in-service teacher education. Dooner et al (2005) and Johnson et al (2007) maintain that a professional community cannot flourish when members strive for individualistic pursuits of self-interest. Therefore co-operation results when “…members… internalise the values underlying co-operation, such as commitment to the common good and to the well-being of other members, a sense of responsibility to contribute ones fair share of the work, respect for the efforts of others and them as people, behaving with integrity, caring for other members, compassion when other members are in need, and appreciation of diversity” (Johnson et al, 2007, p21).

Collaborative learning is dependent on positive interdependence. This means that the members are oriented towards a desired goal, where each member has a part to play in its achievement. The group is also bound by an identity as a group and a common workspace. Basically according to Johnson et al (2007) interdependence means that the group must believe that they ‘sink or swim together’.

The purpose of co-operative learning is to make each member a stronger individual and its success depends on the members helping and assisting each other (for
example providing feedback, challenging each other’s reasoning, and influencing each other in trusting and trustworthy ways (Johnson et al, 2007). Asking unskilled people to co-operate is described by Johnson et al (2007) as futile. Collaborative learning success requires interpersonal and small group skills, leadership, trust building and communication skills. Whilst the final essential element for successful collaboration is whether the group periodically reflects on how well they are functioning and their learning processes (Johnson et al, 2007).

Over fifty years ago Deutsch (1962, 1973) researched two aspects on group dynamics: trust and conflict. Trust by definition means that members of the group are aware that they risk positive and harmful effects from their actions but they believe that the others in the group will behave in ways that are beneficial to themselves. Trust therefore has two factors, the willingness to risk and the willingness to respond positively, which according to Johnson et al (2007) and Deutsch (1962, 1973) cannot be achieved in an individualistic competitive environment. In effective groups conflict is resolved through negotiated agreement. The advantage of RR teacher training is that the teachers have a common pursuit to learn new skills and understandings and this is mediated through course texts written by the author of RR, therefore outside the group dynamic, and the group’s collective aim is to understand the author in terms of their own teaching practices through collaborative discussions guided by a more capable experienced person in the area, the RR Tutor.

2.6.3 Adult Learning and Professional Development

On one hand current literature refers to teacher learning through collaboration and on the other that there is an emerging and compelling evidence base for effective professional learning to be linked to child learning outcomes (Alton-Lee, 2008, p1). Alton-Lee and Timperley (2008) note that a superficial search of Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for the past 40 years there are over 11,000 studies for professional development and a further 17,000 for in-service teacher education. This research is largely what they describe as “self-referential” to the perspectives of adult, with a small amount of literature that attends to professional
learning connected to the learning outcomes of children. Research provided through the “Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration” (publications commissioned by the New Zealand Government) is testament to this research base. The publication on teacher professional development (Timperley et al, 2007) was based on 97 research studies, in the areas of mathematics, science and literacy, (Timperley et al, 2007). As a result of this influential research Timperley (2008) highlighted ten principles of effective professional development that are accredited as a scholarly contribution of international importance. All of these principles can be argued as applying to RR professional learning. However, the following reference is only to those that pertain to this study on RR teacher learning through social interactions.

The highly relevant principle for this study on teacher learning in RR involves providing teachers with multiple opportunities for learning because “… it typically takes one or two years for teachers to understand how existing beliefs and practices are different from those being promoted, to build the required pedagogical content knowledge and to change practice” (Timperley, 2008, p15). Moreover, these opportunities should occur in settings that are characterised by both trust and challenge, when teachers’ trial and display their teaching for others “…because change is as much about the emotions as it is about knowledge and skill... If emotional issues are ignored teachers may close themselves off to learning and adopt defensive postures to avoid exposing their inadequacies” (Timperley, 2008, p15-16). According to this researcher, trust and challenge are both requirements for teacher change because “Change … involves risk … [and] … before teachers take on that risk they need to trust that their honest efforts will be supported, not belittled” (Timperley, 2008, p16).

Timperley’s principle that effective professional learning needs to engage the teachers’ existing theories is relevant for the beginning of RR teacher training through social interactions. RR Tutors begin the course with the advice: ‘you are experienced teachers, you start from there’. This engagement is to avoid teachers rejecting conflicting new ideas, for example as being unrealistic. It “…means discussing how those ideas differ from the ones being promoted and assessing the
impact that the new approaches might have on their students” (Timperley, 2008, p17-18). Furthermore, Timperley’s argument is that teacher learning, like child learning is cyclic not linear. Teachers require opportunities to make small changes in their practices, observe improvements in child learning outcomes, and make further changes. (Timperley & Phillips, 2003).

Alton-Lee and Timperley (2008) assert that major gaps exist in “research knowledge” and attention needs to be given to professional learning that directly influences child learning, which RR does. “The research literature contains many examples of situations where teachers were given the time and resources to meet together to solve a problem or learn about new curricula or pedagogical practices…where this aim was thwarted by norms of politeness and the absence of challenge” (Timperley, 2008, p19). The challenge is the requirement to show a difference in child learning, which occurs in RR teacher training.

In the publication “Teacher Professional Learning and Development” (Timperley et al, 2007) is “A Third Chance to Learn” (Phillips & Smith, 1997) cited as “best evidence research”. It is a core research study included because of sound methodology and impact on child learning. It is particularly relevant to this study because the children involved had been referred from RR (a second wave intervention) to this third wave of intervention after they had made insufficient progress in the time available for teaching on RR (a maximum of 20 weeks). The teacher professional development was similarly based on observation and discussion and concluded that teacher responses to child learning are attributable to the success of seventy-five per cent of these children, but with greater emphasis on teachers’ highly skilled social interactions (self-regulation) when teaching children who are struggling readers.

Engagement in professional readings was not often reported in the exemplary core research studies (Timperley et al, 2007) however when they were, opportunity to observe teaching approaches modelled (in person or on video) provided a link for teachers between theory and practice. In all cases cited by Timperley et al (2007)
modelling of practice followed an introduction to underpinning theoretical principles and rationales (why the particular aspect was being modelled); whilst receiving feedback, usually connected with a discussion of practice with a more expert colleague or the provider, was the most commonly used activity in all the studies that had positive child learning outcomes (Timperley et al, 2007). Both, observing principles and rationales in practice and feedback, are features of RR teacher training. A RR session is modelled on: the introductory discussion (establishing principles and rationales or “emphases” for observations), observation and discussion, and follow-up discussion for group feedback to the two teachers who have taught lessons.

Numerous studies indicate that feedback is an essential element in learning (Timperley & Hattie, 2007; Hattie 2009, Hattie, 2012). Hattie (2009) defines feedback within the context of child learning as “…information provided by an agent … about aspects of one’s performance or understanding… [as] … a consequence of performance” (Hattie, 2009, p174). Feedback is explained by Hattie (2009) as having to address a learning context. Hattie maintains that feedback is most effective when it addresses faulty understandings rather than a lack of knowledge. This is when “instruction” would be more appropriate. Therefore “feedback” is not instruction (teaching something new), and it is not reinforcement, because feedback may be accepted, rejected or modified by the learner (Hattie and Timperley, 2007, p83). Furthermore, feedback is not scaffolding, because scaffolded support involves social interactions through modelling, questioning, prompting, suggesting, hinting and so on that supports a learner in achieving independent performance of a task (Wood, 2003). RR teacher ability to give effective peer-feedback can be scaffolded by the RR Tutor in their follow-up discussions after observing peer-teaching.

Most studies focus on feedback given to children and its effect on child learning, rarely considering adult learners (Thurlings et al, 2012). Thurlings et al’s research focuses on professional learning feedback teachers give oriented towards improvement of teaching performance. Their synthesis of the literature on feedback reveals that the most effective feedback is: task or goal orientated; specific; focused
on details; while corrective feedback (saying something is wrong, specifying what is wrong and what to do to correct it) is more effective than non-corrective feedback (saying something is wrong without specifying). Furthermore, Thurlings et al note that research shows that while positive and negative feedback can influence learning, positive feedback is preferable, and additionally, immediate feedback is more effective than delayed feedback.

Thurlings et al’s (2012) pilot study is relevant to this study because of the importance placed on the social context of giving feedback and the importance of the role of the more experienced person in supporting the teachers in giving feedback. Thirteen secondary school teachers were divided into three face-to-face groups from the same schools and one virtual group from different schools. The face-to-face groups had an experienced adult facilitator (process supervisor) and were involved in VIP (Video Intervision Peer-coaching). The virtual group used a moodle environment that contained discussion wikis. Four cycles were involved in the VIP interactions: teachers deciding which behaviours to observe and videoing these; teachers meeting for the first VIP session to give feedback and design an action plan for improvements; teachers practising improvements and videoing behaviours again, then teachers meeting for a second VIP session to give further feedback.

The researcher’s scored feedback given against the criteria specified in the literature. “If feedback is goal directed, specific, detailed, corrective, and balanced between positive and negative comments, then it is more effective than feedback that is person directed, general, vague, non-corrective, and either too positive or too negative” (Thurlings et al, 2012, p197). Timperley and Hattie (2007) confirm that feedback to the person is the least effective in influencing change.

Thurlings et al’s results indicate that face-to-face feedback is most effective because of the nature of social interactions and the role of the facilitator. The facilitator can scaffold the process of giving feedback (posing and modelling guiding and open-ended questions, clarifying, summarising, and reflect explicitly on the participants’ feedback); and in the social context if unproductive feedback processes eventuates
these can be corrected. Thurlings et al write that social-emotional cues are necessary to reinforce and sustain a positive climate, a sense of community, and feeling that committed social relationships exist when giving feedback. Thurlings et al (2012) concluded that, “The effectiveness of feedback depends on patterns or chains of interactions between providers and receivers” (Thurlings, 2012, p206).

2.7 Summary of the Literature Review

This research is based on Reading Recovery (RR) teacher training in sessions that operated for a single group of teachers with one RR Tutor (leader or facilitator) over one year (2006). The intent of the literature review is to present research and published writings on RR teacher training in RR sessions that is published.

RR involves an international learning community, however descriptions, essays, and professional advice are what are mainly available. Anderson (2011) mirrors this impression when she writes that the analysis of RR teacher learning is sparse in the area of close analyses of coaching conversations between RR Tutors and teachers, which occur on school visits. This review concludes that analyses of RR teacher learning from recorded data (interviews, language data, and surveys) occurred in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. This came from the findings associated with the start-up of RR in new countries (Australia and the United States) (Pinnell, 1994). Interpretations of multiple partners learning through tiers of scaffolded learning (the teacher and the child, the RR Tutor and the teachers) (Gaffney & Anderson, 1994) extends Clay’s own views (Clay & Watson, 1982). The importance of language in RR teacher learning is explained early in the process (Lyons, 1992, cited in Pinnell, 1994). Lyons’ (1994) research on the “chains of reasoning” uses language data to show what constitutes “chains” where teachers build on to what is said by colleagues in a coded thematic area, and concludes that this evidence gives an understanding of how teachers learn from the ideas of their peers. Forbes and Briggs (2006), within the construct of a ‘community of practice’ attributed to RR, explain the parameters of the professional discussions involving respect and trust between members. Rodgers (2000) describes how the arrangement of the RR session facilitates equal opportunities in dialogue, and Anderson (2011) uses coded language data from
school visits to show how RR teachers learn through conversations in which language shapes their thinking. The conversations applicable to the school visit illustrate that the teachers give theoretical accounts that are “flexible, dynamic, professional, supported by data and focused on children” (Anderson, 2011, p46). Moore (1997, 1998) explains that RR training is a community centred model and applies Vygotskian theory of learning through language to understanding how the classroom teachers are transformed through appropriation of knowledge and language in RR. Schwartz (2006) updates the ‘community of practice’ position of RR clarifying tensions that may appear exclusive but which can be inclusive, such as being professional and adhering to fidelity of practice, being able to be trained in a community of practice and learn through inquiry, as well as being able to problem-solve (when the answers are unknown) through reference to texts of answers about theory and procedure.

Borka’s (2010) article shows that this approach to teacher learning results in social constructivist understandings in relation to child learning. Pressley and Roehrig (2005) write that the RR training transfers into exemplary classroom practice, Gibson (2010) that the teachers can articulate complex and integrated expertise in teaching, and Elliott (1996) that teacher decision-making in RR is based on knowledge about the child, the content and pedagogy that involves modelling and scaffolding.

In relation to RR Tutor work Fountas and Pinnell (2009) describe coaching principles for RR Tutors based on experience in the RR field including research. These refer to RR Tutor development of trusting relationships with teachers as well as grounding discussions in behavioural evidence. Rinehart and Short (2010), study ‘RR teacher-leaders’ (tutor's) work in relation to empowerment. This is based on autonomy and inclusion decision-making. Bussell (2001) gives an extensive account of the breadth of the RR teacher-leader’s (tutor’s) work including a demographic description of a large RR teacher-leader population in the United States.

Emotion is reported in RR teacher training (Clay & Watson, 1982, Power & Sawkins, 1991, Barnes, 1996, Compton-Lilly, 2011). This is in terms of negative responses to the model of training involving observation by others while teaching behind a glass-screen and trusting social interactions (Barnes, 1996). However
teacher perceptions and feelings are particular to some and not others (Browne et al., 1997). Emotions and social relationships are important in learning. (Manning, 2007). Fineman (2000) explains social constructivist interpretations of emotion and Barbalet (2006) interprets emotion as always being physical, structural (relating to power) and culture (based on cultural values). Brown and Brooks (2002) explain on the basis of their research that emotion is a complex phenomenon to study. In teaching, emotion is mainly studied in relation to education reform agendas, and until recently very little was known about teacher emotion. (Schutz & Pekrun, 2007), Hargreaves (1998, 2001) studied teacher emotion in relation to education reform in Canada. In the literature Hargreaves conceptualises the construct of ‘emotional geographies’, distance or closeness in social relationships that are personal, cultural, moral, professional, political, physical, and writes that conflict is viewed as a negative emotion in teaching that is avoided. Yin and Lee (2011) write that three emotional geographies are necessary for positive relationships between teachers and trainers, including moral purpose. Meyer and Turner (2007) refer to emotional scaffolding as the way teachers sustain social relationships, while Ingleton (1999) researches shame and pride as powerful emotions to enhance self-esteem if threatened diminish risk-taking by learners. Schuck (et al., 2008) found that trust, openness, friendship and vulnerability allowed a trio of educators to engage in professional discussion based on observation. Brookfield (1995) writes in the area of reflective teacher practice. This includes questioning the structures for social interactions and teachers learning about the feelings of their students in those arrangements.

Adult learning needs to be based on adult learning principles (Gravani, 2012), the purpose of adult learning understood (Rose, 1996), while the relationship between group-process and learning theory explored further, although group learning is known to include the social-emotional as well as task functions, be influenced by facilitation, group size, and development of relationships. (Imel & Tisdell, 1996)

In the last two decades teacher collaboration has been adopted as a pedagogical approach in tertiary education with a substantive research base to support its efficacy. According (Johnson et al, 2007) collaborative (alternately called co-operative) learning needs the following essential elements for success (positive interdependence, individual accountability, ‘promotive interaction’ whereby
members encourage and facilitate each-others efforts, appropriate social skills, and group processing including reflection on interactions and learning). Furthermore the group needs to have ways of establishing and maintaining high levels of trust and ways of resolving conflict. Otherwise self-formed groups of teachers can “fade away” when members become challenged, and the group lacks cohesive leadership, because unrevealed personal motivations for being in the group become a factor in the group disintegrating. (Dooner, et al, 2005)

Research by Timperley, et al, (2007) is a meta-analysis of 97 credible research studies of teacher professional learning based on sound methodology and the advantageous outcomes for students. On the basis of this evidence Timperley (2008) has produced an international document of scholarly repute outlining ten principles for guiding teacher education. These include principles that guide RR teacher learning such as: giving teachers multiple opportunities to learn, and recognising the connection between challenge and trust.

The literature on feedback, including Hattie, (2012, 2009), Hattie & Timperley, (2007) shows that specific detailed goal directed feedback, that’s aim is corrective, and is balanced between positive and negative comments, is more effective than feedback that is person directed, general, vague, non-corrective, feedback that is either too positive or too negative (Thurlings et al, 2012). Hattie & Timperley (2007) write that the most successful feedback is self-regulatory, task and process orientated. Moreover, feedback is more effective in face-to-face social situations rather than in virtual learning situations because people are cued in by socio-emotional cues and facilitators or providers can influence corrective measures to maintain the goal orientated direction of the feedback (Thurlings et al, 2012).

The theoretical premises for RR teacher learning gleaned from this review are based on Vygotskian theory. Given that the structure of RR teacher training sessions has fundamentally remained the same since Clay originally described it (Clay & Watson, 1982), the RR course for teachers developed over thirty years ago is illustrative of professional learning sustainability based on what must be fundamentals necessary for learning. These essential elements are observation and discussion by teachers
involved in the same new learning (peer-teachers) guided by a more experienced teacher (RR Tutor).

Clay offers her own perspective of recognising the importance of the scientific inquiry but focuses on the importance of today’s children and their teachers in their learning. In understanding how teachers assist children Clay (1991b) offers RR (1985) as an example alongside practices such as ‘reciprocal teaching’ (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, cited in Clay 1991b) that illustrate the explanation of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) and new understandings of learning through social interactions coming from Vygotskian theory. Chapter Three, on the theoretical framework for this study, expands on Vygotskian theory as specifically related to learning through social interactions for teachers in RR.
Chapter Three

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework of this study for interpreting Reading Recovery (RR) teacher learning in RR training sessions over one year. The choice of a social constructivist approach based on the work of Vygotsky (1978) as a theoretical framework for this study is appropriate because it allows for understanding the role of social interactions in learning in a particular social and cultural context. At the heart of the theory of Vygotsky (1978) is the idea that social interactions between the teacher and the learner and peer learners play a major part in the way that people learn. According to Vygotsky (1978) co-operative conversations or discussions with more knowledgeable members of society is necessary for capably acquiring the ways of thinking and behaviour that make up the community’s culture. RR teacher learning and training sessions involve adults learning through peer observations of practice (teaching RR lessons behind a glass-screen) and discussions of their teaching guided by the more experienced person, the RR Tutor.

Only the social aspect of Vygotskian theory is referred to in this research, involving social interactions between people and their social relationships. This framework as discussed in the previous chapter has been adopted by researchers of RR (Lyons, 1993a, Moore, 1997, 1998) because co-operative learning through discussion, along with direct observations of teaching, is at the heart of RR teacher training. The key Vygotskian learning concepts reviewed in this chapter are the zone of proximal development, intersubjectivity and internalisation, scaffolding, cognitive apprenticeship and assisted learning.

3.2 A Social Constructivist Approach

Social constructivism may be considered as a postmodern perspective, which maintains that learning is fundamentally social, that individuals learn through
cultural activities and their use of cultural tools (including artefacts, symbol systems and language). In this approach learning occurs through the interdependence between social interactions and the individual. It is through this relationship that the co-construction of knowledge is encouraged (Palincsar, 2005, Wood, 2003, Wood 1988).

The most widely quoted reference to this type of learning is ‘Reciprocal Teaching’, designed and researched by Palincsar and Brown (Palincsar, 2005, John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, Bonk & Kim, 1998). This research provided evidence of the value of social interaction for children’s learning between the teacher and children, and between the children themselves. In the social constructivist perspective, learning occurs through social interactions and the specific structures and processes evident in individual understanding can be traced to the social interactions of the learners (Palincsar, 2005, Vygotsky, 1978). As a construct social constructivism best describes learning that requires problem-solving and reasoning (Palincsar, 2005, Clay & Cazden, 1990). This is the type of learning required in RR teacher training.

Social constructivism is based on Vygotskian theory (1978). In Vygotskian theory how one learns is studied through shared activity and engagement of participants in social interactions (Vygotsky 1986, Vygotsky, 1978, Wertsch, 1985). Learning is explained as occurring when individuals internalise the effects of working together through their ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD). The individual’s ZPD represents development at two levels: the actual level (what an individual can do independently) and the potential level (what an individual can do with assistance). (Wertsch, 1985, Wood, 1988)

Interest in social constructivism in education has been reported as being by to be driven by altered expectations for children’s learning (Palincsar, 2005, John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Children are encouraged to be active in their learning, to be able to explain their ideas to their peers, to discuss differences of opinion, and assist each other in problem-solving, while teachers facilitate this style of learning (Palincsar, 2005, John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The joint construction of meaning through shared understandings is most suited to understandings developed in RR teacher learning when guided by the RR Tutor.
In social constructivism social interactions that involve discussion are thought to improve higher-order thinking (Daniels et al, 2007, Palincsar, 2005, Wertsch, 1991). This is particularly pertinent to this study, as well as the importance of considering all of the voices of the teachers and not being dismissive (Timperley, 2008, Palincsar, 2005) or problematizing issues to avoid conflict (Palincsar, 2005, Anderson, 1997).

In the social constructivist view language is the main medium for learning, “the process of speaking itself often serves as a vehicle through which new thoughts emerge” (Smagorinsky 2007, p. 65). Studies of discourse are supportive of the benefits of instructional conversations depending on the type of talk produced. For example, if the talk is interpretative (based on analysis or finding explanations) it is more significant for learning gains than if it is descriptive (Palincsar, 2005). The shared activity of the group is equally significant. It is important that the structure of the group activity involves shared responsibility, with a distribution of expertise, and an attitude of building on preceding ideas. “Furthermore teachers play an important role in mediating classroom discourse by seeding the conversations with new ideas or alternatives to be considered that push the students’ thinking and discussion and prepare them for conversation” (Palinscar, 2005, p303) In RR Clay emphasises the importance of language in teacher-child interactions (Clay, 2005b, Johnson, 2004).

Clay (1990) uses the neo-social constructivist paradigm of scaffolding for the analysis of social interactions in the RR lesson through the neo-Vygotskian application of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). Clay explains that scaffolded teacher support continues while the child is receiving RR instruction and that this needs to be “at the cutting edge of his competencies in his continually changing zone of proximal development” (Clay, 1990, p219). In this research Clay outlines the pedagogical premises for RR child learning in terms of social interactions. The experienced RR teacher’s interactions with the child are based on her knowledge of what the child can do alone and with her support. The lessons themselves address a variety of literacy activities that mainly involve reading and writing. There is an emphasis on the making of meaning (sense) and the child’s detection of a lack of sense. Independence is encouraged from the beginning of each
child’s lesson series, and the task difficulty is continually increased by the teacher (Clay & Cazden, 1990).

Clay refers to RR teaching as being in alignment with Vygotsky’s well-known words, “the only good kind of instruction is that which marches ahead of development and leads it; it must be aimed not so much at the ripe but the ripening function” (Vygotsky, 1962, Clay & Cazden, 1990). In this way Clay writes, “With RR, instruction supports emergent development rather than waiting for it.” (Clay & Cazden, 1990, p220). Similarly RR writers (Lyons, 1994, Pinnell, 1994, Moore, 1998), including Clay (Clay & Watson, 1982), write about the social structures for teacher learning based on social interactions through discussion or conversation, as outlined in Chapter Two.

This research attempts to extend Vygotsky’s explanation of learning that primarily applies to children, to the context of adult RR teacher learning. Bonk and Kim, (1998) relate social-constructivist theory to adult learning. These writers maintain that the most recently evolved social constructivist theory in terms of adult learning is the “community of learners” construct (Bonk & Kim, 1998) through models that include guided learning, such as ‘reciprocal teaching’ of reading comprehension and cognitive apprenticeships (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, Palincsar et al, 1988, Rogoff, 1990). In their view understanding adult learning involves understanding the social contexts in which it occurs including recognition that historically the contexts change. Therefore it may be questioned whether RR teacher training, explained by research in the 1980’s (See: Chapter Two) in start-up contexts, is similar or substantially different to the RR teacher learning today in a changing educational context. It may also be questioned whether more current and developed explanations in a social constructivist paradigm are useful for understanding this particularly form of adult professional learning.

Theorists that focus on the social aspect of learning (Rogoff, 1990; Wells, 2002, Wells 2007) explain that pedagogical practices in learning communities emphasise dialogue, teacher co-learning, peer collaboration, questioning, students bringing knowledge to class, and joint knowledge construction. The theoretical premise is that “internal construction of reality is the result of interaction with adults, tools, and
more capable peers in the social plane, a movement from the social world to the individual, instead of the reverse” (Vygotsky, 1978, p69). This approach to understanding adult learning is most appropriate for answering the research questions of this study on RR teacher learning, which is to explore the social characteristics of the participants.

The social constructivist framework assisted this study of social interactions in RR teacher training. This perspective allows the researcher to understand how teachers make meaning (involving their capability to create teacher-designed individual early literacy interventions for children) through interpreting the teachers’ learning experiences. Interpretation of social constructivist theory for this study is therefore the interdependence of individual and social processes in what Palinscar (2005) refers to as the ‘co-construction of knowledge’.

3.3 The Zone of Proximal Development

Vygotsky (1978) defined the ZPD as “the distance between actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the [higher] level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p86, Wertsch, 1985). This construct is the connection between interpersonal and intrapersonal functioning. Shifts in the ZPD occur through social interactions. Involving active agents in the zone of proximal development is a contemporary feature of collaborative classrooms and the reading comprehension strategy of “reciprocal teaching” (Palinscar & Brown, 1986). Palinscar and Brown expanded Vygotsky’s concept of the ZPD to include artefacts (books and so on) as well as people thereby “…integrat[ing] Vygotsky’s analyses of tools and symbols with the roles played by the participants in the learning process” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p199). This applies to RR teacher training that includes observation, discussion and reference to RR texts.

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) distinguish the “proximal zone” from the “developmental level” by comparing assisted and unassisted performance.
Vygotsky’s (1978) conceptualisation of the ZPD inspired their book title “Rousing Minds to Life” describing good teaching as that which “…awakens and rouses to life those functions which are in a stage of maturing, which lie in the zone of proximal development” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p20). These functions are termed the ‘bud’ or ‘flowers’ of development rather than the fruits of development (Vygotsky, 1978). In learning from a social constructivist approach interest lies in discovering how the child can become “what he not yet is” (Wertsch, 1985). Therefore this study follows a group of teachers from the beginning of their RR teacher training to understand their learning and their perspective of it in their ZPDs. The social constructivist approach lies in discovering how in-service teachers become RR teachers.

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) explain that there are four stages of the ZPD. In the first stage is learning assisted by more capable others, whereby assistance is lessened as the learner becomes more adept and similarly changes in quality, from saying more to saying less. The teacher, according to these researchers, needs a profound knowledge of the subject matter to achieve intersubjectivity (shared understandings) with the learner at this stage. This stage of assisted learning is complete when the learner can independently complete the task. The next stage of learning, is when the learner manages the task and the phenomena of self-instruction through speech for self-guidance that “remains true throughout lifelong learning” Tharp and Gallimore (1988, p38). The third stage is when that which has occurred on the external social plane becomes internal, or automatic, and is described as “fossilised” or “fixed”. This is explained as being beyond social control (of others) and involving self-control (regulation) when further teaching is not required. The final stage refers to learning being a mixture of the ZPD sequences (other-regulation, self-regulation and automatic processes). Learners can be independent but at times they may still need to ask for help when stuck and learners can revert to controlling vocalisations (regulation). De-automatisation and recursions can occur regularly in learning, due to slight environmental changes, stress, or upheavals. When this occurs the first recursion is to self-regulatory speech and the next is to “remembering the voice of the teacher” (Tharp & Gallimore 1988, p39). Tharp and Gallimore (1988) distinguish between “assistance” and “interference” in the ZPD. Assistance offered at too high a stage of movement through the ZPD is disruptive to individual learning. Therefore
assistance should only be offered where and when it is required. Tharp and Gallimore advise that skilled assistance requires teacher professional development.

Communication is an essential feature of assisted learning in the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1986, Wertsch, 1985, Wood, 1988, Mercer, 2008). While language is the main and essential component of communication, the Vygotskian framework for communication also includes gesture, signs, expression and tone. Language itself is social and communicative, learned in interactions with others. It transforms the way children think and learn.

“For Vygotsky, then, not only do physical actions that serve to manipulate and organise the world get internalised to become (non-verbal) thinking: the physical activity of speaking, which serves to regulate the actions of others, also becomes internalised to create verbal thinking” (Wood, 1988, p27).

Mercer (2008) explains that research in “collaborative reasoning”, like the “reciprocal teaching method” (Palincsar & Brown, 1984) shows that talk influences reasoning. In “collaborative reasoning” (a method of teaching) teachers aim to make sure that students are active and make extended contributions when they discuss texts. Mercer claims that this method is successful because: “reasoning is fundamentally dialogical and best nurtured in dialogical settings such as group discussion” (Mercer 2008, p92). The students express positions, suggest new ideas and challenge each other’s arguments resulting in high quality reasoning. The teachers who achieve better outcomes use “why” questions to encourage reasoning and reflection. They teach methods for solving problems and making sense of experience. They model strategies and explain the purpose and meaning of class activities. Teachers who consider learning to be a social communicative process, arrange for conversations between learners, while encouraging them to be active and vocal in their learning. (Mercer, 2008).

Recent academic discussions have involved a suggested extension of the ZPD to include emotional scaffolding. Levykh (2008) does not concur with this view because of the multi-relational complexity of the ZPD that “encompasses all the intellectual and affective features of human beings within a social-cultural-historical
context” (Levykh, 2008, p98). Levykh writes that there is no need to make changes to what Vygotsky already included (Van Der Veer & Valsiner, 1991, Daniels, Cole & Wertsch, 2007). Therefore, the collaborative and co-operative activity in the ZPD where “assisted performance” occurs involves the cognitive and the affective domains, through social interaction, in encouraging and safe social environments (Levykh, 2008).

The ZPD is a central concept in a social constructivist approach to conceptualising learning and pertinent to this study because the learning environment for RR teacher training involves social interaction (discussion) and joint-observation of teaching practices, starting from their own experiences of classroom teaching, which may be varied. The RR teacher group members therefore have different ZPDs.

3.4 Intersubjectivity and Internalisation

To understand the “zone of proximal development” necessitates the understanding of “intersubjectivity”. In the social plane communication transcends the private world of the participants and sets up states of intersubjectivity. The Vygotskian (1978) perspective of intersubjectivity is that the first stage of awareness in new learning typically involves “social interaction and negotiation between experts and novices or among novices … and it is by means of participating in this social interaction that interpretations are first proposed and worked out and, therefore, become available to be taken on by individuals” (Wertsch, 2007, p187) Furthermore, initial shared understanding can be at many levels of interpretation. Wertsch’s research of American mothers interacting with pre-school children identified four levels in the transition of the interpersonal to the intrapersonal (Wertsch, 1985)

In socialisation and learning learners are often involved in saying and doing things they only partially understand, and in this way individuals can function at a level that is ahead of their mastery. According to Wertsch (2007) “…it is desirable for students to say and do things that seem to extend beyond their understanding… because such a possibility means they can enter into a basic form of intersubjectivity with more
experienced teachers and experts and thereby leverage their way up through increasing levels of expertise… [and]…what might at first appear to be a failure to communicate is often the key to a new area of instruction” (Wertsch, 2007, p188). In this way trainee RR teachers enter into intersubjective relationships with RR Tutors and each other.

The intersubjectivity of the “RR group” as opposed to the individual refers to a joint point of reference. Gallagher (2009) argues that the meaning of the world emerges through our interactions with others, which he calls “participatory sense making”. Gallagher explains that Jean-Paul Sartre offers the most dramatic description of the significance of others for the make-up of “world meaning”. Sartre’s example is of the difference between being alone in the world (sitting on a park bench) enjoying the ambiance of the environment, and the change when someone else enters the park. This is described as a decentralisation of the world (Gallagher, 2009). Sartre’s intuition according to Gallagher confirms recent science which demonstrates “… that our attention to objects changes when others are present - even if it is not explicitly guided by others. The way that others look at objects, for example, or the way that we encounter objects in joint attention, influences the perception of objects in regard to motor action, significance and emotional salience” (Gallagher, 2009, p302).

Shared attention is “action priming” through mirror neurons because when we see someone reach for something our own motor system is activated, and “object evaluation” whereby our perceptions of objects are shaped by intersubjective saliency (the behaviour and emotional attitude of others). The evidence from developmental studies of joint attention shows that we gain access to a meaningful world through our interactions with others. The other person’s gaze guides our attention, so we learn to see things as significant in practices of shared attention.

Intersubjectivity is an essential step in the process of internalisation as the adult gradually removes the assistance and transfers responsibility to the learner’s independent self-regulated activity, or internalised independent ways of thinking. Self-regulation refers to ways of monitoring oneself, and thinking of alternative ways
of problem-solving. One of the Vygotskian theoretical arguments is that self-regulation is learnt and developed through social and instructional interactions (Wood, 1988, Ozdemir, 2011).

Intersubjectivity and internalisation are key concepts to understanding RR teacher learning in the each respective teacher’s ZPD (Daniels, 2007, Wertsch, 1985). To have intersubjectivity in a group, this is based on the premise of the “joint point of reference” (Verenikina, 2012). Internalisation is the process by which what occurs between people becomes internal and “According to this view, an examination of the precursors to intramental functioning (that is intermental functioning) is the key to understanding mental functioning in the individual” (Wertsch, 1991, p26).

3.5 Scaffolding

Scaffolding was originally used as an instructional metaphor in an a-theoretical manner (Daniels, 2007) coined by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976). Wood et al describe scaffolding as a form of adult assistance “…that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal that would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (Wood et al, 1976, p90). The adult assisting the learning of preschool children (as they constructed a block pyramid) made scaffolding moves that were: recruitment (eliciting the learner’s interest and adherence to the task requirements); reduction of degrees of freedom (reducing the number of constituent acts needed to reach a solution); direction maintenance (keeping the learner in pursuit of an objective); marking critical features (accentuating what is relevant); frustration control (reduction of any stress involved without creating dependency) and demonstration (modelling solutions to the task) (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). The authors stressed however that there was more involved than completing the task. “Successful scaffolding was assumed to result in a better understanding on the part of the child of what was involved in successful completing of the task” (Stone, 1998, p345).

In an important review of the literature on scaffolding, Stone (1998) suggested that Cazden (1979) was the first writer to make explicit reference to Vygotsky’s work in
connection with the term. Stone (1998) furthermore suggested that Bruner, who wrote the introduction to Vygotsky’s “Thought and Language” (1962) translation was undoubtedly influenced by Vygotsky’s notion of the ZPD when writing about the metaphor. However, “In her paper Cazden extended the metaphor from its original use in the context of dyadic adult-child interactions to an analysis of teacher-student interactions in classroom settings” (Stone, 1998, p345). Cazden (1979) argued that adults scaffold children’s learning in a range of contexts and Vygotsky’s notion of the ZPD can provide an analytic link to understanding the dynamics of those social interactions. Cazden used as the Vygotskian theoretical framework jointly with Clay to describe RR teaching (Clay & Cazden, 1990) and used RR examples extensively in her writing (Cazden, 2001).

The most well-known application of the metaphor is to adult-student interactions in “reciprocal teaching” (Daniels, 2007, Stone, 1998, Bassok, 1989, Wood, 1988,) in an approach to teaching reading comprehension reading devised by Palincsar and Brown (Palincsar, 1986, 1984). In the initial stages of the interactions the teacher takes responsibility for highly structured scaffolding, and gradually the students take responsibility for the using the strategy to aid their reading comprehension processes.

Criticism of the scaffolding metaphor is that it focused on the micro-level of adult child interactions paying little attention to the social and cultural factors involved in quality social interactions (Stone, 1998). Alternatives to scaffolding are “assisted performance” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). These writers outline a range of assistance adults can offer (modelling, contingency management, feeding back, instructing, questioning and so on), and “cognitive apprenticeship” (Rogoff, 1990) where she suggested there were complimentary processes involved in an apprenticeship of adult guidance and child participatory appropriation. Nowadays scaffolding is thought to include many actions on the part of the tutor, including: hinting, elaborating, leading, linking, requesting, reworking, suggesting, commenting, prompting, probing, simplifying and providing emotional support (Bonk & Kim, 1998, Verenikina, 2012).

The connection between scaffolding and Vygotskian theory is attached to three defining characteristics: scaffolding is a social process, scaffolding is mediated
primarily by language, scaffolding as external support is eventually withdrawn from the learning process because the ‘mental tools’ are appropriated and internalised by the learner. Scaffolding also allows the task being learned to retain its complexity, while simplifying the learner’s efforts through the support of the more knowledgeable and capable peer or teacher. (Turner & Berkowitz, 2005). Dilutions of the neo-Vygotskian conceptual context of scaffolding based on social interactions are criticised by Puntambekar & Hubscher, (2005) and Palincsar, (1998). These can strip scaffolding of its original meaning in a social-constructivist paradigm of tutorial support from the more able partner in the learner’s ZPD.

Scaffolding has been extended conceptually to refer to group scaffolding. Glaser and Bassok (1989) describe this influence between the peer-learners in ‘reciprocal teaching’ (Palinscar, 1984). The alternate views of peer-learners are revealed to each other in the discussion and this, together with the scaffolding by the teacher, assists the peer-learners to maintain the understanding of the task. It is by group sharing with each other that what is complex becomes more manageable. Through discussion each learner contributes what he or she can, and gains from the contributions of the other learners, as well as the teacher. Thus, the combination of group discussion and scaffolded instruction “creates a zone of proximal development where learners perform within their range of competence while being assisted in realising their potential levels of higher performance” (Glaser & Bassok, 1989, p19).

Scaffolding has been criticised because it focuses on the role of the tutor (teacher) and neglects the role of the tutee (learner). Wood (2003) acknowledges that the learner plays a crucial role in child learning. He wrote: ‘it takes two to tutor’, and explains how individual differences between learners influence the tutoring process (Wood, 2003). In on-line computer learning and help seeking (Wood 2003) children who have less prior knowledge and who struggle with tasks are less skilful help seekers. Wood maintains that a feeling of ‘not knowing’ and acting on what is unknown is a constraint on the ZPD, and that the child learners become significant players in the learning process when they can judge the results of their own efforts. The children’s variability included: a readiness to seek help, or an over reliance on help.
Lyons’ (1993b) research on the training of a RR teacher’s skill development through analysed language transcripts investigates how the teacher’s ability in RR language usage, to prompt the learner in the RR lesson tasks and/or ask questions to enable a student to learn how to construct strategic reading behaviours, developed over the time of the course. Lyons concludes that this development occurs on the basis of the teacher’s reflections on the effect her teaching decisions have on child behaviour, similar to Wood’s children judging the results of their efforts. Major changes for teachers occur when the child does not behave in an expected way. Therefore the teacher’s learning is responsive in a social interaction.

Wood (2003) writes that scaffolding learning is influenced by the contingency (relationship) of the help offered with the learner’s actions, as explained by Lyons (1993b). Wood reports, “One outcome of our research is the finding that the chances that learners will be able to go on to do a whole range of tasks that they couldn’t do before they were tutored depends on the contingency of their tutoring experience” (Wood, 2003, p7). Wood (2003) observes that in scaffolding the child’s performance the tutor requires: knowledge of the task; how to relate knowledge to performance (being able to interpret and react to the learner’s ways of learning and difficulties); perspective taking (ability to put themselves in the perspective of another); self-inhibition from doing, to guiding to fading (allowing the learner the space to complete the task); communicative competence (refers to not saying too much in the interaction); and timing (when to intervene or not intervene).

Contingent tutoring in Wood’s (2003) model has levels of support ranging from the most support (demonstration) to least support (general verbal intervention) across three dimensions. These are: instructional contingency (how to support activity), domain contingency (what to focus on next), and temporal contingency (if and when to intervene).

Wood writes that in contingent tutoring the tutor cannot have a fixed agenda. “You’ve got to know where you’re going, but it’s really a process we call leading by following. You’ve got to know where you’re going but always maintain an element of flexibility” (Wood, 2003, p15). Wood maintains that growth in the tutor’s
capabilities comes through reflection and building up a store of localised contextualised knowledge, which involves practical experience over an extensive period of time. Wood upholds that it is his conviction that it is misguided to interpret the learner in a passive role because contingent tutoring depends on the learner’s shared interaction with the tutor, and the tutor’s role is regulated by the progress and activity of the learner.

Another characteristic of scaffolding is ‘emotional scaffolding’ which is new in the literature (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002, Rosiek, 2003, Meyer & Turner, 2007). Mahn and John-Steiner (2002) refer to the emotional support between collaborators (co-learners or partners) as ‘the gift of confidence’. The term is borrowed by these authors from the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. When interviewed by de Beauvoir, Sartre said of her collaboration, “You did me a great service. You gave me a confidence in myself that I should not have had alone” (Mahn 2002, p52). John-Steiner writes that the “profound importance of the gift of confidence” is apparent in many long-term collaborative partnerships. Mahn and John-Steiner (2002) discuss the concept of the ‘gift of confidence’ in relation to university students (English as Second Language (ESL) learners) involved in journaling dialogues with their tutors over one year. The human connection and caring support of the teachers were factors that facilitated risk-taking in student learning.

Western perspectives of Vygotskian theory give little attention to the relationship between emotion and thought, or the affective and cognitive domains. At the time of his death Vygotsky was writing manuscripts about the dialectical relationship between thought, affect and language (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky wrote:

“[Thought] is not born of other thoughts. Thought has its origins in the motivating sphere of consciousness, a sphere that includes our inclinations and needs, our interests and impulses, and our affect and emotions. The affective and volitional tendency stands behind thought. Only here do we find the answer to the final “why” in the analysis of thinking” (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002, p.47).

The social interdependence of human connection and caring support that fosters competence and risk taking within the Vygotskian concept of the ZPD deepens our
understanding of Vygotsky. A break occurs between cognitive and affective learning when negative influences like anxiety and fear are present and this influences ‘appropriation of learning’ in the ZPD. Therefore, “careful listening, intense dialogue and emotional support sustain the co-operative construction of understanding” (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002, p51). Levykh (2008) argues that affect and intellect are inseparable mental functions and therefore the ZPD encompasses both features. Levykh writes that Vygotsky maintained that teaching is a caring process. It is through the development of the child’s (learner’s) trust in safe and positive collaboration with teachers that children (learner’s) have more complete ZPDs that motivate further intellectual and emotional development.

Rosiek (2003) called scaffolding that initiated student emotional responsiveness to an idea: “emotional scaffolding”. The teachers used analogies, metaphors and narratives to influence students’ emotional responses to aspects of subject matter. Earlier, the well-known education writer Holt (1964) first referred to how emotion inhibits learning when it involves the emotions of shame and fear of failure. Holt concluded that teachers needed to help students to reduce their anxieties for improved learning outcomes.

Meyer and Turner (2007) define “emotional scaffolding” as “temporary but reliable teacher-initiated interactions that support students’ positive emotional experiences to achieve a variety of classroom goals” (Meyer & Turner, p244) and explain “emotional scaffolding” within the child’s ZPD as a feature of intersubjectivity that supports learning. This involves scaffolding positive “affective” classroom climates, where emotions are not motivational “afterthoughts” or “add-ons”, but are major influences on personal agency or self-belief patterns, which are referred to by Johnson, (2004) when he discusses how the words used by others can have an impact on learning. Johnson argues for teacher language usage (inclusive of language advised in RR teaching) to be that which fosters positive self-regulation in child learning.

In relation to RR teacher training “scaffolding” is most highly influential in the RR Tutor role. It has two areas of influence: the cognitive and the affective. Furthermore,
research shows that an affective climate is the best predictor of student motivation, and therefore the responsibility of the RR Tutor (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p253).

3.6 Cognitive Apprenticeship, Assisted Learning, Learning Communities and Workplace Apprenticeship

The relationship that allows the learner to benefit from the intersubjectivity shown when people engage in activities for which they have common goals and through which they hope to share meaning and solve problems aided by the scaffolded support, is called a “cognitive apprenticeship”. Rogoff (1990) used the term to apply to child learning. She wrote, “Children’s cognitive development is an apprenticeship – it occurs through guided participation in social activities” (Rogoff, 1990, pxii). Rogoff argues that child learning occurs through “appropriation” of shared thinking for the child’s own use, and through adults transferring to children the responsibility of managing problem-solving by themselves.

The metaphor of apprenticeship, according to Rogoff (1990), stresses the child’s active role in learning the lessons of their culture, and it explains learning in the ZPD with more experienced partners. Rogoff explains that the interaction with peers of equal status is less effective than interaction with adults (the more competent other) because adults are more skilled in the tasks and in remembering the tasks, which assist the child learner. The process of “appropriation” in shared activity as opposed to internalisation of the social interaction is described by Rogoff as being like the use of “air and water”. Air and water are both inside and outside the individual, constantly exchanged without attention, and because humans are social creatures they expand and grow through increasingly complex exchanges and learning.

Children can choose to attend or ignore aspects of the social interaction and transform what is available that fits their use. “Just as the meaning of conversation depends on both the information offered by the speaker and the interpretation by the listener, processes of guided participation depend on the structure provided by the social activity and on its appropriation by the individual” (Rogoff, 1990, p197).
Bonk and Kim (1998) alternatively refer to cognitive apprenticeship as “a socially interactive learning relationship similar to the master-apprenticeship relationship in skilled trades … but in this case, the tutor works closely with the learner to develop his or her cognitive skills through the use of authentic learning experiences” (Bonk & Kim, 1998, p71). They define “assisted learning” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) as a form of “cognitive apprenticeship”. Tharp and Gallimore, and Rogoff, as writers represent two disciplines: educational psychology and developmental psychology. (Stone, 1998)

Bonk and Kim (1998) extend Vygotskian theory to understand adult learning because “Adults are learners in a society of learners, who each contribute to and take from the learning process, who assist and scaffold each other’s learning ventures, and who likely have acquired significant intersubjectivity and shared meaning with their co-workers, family and peers. With adult thinking dependent on learning activities in the sociocultural milieu, it is imperative that we begin to understand the various contexts of adult learning.” (Bonk & Kim, 1998, p83).

Understanding the contexts of adult learning today involves a re-conceptualisation of “apprenticeship” as a “community of practice” as described by Wenger (2006). Communities of practice theory offers a social theory of learning, which assumes that we learn and become who we are with other human beings, and artefacts such as books and computer programs (Lave & Wenger, 1991). People belonging to a community of practice are a group who share an overall view of the field in which they practice and have a sense of belonging and mutual commitment to this (Wenger, et al., 2002).

Successful communities of practice is based on “mutual engagement” (the members respond to each other’s actions and engage with one another); “joint enterprise” (members understand, contribute to and take responsibility for the development of the community of practice); and “shared repertoire” (the ability to make the resources available to the community of practice used and engaged with) (Wenger 1998, Laksov, Mann & Dahlgren, 2008).
In terms of workplace apprenticeships Fuller and Unwin (1998) write that the essential ingredients of effective learning for the workplace are “…ensuring individuals have access to theoretical and experiential knowledge; the opportunity to engage in authentic tasks and interactions with others; the chance to develop their critical and intellectual capacities through the application of concepts and theories in practice; the opportunity to have their thinking and understanding enhanced through the guidance and teaching of others.” (Fuller & Unwin, 1998, p161). These elements of learning are essential for generating educative environments that achieve expansive rather than adaptive learning. In terms of “apprenticeship” expansive learning involves interpretation, criticism and the creation of forms of practice, whereas adaptive learning involves conditioning and imitation, where the learner focuses on copying readily available correct behaviours. If apprentices are to be able to move from a state of relative dependency to relative autonomy, Fuller and Unwin (1998) write that it is necessary for them to be able to “…become accomplished in the activities, conceptual, practical, social and relational, which constitute full participation in communities of practice.” (Fuller & Unwin, 1998, p162).

Guile and Young (1998) explore the concept of apprenticeship in a socio-cultural theory of learning with reference to Lave and Wenger (1991). Guile and Young (1998) take the view that it is useful to assume that there are common processes underlying both learning in school and work-based learning, and that Vygotsky’s ZPD is a useful concept for exploring this. Guile and Young (1998) argue that recent studies on apprenticeship training that refer to the ZPD still refer to the notion of apprentices learning from experts, whereas the changing demands of the workplace call for more generic problem solving abilities, greater levels of collaboration, and more devolved responsibility. These changes, they reason, emphasise a “… need for an approach to learning that links the way employee identities are formed to the increasingly collective character of work and supports a greater emphasis on self-reliance so that learners are able to cope with the changes in work that are taking place.” (Guile & Young, 1998, p180).

These are four different perspectives of apprenticeship: cognitive apprenticeship, assisted learning, learning communities and workplace apprenticeship based on learning through social interaction. The social contexts may be the mother and the
child (whereby learning occurs through appropriation), the cognitive structuring and scaffolding in the classroom involving teachers and students, the adult learning community and workplace training apprenticeships. The aim of each perspective is self-regulated adaptive learners and RR teacher training is aligned to each approach: appropriation through constant dialogue and social interaction, scaffolding by the RR Tutor, drawing on the resources of a community of practice, and preparing teachers for change in the workplace.

3.7 Summary of the Theoretical Framework

A social constructivist approach based on the work of Vygotsky (1978) is relevant to study RR teacher training. It is the most useful model of understanding adult learning in this context, with adults learning through peer observations of practice (teaching RR lessons behind a glass-screen) and discussions of their teaching guided by the more experienced person, the RR Tutor. The social constructivist framework provides a basis for demonstrating that learning occurs through social interactions in a co-construction of knowledge. While learning through social interactions is mainly related to child learning, this study is an attempt to relate social constructivist theory to adult learning. The RR peer teachers (as novices) together with the more expert other (the RR Tutor) engage in observing RR teaching and discussion throughout the course. Over a year the teachers’ differing levels of understandings and competency in their ZPDs are leveraged to higher levels of intersubjectivity and expertise (Daniels et al, 2007, p190). This occurs through joint participation between the teachers and is responsive to the scaffolding by the RR Tutor, who is the more experienced person in this social relationship.

In summary, the key constructs in the social constructivist framework are explained in this chapter. These include the ZPD, an area of learning development that encompasses independent and potential capability achieved through social interaction. This is explained by Tharp and Gallimore (1988) as stages in a process from assisted performance to unassisted performance, involving other regulation, self-regulation and automaticity, with options for recursions (seeking assistance
again) when the environment changes. The relevance to this research is in how RR teachers gain independence in RR session and in their work that occurs in schools through the social structures provided in the RR teacher training course. Communication, mainly through language, is an essential feature in assisted learning in the ZPD. Research shows that students, who express positions, suggest new ideas, and challenge arguments develop higher quality reasoning if the discourse is interpretive and not descriptive, problematizes conflicting ideas rather than ignoring them (Palincsar, 2005, Mercer, 2008). RR teacher learning involves the teacher’s ability to engage in higher order thinking in order to problem-solve as a group the different learning needs of individual children to plan where next in the RR lessons they design and teach. Language has been addressed as essential for RR teacher learning in the RR teacher training literature. However, emotion is also integral to understanding the ZPD, which involves the intellectual and the affective domains in Vygotskian theory, yet this has not received attention. Intersubjectivity and internalisation in the social constructivist framework refers to the social activity of how a group of people share meaning, which is highly relevant to this study. Internalisation refers to how social interaction extends and creates ZPDs. In Vygotskian theory the individual appropriates socially constructed skills and capabilities for independent use, so understanding the social characteristics of participants in RR teacher training from different perspectives (the RR Tutor’s and the RR teachers’) is relevant in this research.

Scaffolding is a key concept that refers to the assistance offered by the more capable partner in the relationship to enable the learner to complete a task with assistance that they could not do alone. The link between a construct developed by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) in relation to adult assisted learning of young children and Vygotskian theory is that scaffolding is a social process, primarily mediated by language and the external support is gradually withdrawn as the learner becomes more competent. Wood claims that while the construct of scaffolding refers mainly to tutoring, the learner is influential in their learning because of their willingness to seek and act on assistance. Wood also claims that research shows that the possibility of learners to be able to continue to do a range of tasks alone depends on the contingency of the tutoring or relationship between the help offered and the learner’s actions. Contingent tutoring involves a range of levels of support, dimensions (how
to support, where next and if and when to intervene) and characteristics (knowledge of the task, relating knowledge to performance, perspective taking, self-inhibition, communicative competence and timing). Scaffolding also involves an emotional dimension to support risk taking when learning new things. The Vygotskian perspective maintains teaching is a caring process, where development occurs through trust in safe and positive collaborations, although struggle (effort) in learning (which has emotional attachments such as volition) is considered to be essential for development.

Cognitive apprenticeship, as a conceptual understanding, involves the child in learning through guided social participation whereby learning is appropriated. “Appropriation” is the adoption of learning (cultural practices) without a conscious attention when it fits the learner’s social use because the learner is engaged with others. Appropriation can be viewed as a very natural process of learning. Rogoff (1990) uses the analogy of “air and water” - how it surrounds you, is inside you, and is taken on-board (appropriated) in a seamless way.

The notion of apprenticeship in adult learning, like RR teacher training, is undergoing a transformation, although master-apprenticeship conceptualisations are still used. The novice (apprentice) in the social relationship adopts greater knowledge and skill because the more expert partner (master) structures the learning experiences to be responsive to the learner’s needs and gradually transfers learning responsibility for the task (skill, trade). Cognitive apprenticeship in adult learning is reported as involving different forms of assisted learning. The forms of assistance include: modelling, feedback, contingency management, instructing, questioning, cognitive structuring and task structuring. (Bonk & Kim, 1998)

The social constructivist theoretical framework through the constructs of the ZPD, scaffolding and cognitive apprenticeship guides the interpretation of data in this study. This includes what occurred in the RR tutoring sessions and interviews of the teachers at the end of the course about what ‘learning in a group’ meant to them in terms of their how they learned and their feelings about learning in this context. The aim of the study is to ascertain what happens in terms of social interactions in the sessions between the RR, Tutor and the teachers and the teachers with each other. It
includes the RR Tutor’s and the teachers’ perspectives of this considerable period of joint participation (one year) into learning how to become RR teachers through joint observations of their own teaching behaviours, and the behaviours of the children they work with, and their discussions about this grounded in Clay’s (2001) literacy processing theory, guided by valued activities and practices that support this theory. (Clay, 2005a, 2005b)
The aim of this research was to explore how Reading Recovery (RR) teachers in training learn to become RR teachers by examining their social interactions with other teacher peers in their training group and with their RR Tutor, the more expert other in the relationship. The training of RR teachers is premised on this dynamic. This chapter describes the main approach to the study, the participants, the setting, the methods of the data collection and data analysis.

### 4.1 Research Questions

The main research focus of the study was on the role of social interactions in this sample of adult learning in Reading Recovery (RR) teaching with research questions as follows.

**Question One:**

“What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session?”

This question has two sub-questions:

1a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions?

1b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

**Question Two:**

What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions?

The two sub-questions were:
2a) What are the teachers’ perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions?

2b) What are the teachers’ perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?

Questions to lead the teachers’ written reflections (an immediate five minute response to the learning that had taken place in the RR session or content knowledge) for Sessions Two to Seventeen were:

a) “What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?”

b) “How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about one particular child?”

(Appendix: D)

4.2 Approach to the Study

This is a qualitative study. The method was selected to provide access to the essence of RR teacher training which is based on teacher observations and discussions of their own teaching over a long period of time (one year). Qualitative research is most suited to research pertaining to people’s lives, stories, behaviour and ‘interactional relationships’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p17). From this perspective, reality is regarded as socially constructed and answers are sought “to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a, p13). This approach focuses on the process of learning not the performance outcomes of learning and is in keeping with the theoretical framework of this research: social constructivism.

The approach to the study is grounded in a Vygotskian theoretical framework where learning is based on the ways we talk and interact with one another becoming the way we think. Three principles form the basis of the Vygotskian approach to research (Vygotsky, 1978, p62): the task of research is to analyse process by turning
it back to its initial stages; that explanation rather than description can reveal the causal dynamics that underlie phenomena; and that fossilized processes tell nothing about their original appearance or internal nature, as they have been over practised or performed. These principles guide this qualitative study.

The Vygotskian method is developmental and dialectic, “behaviour can be understood only as the history of behaviour” (Vygotsky, 1978, p8). This quote refers to interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of Vygotskian theory whereby learning occurs through social interactions with others, and moves through the zones of proximal development as it is appropriated. The dialectic method is a study of the process of change from the beginning of learning. The data for this study of social interaction and change was collected to answer the research questions from three perspectives: what occurred during the training sessions; what did the teachers’ think about how they learned in the sessions; and what was the RR Tutor’s view of what was planned and how the teachers learned. Information related to these perspectives was collected from: a) video-taped and audio taped data from sessions early, middle and late in the RR training course, and b) teacher interview at the end of the RR training course.

4.3 Ethics Procedures

The University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee granted ethical approval for the commencement of this inquiry and data collection in 2006. Before commencement of the research, information was given and consent obtained from the workplace and the participants under the University of Wollongong, Faculty of Education letterhead. (Appendices: R1, R2, R3). The verbal proviso from my workplace human relations department was that the research could not interfere with my work as a RR Tutor in their employ. To this end, data collection was part of the normal social interactions during my work (conducting sessions with a group of trainee RR teachers and school visiting to observe, discuss and guide RR teaching with individuals). Further it did not involve outside support for videoing or audio taping data, or a participant observation technique involving discussion of the data with the participants. At the end of the year of data collection the transcriptions of all
taped interviews were emailed to the participants. All participants were aware that their participation was voluntary, the data collected was confidential, and they were free to withdraw from the study without penalty or prejudice.

All participants in this study have been assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity and personal information that may identify any person has been excluded. Video and audio taped data and transcriptions have only been viewed, heard or read by the researcher and university supervisors. This material has been securely stored under the protocols of the Ethics Committee and the Faculty of Education. The nature of the research questions preclude any interest in the participants as individuals but rather the nature of their social interactions as an exemplar of RR teacher training that could be generalised to any group of individuals in any location. Sub-question 2b, “What are the teachers' perspectives on the role of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?” is inferred from the data rather than posed as a direct question to the participants as an ethical protocol.

4.4 Settings and Procedures

The Diocese of Wollongong, New South Wales, a small but geographically spread education system, trained the participants in this study in RR. This was a favourable setting for the research because RR had been successfully implemented for twelve years as evidenced by presentation of data (2005) at the fifth International RR Institute (NZ) and the Institute of Education Research (University of NSW). The educational community were conversant with RR practices in schools and supportive of the intervention. Furthermore, over this period of time (1994-2006) a large number of teachers were trained in small groups (ten to fourteen teachers) annually for short periods of work in RR (three years) before returning to their classroom teaching, so there was a base of supportive teaching experience in RR in schools.

The ten participants on the course were women. There was a diverse range of teaching experience in the training group, with mature-age teachers and teachers early in their careers. The teacher training period extended from the late 1960’s to
1990’s. Some group members had come to teacher training as mature-aged students. One participant had trained and had extensive teaching experience outside Australia. The teachers all had qualifications at the bachelor degree level and two teachers held a Masters’ degree. Two teachers had held an executive position in a school and one in such a position during the course. Most of the teachers fulfilled the essential criteria for RR teacher training: teaching in a school full time (nine), and having recent successful Kindergarten to Year 2 teaching experience (eight), and were qualified primary school teachers (nine). (See: Table 1; names are pseudonyms).

The participants’ involvement in the training course (2006) was decided by the school principals in each of the ten schools in which the teachers held teaching positions. The process of determining teacher trainees is outlined in the Catholic Education Office, Wollongong, RR Guidelines (2009, pp12-13). The criteria for selection of teachers recommended to schools specifies that the participant is a qualified primary (elementary) school teacher, has demonstrated an understanding of how young children learn, has demonstrated excellence in classroom teaching, has recent successful experience teaching children Kindergarten-Year 2, has demonstrated the capacity to work in a school team, is prepared to commit to a one year training course and teaching RR for two years following the course, is willing to critically examine and incorporate RR practices into their teaching, has a willingness to teach for other RR teacher trainees, has the ability and confidence to articulate personal understandings about learning and has demonstrated an ability to effectively communicate with members of the school community.

The Guidelines further recommend that the principal nominates a teacher to participate in order to gain this skill on behalf of the school learning community. The principal makes available to staff the criteria for RR teacher training, follows school protocols for nominating a candidate (who express an interest in the training) and informs the RR Tutor of an intention to train a teacher in the following year. (Catholic Education Office, Wollongong, RR Guidelines, 2009, p13)
Table 1: Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Qualifications (Bachelor degree) plus additional qualifications/explanation</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Full-time Teacher</th>
<th>Recent K-2 Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Lou</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Yes TESOL</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Masters TESOL</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Participants provided their written biographies to the researcher)

The participants were asked by the RR Tutor to voluntarily participate in the research that year, as required by the ethics provisions of the University of Wollongong, and each teacher signed personal consent.

4.5 Context of Research in Reading Recovery

4.5.1 Reading Recovery Course Texts

During the RR course the teachers learn how to use the course texts written by Clay (2005a, 2005b) as their teaching reference and guide. These course texts are referred to consistently in the RR Tutor interactions with the teachers. Therefore, to understand the process of learning in the RR course it is important to understand that the texts are an important mediator between the RR Tutor and the teachers.
The texts provide explanations for RR teaching based on Clay’s theory and research. They outline the possible teaching procedures to be used by RR teachers in the circumstances they decide; and they ground the teachers’ practices used in schools and discussed with RR professionals. In the year of the data collection (2006) new RR course texts were used: “Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals, Part One and Two” (Clay, 2005a, 2005b). This meant that the RR training environment was in a state of change because the material was new to the RR Tutor body (trainers of RR teachers). NSW RR Tutors had had a meeting with Clay (2005) to discuss major changes to RR procedures and emphases, and NSW RR Trainers in early 2006. In 2006 these were implemented and discussed, guided by draft “RR Tutor Information Guides” (Appendix: I). The teachers also received draft “RR Teacher Guidesheets” (Appendix: H) during the RR course (Appendix: F).

4.5.2 Professional Roles in Reading Recovery (Teacher, Tutor, Trainer)

As a point of reference the following are the professional roles in RR: RR teacher (teaches RR to children in schools after completing an accredited RR training course); RR Tutor (trains RR teachers, and oversees implementations in clusters of schools in school systems, after completing an accredited training course); RR Trainer (trains RR Tutors and oversees large implementations at a state or national level, after completing an accredited training course). In this research the participants were RR teachers and the researcher a RR Tutor.

4.5.3 Researcher’s Background as a Reading Recovery Tutor

In this research I am the RR Tutor. My extensive and successful experience as a RR teacher and a RR Tutor motivated me to undertake this study. This research was
undertaken to allow me to reflect on the nature of social interactions within the RR training situation.

I trained as a RR teacher in New Zealand (1986), taught RR as a classroom teacher and as a teaching Principal in a New Zealand rural school setting. I trained as a RR Tutor at the Auckland College of Education (the University of Auckland) in 1993. In 2006 I had 20 years of experience teaching RR to children in schools (the RR Tutor also teaches RR in schools to inform practice) and twelve years as a RR Tutor in this location, from the start-up of RR in this school system. My RR perspective therefore covered the range of RR teacher, RR Tutor and school Principal in a range of times through change and development. This included teaching RR seven years into the New Zealand implementation in Auckland and three years after the New Zealand national implementation; starting RR in schools as the first teacher in New Zealand (one school) and NSW (two schools), and as the first RR Tutor in a school system (NSW); as well as working with two editions of the RR texts prior to the 2005 editions (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) used for the first time in 2006. My RR Tutoring experience involved training one hundred and forty-seven teachers prior to undertaking the data collection for this research. I therefore brought extensive pedagogical experience, recognised by my RR colleagues, to this study.

### 4.6 Site of the Data Collection

RR teachers are trained at sites that provide the facilities for the training. These sites are situated in schools. The site is called a “RR Centre” (Appendix: A). The collection of data for this research occurred at an Illawarra RR Centre during the normal sessions of the training course with the agreement of all the participants under the ethics provisions of the University of Wollongong. Child data was not collected for this study.

The main RR Centre facilities are: discussion room, teaching room and waiting room. The discussion room (Figure 1) is where the participants sat in a circle for face
to face discussions, balancing their course books on their knees with small notebooks for any personal note-taking. During the session the teachers are seated in this arrangement for the “introductory discussion” (before lesson observations) and were in this arrangement during the “follow-up discussions”. At the side of the discussion room is a glass-screen and seating arrangement for teachers to observe and discuss their peer-teachers’ lessons (Appendix: A).

**Figure 1: The Reading Recovery Teaching Discussion Room**

Two thirty minute lessons are observed back-to-back in each session at the glass-screen. Movement to this arrangement from the “introductory discussion” involves the teachers collaboratively closing curtains to black-out the room, turning on an amplifier, turning off the lights, and drawing up a venetian blind that normally covers the screen. This enables them to view through the glass-screen from a blacked-out space into a lightened room. After the lesson observations the teachers collaboratively reverse the process for the “follow-up discussion”. What is referred to, as “behind the glass-screen” is where the lesson occurs in a “teaching room”. This room has a bench along the glass-screen, a microphone on the bench linked to the amplifier, and magnetic whiteboards for the teachers’ teaching demonstrations. The teachers bring the material resources they require for their lessons with them. A
waiting room separate from both the discussion room and the teaching room is provided for parents, or school personnel, when they bring children to the RR Centre for the lesson demonstrations.

4.7 Reading Recovery Sessions

Training RR teachers attend eighteen sessions at a RR Centre. Each session time attendance required is three hours (Appendix: G). This includes time to interact informally over lunch (thirty minutes) before the formal two and half hour session. This research covered what is referred to in this study as the “Introductory Discussion”, “Observation and Discussion” and “Follow-Up Discussion” (approximately one hour and fifty minutes). These are referred to as “components” of the session. (Appendix: A & G). The RR “Tutor Information Guide” for the development of the sessions states that RR Tutor’s should “Ensure there are many opportunities for the group to articulate, interact and evaluate throughout the session.” (Draft, 2006: Sessions One – Three). Table 2 outlines the components of the RR sessions used for data collection. The teachers’ introduction of children is omitted because the two teachers teaching at a session discuss their introductions outside the formal session with the RR Tutor. The two teachers teaching at a session present a short student introduction. This is to give the group a context for their observations and discussions including: student time on RR, progress by book level during that time, strengths and control of literacy processing strategic activities, and what the teacher is thinking about or highlighting for the lesson. (Appendix: G)

Table 2: Components of the RR Session in this Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Discussion</td>
<td>Establishing teacher talk from the earliest sessions (interaction). Presentation and discussion of Session Emphases (topics or themes) by the RR Tutor to guide observations and discussions. Discussion with the RR teachers. Teachers introduce the children they will teach behind the glass-screen to their peer teachers (Approx.: 5 minutes) (Total: approx.: 10-15 minutes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Observation and discussion

Tutor guides two 30 minute lesson observations with the peer teachers, including: directing attention, scaffolding and shaping teacher talk, encouraging talk where teachers have listened to and build on the comments of others, give different opinions to others, question each other and summarise their discussions for feedback to their peer teacher who taught the lesson. Appendix K explains the RR lesson framework for the two observations.

(Approx: 65 minutes, with movement time included)

### Follow-up discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Acknowledgement of teaching: a positive reflection on the lessons observed with the two peer teachers with example and reason linked to RR theory and practice. (Approx: 5 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Brief reflection: by the peer-teachers who taught on their own lessons (including what went well and why and disappointments with the lesson with brief thoughts around this) (Approx.: 5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Questioning by the group and by the peer teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Main ideas discussed by the group during the lesson observations shared with the peer teachers, for improvements in teaching (their own and the peer teachers’) with reference to the course texts. (c and d, approx. 20 minutes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equal time is given to both teachers who teach lessons at a session. (Total time: Approx: 30 minutes)

### 4.8 Reading Recovery School Visits

RR school visits involve a one-to-one interaction between the RR Tutor and the RR Teacher (Appendix: J). RR teachers receive five to six visits during the RR course. These are not the main focus of this research on group social interactions. However, the social relationships developed on school visits impact on RR session social interactions because the RR Tutor uses this information to guide session topics or themes, called “emphases” in RR and the RR teachers bring their experiences from the school visits to the sessions to share with group members (Appendix L1, p2). The teachers like the school visits for different reasons, the main reason being that they are more personal in respect to the questions they can ask and the focus on the child they are teaching, with immediate feedback available from the tutor (Appendix, M2, p14).
4.9 Procedures for Data Collection

The following table outlines the methods of data collection employed to answer the research questions within the constraints of the ethics workplace approval. This study did involve the researcher as a major participant in the social interactions; however a participant observation technique was not employed. The data was not transcribed for analysis by the researcher, in collaboration with the university supervisors, until after the course was complete. An audit trail is outlined in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Method and Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>Data collected during RR sessions (verbal) Oral language data was gathered from a free-standing video recorder that was pointed at the discussion circle for the “introductory discussion” swivelled and put onto night vision for the “observations and discussion” and swivelled back for the “follow-up discussion”. The recorder was left running for the whole session. In order to pick up data missed, e.g. in the blacked-out room, audio-taping was used for back up data collection. In some cases it was the main form of data collection. The teachers took responsibility for this recording, taking a small hand-held recorder with them during the session, and changing audio-tapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-question 1a</td>
<td>“What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions?” Although data was collected from all sessions (three to seventeen) it was decided in collaboration with the university supervisors, to sample the session data as: early (Session Three), middle (Sessions Seven, Eight, Nine) and late (Session Sixteen) for transcription in keeping with the theoretical framework that emphasised the development of learning. It was also decided to sample these sessions so the interactions at the glass-screen analysed were of reading activities in the RR lessons in Session Eight and writing in Session Nine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-question 1b</td>
<td>“What is the role of the teachers’ peers social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100
interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?"

representative of the beginning, middle and near the end of the course and was justified by the need to capture the data at different points of the process of learning.

The rest of the data has been captured on video and audio and further reviewed to ensure the chosen sessions to represent in the thesis were representative of the whole process

**Data collected during RR sessions (written)**

The participants wrote five minute individual immediate responses without discussion after the follow-up discussion in journals that remained at the RR Centre and were not reviewed by the researcher until the end of the course. The teachers followed these leading questions:

a) *What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?*

b) *How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about teaching one particular student?*

This was designed to capture what the teachers learned from the social interactions in the sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Data collected during RR sessions (verbal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions?” | Each participant was interviewed in her school, or at the RR Centre (one participant). The interview questions were designed specifically to relate to the research questions and to be open enough to allow participants to reflect on their own learning. The researcher interviewed each participant using the same set of questions encouraging participants to elaborate on some of their responses about their learning (semi-structured technique). The researcher transcribed the audio-taped interviews and all participants were emailed copies of their interview transcription (member checking).

The questions reflected learning during the social interactions in the RR session. These included learning through observation and discussion with others (peer teachers and the RR Tutor) and reflection on the participants’ personal feelings (affective domain) during their learning. This was influenced by the RR interest in the affective domain in child learning and how that applied to the learning of the teachers (Lyons, 2003). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-question 2a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-question 2b</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“What are the teachers'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?”

Table 4 outlines the interview questions and the rationales for asking these questions to answer Research Question Two: What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions? and the two sub-questions 2a: What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions? and 2b: What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?

Table 4: The Interview Questions and Their Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. In this course you have observed teaching with the group, discussed teaching in a group, read texts, how important was it for you to learn with other people?</td>
<td>The importance of learning with others in social interactions for the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. a) Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the observations of two lessons at the screen?</td>
<td>The importance that learning with others in social interactions within a major component of the RR participant training had for the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. b) When you learn you know that you think about things, analyse things and you also have some feelings. Tell me, how did you feel during discussions at the screen?</td>
<td>The participants’ feelings about learning through social interactions in a major component of the RR participant training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. a) Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the discussion following the teaching?</td>
<td>The importance that learning with others in social interactions within a major component of the RR participant training had for the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. b) How did you feel during discussions of lessons after the observations?</td>
<td>The participants’ feelings about learning through social interactions are a major component of the RR participant training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of teaching for your peers?</td>
<td>An open question to determine either or both the participants’ cognitive and affective learning in providing lessons for their peers to discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Did you discuss your learning in RR with other people outside the session? Explain.</td>
<td>An open question to sample whether learning with others had importance for the participants outside of the RR sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. When you come to teach the next day or even maybe later on, or when you have a tricky situation, do you feel that what was discussed in the group, or with the Tutor, or what you read in your texts comes to your mind?</td>
<td>A question designed to sample the process of the participants’ learning that involved internalisation of the learning from the interpersonal to the intrapersonal dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. When you leave RR training and move into independent practice in the field what do you think will influence your thinking?</td>
<td>A question designed to sample whether the participants projected learning through social interactions with others as important for their continued RR teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Think about me working with you at the school. How did you get the most out of this kind of learning?</td>
<td>A question designed to sample the impact of the Tutor on the participants’ learning without asking about the impact during a RR session re: ethical considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 How did you feel during your discussions with the Tutor on school visits</td>
<td>A question designed to sample participants’ feelings about the impact of the Tutor on their learning without asking about their feelings towards the Tutor during a RR session re: ethical considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.10 Methods of Data Analysis

The methods of analysis were two-fold: 1) A method of data reduction was used to analyse the data to answer Question One (a detailed discussion is presented in Chapter Five) a method of thematic analysis was used to answer Question Two (a detailed discussion is presented in Chapter Six).
4.10.1 Data Reduction and Coding

Data reduction was used in order to tell the story of teacher training in RR through social interactions. “Data reduction refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data that appear in written-up field notes or transcriptions” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p10). This research data was in the form of full verbal transcriptions from five RR sessions (early, middle and late) in the course. Data reduction is a transforming process and part of the analysis, until the final report is written. Decisions made by the researcher about the chunks to code (the introductory discussion, samples of the observation discussions at the glass-screen, and samples of the follow-up discussions of the lessons taught), what to pull out (the role of the RR Tutor and that of the RR teachers), are analytical choices that evolve into a story to tell.

The thematic analysis (explained in detail in the next section) was applied and themes emerged in relation to the role of the RR Tutor and the teacher peers were artificially divided to answer Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session? And the sub-questions: 1a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions? and 1b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

The following are examples of the categories of the coded data with theoretical explanation and example mainly from the transcriptions of RR Session Nine (half-way through the teacher training course). The session was selected because of its placement in the course. The RR Tutor role involves scaffolding teacher learning as ‘assisted performance’ provided by the more capable person in the social relationship. Sometimes the RR Tutor directs the teachers attention to what is important to consider, or highlights parts of the observation and text readings as part of instruction, at other times the RR Tutor assists through a series of questions which
calls for active linguistic and cognitive responses from the teachers and can assist the teachers lift to levels of sophisticated understandings (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

In the ‘Introductory discussion’ it emerged that the RR Tutor connected session ideas between the series of training sessions, and tapped into teachers’ prior knowledge. This scaffolding for the teachers in their zones of proximal development (ZPDs) (which are different between individuals and for individuals for any domain or skill) relates to the learning principle that teacher learning is circular not linear (Timperley, 2008).

The following are examples of the categories of coded data with examples from transcript data for the Tutor’s role in linking session ideas to the teachers’ prior knowledge, and highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge through references and expert knowledge (which may be reference to an expert of the Tutor’s knowledge).

| Linking session ideas to the teachers’ prior knowledge | In our last session we were talking about our interactions and how we as teachers influence the shaping of the child’s literacy processing by the things we say and the things we do. What have you been thinking about how do you change what you do and say, and why? What has happened in our last session, and the last couple of sessions is that we as a group realise how we need to change. What have you been working on to change in your teaching? |
| Highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge through references or expert knowledge | Through references: From these teaching principles... if we always assume the child is making sense of the task in terms of what they know and understand, how can this help you in your teaching? Think about why Clay says here that the teacher should select carefully the places she intervenes? Why? Through expert knowledge: Another idea Clay would like in our discussion is ‘tentativeness’. If we form rigid ideas what can that lead us to into? Our notion of tentativeness means that you gather information or evidence for what you’re trying to problem-solve doesn’t it? You analyse problems in different settings and think of different things that might be the difficulty? |
The RR Tutor also prepared the teachers for the next component of the session: observing and discussing. The following is an example of priming the joint focus of the teachers’ for this observation.

**Priming the teachers for the next activity**

We’re going to look at the teacher because we are thinking of the teacher and the effect of what the teacher does has on the child.

So you’ll look for evidence in the child’s behaviour… [then ask]… Can you (the teacher) be flexible and change on the run?

During the observation and discussion at the screen what occurs on one side (the Tutor and teacher discussion) is artificially separated from what happens on the other side (the lesson interactions between the teacher and the child) in this analysis, unlike the tiers of scaffolding described by Gaffney & Anderson (1991). At this time scaffolding by the RR Tutor includes directing the teachers’ attention to different aspects of the lesson interaction. This establishes intersubjectivity or a joint point of reference (Verenekina, 2012, p480). Numerous support techniques characterise scaffolding including: questioning, hinting, giving analogies, and breaking the content into manageable pieces, summarized in Verenikina (2008).

The categories of coded analysis in the data reduction this study showed that the RR Tutor’s scaffolded support of the teachers involved: directing the teachers’ attention to aspects of the observation, explaining and clarifying ideas for what the teachers observed linked to the learning intentions of the literacy activities, highlighting what it is important to take note of for future reference and aspects of the interaction that might need to change for improvements in child processing and teacher support. The following are examples of categories for the scaffolding function of the RR Tutor’s role.

**Directing attention**

It’s very important to look at what the teacher does and the effect of what the teacher does?

What did you hear the teacher say? Did she tell him what he needs to do?

**Explaining and clarifying**

So we’re getting the idea that we’re supposed to be shaping behaviour on the run?
It always comes back to this point (to consider): what does the teacher really think he should do [teacher says: read it accurately] and what did she say she wants to help him to do? [teachers: pausing] Read for meaning.

It (child’s reading) is word for word. Why do you think that is? (teachers: pausing) Yes, he’s giving him primary attention to visual information which is reinforced by the teacher. But if you wanted him to give his primary attention to meaning what would happen in familiar reading?

Highlighting what is important

What are we working on in terms of familiar reading? [teachers contribute ‘fluency’ and ‘phrasing’] (Tutor adds on) and speed, pace.

There is pausing (in the child’s reading) but what is important is how the teacher directs attention. If I’m driving and my instructor can see I’m looking in the wrong direction what will he do? He’ll direct me to what I should attend to.

Remember what I was speaking to you about before [last lesson observed] not every example of error is going to support the processing system. Choose good examples as you’re going along [taking a running record] that will be relevant and memorable to the child. Let’s see what she chooses.

Highlighting what needs to change

To get him to read faster, what experiences do you think he needs in familiar reading? [teacher contributes: less interrupting ] What else? [Teacher contributes: an easier book!] That’s it!

In reading what do you make your judgement [to interrupt] on? [A teacher contributes: the meaning]. [Tutor confirms] The meaning. You can always come back [to work on visual errors].

What are you thinking? A change in teaching style might bring about a change in learning behaviour?

The follow-up discussion involves providing feedback information as a powerful means of assistance to the teacher who has taught and for the peer teachers who have participated. “Simply providing performance information is insufficient…unless the information provided is compared to some standard” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p55). In RR teachers learn to regulate their teaching performance against the intentions of lesson activities and articulated success through tuition, shared values and mutual support (Bandura, 1991). The coded data reduction in this research shows that the tutoring function involves scaffolding and is achieved through: summarising and contextualising what has occurred for the teacher who has taught, using course references, explaining and clarifying what these refer to, highlighting what is important to consider in the performance and the texts, and directing the flow
of the conversation. The following examples from transcript data are illustrative of the scaffold categories that emerged in the coded data reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing feedback through summarising and contextualising</th>
<th>With the group we worked on the effect of what the teacher was saying, the child’s behaviour, and we also worked on a developing hypothesis where we ended up with a conclusion about what the group can tentatively say about the child’s processing. He will have to be led strongly by meaning and we need him to do that consistency. Can we work out how we do that?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linking to course references</td>
<td>If we want a child to search for meaning what should we be saying? What page would that be on? Can we look on page 155? ... the heading “Say read it fast will not do”. Can you see “it takes time to develop fast control of many subparts of a complex whole” Can you see that? ... “so it operates smoothly and fluently... what needs to speed up can differ for different children.” Can we stop there and (and after the lesson observation) ask - what needs to speed up for that boy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting</td>
<td>There was one page (in his familiar reading book) where we particularly felt that his reading was word by word. Why did we think that happened? What about the point above “ Seeing and recognising objects is fast and fluent in ordinary life but only after we have become familiar with objects in general and some objects in particular. Recognition becomes faster as visual familiarity increases.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Can we start off with the conclusion and then I would like everyone to join in the discussion. (management of the discussion) That’s great. The group thinks the problem is point two on page 155. This means that he must have the meaning in his head to link with the words he is looking at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating and modelling</td>
<td>You want to say “Think what would make sense” You can then elaborate ‘sense’ for the child. (modelling stress in the verbal prompt for reading) She knew about the little pigs didn’t she? She knew there was going to be straw, sticks and bricks. So...your skill... [is] ... to get her...to think about that. So, san you turn to page 111 again because we want children who are going to search for meaning. Say: “Think about the thirds little pig. Think what would make sense.” Then you don’t need to say [so much].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The broad categories revealed by data reduction analysis to answer Research Question One sub-question 1b are presented below. Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session? Sub-
question 1b: What is the role of the teachers’ peers’ social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

In the introductory discussion the data reduction showed macro-scaffolding by the RR Tutor to link the current sessions to previous sessions before introducing a new session ‘emphasis’ (theme for discussion related to literacy processing – teaching and learning) (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). The teachers contributed by sharing their teaching experience, ideas about that and knowledge where they were developing their learning. This provided a common point of reference for the teachers at the beginning of the session.

In the introductory discussion the teachers were involved in sharing experience, ideas and knowledge for where they were up to in their learning, co-construction of knowledge through working together on ideas, and support of their developing self-awareness as learners about what they know and what they need to know or do. The following examples from transcript data demonstrate the categories that emerged in the data reduction.

| Sharing experience, ideas and knowledge | Belinda: I am trying to be very clear in my own mind about what I am asking the child and gauging more from the child whether the child gets it. (experience) |
| Co-constructing knowledge | Jemma: You can ruin their network, their strategic activity can be impaired if you jump in too quickly or too late. They either don’t get an opportunity to make meaning or they’ve already made a connection that’s incorrect. |
| | Diane: I’ve had a few difficulties with one little boy. I’ve been re-reading the guidebook, with a focus on me again, like you two (other teachers). I am asking: What can I do to help the situation? What am I doing? What am I saying? (knowledge) |
| | Maura: I think that instructions should be clear and precise and to the point instead of rambling on because they (children) just don’t get it if you keep on. (idea) |
| | Lara: If the child’s able to respond appropriately you’ve given him the correct prompt. |
| | Shelley: You just take a little time (during reading) and say “This is the part where Ben is talking to Mum” or whatever. He wasn’t baulking at the words because he had the meaning. The words just flowed. |
| Supporting self-regulation | Jade: You’d need to look at what you’re saying and think if you could change somehow because it’s obviously not working for that child. |
Belinda: You have to be very open and be able to be critical about… our own teaching in a positive way. We have to be honest to ourselves about our teaching.

Diane: With that little boy I can be thinking “Oh no, the accuracy rate’s down, ahhhh!” Then I reflected on it, as Belinda said. I thought about our gathering knowledge about strategic activity. I thought this boy isn’t using visual information properly. So, obvious as that is, it seemed a big revelation to me. I need to get over this kind of reaction “Oh, what’s wrong? What’s wrong?” and reflect on it. Think about it.

During the observations and discussion the categories that emerged from the data reduction revealed that the teachers responded to the RR Tutor scaffolding and made their developing thinking available to their peers through a co-construction of knowledge at any point in time. This assistance helps to shift each individual teacher in their ZPD and is directed (what to attend to and talk about) and redirected by the expertise of the RR Tutor. The following are examples of the categories that show the teachers’ involvement in the learning that occurs in a RR session when they: replay (say aloud what they have seen and heard) and interpret their observation; reach agreement about what they are interpreting; evaluate the child’s behaviour, the teachers’ behaviour and compare this with their own teaching; and make links between beliefs (personal theories) and practice.

Replaying and/or interpreting observations

Maria: She’s showing him how the word changes and she wants him to find it in the book. (magnetic letter activity)

Lara: It’s not quite decoding but he’s having to look at every word rather than predicting more. (familiar reading activity)

Shelley: She wants him to read expecting something about a relay race so she thinks he’s going to get the meaning. (introducing the new book activity)
Agreement

Tutor: Was he faster? No
Tutor: Have you heard any input to scaffold the meaning? No

Tutor: Let’s see what happens (writing ‘skateboards’ – clapping two parts and writing ‘skate’ into Elkonin sound boxes) Now he’s good at that isn’t he? Affirmation
Tutor: Would there be comments about the plot (in reading)? Affirmation.

Tutor: What is the hardest thing for us to do? To let things go [No response] Do you think? Contemplating noises “Mmmm”

Evaluating

Child behaviour:
Tutor: Why was he not faster? Tracey: Meaning? The meaning wasn’t there.


Tutor: What does this girl need to do to be discontinued? [Finish her RR lesson series] Maria: Get faster (in reading) Shelley: Write in groups.

The teacher’s behaviour
Tutor: He made an error with tense, ‘had’ instead of ‘has’. Why did the teacher stop him? Jade: She wants him to look at the visual.

Tutor: What does the teacher really think he should do? Belinda: Read it accurately.

Tutor: What do you think of that? (Instruction after running record)
Shelley: A bit wordy.

Own teaching behaviour

At Session 3 (what teachers think and do)
Diane: See how he’s holding his head… I’ve been saying put your hand down and hold the page. Is that OK?
Belinda: [In the introduction to a new book] So you’d focus on the meaning and structure more than the words?
Lara: [When the child reads the book the next day] I think it’s going to tell you whether she took it in, whether it was taught well.

At Session 9 (what teachers would do differently)
Jade: I’d do what you showed me last time to try to teach for meaning.
Tracey: I’d introduce the book with a bit more for meaning.
Lara: Maybe at the end I’d ask him a question that would relate to the story.

Linking beliefs (personal theories) and practices (in the lesson observations)

Tutor: Anyone with a different hypothesis for why he is not going faster? Maria: He hasn’t mastered the level yet. Tutor: Not thinking level. Maria: He’s not scanning enough.
Tutor: What would be better? Jade: Maybe if she stuck with what she was doing in the first couple of pages. Shelley: because it was working. Jade: Yeah, it was!

Tutor: The teacher always goes back to visual information. Why was the child led to say ‘had’ (instead of ‘hid’)? …say something about that. Jade: …it’s that fear of [thinking the child] is not able to see the word. Tutor: Personal theory? Jade: Yeah!

During the follow-up discussion the categories that emerged from the coded data reduction revealed that the teachers in response to the scaffolding by the RR Tutor provided feedback to the teacher who had taught, used their course references, and co-constructed knowledge about teaching strategies. The following are examples under each of these categories.

**Feedback**

Diane: Jemma, we thought that you need to continue to focus on scaffolding for meaning. Where you took [the scaffolding] away [the reading] fell down.

Maria: It really went well as you… [scaffolded]… paragraph by paragraph, but then after a couple of pages when you thought it was going well you stopped …[and] he went back to his old habit. This meant that you needed to come back in and push it more.

Diane: We thought that in familiar reading he lacked fluency and pace and you said read it faster but you didn’t follow up on how to do that. What we got out of it … [for all of us is]… to shape behaviour on the run.

**Linking to RR Texts as a point of reference**

Tutor: If you wanted a child to be searching for meaning what would we be saying? What page would we be on? Tracey: Page 111. [You could say] ‘Try that again and think what would make sense’.

Tutor: Can we look at page 155? Look at the dots. What [do you think] needs to come together] so he can read faster? Shelley: I think it could be number two because he’s not got the meaning in his head, so…he can’t make… the fast link with the words.

Diane: The test for all of us was what words to take to frequency [so that they know it tomorrow] and another technique is perhaps …to learn by analogy…Tutor: Where does [Clay] write about this? Tracey: On page 62 I think.

**Co-constructing knowledge of teaching strategies**

Tutor: If we want the child to predict the meaning we have to say [something] before they read, not after they’ve made a mistake. Maria: So, as they’re turning the page.

Tracey: I think [Clay] has it here where she’s got the quote: I think you could write that word you wrote it yesterday. Tutor: Where’s that?
The way that the RR Tutor influenced the teachers’ learning is defined as the skill of assisting learning in the teachers’ ZPDs (questioning, prompting, telling, directing attention, clarifying, explaining and so on) and in turn, through the RR teacher training experience, the teachers acquire the ability to assist the performance of the children they teach. The Tutor’s influence occurs through interactional scaffolding (Verenikina, 2012, p 480). Both tutors and teachers respond to learners (teachers and children) contingently, that is: based on teaching and learning opportunities as they present themselves.

“Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organises data in such a way that ‘final’ conclusions can be drawn and verified.” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p11) The data are not necessarily quantified, although part of the process can include quantifying coded data. In this case, the qualitative data was coded, transformed and reduced through summaries. The focus was not to strip the data of the context in which it occurs, thereby negating the story of the social interactions during RR sessions, as advised by Miles and Huberman (1994, p11). However, the categories that emerge can be applied across the data (for example: each RR session).

In this research data reduction involved: a) coded observations in collaboration with the university supervisors, and generalised codes grouped so as to give meaning to the source data by the participants involved, the teachers and the RR Tutor, b) data display (in tabular formats), and c) a conclusion (summary) about the social characteristics of the RR Tutor and the teachers drawing from one case (Session Seven) (Appendix: L2a). The process was applied repeatedly to further cases (RR
sessions) (Appendices: L1, L3, L4, L5). The conclusions (summaries) for each case analysed in this way were stripped of examples from the source data to form a condensed analysis of the data across different cases. These summaries were then drawn together by category and examples reinserted across all the cases, giving a condensed abstracted description of what occurred in RR sessions (Chapter Five).

Conclusions were verified by the researcher in this analysis by revisiting the source data and through replicating the findings in other cases of the same social event (RR sessions). The triangulation of the data involved the comparative case by case analysis of the RR sessions and the participants’ immediate written reflections. These were used to illustrate the range of teacher interpretations of their own learning during a RR session and the uniformity of themes that matched the content of the sessions. Appendix E is an example of how the teachers’ reflections related to the transcript data representing the content knowledge in RR Session Seven.

4.10.2 Thematic Analysis and Coding

A thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p79) was used to answer Question Two using the transcribed interview data as a method of identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within the data. The data came from carefully worded questions (See: Table 4) designed to elicit information to answer the research question.

The process of analysing this data involved:

i) transcribing the data from audio-tapes for the ten participants

ii) initial coding of one interview using themes grounded in social constructivism verified through inter-subjective consensus with two university supervisors (Appendices: M1, a sample, M2 full analysis). The initially identified themes included: learning and development in the zone of proximal (potential) development, co-construction and scaffolding.

iii) (as above) for a second interview (Appendix N)
iv) presenting the initial categories with definitions and examples from two interviews as a power-point for discussion with RR Tutor peers at the Sixth RR International Institute, Baltimore, USA (July, 2007). The feedback taken from this experience was to build a story of how adults learn that involves co-construction and reflection using the data available and confirmation of the theoretical framework and initial coding with examples. (Appendix N)

v) applying emerging themes to a third interview (Appendix O)

vi) bringing the data from three interviews together under broad categories with emerging definitions (Appendices O). These categories included: co-construction of knowledge, scaffolding by the RR Tutor, Shifting in the Zone of Proximal Development, Trust in the Relationship, and Self-regulation.

vii) bringing all interview data together under broad categories for each question, merging the themes into three broad meta-themes that told the story of the participants’ perspectives of the role of social interactions in their learning: co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationship and self-development as a learner. (Appendix Q) (See: Chapter 6)

This process aligns with the six phases of thematic analysis as described by Braun and Clarke (2006, 87) and shown in the following figure.

**Figure 2: Phases of Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke)**
The initial categories selected for the analysis were grounded in the theoretical framework such as: co-construction, intersubjectivity, scaffolding, shifting in the zone of proximal development and additional categories for data were described by the researcher. The categorisation of the emerged themes from thematic analysis of the data and its interpretation was conducted in collaboration with university supervisors through interpreting the transcriptions of the language interactions under the theoretical framework. The principal supervisor was selected because of her expertise as a Vygotskian scholar. All writing and re-writing was done under this supervision over a period of one year. The thematic analysis involved meeting regularly with the supervisors (every two to three weeks) for six months, to familiarise ourselves with the data and negotiate developing initial (emerging) themes, and reviewing preparation of a power-point presentation for peer-discussion (Baltimore, USA, July, 2007). The themes were confirmed with the supervisors and the literature as being linked to the Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian theoretical framework social constructivism. A further six months (monthly meetings and
contact by email) was spent reviewing the themes and applying them progressively across the interview data set. This data was then merged into the three broad meta-themes: co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationship, and self-development and written as Chapter 6 over a period of four months (fortnightly meetings and contact to review the writing by email) in 2011 to answer the research question “What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions?” This process follows the phases of thematic analysis as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). (See: Figure 2)

Braun and Clarke (2006) write that themes do not reside in the data to be discovered but are rather actively identified and selected to be reported to readers by researchers. The themes that are of importance to the researcher are those that represent a patterned response to answering the research question. Braun and Clarke (2006) provide this advice for researchers: “Your write up needs to do more than just provide data. Extracts need to be embedded within an analytic narrative that compellingly illustrates the story you are telling about your data, and your analytic narrative needs to go beyond description of the data, and make an argument in relation to the research question.” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p93) These authors further outline the criteria for a good thematic analysis which includes: accuracy of the transcription; equal attention given to all the data in the coding process; collating of all relevant extracts for each theme; and checking themes against each other and the original data set.

### 4.10.3 Coding Categories

The coding categories that emerged for three of the ten interviews and were subsequently used across the interview data are explained with links to the theoretical framework or literature through examples of teacher transcription data (more information on coding can be found in Appendix N).

**Co-construction of Knowledge**
Co-construction refers to the interdependence that contributes to building learning that involves the learner and others (novice peers and the more expert other) (Palincsar, 2005). This theme is presented from an individual perspective of each teacher for how the ‘other’ (peers and or tutor) were involved in the teachers’ learning. The following are examples of how the coding for this category was done in relation to different contexts.

Jade: I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable [you can see] why some of your lessons don’t go the right way. It just makes you clue into what other people are saying…Someone will say ‘Oh, I think this child… is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about.

Maria: Well, in my head I was sort of was going through… Yes I did that, no I don’t do that, and that’s something that I should do. …It sort of brings things forward for you, in your mind what you maybe haven’t thought of before.

Maria: I would know on the other side of the screen they would be saying now why isn’t she doing this and why do you think she did that? You’re looking and you’re seeing yourself doing it because you know that someone’s saying why is she doing this?

Jade: It’s the same as videoing yourself teaching is very valuable…not that you got to watch yourself… but with other people watching they told you what their observations were

Jade: When you come out [from behind the screen] you need feedback… It’s the opportunity to show, ‘this is what I’m doing’ and ‘what do all you people think?’ The most important thing I think is you get their ideas, their feedback and [that’s] what it’s all about.

Jemma: The group helped me focus on particular aspects [for my learning]…like working with the child to make meaning, which we have been working on… It really focused my thinking in response to whatever the topic was for the day.

Shifts in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The ZPD is the gap between individual’s ‘actual development’ in a given area, for example, in RR teaching (what is known, the learner’s skilled action, the learner’s problem solving capabilities) and what is yet to be known or accomplished (Vygotsky, 1978). To have shift in this area there has to be evidence by speech, or action that the learner’s development has moved forward or been extended, that is: moving forward, improvement and extension will need to be in expressed or shown because it is about ‘what a learner can become’ rather than the person’s current learning performance (Bonk & Kim, 1998). Within shifts in the ZPD features of co-
construction will be observed, but not scaffolding because scaffolding involves an act of tuition or assisted learning by a more expert person. The following are examples of the teacher’s learning shifting in their ZPDs.

Jade: To see very good teaching behind the screen is important and very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading.

Jade: It gave you the sense that ‘OK, you’re on the right track for where you’re heading so you can get better. It just kind of lifted you and pushed you further.

Maria: You know that someone’s saying why is she doing this… [and]… that actually carries over, because when I used to come back to teach the next day, I’d be still sort of be in that frame of mind.

Jade: The feedback coming in was just as long as you do this this’ll work and if you extend that part of the lesson or if you go further with that idea, then you can improve.

Maria: We’d sort of get an answer, if you like, and [it would] give you something to chew on when you go back [to school] the next day. Discussion would move on … so we’d sort of go further than just there, which was good.

Jade: [The next day I would think] they’d say I’m not prompting for meaning or he doesn’t understand the text or he doesn’t understand the structure … but then what would they say after that? Pointing out the possibilities of the answers to it…that answering behind the screen [were] the voices in your head.

Maria: I’ll try this and I’ll see how it works and that sort of brings you to go forward you’re not just stuck in the one spot… You’re either going forward or finding something else.

Intersubjectivity and Internalisation

Intersubjectivity refers to the way people think about the world or share meaning (Bonk & Kim, 1998). Within a social –constructivist theory this refers to a joint point of reference (Gallagher, 2009) for the group of teachers that allows for learning from what you learned yesterday to further your understandings to what you learn today. Internalisation emerges within one’s ZPD bandwidth or potential development, and is supported by scaffolding or assistance provided by more capable others (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Internalisation refers to the gradual transformation of shared understandings (the interpersonal) into individual internal self-regulatory processes (the intrapersonal).

Maria: You’re seeing something in action and you’re talking about it rather than just looking. It brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it. It’s like watching television and you’re talking about something that’s going on. It sort of puts it more concrete in your mind.
Jade: When I’m teaching sometimes I kind of think, now if [the Tutor] was watching me, or if I was behind the screen in this situation and the lesson wasn’t going well, what would they be saying? It’s helpful to put yourself in that situation in your own room and hear those voices.

Jade: I think that you can kind of imagine what people would say in that situation, but only because you’ve been on the other side in the conversation, watching other people. I think the main voice is yours [the Tutor’s]

**Trust in the Relationship**

In this research ‘trust’ was coded as when a participant indicates that a context of trust exists in the relationship between learners or learner and tutor explicitly or implicitly (for the action to occur and be accepted). Trust is considered to be important for learning in groups so that no person feels that their efforts are bring disregarded or belittled. (Dooner et al, 2006, Forbes & Briggs, 2006, Timperley, 2008).

Jade: I think that the most valuable experience we had, [was to be] the same group continuously, to get to know each other and trust each other.

Maura: Well when I was teaching I just felt I’m not the only one doing this. The whole group goes through it... behind the screen ...I just forget about everything... and even though I know that there are people watching me I just do my own thing and I think it’s good because then people are watching and they give you some positive feedback

Diane: I felt that we supported each other. I don’t think anybody would have got the feeling they were an outsider or they weren’t up to scratch or they should feel wounded about their efforts, or whatever. I’ve never felt uncomfortable in that group.

Jade: The group dynamic in that particular group was open and honest. …Constructive criticism…[is] a different pressure… probably the most important thing… is that group dynamic

Maura: I find that discussion is good because the group is very supportive of each other… if there is something that needs to be changed with my teaching it’s always [discussed in] a very positive way.

**Active Participation**

The category of active participation in this study referred to engagement and what the participants say about that. It is assumed and discussed at the beginning of the
course that there is an expectation that the teachers will teach for their peers and contribute to conversations (Clay & Watson, 1982, Catholic Education Office, Wollongong RR Guidelines, 2009). This allows for the social interactions to take place that are essential in a social constructivist paradigm (Vygotsky, 1978, Lyons 1994, Moore, 1997, 1998).

Jemma: And I found that observing other people and talking about it afterwards helped… to just unpick that and make comments… everyone would pitch in and build on ideas, and I found that very helpful.

Shelley: I felt like I really had to be on my toes… (laughs) … I think once or twice I kind of started saying something but then I had to pull back because I thought ‘no it’s not my turn’… you have to be aware of other people and what they’re saying and you can’t jump in if they haven’t finished.

Belinda: Sometimes I became so engrossed in watching that I wasn’t discussing enough myself. So that’s something that I felt I improved with… over time.

Self-regulation as a learner

The power of Vygotskian theory lies in the interdependence of social and individual processes when he conceptualised development as the transition of socially shared activities into internal processes (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p192). Self-regulation (involving self-appraisal, self-awareness, affective feedback, self-monitoring, and self-belief in self-efficacy) refers to the ability a person has to regulate their own thinking and behaviour against personal and social standards (Bandura, 1991). ‘Self-regulation’ is a discovered and perfected in the course of social and instructional interactions (Wood, 1988, p196). Self-regulation is essentially an invisible and inaudible process and teachers indicate their self-regulation through their talk about their self-awareness. “From a socio-cultural perspective the development of self-regulation requires an awareness of socially approved behaviours through social interaction” (Ozdemir, 2011) and the capacity for self-regulation occurs within the teachers’ social participations involving self-reflection.

Belinda: I was able to… see, reflect on what I was doing. So I could see myself in what the other person was doing. Or I could see myself in what they were doing or weren’t doing.

Jade: I think …as teachers you get this idea…especially when you’ve been with one student for a long time, this idea of…where the problems are and where you’re going, and you
Scaffolding by the RR Tutor

Scaffolding is an act of tuition that is usually tutor-learner but may involve the group acting as the tutor. This involves many actions or speech that impact on the learner. Scaffolding usually occurs in a one-to-one social interaction and the tutors responses are contingent upon the behaviour of the learner, but can be applied to group settings.

The process of scaffolding learning involves different acts by the tutor such as: direction maintenance – for encouragement and motivation, marking critical features – to accentuating relevant aspects of the task the learner may have missed, as well as direct demonstration or modelling of the task or parts of it. (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) In the original seminal paper on scaffolding by Wood et al (1976) the completed task was seen by the learner before the tutor scaffolded the learner in the task (constructing a wooden pyramid out of interlocking pieces). Similarly the teachers in RR sessions view three lessons in sessions one and two, taught by trained RR teachers, and have the opportunity to ask questions before they begin teaching for their peers and are scaffolded by the tutor and the group in their capabilities (pedagogy) and understanding of the theory guiding RR teaching.

Many scaffolding acts are as qualitatively different such as directing attention, holding important information in memory for the learner, or simply offering encouragement (Tharp & Gallimore, 1998). These are the various means by which the more capable person lifts the performance of the learner towards their success.

Quality interaction depends on establishing intersubjectivity or a joint point of reference, in which the tutor tunes into the learners’ current level of understanding and then leads them carefully to higher levels of performance and understanding (Verenikina, 2012).

Hammond and Gibbons (2005) refer to a model of macro and micro scaffolding to differentiate the planned design of lessons by the tutor and the contingent
interactions. Palincsar (2005) argues for understanding scaffolding in its social constructivist paradigm of contingent social interactions which is the perspective of this study. The following are examples of scaffolding by the RR Tutor from the teachers’ perspective.

Jade: You’re thinking ‘I’m doing the right thing, and ‘we’re going OK’, but then [the Tutor visits] …and you say ‘why don’t you try this? It doesn’t mean that… you’re [always] heading down the right road for the student all the time. [It’s] going back to that that flexibility of [understanding] just because that worked for one week doesn’t mean it’s working next week.

Jemma: [For my learning] I found that, ‘oh, okay, C… showed me how to do that! I can do that in a tricky situation’…what I drew [on]… wasn’t necessarily what I’d read but more from what I’d seen. I thought that that’s why the [Tutor] demonstrations were so valuable to my learning.

Diane: I found that [The Tutor helped] especially with the harder children to teach… [The Tutor] listened, suggested things and occasionally said stop and demonstrated how to do something. But, [with] demonstration… I think that as a beginning RR teacher we have to be careful that we don’t think ‘oh that’s the panacea’…and we don’t keep children at that level.

Emotional responses

Learning in the ZPD involves the affect and the intellect as inseparable (Levykh, 2008), with emotion being influenced by historical experience (what has happened to the learner before) and cultural experience (involving practices of self-control and self-expression) in the social and individual spheres of one’s life. The following are examples of the teachers’ expressions of their emotions in RR teacher learning.

Jemma: I was terrified every time I taught behind the screen… I was absolutely horrified. I knew that what was being discussed was relevant to my teaching and relevant for my child, but when I came out I was pleased it was over. I knew I could walk back into a group that would say ‘thank you for what you did’… they weren’t there to unpick you to the point where you’d never go back there again.

Mary-Lou: If I was confident that what I was saying was… the right thing, then I would join in but I … towards the very beginning I didn’t say hardly anything. I’d speak [to the teachers] before we started [the session] and after we finished. [I joined in when] I was…confident [to] get it wrong without [that] having too much of a backlash for me.

Interviewer: Can you elaborate on that?

Mary-Lou: If I get it wrong, I tend to close down and think I’m stupid, so I didn’t really like saying anything in front of other people, in case…[they] thought I was stupid, so I tend to
not say anything. I was more willing to take risks when I was more comfortable in the group.

Appendix P1 samples bringing the teachers’ responses together under major themes and the categories revealed under those themes. For example the theme of co-construction for the context of the teachers’ discussion at the screen revealed the following categories: learning from how others interacted with the child, learning though group dialogue (clueing into what others are saying and interpreting and getting feedback for your own thinking), bringing to your attention what you have not thought of before, learning through building on ideas group members and talking about the common experience and learning from other people think.

4.11 Trustworthiness

Triangulation was incorporated in the research design. “Triangulation is defined as the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour… Exclusive reliance on one method …may distort the researcher’s picture of the particular slice of reality she is investigating” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p233). The investigator needs to be confident in the trustworthiness of the data collected and this can only be achieved when different methods of data collection produce substantially the same results. Therefore, different methods aim to validate findings. There is the assumption that there is a ‘fixed point’ or ‘object’ that can be triangulated, referred to as ‘domain assumption’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p517). In this case the domain is: learning through social interactions in RR teacher training. It involves a more expert person, the RR Tutor, and novice peer teacher trainees in joint observations and discussions.

Triangulation of data in this study was achieved through: data collected from sessions (social interactions that occurred between the teachers and the teachers and the RR Tutor, and five minute teacher written reflections immediately after the follow-up discussion), teacher interview (the teachers’ perceptions of what occurred over the entire course); and was interpreted through experience and expertise of the RR Tutor (confirming interpretations with academic supervisors and RR Tutor peers).
4.12 Limitations

The limitations of this study were considered and addressed to ensure an objective collection of data which was sampled from across the series of RR training sessions. In relation to video-taping the main purpose of the study was adhered to. That is: to investigate the social interactions between the participants (tutor and teachers) without another person involved in this process. Therefore the data was collected with a free-standing video-taping arrangement (See: 4.9) and teacher involvement holding a small audio recorder. Furthermore, the data was not reviewed (e.g. written reflections) or transcribed until after the course was completed and the interview data collected. This guaranteed that data gathering did not interfere in the social interactions between the tutor/researcher and the teachers thereby influencing the social interactions.

In relation to the tutor/researcher interviewing teachers who had participated in her RR training course the aim of the study was to determine what was helpful in the co-construction of knowledge from the teachers’ perspective not to investigate the tutoring style or to evaluate the RR Tutor. The interview questions were carefully crafted to specifically ask about the quality of the social interactions (See: 4.9). The Tutor collecting the interview data had minimal impact on the teachers’ responses because care was taken to ensure that the questions were asked as planned, without influence due to intent or demeanour. It is recognised, however, that there are issues related to interviewing quality. Miles and Huberman (1994, p89) refer to Mishler (1986, in Miles & Huberman, 1994 ) who says the interviewer and interviewee can co-construct meaning during the interview, such as reading signals (phrases, pauses, initiating a new question, cutting off the discussion and so on). In this way the interviewee reads the purpose of the interview and how to respond. However, ‘one shot interviews’ between strangers can also be suspect because neither can make out the other’s frames of meaning. (Miles & Huberman, 1994)
The issue of dependency and/or researcher bias particularly relevant for a participant researcher is addressed according to Miles and Huberman (1994, p144) by three questions: a) Can we say that we have evolved or tested a theory? b) Have we stuck to all of the available data? and c) Has there been a steady dialogue between our ideas (the theory) and the evidence (data). Furthermore, a good theory to use is one whose categories fit the data, is relevant to what is happening (being studied) or can be used to explain and interpret what is happening. The analysis of the teachers’ interview responses were analysed in terms of the theoretical framework (See: 4.10.3) giving clear examples for the emerging themes. The analysis shifted beyond what was being shared to how knowledge was being constructed. This is presented as a story of the teachers’ perspective in Chapter Six.

A theoretical focus and clear examples still however does not discount researcher effects (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p265-66). There are two levels of effect a) the effects of the tutor/researcher on the case, and b) the effects of the case on the tutor/researcher. In this study the RR Tutor is the primary person influencing the case (RR teacher training), and could be subsumed by the case through over familiarity with the teachers. This situation has been addressed by: not viewing or analysing data during the RR training course, not making the theoretical measures obvious to the teachers in any way (that is: not altering the types of social interactions, content knowledge, and expectations held for any other training course), including all of the participants in the course in the data without exception, and using different methods of data collection (video and audio data, written reflection data and interview data).

4.13 Conclusion

This research was conducted by a RR Tutor as the researcher during one course of RR teacher training. Data was collected from a sample of the eighteen sessions in the course (beginning, middle and end). The methods of data collection included video and audio taping of the sample session and interviews of the participants at the end of the course. This was analysed by the techniques of data reduction and thematic analysis. The trustworthiness of the data was ensured by member checking.
(interview data), checking themes with university supervisors, and triangulation of the data.
Chapter Five

5 MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS THAT UNFOLD OF THE TUTOR’S AND TEACHERS’ SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

The aim of this chapter is to answer Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session? and the two sub-questions: 1a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions? and, 1b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

5.1 Introduction

The sub-questions are answered from an analysis of video and audio-taped data and by data reduction (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p10-11) in relation to the characteristics of the social interactions, which occurred during the chosen sessions. (See: 4.10.1).

The presentation of the findings are structured around the major steps of a RR session: 1) the introductory discussion; 2) the discussions during the teacher lesson observations of two 30 minute demonstrations of RR teaching presented by two peer teacher participants; and 3) the follow-up discussions of the lessons. Additionally, the teachers’ reflections of what they had learned, written immediately afterwards, were analysed.

The introductory and follow-up discussions occurred where all the teachers were together with the Tutor were sitting in a circle facing one another with their course books and notebooks on their knees. During the teacher lesson observations the teachers were seated in two rows at the glass screen and the Tutor facilitated the discussion, moving occasionally from one side of the screen to another so she could attend to each individual teacher. The teachers could turn around in their chairs to talk to each other. (See: 4.6)
An analysis of the major characteristics of the social interactions that unfolded are structured under the three major steps of each session (introductory discussion, lesson observation discussions, and follow-up discussion) and follow the logic of the two sub-questions with the tutor’s social interactions and the teachers’ social interactions ‘dovetailed’ to indicate the dynamic of the relationship between the two roles.

The sessions chosen for the analysis were selected to sample the range of the eighteen RR training course sessions: early (session three), middle (sessions seven, eight and nine) and late (session sixteen). In this chapter the findings of the chosen sessions are integrated and discussed to answer Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session?

The boundaries of the study are restricted to the analysis of social interactions for the story of the teachers’ co-construction of knowledge in the RR training course related to data that could be objectified. A social constructivist perspective was used for framing these results based on the premise that individuals learn through their social activities and interactions. The study therefore utilises Vygotskian theory that focuses on intersubjectivity, the teachers’ zone of proximal development (ZPD), internalisation and the neo-Vygotskian concept of scaffolding.

Social constructivism emphasises learning as an active process that involves constructive dialogue between participants. Even though the Vygotskian theory relates to child development the conceptualisations of this theory are useful in understanding adult learning (Kim & Bonk, 1988). “According to Vygotsky (1978), social interaction—in particular, co-operative dialogs with more knowledgeable members of society—is necessary for the learner to efficiently acquire the ways of thinking and behavior that make up a community’s culture” (Verenikina, 2012, p479).

The major contribution of the RR Tutor in this study was through scaffolding the teachers learning in the social interaction (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) at the interactional mico-level as distinct from the macro-level in-design scaffolding
involved in planning sessions (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005, p11). In this study the RR Tutor acted contingently (Wood, 2003) on teaching and learning opportunities that presented themselves in the act of jointly observing and discussing teaching at the glass-screen with the teachers. The Tutor also scaffolded conversations prior to and post observation (the introductory and follow-up discussions). Therefore ‘observation and discussion’ were the central and most important component of the sessions in the study, with the introductory discussion for setting expectations and context and the follow-up discussion for the provision of teacher feedback.

The evidence from this research data showed that the RR Tutor scaffolded by recruiting the interest and participation of the teachers; maintaining the direction of the dialogue; restricting the degrees of freedom for searching for answers; confirming what the teachers say and do; directing and redirecting attention; questioning the teachers; extending and clarifying arguments and knowledge; telling and explaining. All are acts of scaffolding and are shown in Figure 3.

Scaffolding is most effective when the participants experience intersubjectivity. This refers to the way people share meaning (Bonk & Kim, 1998) through a joint point of reference (Gallagher, 2009) that supports internalisation within the learners’ zones of proximal development (ZPDs) (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Bonk & Kim, 1998). The zone of proximal development is the distance between the learner’s “actual development determined through independent problem-solving” and the higher level of “potential development as determined through problem-solving under [more expert] guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Wertsch, 1985, p67-68). Internalisation extends the ZPDs and they gradually become self-regulatory (Bonk & Kim, 1998). This is when the individual appropriates new information about skills from the social plane for independent personal use. The social constructivist perspective of learning is that internalization starts from a constructive process of shared participation in language and activities.

In this study the RR Tutor acted as a facilitator and co-constructor of language and thinking in RR through a process called social mediation. Social mediation is more
than instructing, modelling or demonstrating (Vialle et al, 2005, p52). The Tutor constantly interacted with the teachers analysing what they are saying, how they are teaching and inferring what they were thinking – or how they were constructing meaning. The trainee RR teachers were not passive recipients of the social context around them. The teachers actively influenced their social surrounding and interacted by teaching for each other and discussing their own teaching and child learning. As the teachers developed as RR teachers over time (the year-long course) they developed their own agency or capacity to act independently as RR teachers.

Language in Vygotskian theory is the central to higher-order cognitive processes, including abstract thinking and self-regulation (Vygotsky, 1986). It is also a critical tool for social interaction, communication and interpersonal influence. In this RR teacher training study great emphasis was placed on ‘thinking aloud’ in the group situation (talking while thinking as the teachers observed teaching at the glass-screen), and talking while reading was also encouraged, rather than reading in silence, when the teachers repeatedly reviewed their course texts. Hearing others “…enables the… [learner]… to better reflect on their own problem-solving and helps them to regulate their thinking.” (Vialle et al, 2005, p59)

The following section is the analysis based on data reduction of the RR Tutor’s and teachers’ social interactions during the three observation periods (the introductory discussion, the observations and discussion and the follow-up discussion) in the five RR sessions used to answer the sub-questions 1a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions? and 1b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions? A theoretical interpretation is incorporated and examples of transcript data are used for illustrative purposes.

---

1 Reading of texts sections were repeated throughout the course because the texts were used as reference materials (a RR tool).
Figure 3: Tutor Scaffolding and Teacher Interactions in Reading Recovery Sessions

**INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION**
(approx. 15 minutes)

**TUTOR**
A) Facilitating teacher interactions
B) Co-constructing teacher knowledge:
   i) Establishing session emphases
   ii) Linking to teachers’ prior knowledge
   iii) Highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge
   iv) Using course references

**TEACHERS**
A) Sharing experience, and knowledge
B) Co-constructing knowledge
C) Supporting self-regulation

**LESSON OBSERVATION AND DISCUSSION**
(at least one hour)

**TUTOR**
A) Facilitating teacher interactions
B) Co-constructing Teacher Knowledge
   i) Directing attention
   ii) Explaining and clarifying
   iii) Highlighting what needed to be remembered
   iv) Highlighting what was important
   v) Highlighting what needed to change

**TEACHERS**
A) Co-constructing knowledge
   i) Replaying and interpreting observations
   ii) Reaching agreement
   iii) Evaluating
   - The child’s behaviour
   - The teacher’s behaviour
   - Their own learning
   iv) Linking Belief (personal theories) and practice

**FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION**
(approx. 20-30 minutes)

**TUTOR**
A) Facilitating the interaction
B) Co-constructing Teacher Knowledge
   i) Influencing Feedback through summarising and contextualising
   ii) Using course references
   iii) Explaining and clarifying
   iv) Highlighting
   v) Directing
   vi) Demonstrating/modelling

**TEACHERS**
A) Learning the discussion format
B) Giving contextualised feedback to each other
C) Using RR texts as a Common Point of Reference
D) Co-constructing knowledge of teaching strategies and child learning
Figure 3 (above) outlines the main social interactions in the RR session within the cycle of social interactions in each RR session: the introductory discussion, the observations and discussion and the follow-up discussion.

Figure 3 shows: the main social characteristics in the introductory discussions of the Tutor were – facilitating the teachers’ interaction, and co-constructing teacher knowledge by: establishing session emphases, linking to teachers’ to prior knowledge, highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge, using references or personal expert knowledge; whilst those of the teachers were – sharing experience, ideas, and knowledge, co-constructing knowledge, and supporting self-awareness.

The main social characteristics in the observations and discussion of the Tutor were – facilitating teacher contributions and co-constructing teacher knowledge by: directing attention, explaining and clarifying, highlighting what needed to be remembered, highlighting what is important, and highlighting what needed to change; whilst those of the teachers were – co-constructing teacher knowledge through -replaying and/or interpreting observations, reaching agreement, evaluating (child, teacher, self), and linking belief and practices.

The main social characteristics in the follow-up discussions of the Tutor were- influencing feedback through summarising and contextualising, linking to course references, highlighting, directing, and demonstrating/modelling; whilst those of the teachers were - getting and giving feedback, linking to RR Texts as a point of reference, and co-constructing knowledge of teaching strategies and child learning. (Refer to 4.10.1: ‘Data reduction and Coding’ for a detailed explanation of the theoretical foundation of the coding with transcript examples).

5.2 The Tutor’s and Teachers’ Social Interactions: Introductory Discussion

5.2.1 The Tutor’s Social Interactions: Introductory Discussion
a) Facilitating the Teacher Interactions

The Tutor coordinated this introductory part to the RR Session. She planned references to texts and questioning prior to the session around session themes, called session “emphases” in RR. The Tutor facilitated the teacher interactions through questioning, clarifying, extending areas and explaining. The RR Tutor explained to the teachers how the sessions were organised in Session Three. This was the first time the teachers had taught for each other behind the glass-screen. The Tutor explained that it was an expectation in RR Teacher training that all the teachers would make a contribution. In Session Three the Tutor linked the discussion to the teachers’ current teaching experience. The same format started sessions seven, eight and nine. The change by Session Sixteen was to a discussion of RR knowledge, separate from teacher experience, facilitated by the questioning of the Tutor. The following are examples of facilitation of the introductory discussion.

(S3) 2I want to start where everyone speaks in the first five minutes or so about something to do with teaching in school, so you are prepared.

(S8) We are into in-service eight which is almost half-way through the course. At this point I have decided to talk about what the teacher does by observing exactly what the teacher is doing.

(S16) Today we’re thinking about teacher and child learning. Clay asks us to be observant, flexible and tentative teachers. If you are observant what does it mean you have to know? What can you observe? All that you do is based on observation, so what does this mean for your teaching?

b) Co-constructing teacher knowledge

To assist teachers' interactions in forming their common understanding of each session’s theme the Tutor facilitated the teachers' 'co-construction of knowledge' (Palincsar, 2005) to build up a joint point of reference for the observations and discussions. Palincsar writes that almost all cognitive sciences explain meaning making in the process of interpreting experiences (Palincsar, 2005, p286), and John-Steiner and Mahn (1996, p204) argue that the true interpretation of social constructivist theory is the interdependence of individual and social processes in what Palincsar refers to as the co-construction of knowledge (Palincsar, 2005, 287).

2 (S) is abbreviation of Session
The techniques that the Tutor employed included: establishing the session ‘emphasis’ linking to teacher’s prior knowledge, highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge of the teaching process. The Tutor also guided the teachers in using the RR course materials (the text and teacher guide sheets) to inform their observations.

The following are the features of the co-construction in the introductory discussion to answer Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session?

i) Establishing the Session ‘Emphases’

At the beginning of each session the Tutor shared the session themes or ‘emphases’ which can be described as ‘setting the scene’. This reduces ‘the degree of freedom’ in the observation and discussion (a scaffolding function, Wood et al, 1976). The emphases for the sessions sampled were: Interaction (Session Three); Independence (Session Seven); Teacher Change (Sessions Eight and Nine); and ‘Teacher and Child Learning’ with the emphasis being on: ‘Observation, Tentativeness and Flexibility’ (Session Sixteen). In Session Seven the Tutor explained the theme (e.g. “independence” was a key understanding for teachers to have in RR) and in Sessions Eight and Nine the reason for the ‘emphasis’ were specifically assist teacher change in teaching language and actions. The Tutor reviewed a previous ‘emphasis’ when the topic ‘teacher change’ carried over two sessions. The Tutor extended this “theme” by acknowledging that “teacher change” did not come about in any learning unless the learner was aware of the need to change. The Tutor explained the necessity of the long RR course was to allow for teacher change through time to able to revisit their teaching repeatedly over the course of the year. By Session Sixteen the Tutor explored the ‘emphasis’, “Observation, Tentativeness and Flexibility”, through an exploration of the meaning of language in RR teaching, e.g. close observation was the basis for “moment by moment” teacher decisions made in RR teaching; tentativeness was “preparedness to change”; and the Tutor’s explanation of “hypothesis making and testing” in RR teaching was where the teacher judged the efficacy of her own interactions on the basis of improving child behaviour, and if it did not the teacher “went in a different direction”. The Tutor initiated teacher
discussion in order to reach a joint understanding that “flexibility” was underpinned by choices teachers had for their actions (knowledge of language prompts and procedures) their disposition of “tentativeness”.

The emphases for sessions are part of the Tutor’s planning for the teachers’ learning referred to as macro ‘designed-in’ scaffolding (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). It is found for instance in the ways classrooms are organised, how goals for tasks are set and in the selection of sequencing tasks such as across and within the RR training course. As ‘emphases’ or ‘themes’ are disclosed to teachers with rationales at the beginning of each session they can be viewed as fulfilling the function of ‘learning intentions’. “Good learning intentions are those that make clear to the … [learners]… the type or level of performance they need to attain … [and what to participate in]… so that they understand where and when to invest their energies, strategies and thinking, and where they are positioned along the trajectory towards successful learning ….” (Hattie, 2012, p47). The change of emphases over the sessions sampled were from an emphasis on teacher participation, to key ideas in RR as exemplified in teacher-child interactions, to closer scrutiny of the teacher’s interactions with the child, and to discussion couched in terms of the disposition of teachers and premises of RR teaching.

ii) Linking To Teacher’s Prior Knowledge

The Tutor facilitated the teachers’ oral language interactions whereby they shared their teaching experiences since the previous session. She invited active participation and waited for most teachers to contribute. For instance, the Tutor started Session Three with the expectation that teachers would contribute so her first initiating question was open. The teachers were to respond to: “What am I thinking about in my teaching and why?” Some contributions related to experiences that teachers had had with the Tutor on a school visit and how that had influenced their RR teaching. In the middle of the course the contributions related more to important ideas in RR. In Session Seven the Tutor elicited teacher prior knowledge about what they thought independence would mean in RR teaching, before and after they had read the teachers’ RR guidesheet and quotes from the RR texts. Prior to the readings the
teachers thought independence would mean that the children could self-monitor their reading and problem-solve difficulties. After reading about RR being an intervention that valued independence and self-correcting behaviour by children, a teacher added that allowing for child independence would involve “wait-time” or room for the children to take the initiative without an emphasis on correctness. In the next two sessions the Tutor’s macro-scaffolding shifted from the child to the teachers themselves and what they did in their social interactions with children. In Session Eight and Nine the teachers shared how they actively worked to change their RR teaching. Later in the course, in Session Sixteen the Tutor explored language meanings with the teachers related to the emphases on teacher disposition in RR teaching (tentative, observant and flexible) which draws on their personal knowledge and introduced the understanding of the important teacher role in child learning, introducing the teachers to the concept of co-construction which had been understood ‘co-workers’ from the beginning of the course (Diane’s written reflection of what a RR lesson looked like to her in Session Two).

Linking to prior knowledge assists learning from one session to the next or from previous experiences and understandings to the current social situation in adult learning (Hailikari, Katajavuori & Lindblom-Ylanne, 2008). This is part of macro-scaffolding (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005) by the Tutor.

(S8) In our last session we were talking about our interactions with children and how we as teachers influence the shaping of the child’s literacy processing by the things we say and do. What have you been thinking about and how do you change what you do and why?

(S16) If you are observing a child what are you thinking? Think about the moment by moment interaction. That’s when it will be critical how you respond.

**iii) Highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge**

In all sampled sessions the Tutor highlighted significant RR knowledge. The Tutor gave the teachers a handout about the session theme, a guidesheet and quotations related to the theme in sessions seven, eight and nine (Appendix H). The Tutor directed the teachers to review sections in their texts related to the theme (e.g. independence and self-monitoring procedures in Session Seven).
The main way the Tutor highlighted RR knowledge was through explanation. In Session Eight the Tutor gave a long explanation about the need to address “teacher change”. The Tutor said that this was because despite the different personal theories the teachers may have about how children learn to read or what they had focused on in their teaching of reading (reading for meaning or focusing on fixing errors), all learning teachers needed to make shifts in their teaching. The Tutor used a series of teaching maxims (principles) that were pivotal for child success (Phillips & Smith, 1997).

The principles for effective teaching highlighted by the Tutor were: clearly understanding the purpose of each literacy activity in the RR lesson; being consistent in what needed to be learned (e.g. the purpose of “familiar reading” was for the “orchestration” of the reading process); acting consistently in their social interactions with children (especially in the use of language prompts); assuming that any child was always making sense in terms of his or her current understandings, therefore there was no blame to be placed on the child.

The Tutor explained that the teacher needed to search for different approaches to facilitate child success; using the language prompts for the purpose they were designed (to teach for “strategic activities”), especially through facilitating child self-management in locating their errors before teacher support to correct them; teacher time-management and judgment for where they selected to intervene and why. This initiated the teachers further into the not only the technical language of RR but the actions of expertise. Teacher-child interaction was further developed in Session Nine. The Tutor explained that RR teaching involved “continuous change” in relation to the child’s responding, and that the teachers would have to have a “tentative disposition” for effective RR teaching. She clarified that this meant that teachers gathered evidence about how to assist the child in a RR lesson as they taught, and made their decisions on the basis of accumulated of evidence. In this session the Tutor re-presented the teaching principles from Session Eight with the emphasis on when teachers intervene in the child’s reading, and linked teacher effectiveness with child success. The Tutor explained that this disposition necessitated flexibility in their actions and they were not to interfere with the child’s
“making of meaning” by being intrusive (with regard to the error) intervening too often, or breaking down the child’s ability to self-manage “making meaning”.

In Session Sixteen the Tutor scaffolded the teachers’ understanding through questioning and extending teacher explanations. The teaching knowledge influenced was: the need for observation, tentativeness and flexibility. The Tutor explained that RR teachers taught for “acceleration of the rate of learning” (a key RR teaching principle previously introduced and discussed in relation to teaching mid-way through the course) through carefully managing their responses in relation to the child’s behaviour. This primary aim of RR was teacher dependent on: observations; inferences; and their knowledge base of RR theory and procedures, which afforded them their teaching “flexibility”.

In this session the Tutor explained that language prompts in RR offered levels of support (more or less) and were for specific “strategic activities” (e.g. self-monitoring, searching, self-correcting). The Tutor argued that if the teacher had too few options in prompting (a series of prompts they could use) they would have few choices for assisting the child, and developing “flexibility” would be a challenge. The Tutor linked “flexibility” to “creativity” in RR teaching, because the teacher’s language and actions were responsive to the child’s actions. The Tutor explained that small children can construct erroneous ideas about reading, for example, looking at print in inappropriate ways, so they had “an observant teacher sitting beside them”.

Then the Tutor also carefully explained, phrase by phrase, the meaning of Clay’s definition of reading that begins: “I define reading as a message getting problem-solving activity”. The explanation was interspersed with “that means”. (See: Appendix A) This type of explanation highlights what to think about and assists the teachers in understanding the task and their role in it.

(S3) Now that’s a really important word that we all have to have in our understanding, “orchestration”... if you’re listening could you hear if it was not orchestrated? So, you would hear that...and if there was an over attention to visual information what might you hear?

(S7) It is important that when you say something to teach to say “how to” that is to teach for strategic activity.
You’re talking in terms of – you have an hypothesis, you interact with the child, that’s a way of testing your hypothesis, you see if that’s improved [the child’s responding] and if it doesn’t you’ll go in a different direction. That’s when you come to this notion of being flexible.

The change over the time of these sampled sessions is from what is more familiar (describing what can be seen and heard), to what is less familiar (reflecting on how to think to be flexible teachers).

iv) Using Course References

The RR course references are the course texts (Clay 2005a, 2005b) and teacher ‘guidesheets’. These are used as a joint point of reference for the Tutor and teachers. In Session Three the Tutor explained that the ‘guidesheets’ were to provide ‘guidance’ and support for their teaching using “Literacy Lessons, Parts One and Two” (the texts were abbreviated as “Literacy Lessons”). The Tutor explained that the course texts would be used and available when they taught RR lessons. She encouraged the teachers to write in the margins, highlight relevant parts and to use coloured tabs for quick reference. This ensured that, the independent teaching between sessions, are guided by RR theory and practices within the framework and timing of RR lessons.

The teachers were assisted in how to use the RR texts from the beginning of the course. In this Session Three the teachers were directed to find references for teaching “familiar reading” (See: Appendix K). The Tutor used the authority of the texts that related to the lesson observations first literacy activity. In Session Seven the Tutor had a handout of two quotes from the texts on ‘independence’ for discussion (See: Appendix A). This also related to the session emphasis for the observations (See: Appendix I). In Sessions Eight and Nine, the teachers had a handout on teaching principles to refer to (See: Appendix S) in the discussions. There was no reference to the text in Session Sixteen.

The importance of using course texts is twofold: a) it provides a joint point of reference for intersubjectivity, and b) the texts can be referred to again so each teacher can learn within his or her own ZPD.
The following are transcript data examples from earlier in the course:

(S3) Let’s look at re-reading two to three familiar books. Where are you going to find that? Why do we do this activity in the RR lesson? Can you unpick ‘sounds good’ Jade?

(S8) We have this principle ‘the teacher must check that her prompts act as intended’ Our aim is that we teach the child to detect their own error and correct their own error. We are not using the prompts as intended if we find the error by voice, pointing or intervening too quickly because it denies the child the opportunity to monitor and search.

(S16) To be a RR teacher next year you need to be these three things: observant, tentative and flexible… and base all of your moment by moment interactions with children [on this rather than] …classroom teaching… not planning what I’m going to do…

The change shown in these examples are from the particular to the general over the time of the course and preparatory for independent RR teaching.

5.2.2 The Teachers’ Social Interactions: Introductory Discussion

The data analysis of the “Introductory Discussion” at the beginning of the session substantiates a number of features of the teachers’ social interactions. These included: sharing with each other their experience and knowledge; creating common meaning of the emphasis of the session (co-construction of knowledge) and supporting each other's awareness of own teaching and learning. The teachers assist in joint learning on the social plane in their respective zones of proximal development (ZPDs).

a) Sharing Experience and Knowledge

In Session Three the teachers contributed following the Tutor’s request to participate because the request was related directly to their experience. The teachers disclosed that they were thinking ahead about how the children would achieve and where they would be going next; and what the challenges were to them at the beginning of the course (for example: using lesson records, timing the lessons, having conversations with the children before writing to elicit a story composition). One teacher shared a
school visit experience she had had with the Tutor. The teachers related their own teaching experience to the text and expressed their understanding of the meaning of the text in this light for the ‘familiar reading’ activity. The teachers knew what the reading would ‘sound like’ therefore what they were to teach for. This meant that early in the course the teachers related prior experiences for the group collaboration in their co-construction of meaning.

The teachers came had a prior understanding of what “independence” would mean to bring to the conversation in Session Seven. They shared this before and after reading the hand-outs for the session (new information from the specialist group of RR). Before the reading, two teachers volunteered that it would mean children would be able to “problem-solve” and “monitor”. They did not express more from the quotation but agreed that “independence” was the expectation of classroom teachers and that being able to “have a go” was a pre-requisite. In Session Eight five teachers reflected on their experiences related to working towards change their teaching practice and related this to their practices (teaching between sessions). Tracey: “I've been working on my prompts and making sure what I say is what I want the child to be doing.” Belinda: “I’ve been analysing what I’ve been doing to make sure it’s the ‘how to’ and making the child less reliant on me.” Lara: “I’ve been working on pace. Like not just with the timer, but just the whole pace and tone of the lesson.” Jemma: “I’ve been explicit in what I expect of the lesson…I was assuming that they knew what was inside my head and what I wanted them to do. Now I’m up front. This is what we’re doing today.” These examples indicate that the teachers are influenced by their RR training working through their social experiences into their independent practices. Further examples come from the next session when six teachers responded to how they had been changing their teaching. Belinda was working on language, trying to talk less and be more consistent, concise and clear; Tracey was working on consistent expectations and follow-through with those expectations; Diane was re-reading her texts while asking herself: “what can I do to help the situation from the point of view of my action? What am I doing? What am I saying?”; Lara was thinking that every lesson had to be better tomorrow; Maura was trying to have clear and precise instructions “…instead of rambling on because sometimes they just don’t get it if you keep on”; Jemma was targeting change in one area which was writing;
and four teachers responded to what teachers needed to be like in RR. Belinda said that teachers had to be open and be able to be critical in a positive way about themselves and their own teaching. Lara said that the teachers had to be flexible: “If what you’ve planned doesn’t work or isn’t what the child needed, you need to be flexible to be able to do it on the run…” In response to the Tutor suggesting that teachers needed to be tentative and not have rigid ideas, Jade said: “Your ideas don’t suit every child do they?” And Diane said that rigid ideas “blind you to what is actually happening.” These examples illustrate the thoughtfulness of teachers as they are changing in their zones of proximal development (ZPD) and the influence of the social interactions from sessions. Sharing fulfils a collaborative function. The teachers hear what others say and relate their thinking to the ideas of others.

In Session Sixteen Jade said that “observation” meant that they were looking at what the children were doing and not just “doing” themselves. This meant that teachers influence what children do when they are observant and it is different from teaching lessons. The following are examples of how to observe and how observation supports teaching from the teacher perspective: “keeping your mouth closed is the best way to observe effectively.” (Jemma); “if you are noticing something repetitively you’re seeing a pattern. So it [the pattern] starts to emerge, and might confirm what you are predicting.” (Lara), “you plan your lessons around what you observe” (Diane); “[what you observe] will determine where you go in the lesson series.” (Shelley); and Jade said that observing effects how the teacher is thinking, “what you need to do for them at that moment of the lesson.” Jemma contributed that the teacher’s aim was “…that they will be successful, that at the end of the lesson they will have learned something new.” These conversations were developed through RR Tutor scaffolding around session emphases. The change in the teacher disposition is reflected over the time of the course as the teachers take on the views, ideas and practices of RR through their multiple opportunities of social interaction.

In terms of prompting (using the expert language of RR), the teachers agreed that child success was how they judged whether what they did was appropriate, and they thought, “prompting” was for “independence”. Mary-Lou said, “…you’re trying to get them to do it on their own.” The teachers confirmed that strategic activity was:
“the how to’s” (Tracey); “the brainwork.” (Jemma), which was their constructed understanding near the end of the course, based on emphases of the Tutor and how they were to write-up their assessment data and teaching goals in terms of strategic activities (hence the how to’s), while reference to ‘brain function’ had been reviewed and explained in their course text. Shelley explained in her understanding that strategic activity was based on the child’s experience so “… it is ultimately theirs.” The discussion included the concept of “co-construction” Lara said that this was about “trying to help them make the most useful links, so there are better ways of looking at it and refining it [their actions].” Whilst Shelley thought her role in “co-construction” was “to prevent error, so you can erase that pattern [of poor responding]”

Teacher sharing of experience and knowledge allows the Tutor to analyse the teachers’ current understandings and thereby influences how the Tutor interacts with the teachers socially to lever them higher in their zones of proximal development (ZPD). The teachers’ collaboration in sharing allows them to include their peers in making meaning. The following are examples of the teachers’ sharing experience and knowledge in the early in the course, around the middle of the course and later in the course. The flow of the conversation is scaffolded by the Tutor. Early in the course the teachers think specifically about procedures and management with a little input from the individual Tutor after school visits.

Lara: I’m really starting to think ahead. Where do I want them to go so what do I have to do to get them there? That’s what I’m looking at with each of the children.

Diane: I just had my first RR lesson today and I planned it on the sheet and then I thought I’ve got to do this note-taking while I’m actually working, so that will be a challenge for me.

In the middle of the course the teachers were grappling with their teaching:

Tracey: I have been working on my prompts and making sure that what I say is what I want the child to be doing. So I’m really phrasing my prompts quite heavily.

Belinda: I’ve been analysing what I’ve been doing to make sure it’s the ‘how to’. What I am working on is that I’m teaching the child ‘how to’ do whatever and making them less reliant on me. I thought I was doing it but I am making them dependent.
Near the end of the course the teachers shared ideas associated with how they influence the child’s literacy processing as shown in these examples:

On observing:
Lara: If you’re noticing something repetitively you’re seeing a pattern…

Shelley: What you observe will determine where you go in the lesson series.

On flexibility:
Jade: You’re able to change your mind at that moment for how the lesson will go.

Jemma: Every child is different so one strategy is not going to work with each and every child, to be flexible is what work’s for that child.

b) Co-constructing of teacher knowledge

The concept of the co-construction of knowledge is adapted from social interactions in child development to adult learning in this study. “For Vygotsky… co-operatively achieved success lies at the foundations of learning and development … [and is]… the main vehicle for the cultural transmission of knowledge. Knowledge is embodied in the actions, work, play, technology, literature, art and talk of the members of society. Only through interaction … [can learners]…come to acquire, embody and further develop that knowledge” (Wood, 1988, p25). Co-construction, according to social-constructivist theory occurs through intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity in this study, is about the way a group of people think about the RR teacher training experience, and share meaning through their teaching actions and their language.

After reading the text about “familiar reading” in preparation for the lesson observation in Session Three the teachers explained what they thought reading that ‘sounded good’ was like. This established the goal for the lesson activity. Jade said, “It sounds confident and phrased and the intonation is correct at the end of sentences, and taking note of punctuation, and the pausing is correct for punctuation.” Shelley said it was about linking words together so they had “flow”, which was scaffolded by the Tutor as the meaning of “fluency”. The teachers also discussed “orchestration” in reading as meaning “bringing everything together.” (Shelley). The teachers knew what reading would sound like if it were not “orchestrated”: disjointed; hesitant; unnecessary and extra pausing, robotic; stilted and broken down. The Tutor had a
habit of exploring language in this way relating prior general linguistic knowledge to the new specific psychological interpretations in RR teaching, coupled with how to teach for these features.

The co-construction around use of the texts are shown in the example where Jade inferred from reading the course references on independence that teaching for this involved “wait time”, not jumping in to fix mistakes before children had the opportunity to solve them. (Session Seven) Explaining what you understand to others can show teachers development of their understandings in their zones of proximal development. Maria explained to the group how she was using a procedure to assist the children in self-monitoring visual information in this session. Her explanation and demonstration of how the procedure worked needed to be clarified for the group, by the Tutor. Maria, however, assured the group that she thought the RR procedure had value because “they’re [the children] just taken aback you know, and then they hurry up and they get that next letter.” This example shows that teacher learning has ‘ups and down’ when what you can do (in your lessons at school) you cannot explain to others.

After teaching RR children for fourteen weeks in their schools the teachers expressed the view that the children they were teaching were not independent and that they did not have the teaching skill to scaffold their “independence”. Maria said “…they just sit there and wait for you to tell them. They fuss and they fuss and it doesn’t happen.” Diane added, “…well, I’m just jumping in and telling them because I don’t know any other way.” How to teach rather than what to teach for seemed to be the problem for these teachers in their construction of RR teaching skills.

During Session Eight the teachers mainly listened to the Tutor and took notes in the introductory discussion. The Tutor re-visited the same ‘emphasis’ on teacher change and the same material on teaching principles (Phillips & Smith, 1997) in the next session. In response to the principle of “seeking the child’s point of view” in analysing what to do Shelley provided her experience for the group. She said that she had a child that puzzled her. However her discussion with the Tutor and reflection on her notes from an observation led her to suggest that the child’s reading was slow
and effortful was because his first efforts at difficulty were to decode. Shelley said: ‘So I did what C… advised, just to take a little, a paragraph at a time, and say ‘this is the part where Ben is talking to Mum’ (or whatever) and it was fantastic. It worked so well. So he wasn’t baulking at the words because he had the meaning, so…therefore the words just flowed. It was really good.”

In relation to the principle about “carefully selecting places to intervene” Jemma explained why this was important: “Because you can ruin their network, their strategic activity, if you jump in too quickly or too late, so they either don’t get an opportunity to make meaning, or it’s too late, they’ve already made a connection that’s incorrect.” This was a misunderstanding between Tutor guidance not to intervene at the error and Clay’s advice that children do not learn equally from teacher treatment of all errors. This is a further example of how teacher learning can be mixed near the middle of the course.

The teachers were clear by the middle of the course that RR teaching involved using the language of RR (prompting) in their teaching. Lara said that children would be able to act appropriately if you gave the “correct prompt”. In response to the Tutor asking the teachers what they were going to do if they did not get the behaviours they were expecting from their prompts Jade said, “You need to look at what you’re saying and think how you would change that somehow…” The quandary for teachers that they shared with each other (encouraged by the Tutor) was how to match teaching actions to child responses for a successful child learning outcome, half – way through the course.

In the co-construction of knowledge the teachers were convinced by Session Sixteen (based on what they said in the introductory discussions) that what helped their teaching were: knowledge of the teaching procedures and the prompts to use to encourage strategic activity. Shelley said, “Sometimes we know what works best with a particular child. Some children work better with meaning scaffolding than others.” This example shows that teacher talk was about information (meaning,
syntax or visual) used in reading, and not strategic activity or ‘processing’ at this late stage of the course.

The teachers’ co-construction of RR teaching knowledge lies in the flow of dialogue. Through ‘talk’ teachers have a social reference for how you do things and what this means learned through peer teacher collaboration.

c) Supporting self-regulation

Self-regulation involves self-awareness or reflection and it occurs as part of the process of internalisation (Palincsar, 2005, Bonk & Kim, 1998). Self-regulation includes the process of self-monitoring. This awareness of ‘self’ is a key feature in the development of self-correcting behaviour in literacy learning by children (Clay, 2005b) and the effectiveness of teaching agency (Phillips & Smith, 1997). According to Bandura people have orientations for regulating their behaviour, (and thinking) which are shaped by influential people in their environment and socially referenced standards learned through comparing oneself with others (Bandura, 1991, p254). For RR teacher training this means that teacher self-regulation arose from their social interactions with the RR Tutor and each other. The teachers oriented their RR learning by their desire to teach RR (actions and prompting etc) and their lesson observations and discussions of both successful and unsuccessful peer-teacher teaching interactions with children. Teacher self-regulation is involved in the process of internalisation in the zone of proximal development. In RR training self-regulation is developed through collaboration with peer-learners rather than observing and participating with more expert or more capable RR teachers. This allows teachers to comfortably compare their own learning to this social reference.

In the introductory discussions the teachers expressed their awareness of their development as RR teachers for each other sharing: “Oh I can’t remember”, “I’m questioning myself” “I wasn’t doing what I thought I was” “I don’t know how to move on”, “I didn’t know what else to do, “It’s the same for me”. The teachers also realised in hindsight the importance of what was built in to RR teaching, for example
when Jemma said, “It means that ‘Roaming Around the Known’ is much more vital… I don’t think we appreciated that.”

The teachers shared what they thought about themselves in this example: “[we need to be]…honest to ourselves about our teaching… [and]… you need to become reflective about what you’re doing” (Belinda). They were also forthcoming about their emotional versus cognitive responses in teaching in respect to their self-regulation. For example Diane said, “I can be thinking ‘accuracy rate is down ahhh!’ I need to get over this kind of reaction: ‘Oh what is wrong? Oh what is wrong?’ And just reflect on it. Think about it.”

By Session Sixteen the teachers were still identifying challenges in reading and writing that related to their social interactions with children. Belinda said, “Choosing the right prompt, the most appropriate prompt for the child’s success.” Jemma said, “…using the writing component of the lesson more effectively. I’m thinking that there’s such potential and I personally miss the opportunities.”

These examples of awareness from the introductory discussions across the RR teacher training sessions illustrate that the teachers were thoughtful about their own learning in relation to RR teaching expectations and had trusting group relationships which meant they could discuss reflections about their own teaching with each other as a social reference for their developing abilities and knowledge.

5.3 The Tutor’s and Teachers’ Social Interactions: Lesson Observations and Discussion

The analysis of the recordings of the second component of the sampled RR sessions (See: Appendix G) identified the following the main characteristics of the Tutor’s interactions with the group of the teachers: encouraging the teachers to actively participate in the discussion of the observed lessons in order to form an

---

1The first ten lessons in RR are for fluency building in what is known and partially known, as well as establishing relationships with children and extended observation, beyond the initial assessments for child entry to RR.
understanding of the child's literacy processing (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) and teachers' interactions with the child (Vygotsky, 1978; Clay 1982) thus, co-constructing teachers' knowledge of Reading Recovery competencies.

5.3.1 Tutor’s Social Interactions: Lesson Observations and Discussion

The Tutor’s social interactions with the teachers during the lesson observations that emerged were: prompting the teacher’s contributions, and co-constructing teacher knowledge through scaffolding (directing teacher attention, explaining and clarifying, highlighting what needed to be remembered for the follow-up discussions, highlighting what was important for their teaching, and highlighting what needed to change in their teaching).

The RR Tutor's social interaction in influencing the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions refers to directing the teachers to a joint point of reference for their discussion and keeping the dialogue focused on moving forward with links to the session emphasis (the frame of reference presented in the introductory discussion) for viewing and discussing literacy processing.

a) Facilitating the teachers' contributions

In the Vygotskian (1978) perspective the first stage of awareness in new learning typically involves “social interaction and negotiation between experts and novices or among novices … and it is by means of participating in this social interaction that interpretations are first proposed and worked out and, therefore, become available to be taken on by individuals” (Daniels, Cole & Wertsch, 2007, p187). Therefore, at the glass-screen the Tutor orchestrated the teacher contributions for sessions. This involved: directing the teachers’ attention to aspects of the lessons involving teacher and child behaviour; and, eliciting teacher responses through questioning, explaining, clarifying and evaluating in time with the lessons such as: “What have you seen so far?”; “Why do you think it goes like that?”; “How can you tell?” and called for
further contributions: “someone else?”; “what else?” The following is an example of facilitating teacher interactions while observing which they found difficult.

Tutor: If you want to improve the writing what can you be doing?
Shelley: Asking him to say it.
Tutor: That’s right! He’d do a ‘slow articulation’.
Maria: To [have him] have a go, to practice.
Shelley: For him to go back and re-read… (pause) … for him to go back and check.
Tutor: Good. Now we’re getting more talking from the group.
Shelley: It’s hard to talk and listen at the same time.

When the teachers contributed the Tutor could ‘tune into’ the teachers as learners and evaluate, modify or change their interpretations. This is one example of change.

Tutor: Alright he used ‘washing’ over ‘cleaning’. What information did he use?
Belinda: Meaning.
Tutor: And the structure.

b) Co-constructing teacher knowledge

The analysis of the social interactions showed that the Tutor used a number of techniques to scaffold the teachers’ peer interactions (directing teacher attention, explaining and clarifying, highlighting what needed to be remembered for the follow-up discussion, highlighting what was important for their teaching, and highlighting what needed to change in their teaching).

i) Directing attention

The Tutor directed the teacher’s attention throughout the lesson observations for different reasons, for example: to elicit the teacher’s contributions based on what they had just seen. This included requiring them to ‘replay’ or put into words what they had seen, infer what this meant; and evaluate what they had seen against their current understandings and what was valued in RR.

The following is an example of where the teachers learn from the errors of their peers, and the Tutor directs them to infer what may be a better way to interact with the child.
Lara: She’s directing her to the end parts (of words) (example: straw/sticks)
Tutor: When you are talking about visual information you are asking: “what do you expect to see.” … What are you asking her to do?
Maria: Think about it.
Tutor: Think what it would look like… then search the word.

In Session Nine the Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to developing a hypothesis as the lesson progressed including attention to the child’s self-monitoring of meaning, where the child was prompted to correct and where the child spontaneously self-corrected by cross-checking meaning and visual information. By Session Sixteen the Tutor strongly facilitated the teachers’ talk saying: “build on that”; “Think what the teacher has said” (in her child introduction), as well as directing their attention: “Did he put a meaningful word there? “What about the pausing? “Let’s watch some more. What did you think of that?”

Over time, in social constructivist theory, there is a steady decline of the RR Tutor’s responsibility for the interaction and an increase in the teachers’ portion of responsibility (Tharp and Gallimore, (1988, p35). This does not mean that the RR Tutor necessarily said less but that the scaffolding changed in quality from the more explanatory scaffolds in Session Three and more encouraging and prodding scaffolds in Session Sixteen, when the teachers know more and are more independent in their RR teaching.

The analysis of the social interactions showed that the Tutor used a number of techniques to scaffold the teachers’ peer interactions (directing teacher attention, explaining and clarifying, highlighting what needed to be remembered for the follow-up discussion, highlighting what was important for their teaching, and highlighting what needed to change in their teaching).

ii) Explaining and clarifying

The Tutor’s explanations were varied and responsive to the lesson observations as they presented themselves. Some explanations related directly to knowledge in the teachers’ texts, for example, in Session Eight the Tutor explained why it was not a good idea to insist that children repeat their oral compositions for writing because
they may change their composition. Some explanations related to the Tutor’s shared teaching experience, for example, developing fluency in writing words by writing a series of “stories” (one or two sentences) around one topic, such as “birthdays”. The Tutor said, “…and by the end of it he could write ‘birthday’, but it was going faster each time.”

In Session Sixteen where both children were reading higher book levels (Appendix T) the Tutor was explaining teacher intervention in the same terms involving waiting for children to have the opportunity to monitor their reading; ‘feeding forward’ to maintain meaning and prevent error; thinking about the appropriateness of their prompting when they prompted for semantics and syntax (why the error was made); what the main challenge for teaching was at the higher levels (language structures and vocabulary); and encouraging children to substitute words that were “OK for now” and to keep the reading activity going.

The Tutor clarified the meaning of comprehension (understanding). This was a continuous state in reading facilitated by “orchestration” of the reading process as young children read aloud involving fluency, phrasing, pace, intonation, stress, and pausing, whereby the children could listen to themselves and continuously self-monitor what they heard themselves read against their oral language knowledge. In Session Seven this was different to the teacher idea of comprehension meaning asking questions at the end of the reading.

The varied examples given from writing and reading illustrate that the Tutor’s explanations and clarifications of teaching approaches related to: the guiding texts (which the teachers can refer to), pedagogical experience (which teachers can relate to), and a theory of what reading ‘looks like’ at higher book levels (which the teachers could verify through their own practices).

iii) Highlighting what needed to be remembered in the session

The Tutor’s scaffolding was contingent on the teachers’ social interactions at the micro-level, and influenced by the Tutor’s design of the course across sessions, at the
macro-level (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). This study aimed at understanding teacher learning from the social interactions that occurred in RR sessions. The Tutor had a practice of nominating group members to record what needed to be remembered for the follow-up discussions (See: Appendix G). For example in Session Three she said: “Would you hold on to that Jade?” What needed to be remembered was that the child was reading “word by word”. In Session Seven what needed to be remembered was: phrasing in reading is important; the familiar reading should not be interrupted by the teacher; the child needed to be an active participant in the lesson; and that one of the children, in the two lessons, was reliant on visual information, while the other was capable of integrating all sources of information to solve. In Session Seven the Tutor asked: “So what did we get to as main areas for the reading part Jemma?” To which Jemma replied from her notes: “Not interrupting, the re-reading, conversation, that rising voice.”

This scaffolding assisted the teachers’ learning in two ways: a) they could summarise the main topics of conversation which improved in speed over the time of the course as they developed their capacity as RR teachers through internalisation of their collaborative experiences, and b) they could participate with greater speed in the follow-up discussions, when the teachers who had taught were waiting for useful feedback. Improvement in the speed at which the teachers could summarise at the glass-screen and refer back to their observations in the follow-up discussions improved the flow of the teachers’ social interactions when giving feedback.

iv) Highlighting what was important

In Session Seven the RR Tutor presented the following as important ideas. In relation to reading: the familiar reading by the child was to be phrased and fluent, adequate time was to be allowed for the whole of the ‘new book’ to be read in a lesson of thirty minutes, and the teachers were to talk about ‘processing’ that involved the integration of many sources of information. Child independence was facilitated by open questioning and prompting therefore teachers needed to refine their prompting. Storybook introductions were to facilitate successful child reading and the child’s reading of the first page of a book easily was pivotal for their success in reading the
book. A main emphasis by the RR Tutor was that child independence in reading involved knowing “how to” control strategic activities (See: Appendix H on strategic activity). In the same session, the RR Tutor highlighted the child’s monitoring of his or her own message in story writing as important, that children understood more about new words if they were linked to known words; and independence involved improvements from day to day.

In Session Eight, a writing activity analysis in this study showed that what was important was: what was learned in writing (spelling) needed to be known the next day and discussion about whether the teachers could make judgments about what was “known” and how. This could include: children articulating words independently; child control of the Elkonin sound-letter technique used in RR (2005b pp72-81); child linking of words (analogies); and that teachers should expect children to act independently on what they have been taught.

In Session Nine (a reading activity analysis in the study) what was important was that: teachers developed a hypothesis about the child’s reading which was modified during the different reading activities; teachers made judgments about effectiveness based on the purposes of the activity and the child’s behaviour; teachers shaped the child’s behaviour “on the run”; that “making sense” in reading was linked to fluency; interruptions of the reading disrupted the “making of meaning”; and scaffolding for meaning supported the reading of the visual information. In Session Sixteen “reading for meaning” was still an important topic however the teachers were more independent in their observations and priorities for changing the child’s behaviour.

The main messages the RR Tutor emphasised related directly to what the teachers took away from their learning experience. The following are examples of what the teachers wrote in their five minute written reflections for Session Seven.

Jade: Still need to build child independence. Need to work on my wait-time.

Maura: Today I learned how to make the task easier for children on RR. To read for meaning, they must re-read to predict and then check the visual information. The key understanding of RR is the importance of independence.
Belinda: I need to be looking at what I am doing/saying that is helping my children to be independent. I need to show them HOW TO do what they need to do to become independent.

The following are examples of what the teachers reflected on as main messages after Session Eight:

Belinda: I need to make sure I expect more of my children in both reading and writing. I need to make it clear to the child.

Mary-Lou: Am I encouraging the child to be better tomorrow? Are they learning because of my teaching or because of their efforts?

Jade: Raise expectations. Make sure they are better than yesterday and will be better tomorrow.

These examples indicate that the teachers are reflective of their own capabilities in relation to improvement (change). (Refer to Appendix E which shows that the teachers’ written reflections were inextricably linked with the RR session interactions).

v) Highlighting what needed to change

Highlighting what needs to change is important information for the teachers at the glass-screen involved in the discussion and that they can relay this feedback to the peer teacher who taught the lesson. Feedback according to Hattie & Timperley (2007) is effective when learners’ actions are faulty in some way, for their improvement, rather than for when the learner cannot do the task. The RR observation arrangement allows for tiers of scaffolding according to Gaffney & Anderson (1991): the teacher of the child’s learning (behind the glass-screen) and the Tutor’s scaffolding of the teachers’ learning (at the glass-screen). Additionally, this study shows that the teachers through their collaborations in observations and discussion, and internalisation of the main areas for improvement, as scaffolded by the Tutor, learn to give peer feedback. In this way both the teachers who observe and the teachers who teach improve in their zones of proximal development.

In Session Seven the following was problematic: the child’s first action “at difficulty” being to decode (sound out); teacher interruptions at the error not allowing for child self-monitoring and independent solving; neglecting to teach the
child to re-read to locate his own errors; inappropriate stress on the first words on pages and of new sentences (the “rising voice”); and allowing time in the lesson for the child to read the whole of the “new book”. What needed to change was: primary attention being given to visual information for solving by the teacher and the child; the teacher developing “wait-time” to allow the child to act independently and that the RR teacher was not to read to the children during a RR lesson. The following are examples from written reflections of what the teachers viewed were the main messages for change in their own teaching, irrespective of whether they taught or not.

Diane: I will take away the need for breaking habits and promoting good new habits that focus on meaning. I should not have a focus (perhaps other than meaning) but should be tentative and flexible and respond to the needs of the child.

Tracey: Reading for meaning – I am going to work really hard in ensuring that my children are able to use all the skills to problem-solve and read for meaning. I need to especially work on helping the child to understand that they need to LISTEN to THEMSELVES.

In Session Eight (writing) the teacher’s choices for teaching “on the run” were problematic. For example, the teacher’s understanding of appropriate analogous links between words, such as the ‘y’ (sound) in ‘spooky’ best linked to the ‘y’ in ‘mummy’ (the Tutor’s example), than the ‘y’ in ‘play (the teacher’s example in the lesson). While the Tutor viewed this interaction at the glass-screen with the teachers (see below). The Tutor prioritises what is important to be taken away as a main messages for change and what to leave. The example is long but it illustrates the fact that the teachers have multiple zones of proximal development, just as the RR children can have varied learning profiles described as early, middle and late levels of achievement in the RR literacy activities (Clay, 2005b). Furthermore, teachers are not taken forward in their learning by all their areas of faulty learning.

In this example of the teacher there are many faulty understandings for RR teaching: articulating sounds for the child, misunderstanding in the act of teaching that different sounds can have the same visual representation and are therefore not phonemically analogous, teaching a personal version of ‘phonics’ rather than phonemic awareness (linking of sounds heard to visual representations), for example “we’ll learn the ‘oo’ sound today”. The teacher group observed this social interaction and one group member her own faulty understanding articulating that ‘sp’ was one
phoneme. This type of misunderstanding can be addressed over repeated teaching examples in this year-long course.

**On writing ‘spooky’ in Elkonin sound boxes on the child’s working page**
Teacher: We’ll do some boxes shall we? Right! Finger please!
Child: (articulating) spoo…spoo (co-ordinating sounds and placing finger in the sound boxes then writes s in first box)
Teacher: What comes now? p-p- (teacher makes sounds)
Child: P? (Letter name)
[Break – tutor-teacher talk at the glass-screen]
Child: (continues) oo…oo…
Teacher: What says oo? oo?
Child: O? (Letter name, writes in the sound box and continues) Spoo..k
Teacher: Think about it! What goes on the end that says E (long vowel sound)?
Child: E? (Letter name)
Teacher: No. Close. Very close. This is how we’re going to do it. We’re going to do the ‘oo’ sound today. (Makes sound as in spooky and repeats this). Like in look. (Says the sound as in look and repeats it) What two letters say oo (sounded as in look).
Child: OO (Letter name twice)
Teacher: Good girl! Now on the end I need another sound that says E. What is it? No nearly
[Break- tutor-teacher talk at the glass-screen]
Teacher: Try again. E like play (pronounced plaEE twice). What’s on the end of ‘plaEE’? (No response) It’s a ‘y’ Susanna.

In Session Nine (reading), teachers pulling children up when they made errors was problematic when it caused the child to neglect to self-monitor meaning and structure of the language being read aloud “on the run”. Child inability to self-monitor was exacerbated by the teacher interferences about what to prioritise and the children not reading “fast enough” to “hear the language” and self-manage on that basis. By Session Sixteen, the teachers’ interactions with children, was still problematic and needed to change, but the teachers were more self-initiating in discussing this because of increasing self-awareness gained through their social interactions at the glass-screen.

Therefore, the development of change involved increasing awareness of problematic practices based on repeated observations and discussions. Change in practice takes time and effort on the part of the teachers with the Tutor continually discussing issues in sessions as opportunities highlight areas for improvement arise. This supports Timperley’s (2008) principle for effective professional development: give teachers multiple opportunities to learn.
5.3.2 Teachers’ Social Interactions: Lesson Observations and Discussion

The teachers’ social interactions during the lesson observations that emerged were: co-constructing teacher knowledge (replaying and interpreting observations), reaching agreement about what had been observed and thought about, evaluating the child’s behaviour, the teacher’s behaviour and their own teaching, linking their beliefs about teaching to their practices.

The teachers’ task during the lesson observations was multifaceted. They had to: observe (look and listen) to the lessons as they proceeded; comment on their observations (what they saw and heard); listen and respond to the Tutor; listen and respond to each other; link personal ideas and questions to their observations, their teaching and their own reading from their course texts; and synthesise this as a group, into ‘main areas’, which they could share as summaries with their peers who had taught the lessons in a follow-up discussion. The Tutor worked on assisting the teaching to organise and summarise their observations after lesson activities or in relation to reading and writing, and sometimes nominated teacher recorders who could assist the group to recall their main areas of discussion.

The teachers’ attention was constantly switching from the observation, to their own ideas; and from the observation, to the ideas the Tutor was presenting; and linking these to RR practices and rationales. This attention switching was orchestrated by the Tutor.

The working of the group social interactions was explained at the beginning of the course. There was a joint focus of attention and the maintenance of the joint direction of the attention, without dissipating into fragmented “talk” or “aside talk”. The Tutor facilitated “keeping the group together” in the observations and discussions by reviewing and reminding the teachers of the group nature of the learning experience when this occurred. Working as a team is a feature of collaboration which is the
teachers’ role in the social interactions, and which was shown to be emphasised by the RR Tutor in this study.

The analysis of the transcripts of the teachers' discussions during the Lesson Observations demonstrates the complexity of the teachers' interaction with each other (as lead by the Tutor) to make sense of the demonstrations of RR teaching provided by their peers. The analysis of the teachers’ unfolding social interactions, which evolved during this component of each session showed that they engaged in co-construction of knowledge in a number of ways. These included: talking through and interpreting their observations; forming a common understanding and making sense of what was happening at the glass-screen; evaluating the observed and framing a group feedback for the teachers who taught the demonstration lessons. The peer teachers’ social interaction was to actively participate to facilitate their own learning through collaboration.

a) Co-constructing of Teacher Knowledge

i) Replaying\(^4\) and interpreting observations

The teachers replayed what they saw or heard as they observed it, for example: in Session Three (early in the session series): “She’s noticing the initial letter”, “She’s quicker on the next page”, or interpreted that the observation meant: “So she’s starting to notice punctuation”; and similarly the teachers replayed what the teacher did: “She’s making the word left to right”, “Getting her to re-read what she’s written”, or interpreted what the teacher did: “She’s making it go quickly”, “She’s modelling”, “Tracey is letting some things go…rather than trying to teach everything all at once”, “She’s always enthusiastic.” By Session Sixteen (late in the session series) the teachers were more self-initiating in offering their interpretations, which started with “I think” or “I wonder” as initiated by the Tutor.

\(^4\) Replaying – meaning just to say what it is you are seeing or hearing, repeating someone else, saying what someone else has said differently.
The following series of data are an example of how the teacher talk developed over time. Saying aloud in the company of others what you see and giving your interpretations is a collective social engagement that was encouraged by the Tutor this study. The following is an example of how the teacher talk developed:

In Session Three the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example, in reading:

a) Replaying: How the teacher knew the child was searching: Diane: “...because she made a mistake in it.” What the teacher was doing: Diane: “She broke the word into two.” How the child read: Shelley: “It’s quick.”

b) Interpreting: What the teacher liked about the teaching: Lara: Ownership given to the child and the links (across the lesson activities). What the child was learning: Shelley: “to put two words together.” What the main idea of the new storybook was: Mary-Lou: “Billy doesn’t want to have his photo taken and they convince him to have his photo taken.” How giving the ‘main idea’ of a story supports the reader with the meaning (Shelley). When the book is read independently the next day how this informs the teacher: Lara said, “It’s going to tell you whether she took it in; whether it was taught well.”

In Session Seven the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example in reading:

a) Replaying: Belinda: “He covered the ‘a’ and said ‘gain’ and then ‘again’.” Maria: “He’s looking at her for confirmation.” Maria: “It’s very static.” Belinda: “He’s focusing on the word parts to work it out.” Maria: “He puts his finger on it... and he doesn’t re-read. He just keeps on looking at the word.” What the child does to solve: Mary-Lou said “Getting parts of word” and Belinda said, “And the pictures.”

b) Interpreting: Lara said, “He knew that part. He knew that it didn’t have meaning.” Belinda said, “Yes, because he did that totally without referring to the teacher. Lara said, “That also shows that he’s not relying solely on one strategy to solve a word, like he doesn’t always re-read. He goes somewhere else.” Jade said, “The phrasing (needs to be improved).” What the child is expected to do at difficulty: Lara said, “So pulling the
strategies together quicker...like try re-reading.” Belinda said, “He’s good on the familiar reading.” Maria: “So he’s just relying on one strategy.” Lara said, “He’s reading on from the word rather than going back… He’s just reading from the word not from the meaning.” How to teach: Diane said, “I think it’s the same for all of us...getting that meaning activity going. Lara said, “…by using prompts like does it make sense and then what would make sense with this story and look like that?” What teachers focus on when teaching: Belinda said, “The word level.” What the teacher could say and do: Diane said, “Try that again and think what makes sense.” Maria said, “He needs to be shown.”

In Session Eight the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example in writing:

a) Replaying: Diane said, “Confusion with L, a capital L.” (written in the word)

b) Interpreting: What the child has learned: Maria said, “She’ll know about the ‘e’ being silent and the ‘L’s’ on the end.” Whether the child will know the word tomorrow: Maria said, “Probably not.” Conditions for knowing the word tomorrow: Shelley said, “If she was able to write it three or four times.” Maura said, “She wrote it on the work-page.” Diane said, “She didn’t write it on the whiteboard.” What was good in the observation: Belinda said, “Not breaking up the whole word” (word slowly articulated). What the teacher said that was useful: Lara said, “Write the part you know… she’s saying how you do it.” Shelley said, “She’s showing her what to do.” Commenting on the teacher’s use of Elkonin boxes and the number of boxes for the sounds (phonemes): Maria said, “‘sp’ (interpreted as one phoneme/sound) isn’t it? Shouldn’t it be? What is it? Shouldn’t it be ‘sp’ ‘spooky’?” What the teacher is doing: Jade said, “She said it.” Maura said, “The child isn’t saying it.” (slow articulation of word to hear and record the sounds independently)

In Session Nine the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example in ‘Familiar reading (Lesson One)
a) Replaying: Where the child’s attention is going: Lara said, “Word by word.” What the teacher is doing: “She’s asking questions all the time.”


Teacher actions to bring about change: Shelley said, “She told him to read like talking.” Diane said, “Maybe she needs to use a card or something? You know, read a certain amount in a certain time.” Tracey said, “Introduce the book with a bit more meaning.” What the teacher said in her child introduction that she wanted the child to do: Lara said, “Re-read.” What the teacher shows that she thinks by her actions: Belinda said, “Read it accurately.”

In Session Nine the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example, in the ‘new book’ activity (Lesson One):

a) Replaying: Where the child’s eyes went during reading: teacher said, “…to the visual information.” What the child did: Diane said, “Trying to sound it out.” Maria said, “He’s taken four goes to get that.” What the teacher did: Jade said, “she goes to the visual information…it’s going back again.”

b) Interpreting: When the reading stopped being integrated: Tracey said, “At the start of the page.” When the reading was integrated: Jade said, “Maybe if she stuck to what she was doing on the first couple of pages?” Shelley said, “…because it was working.” Jade said, “Yeah, it was.”

In Session Nine the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example, in the ‘familiar reading’ activity (Lesson Two):

a) Replaying: The pace of the reading: Maria said, “It’s not fast…. It’s smooth and got a bit faster.” A spontaneous self-correction: Diane said, “She got it.”
Teacher action: Maria said, “She said you moved it. Hold it (the book) because you made a mistake.”

b) Interpreting: Diane: It needs to be faster. What assisted the child to re-read: Tracey: The message. Who told her about the sense: Diane: The teacher. What the child did: Lara: She’s responding to the prompts. Integrating information: Lara: Then she attended to visual. Shelley: She’s keeping it together.

In Session Nine the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example in the ‘yesterday’s book reading’ activity (Lesson Two):

a) Replaying: Interpreting independent reading as the teacher took a behavioural record: Shelley said, “She kept going.” Maria said, “She didn’t stop.” Shelley said, “It didn’t break down…She corrected quickly under breath, didn’t she?”

b) Interpreting: After the behavioural record when the teacher taught from her observations the teacher said it has to make sense: Shelley said, “…meaning.” Why the reading became hard: Maura said, “Is it to do with the sentences? …a lot of them do it…for aren’t they say ‘are not’.” Thinking about the written language structures in the book: Maria said, “It’s hard.”

In Session Nine the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example in the ‘new book’ activity (Lesson Two):

a) Replaying: Lara said, “She’s directing her to the end parts.” (of words)

b) Interpreting: Diane said, “So that’s not what you should be doing?” Shelley said, “So you keep scaffolding as you go? What you are asking the child to do when you say ‘what do you expect?’” Maria said, “Think about it. How you can assist the child to solve the word ‘bricks?’” Diane said, “You’d say it’s not ‘bri’ (long vowel).” Tutor said, “You’d say the first one was straw and the second one was sticks and the third one was…” Maria said, “Bricks.” Shelley said, “So you go for the meaning rather than the word level?” The child’s actions: Diane said, “She’s getting bogged down.” Jade said, “Too much attention to visual by the teacher.” Maria said, “She’s lost meaning now.” Jade said, “The teacher started to take her in the wrong direction.” The hardest thing for the teaching: Jade said,”… to be consistent… [and] …that’s
the thing that you think if you don’t show them that they’ll remember it the wrong way or they’ll make that mistake.”

In Session Sixteen the teachers replayed and interpreted their observations, for example, in reading:

a) Replaying: Diane said, “It’s word by word.” Jade said (repeating the teacher behind the screen), “You know what to do, put your fingers on it.”

b) Interpreting:
Lesson 1: Maria said, “I’m wondering if he’s getting any meaning out of that? It’s very monotone and I’m wondering if he understands it.” Shelley said, “It’s gone to the teacher level rather than him listening to himself.” When the child stopped: Diane said, “‘Machine’. Just tell him. It’s a running record, so she shouldn’t be interfering.”
Lesson 2: Shelley said, “She’s sounding good.” Mary-Lou said, “I think she writes a lot.” Lara said, “I’m thinking, what am I going to do at the end of the book? ... [And] ...I think we assume things too. You know, we’ve done it once or twice. These children you can’t make judgments about.” Mary-Lou said, “I think she’s reading for meaning because she’s putting good intonation in her voice.”

These examples of social interaction support understanding the zone of proximal development (ZPD) which at its heart is “… the assumption that social interaction utilizes, extends and creates ZPDs to foster skills and capacities that initially function effectively only within supportive or collaborative situations, but gradually become internalised as self-regulatory processes” (Palinscar & Brown, 1989, in Bonk & Kim, 1998, p70). To replay an observation makes it available as a joint reference for others and sharing interpretations aloud allows the teachers to compare their developing knowledge with that of their peers. In this way the teachers learn through collaboration. (Johnson et al, 2007)

ii) Reaching agreement

Reaching agreement was a co-construction of knowledge between the Tutor and the teachers and the teachers with each other. Some examples of reaching agreement related to the propositions put forward by the Tutor. The teachers’ responses were to
concur or to contemplate the propositions. (See: Data reduction and coding 4.10.1) For example, in Session Eight the teachers agreed with the Tutor that: the child had to be active in writing; that the product in writing told the teacher nothing about how it was constructed; that there was a problem when teachers thought minimal attempts in writing in RR were good; that the children lacked independence after they had been receiving individual tuition for fourteen weeks; and that children needed to be taught control of techniques in writing (for example: linking sounds to letters using Elkonin sound boxes).

Maria explained that: “The expectation of writing is lower than for reading” and that “the teacher was doing the work for the child.” Jade and Maura agreed that the child was inactive. Jade said, “She said it.” Maura said, “He’s not saying the words either… [And]…That’s why they’re not getting it too.”

By Session Sixteen the teachers had occasional self-initiated strings of commentary without the Tutor involvement, involving two or three teachers such as:

a) Mary-Lou said, “He’s attacking the word”; Diane said, “It’s word by word” and Maria said, “Not predicting.”

b) Maria said about providing word choice for cross-checking information, “…say it is ‘build’ or ‘something’ and they make a choice”; Shelley said, “I’ve been trying that and it gives them the most success.” Maria said, “Yes, you’re giving them the vocabulary.” Diane said, “Then they have to check it too. Don’t they?” Maria said, “Yes, they check it and come up with the right answer.” Shelley said, “Most times.”

To reach an agreement with peers during the observations is illustrative of how these teachers collaborated in developing a group understanding of RR teaching.

iii) Evaluating

Child behaviour

The teachers evaluated child behaviour throughout the sessions, for example: against expected learning outcomes (the purposes of the activities and whether the children were ready to have their ‘lesson series’ discontinued because they no longer required
The teachers also identified what needed to improve, for example: “more independence”; “he has to re-read more”; ‘he has to understand what strategic activity he can use.” (Session Seven)

The teachers evaluated that the child would probably not know the word worked on in writing the next day on the basis of the child’s control (Maria); that the child needed to articulate words in writing (Maura); that the child would probably sit and wait in the classroom if he was unresponsive in RR (Mary-Lou); and that “he’d be in my bottom guided writing group” if he showed his current competencies in the classroom (Jemma); so the child needed to write faster (Shelley) (Session Eight).

In Session Nine the teachers evaluated the child’s reading as being poor, reading that is “word by word” instead of being phrased and fluent; and that the child’s responsiveness only to teacher prompting instead of spontaneously self-correcting was not indicative of “independence”. Lara said, “…she’s responding to the prompts.” The teachers evaluated effective processing as it was observed: “It’s smooth”; “She’s keeping it together”; “She kept going”; “It didn’t stop.” “It didn’t break down.” (Session Nine)

In Session Sixteen the teachers observed reading that was integrated and orchestrated at a high book level (Level 21). The teachers commented on the reading: “sounding good” (Shelley); having good intonation which they linked with accessing meaning of the story (Mary-Lou); that the quality of the voice was as though “…she’s kind of stretching the words out so they join up” (Shelley); that the child was spontaneously and quickly self-correcting words (Mary-Lou); and spontaneously self-correcting intonation because “…she’s thinking about how it would sound herself?” (Lara); that they thought the quality of the writing matched the reading (Maria); and that the child was a “good reader” because she substituted meaningful words when there were difficult language structures, for example: saying “none of them” instead of “neither of them” and continuing to read (Maria).

Evaluations in the company of others provided the teachers with standards or goals for their expectations of successful child reading (the target performance in RR
teaching). In this study (from these sampled sessions) the teachers’ conceptual understandings (expectations) seemed to be ahead of their practised skills in achieving them. Therefore, in the zone of proximal development for these adult learners cognitive understanding preceded their capacity to apply this knowledge in the varied social interactions called for in their teaching.

**Teacher behaviour**

The teachers evaluated peer behaviour throughout the sessions in relation to how it influenced the child’s behaviour. This included what the teacher did that positively and negatively influenced the child’s behaviour. For example, they identified that the teacher needed scaffold child learning, for example to give demonstrations: “he needs to be shown” and “…he needed to know the how to’s’” (strategic activities, such as how to self-monitor; search and self-correct) (Session Seven).

The teachers suggested conditions for learning. These were mainly focused on the speed and connectedness of child processing, for example: if the child was able to write words three or four times quickly then the child could learn the word; if the child articulated the words he could link sounds (heard) to letters; if the child could initiate a conversation to compose a story to write and write quickly, especially words he already knew, he could be ‘discontinued’ in writing; if equal attention to speed in reading was also given to writing the child would be better at writing. (Session Eight)

The teachers mainly identified behaviours in themselves that prevented the children reaching the level of success that is expected in classrooms: teacher interrupting of the reading; teacher choice of books; teacher over-attention to visual information; teachers asking questions during reading; teachers withdrawing scaffolding for meaning; and teacher inattention to making changes in their teaching, for example, to influence the pace of the reading, as factors inhibiting the child’s ability to read successfully.

By Session Sixteen factors inhibiting the child’s ability to read was a recurring theme. The teachers evaluated that teacher scaffolding for meaning would lead to
improvement in the child’s reading; that if the teacher monitored for the child, the child would not develop independence (Lara); and that teachers should only intervene “when it doesn’t make sense” (Mary-Lou), and “at the end of a sentence” (Lara), for the children to have the opportunity to self-monitor.

Each RR lesson was an example of the teacher’s learned capacity in their zone of proximal development or movement through the zone towards internalisation (the ability to effectively teach lesson activities in RR). In this study it was through social interaction that the teachers could identify what needed to change in teaching behaviour which led to individual self-awareness and growing self-regulation.

**Their own behaviour**

The teachers could identify what they saw in others in their own behaviours. Diane said, “I think it’s the same for all of us…getting that meaning activity going” was the most difficult aspect of teaching RR children (Session Seven). The teachers acknowledged that as a teaching group they focused on “teaching to get the word right” or “fixing errors”, even though they wanted to “teach for meaning” and valued comprehension. Diane said, “…she [the teacher behind the screen] sounds like us because we know we do the same things”. However, despite having a heightened awareness of themselves as teachers by Session Seven they were still asking: “…when do we teach this?”, and “how do we teach this?”

The teachers identified that teacher expectations for writing needed to change because they were lower than for reading (Maria); that they needed to teach the children to control the Elkonin technique (linking sounds to letters); that they responded to child appealing and inactivity by doing the task for the child; and that doing the task for the child slowed the child down further. Diane said, “I find myself doing the same. If I’m not careful the kids don’t say a word, do they?” (Session Eight)

At the end of Session Nine Jade said, “You can see what you’re doing in their lessons, and you compare it with your teaching and think ‘well I do that and maybe that’s why I’m getting the same result?’” This view summarised the teachers’
evaluations of themselves as learners half way through their RR training course. She commented on the learning experience of observing each other teach by saying, “It’s hard to stand back and look at yourself or your own teaching, I guess, or your lesson, because you’re giving it.”

Bandura writes that people compare their own performances in relation to the achievement of others and that their self-appraisal is based on their sense of self-efficacy or agency. “A strong resilient sense of efficacy [ability] …is achieved by equipping people with knowledge, sub-skills and the strong belief of efficacy needed to use one’s skills effectively. (Bandura, 1990, p133) In RR teacher training this came from individual aspiration to change with collaborative peer support.

iv) Linking beliefs and practice
The teachers throughout the sessions stated what they believed was important in literacy learning and why children engaged in the literacy practices of reading and writing. The difficulty for the teachers was merging their beliefs and their practices with the diversity of individual children they worked with making ‘moment by moment’ (contingent) decisions that allowed for child success. For example, the teachers said they valued meaning as an important source of information and that comprehension was an important outcome in reading but it was evident that they could not teach for it ‘on the run’ when their attention went to ‘fixing’ errors during ‘moment by moment’ decision-making. (Session Seven)

In Session Nine, teachers expressed the view that comprehension was important in reading, and thought that you determined comprehension by asking questions at the end of a reading. The teachers also thought that they could influence the child’s ability to “read for meaning”, if they gave “stronger book introductions” (told more about the story before it was read), before the child read a ‘new book’ and the teachers continued to talk about “scaffolding for meaning” as what they needed to do.

In Session Sixteen, the teachers strongly linked the “sound of the reading” to whether the child could access meaning which was a change from ‘testing’ for
comprehension it questioning. Mary-Lou said, “I think she’s reading for meaning because she’s putting good intonation in her voice.” Lara said, “And it sounds natural” and a teacher said, “Would you say that if she’s correcting the intonation that’s a higher level [of processing] because there wasn’t an error in any of the words, so she’s thinking about how it would sound herself?” Whilst the teachers thought that the teaching challenge at the higher book levels would involve more complex language structures than the student controlled in his or her oral language.

A factor in the judgmental component of self-regulation concerns the value people place on activities (Bandura, 1991). The teachers, for instance, may not work strongly to influence the sound of the reading, or try to analyse why reading broke down at higher book levels, if they did not value reading that ‘sounded good’. The RR training course therefore incorporated the important principals for guiding professional learning. The first principle emphasises that effective professional learning for teachers focuses on “activities that produce positive teacher valued child learning outcomes” (Timperley, 2008, p8).

5.4 The Tutor’s and Teachers’ Social Interactions: Follow-up Discussion

The analysis of the transcripts of the Follow-up Discussions of the selected sessions identified a number of characteristics of the Tutor's interactions with the group of the teachers which partly resembles the techniques used in the earlier stages of the session: facilitating the interactions; co-construction of teacher knowledge; shaping feedback through summarising and contextualising; explaining, clarifying and highlighting; and demonstrating (modelling).

5.4.1 Tutor’s Social Interactions: Follow-up Discussion

a) Facilitating the interaction
In the Vygotskian (1978) perspective the first stage of awareness in new learning typically involves “social interaction and negotiation between experts and novices or among novices … and it is by means of participating in this social interaction that interpretations are first proposed and worked out and, therefore, become available to be taken on by individuals” (Daniels, Cole & Wertsch, 2007, p187). Therefore, through interpersonal conversations in RR training, teachers can take on specific language and actions as teachers that may be “ahead of” their current understandings.

It is important for the teachers to say and do these things so that they can enter into basic forms of intersubjectivity with more experienced teachers and experts (for example, the RR Tutor), and thereby lever their way up through increasing levels of expertise over the course of a year. The Vygotskian approach to encourage novices to master the use of cultural tools and expertise is reflected in the individual’s ability to use these tools fluently and flexibly.

The Tutor facilitated the teachers’ social interactions during the follow-up discussions. In Session Three this involved asking the teachers to thank their peers for teaching their lessons and giving the teachers who taught the opportunity to say what they thought of their lessons in terms of typicality. The format of these discussions was: acknowledgement of teaching by the group (positive feedback); comment by the teachers about the typicality of their lessons; and a ten minute discussion of each lesson focusing on main areas discussed in reading and writing, with reference to the course texts. The Tutor facilitated the problem-solving of the “main areas” to discuss after the observations and discussion at the glass-screen as a group activity, sometimes eliciting the support of the teacher who had recorded for the group during the observations, thereby linking what had been observed to what was to be discussed and summarised during the training course sessions.

The Tutor structuring of feedback interactions was learned over the session series. This allowed for teachers to interact in a challenging situation with surety about how this will be conducted and it thereby ensured an arena of safety for the teachers. The emphasis on positive acknowledgement by teachers for each other ensured that the teachers maintained trusting respectful relationships which is essential for group
collaboration. (Johnson et al, 2007) This is confirmed by what the teachers said about their learning experience. (Chapter Six)

In Session Sixteen when the lessons had not gone well the Tutor scaffolded the interaction by explaining that the lessons offered an avenue for a discussion about literacy processing thereby maintaining interactive ease in the group: “…we had a wonderful conversation about challenges as we move to high levels, and thinking about ourselves and how we interact with a child.”

The Tutor invited the teachers who taught to share what they thought was “challenging” in their teaching. This resulted in explanations from the teachers who taught related to their disappointments, what pleased them, and how the lessons were similar or dissimilar to those taught at their schools. The teachers’ explanations about their own lessons were accepted by the group and the Tutor but not discussed further in this session. The structure of the social interactions having teachers speak specifically to their own lessons before group feedback ensured that the teachers had the opportunity to air what the group may talk about (whether positive or negative) first, and this thereby smoothed respectful feedback for teaching improvements.

During the “Follow-up Discussion” component the Tutor’s role was to facilitate the teachers’ interactions around “main areas” discussed in the observations and monitor the timing of the discussions to allow equal time for the two teachers who taught the lessons.

b) Co-constructing Teacher Knowledge

In assisting the teachers’ peer interaction in the teachers’ co-construction of knowledge the Tutor did the following:

i) Scaffolding feedback through summarising and contextualising

The Tutor scaffolded how the teachers were to give feedback to each other which involved summarising and contextualising the talk. Research shows that, “If
feedback is goal directed, specific, detailed, corrective, and balanced between positive and negative comments, then it is more effective than feedback that is person directed, general, vague, non-corrective, and either too positive or too negative” (Thurlings et al, 2012, p197).

Giving and receiving feedback is a feature of collaboration and this is an important feature of RR teacher learning. Numerous studies indicate that feedback is an essential element in learning (Timperley & Hattie, 2007; Hattie 2009, Hattie, 2012). It is a consequence of performance (the lessons taught) and is best directed at the teacher’s self-regulation (how they managed their own actions), the task (teaching to the intention of the literacy activity in the lesson) or the process (the aspect of literacy processing governed by theory and suggested ‘best moves’ and prompts) engaged in in the lesson.

Scaffolding feedback involved referring back to what had occurred in lessons without replaying the lessons. This meant taking the teacher back to concrete examples (contextualising the feedback) and briefly explaining the group discussion (giving the main idea) for further discussion.

(S9) T: Now, with the group, we worked on the effect of what the teacher was saying on the child’s behaviour and a developing hypothesis where we ended up with a conclusion about what the group could tentatively say about the child’s responding. So, can you remember that little boy? OK.

(S9) T: There was one page where we particularly felt that his reading went back to his old habit of word by word, and why did we think that happened?

The Tutor elicited the topics for the follow-up discussion from the teachers in the group. For example, the RR Tutor said, “So when we were at the screen talking, we try to come up with a summary of what will be beneficial for the whole group” (Session Three). In the different sessions what was to be discussed evolved through a joint Tutor and negotiation of priorities in reading and writing activities with involvement from the teacher who taught.

In Session Three (early in the session series) the Tutor modelled how to summarise using examples of the discussion at the glass-screen the teachers could recall.
Otherwise the teachers seem to offer de-contextualised ideas to the teachers who had taught as feedback which did not socially connect with the person as the discussion at the screen occurred in their absence.

In Sessions Seven to Nine (in the middle of the session series) the Tutor asked a teacher recorder what the “main areas” were in the lesson observations and assisted in determining the topics for discussion, for example, “What did we get to as the main ideas for the reading part Jemma?” (Session Seven) The teachers readily agreed that this was “reading for meaning”. In Session Eight (writing sample used in this study) a main idea from the lesson observations was initially summarised by Mary-Lou, “…if we’re going to give an expectation we need to make sure that the expectation occurs.” In Session Nine (reading sample used in this study) Diane explained that the main area was that the reading fell down across the lesson when the teacher removed her scaffolding of the meaning, and this started from the slow pace and fluency in familiar reading. In Session Sixteen, when the children were reading at higher book levels (Book Level 21), the main idea was ability to assist the child to access meaning during reading, and visual information faster on the run.

The Tutor directed the teachers to recall their common experience of observing and discussing at the screen. The Tutor said, “Think about the process … Think strategic activity … Think what he did.” (Session Seven) The Tutor galvanised group support in solving teaching problems, “…What I hope we will all be able to do, now that we can work with one another, and we can see that sometimes things work and sometimes they don’t work, the best thing is, I think, that we all know what needs to change, then what we need to do is work out how we do it.” (Session Nine) The Tutor redirected the discussion after the teachers gave ‘de-contextualised’ advice such as “…perhaps there’s an over-attention to visual” to explain further what the teacher meant; restricted the discussion to aspects of the literacy activity; and contextualised the discussion to specific examples from the lessons. “Feedback has no effect in a vacuum; to be powerful in its effect, there must be a learning context to which the feedback is addressed” (Timperley & Hattie, 2007, p82).

ii) Using course references
The course texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) referred to as “Literacy Lessons Parts One and Two” were a common point of reference in the follow-up discussions that linked with the lesson observations. The Tutor used the texts to help guide discussions around teaching problems, encouraging the teachers to quickly reference them from the beginning of the course. Reciprocal teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1986) a contemporary teaching approach, like RR, expands the concept of the zone of proximal development to include artefacts as active agents in learning. John-Steiner and Mahn (1996, p199) refer to this as integrating Vygotskian theory of tools and symbols with the roles played by participants.

In Session Seven the Tutor linked the discussion to the text. The Tutor asked the teachers: “And what does Clay say about taking words apart in reading?” leading the teachers to search through their text. The Tutor guided the teachers through a series of prompting actions in the course text (Clay, 2005b, p113) explaining each action. In this same session the Tutor led a discussion on the meaning of the word ‘creates’ in the procedure for ‘eliciting a story’ (Clay, 2005b, p55) to have a common understanding of language used in their RR texts.

In Session Eight the Tutor directed the teachers to a page reference describing how the teacher’s role changes across a RR lesson series when teaching writing and assisted the teachers to think about what the word “should” meant in a sentence: “The child should gradually take over the problem-solving of new words and the teacher then reminds, prompts and facilitates the production” (Clay, 2005b, p59) and the implications it had for their teaching.

In Session Nine the Tutor directed the teachers to locate references themselves related to their issues of searching for meaning and encouraging phrased and fluent reading. This led to a discussion about reinforcing searching behaviours from transcripts between teacher and child in the text, the concluded: “Yes that was good, you found two ways to check on that tricky new word.” (Clay, 2005b, p113) Concrete examples in “Literacy lessons Part Two” made discussions concrete and memorable for teachers’ collaborative learning.
Searching for text references by Session Sixteen the Tutor highlighted an issue, which was, effective reading at higher book levels. The Tutor thought aloud about where to refer to in the text: “…getting it right … but the issue is do they understand it? So that’s the challenge. Where could we go?” The onus was on the teachers to explore the text because in their daily teaching this was their reference.

### iii) Explaining and clarifying

Explaining and clarifying the meaning of concepts (phrasing, monitoring, searching, prompting etc), as well as what is meant by the explanation of alternate procedures was a form of scaffolding teacher learning throughout this RR teacher training course.

In Session Three the Tutor clarified meaning for the teachers by explaining procedure: the difference between a procedure of “putting two words together” (Clay, 2005b, 152) and the meaning of “phrasing” which is different; linked the procedure under discussion to her own teaching (what she did with her child today); and showed how to teach the procedure using storybooks the teachers knew as examples that were available on the small table in the middle of the discussion circle. This was clarifying the meaning of the text through modelling and relevance.

In Session Seven the Tutor explained a teaching procedure for looking at a word ‘stop’ in two parts’ and that the teachers wanted children to solve on the run without slowing the reading down. The Tutor explained that it was the teacher’s role to follow guidance in their text on “keeping the task easy for the child” (Clay, 2005a, p38). The Tutor explained the procedures involved in the “scale of help” from least to most assistance when assisting children to solve words on the run. (Clay, 2005b, pp 132-133)

In Session Seven the Tutor also explained that the teachers needed to be flexible in their scaffolding of the child’s learning: “if you say a prompt and it doesn’t work, then what do you do?” The Tutor explained to the teachers: “what you say has to be
something that’s going to get her there quickly. It has to be pertinent to what she needs to do”. The Tutor described how the teachers could start with the most open prompt and then progressively restrict the prompting to assist the child to independently solve, instead of “telling” after their first try at prompting (Clay, 2005b pp108-113). The Tutor used specific examples from the lessons (‘Luca fell over/off his bike’) and clarified that the decision-making for “what is said” was determined by the teacher: “it’s up to you.”

The Tutor explained teaching writing involved having a topic that interested the child (Clay, 2005b, p55) and that could carry over a series of days. This challenged the flexibility in teaching: “So you can still keep on writing about the same thing the next day? So that’s OK?” The Tutor explained to the disillusioned teacher (Maura) in Session Seven who said: “…but you’ve seen him and I say ‘football’, and he just doesn’t want to, like, go on”, that: “You need to come in a different way…It’s about saying ‘gosh, there are a lot of interesting rules in football aren’t there? I saw this happen, and this happen, and… he is invited in to something you have created.” The Tutor thereby gave the teachers permission to use their initiative when teaching in difficult situations based on their classroom experience. The Tutor similarly explained to the disillusioned teacher (Lara) in Session Eight what she could do to elicit conversations in writing. However Lara said, “we’ve done that” and “it just didn’t work”. So the Tutor involved the teachers in explaining their experiences and making suggestions as professional people. The Tutor further asked Lara to consider learning as building from day to day on the basis of teacher expectations and child reminders of what had been learned the previous day. This assisted teacher understanding that child learning was built on a series of connected lessons.

In Session Eight, the Tutor explained that teachers could avoid saying so much in their teaching interactions. They were encouraged to use signals as reminders for child actions. This information was not available in the texts. The Tutor therefore has a role in taking the teachers beyond in the texts in the spirit of the text theory.

In Session Sixteen the Tutor explained the meaning of Clay’s definition of reading as being “message getting”, playing the part of the child: “I go in search of meaning”,
continuing the quote “which is brought together within the constraints of the printer’s
code”, playing the child’s part again: “I’ve got to make some meaning out of this and
then I have to bring it together.” The Tutor explained that if the child had an over-
attention to visual information, the teacher attention was “the opposite”. The Tutor
explained that teachers do not have a script for scaffolding meaning in RR.
Furthermore it was her observation that teachers thought access to meaning at higher
book levels was through use of “visual information” (decoding). The Tutor explained
to the teachers that in reading they were thinking about how the child is linking
“language” (or meaning) to a visual response. This further is a mixture of the use of
the text and Tutor experience in scaffolding teacher learning.

In Session Sixteen the Tutor clarified that assisting the child in writing involved
initiating links between the new words that the child wanted to write with words he
or she already knew. The Tutor expressed the view that teachers teach what they are
attending to at the time, contrary to one teacher’s view (Maria’s) that teachers teach
what they know about. Both views are acceptable. In Maria’s case the perspective is
if you don’t know something you will neglect to teach it, so feedback is essential for
learning.

iv) Highlighting

The Tutor highlighted intentions of the RR author (the aims and goals of teaching
sections) and explained the importance attached to the words of the author, for
example, in the procedure for “storybook introductions” the recommendations were
for what teachers “might” do. (Session Three) This impressed upon the teachers the
importance of fidelity in RR (Schwartz, 2006). The purposes and words matter but if
studied the teachers could determine when they were not restrictive and when there
was a non-negotiable expectation.

The Tutor also highlighted what the teachers needed to remember and think about in
their teaching, for example, in conversations for writing: “Put that down for
yourselves. You stick to one idea and work on one idea”. This was said to help the
teachers avoid conversations they could not scaffold into compositions for writing.
The Tutor highlighted the teachers’ expectations for “sentence length and complexity in writing” to be linked to what the children could speak, “their longest utterance.” (Session Seven) with reference to their text (Clay, 2005b, p51) because small parts of the text (even italicised) can be missed. The Tutor highlighted the notion of child resilience in Session Sixteen for children to be able to continue reading at higher book levels, which is beyond their texts.

v) Directing teaching

Directing is about pointing people in the right direction as an act of scaffolding. The following examples relate to teachers ‘not going in the right direction’: omitting to scaffold phonemic awareness training to child independence, limiting teacher talk during writing that is often management driven, and teaching for important self-regulated actions the child can initiate in reading, for example: re-reading or continuing if reading made sense and prolonged pondering and ineffectual attempts would break the flow of making meaning. The importance of ‘direction’ as a scaffold is in helping teachers get over road-blocks in their own lessons.

For example: In Session Eight the Tutor directed the teachers to consider their use of Elkonin boxes in RR lessons and to review their RR course texts (Clay, 2005b, pp72-79) to discover when they were omitted from a RR lesson. The Tutor concluded: “you’re all trying to do that too soon I think.”

vi) Demonstrating/modelling

Overt modelling by the Tutor (direct demonstrations) was minimal and mainly early in the series of teacher training sessions. This related to instruction in new procedures such as the use of magnetic letters. Modelling is a direct form of scaffolding (Wood et al, 1976). In this case, it was the practice of the Tutor to model the child’s perspective (role-play), the use of language from the texts, and to use children’s reading books available in the discussion circle for teaching points. Teacher role playing was used rarely, for example: paired teachers practising
introducing story books to each other (Session 15) or teaching each other steps in the phonemic awareness training, as the teacher and child roles (Session Four).

5.4.2 Teachers’ Social Interactions: Follow-up Discussion

The data analysis of the Follow-up Discussion demonstrates a number of features of the teachers’ social interactions, which took place during this step in each session as facilitated by the Tutor. These include: learning the discussion format from being substantially scaffolded by the tutor to appropriation of the procedures of a structured discussion; teachers providing contextualised feedback to each other; using the RR texts as common point of reference; and co-construction of the knowledge of teaching strategies.

a) Learning the discussion format

The follow-up discussion was a novel social interaction for the teachers from Session Three because this was the first occasion they had taught for their peers behind the screen. In addition, the Tutor initiated a new social structure whereby the teachers were involved in thanking their peers, brief reflections of the lessons taught and learning how to summarise their observations into main areas, so that these topics were discussed in the follow-up discussion.

In Session Three two teachers who thanked the teachers who taught highlighted: their bravery (going first); their enthusiasm; their rapport with the children; how planned they were; their time management; how they used what the children knew in their teaching; how they made links across the lesson; how they used their written notes for their teaching points; and how they were in control of their lessons. The two teachers who taught both thought that their lessons “went well”.

The Tutor asked the group to summarise what they had talked about during the first lesson observation. The teachers mainly responded with what they could recall: “letter sorting”, “phrasing and fluency” or offered de-contextualised advice, for
example, “we talked about one to one matching, maybe try to get him away from that?” (Tracey).

The Tutor modelled how to give summarised feedback to the teacher who had taught and asked for the group to think of another main idea. The teachers could not do this. For example: Mary-Lou said, “Was it how you choose topics for writing?” Shelley said, ‘No, introducing the book.” When the Tutor redirected for Shelley to try to say what was a “main idea” from the discussion and why, after a pause, she said, “sorry, I can’t.” This indicated that summarising observations to explain to others is a skill learned by RR teachers in the course.

In Session Seven the teachers could summarise the main areas from what had been discussed during the lesson observations, when a teacher was recruited to be the group recorder (to aid remembering). However, when the Tutor said, “So what did we get to as main areas for the reading part Jemma?” Jemma said, “Not interrupting, the re-reading, conversation, that rising voice” This decontextualized feedback could be very disconcerting for the teacher hearing this as the discussion about their teaching. It is an example of feedback in a vacuum (Timperley & Hattie, 2007). Face-to-face feedback however, having a Tutor facilitator means that situations can be socially salvaged (Thurlings, 2012).

By Session Eight this group of teachers continued to offer ‘de-contextualised’ feedback, for example, Maria said to Tracey, “If you want her to read it smooth, she has to read smooth. When you said read it smoothly, then you …actually made sure there were no errors. It’s not that you don’t know what smooth is… maybe you need to use another word?’ The Tutor re-phrased this for a discussion topic.

By Session Nine (half-way through the course) the teachers could give contextualised feedback if scaffolded by the Tutor beforehand and if they had some brief notes. It is evident in this study that giving feedback after an event is difficult and something teachers need training in. Shelley’s summary for the second lesson in this session was, “Perhaps an over-attention to visual. I mean that you worked very
hard on the meaning but there still might be an over-attention to visual” was not very illuminating for the teacher who taught the lesson.

b) Providing contextualised feedback for each other

In this study the difficulty for the teachers who observed was to give feedback to the teacher who had taught the lesson.

The following is an example from Session Seven:

Teacher: “So if we have a conversation around reading for meaning…when does it become more difficult for him? Let’s share that from your observation.”
Tracey: “When he’s trying to work out a word he’s working at the word level.”
Maria: “He needs to re-read instead of trying to work it out at the word level. You need to go back and re-read the sentence to get the meaning.”

The teachers were adept at giving advice which is not feedback. Advice relates to personal experience that give others (the teachers) hints about what could work because it worked for them. Advice has its origins in what Timperley et al (2007) call “craft knowledge” which routinely guides teachers’ daily teaching (Timperley et al, 2007, p 203). Feedback, however, is about changing faulty understandings (based on evidence) and exploring possible improvements. The following are examples of advice:

Jade: “I think he’s similar to the girl I’ve got…and she was dependent on me, so I just said no, you do your job and I’m doing mine over here. I even dropped the eye-contact a little, because I found that she was just looking at me, and I’ll tell you, that made a huge difference.”
Mary-Lou: “With one of my boys that I’m working with the conversation is actually very difficult and I’ve found that going on personal experience is too hard for him to come up with sentences and stories, so I’ve worked on the book that he’s had in familiar reading, what’s happening in the book, tell me about that.”
Shelley: “He has to have it [his story for writing] in his brain when he comes” to the RR lesson.

Similar to ‘advice giving’ sharing is not giving feedback, although it builds a group camaraderie which is involved in collaborative relationships. In Session Nine a teacher shared with the first teacher who taught that her child read well when she “scaffolded for meaning” and fell down when it did not. Another teacher shared that it was hard for the teachers not knowing how to interact when the child’s reading
became problematic, she said, “…you think everything’s going fine and then it falls down and then you think: ‘God what do I do?’”

In Session Nine the teachers followed the Tutor’s direction to try to get to examples for their feedback. The teachers found it difficult to give an example, and therefore continued to offer disjoined feedback of what was needed for improvement related to their own memory of the discussion of the observation prompted by the Tutor.

The teacher feedback for the reading in the second lesson started with the “de-contextualised” summary, “perhaps there’s an over-attention to visual?” The teacher receiving the feedback nodded. This led the original teacher to re-state, “I mean that you worked very hard on the meaning but there still might be an over-attention to visual.” The Tutor intervened and ‘contextualised’ the discussion to the ‘New Book’ and an example from the book around the problem-solving of the word “bricks”. When the example became available the teacher who taught could immediately connect to what was being addressed and give an opinion on it.

In this study there were examples of teacher confusion in giving feedback late in the series of sessions trying to decide on what the word example was. In this example the Tutor intervened and summarized the principle under discussion for the group: “How about this? Link to words you know that sound the same. That’s what it means. So instead of saying, ‘if you can write this you can write this’, what we’re saying is: if you want him to make links it is to think: ‘here is a difficult word that I want to know’, and think: ‘do I know a word that sounds like that?’”

The Tutor tried to scaffold the teachers’ connection examples in the lesson observation. The Tutor said, “There were additional structures on the ends of sentences.” Lara recalled an example from a sentence in the book, “…and the practice.” Diane, also making the connection said, “The practice one.” The Tutor said, “…something, something, to practice.” Jade, who taught the lesson, connected to this example, “Oh, OK.” The Tutor clarified this and had a teacher explain it. The Tutor said, “So you might be able to read a word in one context but can you read it in another context? What did you say about it Shelley?” Shelley said, “…when she
expects to see it in the middle but not at the end,” for example, “to practice swimming” not, what was in the sentence, “she went to the pool to practice.” This example illustrates how closely learning is tied to the joint social interaction. The teachers have a joint point of reference (intersubjectivity) in their RR teacher training.

The teachers, when prompted, gave further examples in their feedback in this late session in the RR Teacher training course. The Tutor said, “…the other thing that she’s doing that’s really good is what Maura was saying.” Maura said, “When she substituted the word and it made sense. The word was ‘neither’ and she said ‘none’; she said ‘none of them’, and it made sense, so that was a good thing.” The teachers repeated why this was a good thing when asked by the Tutor. Diane said, “It makes sense.” Jade said, “She put a word in.” The Tutor directed the teachers to write down “OK for now”. She said was a sign of the child’s resilience, which had been discussed previously. This example indicates that there a ‘crafted knowledge’ is developed in RR through the experiences the teachers have under the tutelage of the RR Tutor.

c) Using RR Texts as a Joint Point of Reference

The RR texts provide a joint point of reference that supports intersubjectivity of the teachers and the scaffolding by the Tutor. They may be returned to again and again as the teachers use them in sessions and to support their teaching daily in schools. Incorporation of texts in the feedback involves the words of the author (Clay) as a guide for interpretation and action, as facilitated by the Tutor. The RR texts therefore lift the “sharing” and “advice giving” to the level of theory and research based procedure, which a form of “feedback” for correction and improvement, as well as confirmation.

The use of the texts was introduced early in Session Three the teachers cooperatively searched for references in their texts for how to teach for phrased and fluent reading, which was repeatedly redirected by the Tutor to be a search for ‘how to teach’ for this rather than what it was. During the search Diane commented, “we
are wondering how we should be establishing fluency and orchestration. I haven’t heard of that word until today, even though I’ve read it … ‘orchestration in processing’… ‘I think it makes interesting points that I found interesting when I read it. The familiar book is not memorised and it can still have teaching points in it.” Tracey commented, “I have read it somewhere on how to do it”, and once the place was located in the text explained, “…there’s a lot of really good strategies to encourage phrasing, in which I’ve tried one of them”, which she then explained to the group. The teachers used the texts in sessions. The following are the text references referred to in Session Eight (Clay, 2005b) that illustrate the range of the teachers’ discussion in relation to their teaching: the twin aims for the book reading in RR (pp87-89), teaching for literacy processing after taking a running record (p97), reading the new book with help (p92-93), teacher interactions in reading involving more or less help and comments that need not interrupt the story reading (p94), the change in the teacher’s role over time in writing (p59), complexity of sentences and expectations in writing (p68). Therefore the use of texts (tools) in the follow-up discussion ensures that teacher feedback and learning is lifted above the level of “sharing” and “advice giving”. The texts are essential artefacts in RR teacher training through intersubjectivity, as a joint point of reference.

**d) Co-constructing knowledge of RR teaching strategies**

The teachers easily related their own experiences from the beginning of the course, therefore they could explain to each other how they had tried to use procedures in the texts and their experiences in their schools when the Tutor visited them to observe and give guidance around a lesson. For example Diane could recall an interaction the Tutor could not, “Now I remember when you came to see me you said ‘you get back what you put it in’.” Tutor, “did I?” Diane, “Yes. It was very appropriate. I’ve written [it] down…I think what you were meaning was that you have a good book introduction. If you don’t rehearse the structures they can’t give it back to you.”

Shelley shared her Tutor visit experience; “you cleared up a lot for me yesterday. C… came and demonstrated how to rehearse. C…was rehearsing the structure
‘Come here Kitty’ and I had to repeat it the same way, and I tried it today with a little boy and it was really successful.” (Session Three)

In Session Seven the teachers were easily responsive to ‘unpicking the meaning of language’ in the text, for example, for “create a conversation” because they understood the meaning of words, other than technical words which were explained during the course and defined in the texts (for example: attention; orchestration; orientation; self-monitoring; cross checking on information). However, they did not have the pedagogical skill to enact the “meanings” they could explain by Session Seven. This showed that the teachers could participate in reading and discussing the specialist language of RR and its procedures long before they could adapt them to their teaching. Learning in the zone of proximal development is the interest in tracing the problem of how the learner can become “what he not yet is” (Wertsch, 1985, p67).

The teachers understood “it’s crucial what you say” to the child in the social interaction; that “you have to say it quickly”, and that it has to be “pertinent to what the child needs to do,” before their teaching capacity. The teachers had yet to develop flexible options for scaffolding child learning (a series of things to say), based on the language used in RR teaching, which involves highly crafted and short worded prompts to promote “strategic activities” (which has a specialist meaning) in reading.

In Session Eight the teachers readily understood expectations for writing in RR when the Tutor they explained by the Tutor these were the same as for the classroom. The difficulty for the teachers was that what they applied in one setting (could teach in one lesson), they did not apply in another (teach in another lesson) which related to the adaptability of teacher knowledge in situations where RR children would do the unexpected. In general terms when the teachers discussed how the child needed to change in order to have acceptable writing behaviours for their classrooms they were clear about what these should be: initiating the conversation; composing and writing quickly; writing known words quickly; independently linking sounds to letters and so on, which was essential for having a goal for discontinuing the children’s lesson.
series discussed in Session Seven. In this way Clay (1982) wrote that the teachers build their RR practices on their current classroom teaching knowledge and capacity. RR starts from the premise that ‘you are experienced teachers so you start from there’ (Clay, 1982).

In Session Nine the teachers who taught spoke to the group of their disappointments about how their lessons went behind the screen and in an emotive way indicated that they did not know what to do to improve their teaching in a way that would improve the children’s processing. Jemma in particular was open about her feelings when said, “I was cranky with myself in the text introduction for the new book… I know what it is…about …and it all went out of my head.” About the child’s problem-solving she said, ‘He would not go back and re-read. He was just on the first part. No, it was no use…he does get it when he goes back and he rereads it…and it’s taken me a good week …to get him to do that…to break that habit.” In respect to her lesson behind the screen Belinda was focused on the inconsistency of the child Belinda said “that was very typical of a pattern rather than a particular lesson …so she knows but she’s not consistent with it …so I’m trying, but what can I do other than pull her up and say, ‘you know that it has to make sense?’” These examples show that experienced teachers in their RR teacher training reach a point of disequilibrium (not knowing what to do) near the middle of the course.

In Session Nine the teachers (including the very experienced like Belinda) gave confusing explanations about their own teaching and the decisions they made ‘on the run’ and did not complete the reading of the new book behind the glass-screen. This is her explanation of her teaching of the word ‘bricks’ in “The Three Little Pigs”, a Price Milburn (PM) book at RR Book Level 15/16. Belinda said, “Well, I was getting her to attend to the second part but I should have attended to the first part as well because she was going ‘dr’. She has a b/d confusion and I should have brought her attention to that and not just the ‘k’ part (at the end), because then she was reading ‘straws’ because she’d read ‘sticks’, so she was getting herself confused on the visual.” The Tutor re-directed the discussion to the teachers and Jade said, “I think what came out was that it would have been better to go to the meaning than ‘bri’ (long vowel) or the visual.”
These reading and writing examples using RR teacher training as an example that experience in teaching does not equate with expertise, and that expertise takes time to develop. (Hattie, 2012)

The challenge of adaptive expertise was still expressed by the teachers in Session Sixteen. When the teachers who taught the lessons responded to the Tutor invitation to share what they were thinking about their lessons, Jade said that she felt that she didn’t know where to go next. She did not know “what else to put in” and thought, “too many minutes in the lesson are wasted because I’m just listening.” Whereas Jemma felt that she did not have the opportunities to make the links she did in the classroom with the same child, “…so when I’m listening to him read I’m starting to think that we’ve read a word similar to that in another book. I wish I could just reach in and grab it and show that there are links that you can make, and I feel that I miss lots of opportunities in lessons because of that.”

The teacher’s personal theories which they were willing to share seemed to impede their successes when teaching their lessons. Jemma gave her personal hypothesis about why she thought the child had some difficulty with his reading at a high level, “…if he could just make links quickly he wouldn’t lose meaning as much.” This meant for Jemma that, “…[he had] to use the many words he knows well and to use them to solve the words he’s not terribly good at.” Jemma thought that the child was “…wasting too much time processing visual and that’s why he’s losing meaning.”

Jade explained her rationales for a teaching decision. She said, “I think I went to punctuation because when she started [RR lessons] she wasn’t looking at any punctuation.” After discussing why she taught for a final –s on the end of ‘pools’ (an early level of teaching) asked, “So what am I going to do then?” The teachers suggested that she teach unusual language structures, which had been discussed in the lesson observation. Shelley said, “We thought going back to unusual structures that she doesn’t have within her, for example, when she said ‘she doesn’t like our school does she?’” (a phrase in the book). Jade immediately connected with the example and the child saying, “doesn’t she?” (She doesn’t like our school doesn’t
she?) This is one example where both teachers (the observer and the observed) could refer to the same piece of behaviour and understand each other.

In Session Sixteen, Maria shared the following about her development as a teacher, “As we are getting more experienced, well I’m more willing to take the challenge more, rather than when we’re at the beginning, you were … more kept on the line, and only wanted to get them from a to b in one piece.” The Tutor reiterated for the group that if the teachers were going to be flexible in their interactions they would need to be risk-takers as well as the children. However, Mary-Lou disagreed with this, “I don’t even think it’s that. I think it’s that you’re missing opportunities because you’re focused on one spot and you’ve actually missed it.” This referred to a discussion that teachers teach not necessarily on the basis of “what they know” but “where they direct their attention at the time.” which meant that teachers are guided by their knowledge at the time. Therefore the social interactions open up more possibilities for the teachers, so long as they can relate to the feedback given. This suggests that skilled feedback practices are an essential for RR teachers to support each other in their zones of proximal development (ZPDs) through intersubjectivity (teaching and talking together). It does not negate the importance of teacher social experiences but perhaps the effectiveness of their experiences for learning develops over the time of the course (over a year).

The teachers’ change over time was evident in what they wrote in their reflections about what they would be taking away as main messages from the sessions. The following are excerpts from two teachers that show RR teacher internalisation of the specific language of RR from February to November from their perspective.

From Diane’s example, key terminology in RR includes the following concepts: ‘acceleration’ (referring to the child’s rate of learning); ‘searchers’ (refers to how the children search for an use multiple sources of text information); ‘try that again’ (refers to a specific prompt for the child to self-monitor and then the teacher writes re-read to search); ‘scaffolding’ (refers to the assisted support given by teachers for children’s reading of books); ‘a self-extending literacy processing system’ is one that can extend itself when children behave in certain ways that involve monitoring,
searching, and problem solving, which is the goal of RR teaching); ‘prompting for strategic activities’ (refers to scaffolded language support for the child to initiate internal control referred to as ‘brain function’); ‘linking reading and writing’ (refers to the reciprocal relationship between the two in early learning); ‘co-constructors’ (refers to the construction of knowledge involving the teacher and the child through their quality interactions); and ‘meaning-getting’ (refers to Clay’s definition of reading).

From the perspective of learning through social interactions and the teacher’s internalisation processes Diane spoke about her language “prompting” in May, August, September and October. Her last entry indicates her disappointment in her language prompts and her interaction with the child. This evidence supports the Vygotskian (1986) view that novices can enter into dialogue with those more expert in their zones of proximal development before they have internalised the language of the social interactions to apply in their teaching interactions, from the teacher’s perspective.

Diane’s written reflections:

In April Diane wrote “I must get into acceleration and get out of notions of consolidation.”

In May: “I learned lots today: The need to get children to be independent searchers in reading and writing. Also to establish TTA [try that again] means re-reading, then to prompt the children to search and use information.”

In June: “I learned how to scaffold the meaning of each section of the book.”

In July: “… today I learnt that we get the children on to the path only. That we are helping them to build a self-extending system that is just the beginning for them… that children cannot ‘read to learn’ until at 9-10 years old”

In August: “Today the big thing for me was to get the children to search the visual information,” “I learned the importance of prompts and how limited my use of them can be in terms of the specific strategic activity,” and “ The importance of prompts: prompting in reading to see, in writing – to hear.”

In September: “I am understanding more about how to link reading and writing …and again to be precise in the prompts I use.”

In October: “We talked about being co-constructors with the child: the need to be observant, flexible and tentative. This means we as teachers must know all of our RR options that can be used to meet the child’s needs. We must have a great knowledge of what reading is about and what strategic activity the child appears to use. We must focus on meaning-getting.”
At the end of October: “Today I taught behind the screen. I have already realised that I did not use the prompts that are necessary but was quite bogged down in visual information…

Similarly Jade’s process of internalisation refers to the specific use of language and how teachers can interfere in the child’s ‘self-monitoring’; in May she is writing about ‘forcing independence on the child’ and later the same month she is writing about ‘building independence’; ‘how to’ refers to prompting for strategic activity; use of all the information together refers to integration; and ‘cross-checking’ is a strategic activity. Jade wrote about ‘language and prompting’ in April, May when she wrote that she ‘still had a way to go in the language she used’, June, August and September, replicating Diane’s experience. The difference between these examples and learning and using the technical language of an expert group, is that it took the teachers the year to learn how to use it more effectively in their interactions with children behind the glass-screen.

Jade’s written reflections:

In April Jade wrote: “Watching others teach is helpful because we compare it for our own teaching. I need to focus on no unnecessary talking! [And] Don’t stop them [the children] from monitoring!”

In May: “I feel I am becoming better at forcing independence upon the child but still have a way to go with the language I use.” And “Still need to build children’s independence. Explain to the child why they must do the things I’m telling them to do.”

In June: “Work on attempts – they [children] are not to stop – must pick themselves up and continue – predict quickly. Don’t stop – RE-READ. Make sure they are better than yesterday. And “I have shifted much of my focus this week to MEANING. I need to scaffold throughout the lesson and need to be consistent with my prompts…”

In July: “Fantastic discussion after lessons behind the screen regarding self-extending. Children do not learn from verbal instruction. Each child will take different things from any given lesson. Children must learn to read well before they can read to learn.”

In August: “I think sometimes I have assumed something has been taught/learnt well and have let it go.” “Children must be taught ‘HOW TO’ in reading and writing… [I] must be encouraging the use of all information together. Prompts: I need to prompt more for cross-checking, keep prompts short and prompt from what they already know.”

In September: “More meaning – prompts. Don’t assume the children know more just because they come in on high [book] levels.”

In October: “My lesson behind the screen: Must be flexible and tentative… I really appreciated the feedback… this session helped me with: Where do I go next?”
5.5 Discussion: The Social Interactions that Unfolded in This Study

In this research I undertook a systematic study of the role of social interactions in RR Teacher Training. The first step of the study was to capture all the social interactions, which unfolded during one RR training course and identify the major characteristics of these social interactions. This was framed by the first research question: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session? And it’s two sub-questions: 1a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions? and 1b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions?

The objective in answering Research Question One was to capture what was happening in my own sessions in terms of the teachers’ social interactions as guided and orchestrated by the Tutor. Sessions were sampled to represent early, middle and later in the course in order to reflect on change as the teachers became more proficient as RR teachers. The presentation follows the structure of a RR session: Introductory Discussion, the Observation and Discussion at the glass-screen and Follow-up discussion.

The following is my perspective of the social interactions that unfolded in this study based on observation course notes and the experience of participating in this research. This perspective supports triangulation of the data: what occurred, what the teachers thought of what occurred (Chapter 6) and what the Tutor thought about what occurred.

I used the introductory discussion to facilitate teacher interactions from the beginning of the session. In this discussion my aim was to explore and have some input into session themes, or topics, called emphases in RR. I tried to link the themes to the teachers’ prior knowledge based on their current teaching experience in RR (including what I may have engaged with them on school visits) as well as their broader knowledge as classroom teachers, such as what ‘independence’ would mean to them. As is the requirement of the course ‘teacher guide-sheets’ and quotations
from the course texts were also referred to. Through explanations of the themes I aimed to shape the teachers’ expectations for their observations and discussions. I consistently used the course texts as a reference in the introductory discussions in early and middle sessions. In the later session, I tried to shape the teachers’ understandings of ‘observation, tentativeness and flexibility’ in teaching, through open questioning and extending their explanations.

From the teachers’ perspective, it was easier for them to contribute on the basis of the known such as their teaching experiences, the meaning of language in their lives and teaching work, concrete examples from classroom and RR teaching. The more challenging, new ideas in the introductory discussions (such as changes of child development, teaching practices, or responding to quotations and sections of text) were more difficult to talk about without opportunity for prior thought. The teachers were, as one teacher said, just getting used to new ways of speaking and thinking about teaching that I presented as the RR Tutor.

In the early session I started the introductory discussion by specifically engaging the teachers in their immediate prior teaching experiences. I found that the teachers willingly contributed to short discussions about what was memorable to them and that they readily shared this information with one another through social interaction. For instance, they shared how they were using new teaching techniques and what worked for them in their teaching. I asked even at this early stage for the teachers to reflect on how their teaching was changing. They mentioned their thinking about explicit language, consistent expectations and working on daily improvements. The social interaction in my view captured the newness and excitement of the learning. At this time the teachers built on to what other teachers had contributed and carried their conversation easily without a lot of Tutor contribution or direction. However, by the middle of the course, when I was probably trying to input too much new material for the teachers, they were more engaged in listening to my introductions and explanations, particularly in relation to teacher change.

The teachers were self-aware about their own learning, as they had rationales for why they acted the way they did in their interactions with children, and their current
understandings of procedures which they could not always easily explain to each other, and admitted that they did not fully understand them, although they were prepared to try them. In the sampled session late in the course my input was reduced in the Introductory Discussion because it was less guided by content, and my role was to prompt and give feedback as the teachers discussed the lesson emphasis.

The teacher’s perception of my scaffolding near the end of the course was that they knew more about what and how to talk about general ideas (what it means to be observant, tentative and flexible in teaching) so they could be more forthcoming with ideas about the session ‘emphasis’ or ‘theme’.

During the Observation and Discussion component of the session I facilitated the teachers’ commentary on the lessons they were observing through the glass-screen. I stood at one end of the screen, ensured that I could engage with all the teachers, and they could engage with one another and managed the conversation in keeping with the pace of the on-going lesson. I tried to influence the teachers’ understandings of why the activities were in the RR lesson, and explained any technical language linked to examples in the lesson, encouraging the teachers to articulate their purposes for using the language.

At the beginning of the course the teachers were listening to commentary as they excitedly observed lessons demonstrated by a trained teacher (Session Two) and then their peers starting to teach (Session Three). They were focused on asking questions related to what they were about to embark on as RR teachers, and some found it hard to observe, think, listen to the tutor and comment themselves. Over time they became more used to the arrangement but said that they needed scaffolding in how to develop the conversations among themselves as separate from the Tutor. One teacher said she found it easier to describe what she saw than interpret it in depth at the sessions, but she liked to go away and think about it.

At the glass-screen my role as the Tutor was to elicit talk. In order to elicit the teachers’ peer interactions I directed the teachers’ attention to aspects of the observation, asked the teachers to explain their observations and infer from their
observations what this meant for literacy processing, as well as evaluate their observations by linking to the intent of the literacy activity and the session theme. I explained and clarified the observations as they were being observed, including the meaning of RR language. I highlighted important child and teacher actions in the observations, what needed to be remembered for further discussion in the session, and changes when the teacher’s assistance was unhelpful for the child’s learning or indicated misunderstanding of her role and procedures.

The teachers perceptions of the idea of talking while observing was that it is better to observe and talk than silently observe, because you learn more when you consider the opinions of others. However, it was hard to form thoughts quickly to contribute. The teachers were aware of their social role to each other in allowing for turn taking and people to express their opinions more than the scaffolding of the RR Tutor. The teachers knew that the Tutor’s role in scaffolding at the glass-screen was to get everyone to contribute. Some teachers did not want to contribute if their thoughts were ‘wrong’ and if they perceived that they contributed ideas that were wrong they withdrew for some time in making contributions. In the early sessions the teachers commented directly on what they had just seen or heard in the lesson or from peer teachers. They also interpreted what that meant for teaching in the lesson currently being observed and for their own teaching. The teachers evaluated the child’s behaviour in terms of good and poor behaviours and determined what they thought needed to change to improve the literacy processing. They compared the current observation with expectations they held for children in the classroom. They also evaluated the behaviours of peer teachers as to how that influenced child behaviour, positively and negatively, and made suggestions for other steps that a teacher could take to improve a child’s behaviour based on their developing knowledge of RR procedures. By the middle sessions the teachers were very aware of themselves as learners and this awareness continued to the late session. When they observed lessons they would say for example, ‘it’s the same for me’, and mentioned how difficult it was for them to monitor themselves when they were engaged in teaching.

To facilitate the flow of the follow up discussions in communicating with the teachers who had taught the lessons I scaffolded the process before the teachers moved back to the discussion circle. I organised the teachers between the lesson
observations whilst seated at the glass-screen and after the second lesson to rehearse the direction of their feedback. This included their positive remarks about lessons as an acknowledgement of what went well for the teachers, and organising agreement as to the main areas of discussion to share, rather than disparate memories of what was discussed. I sometimes did this with the assistance of a nominated group recorder during the lesson observations. The aim was to contextualise the discussion as a whole for the teachers who taught the lessons with examples from the lessons. The teachers were better able to summarise a discussion in terms of key ideas in later sessions for the teachers who taught the lessons. During early and middle follow-up discussions I led the teachers to their course texts or asked teachers to locate references. I explained the meaning and intentions of procedures in the texts. I directed the teachers to changes they could make in their teaching, and demonstrated some procedures in early sessions.

Knowing how to give feedback was the difficult part for the teachers in their view. In this group it involved being able to bring a summary of the main discussion at the glass-screen that was of interest to the group to share with the teacher who taught, that would take the whole group forward in their teaching. I explained this carefully and scaffolded how to give feedback through facilitation of it over the year. The learning for the teachers was not to mention isolated parts of the lessons, when that was what they could remember. Focusing on main ideas meant that it was a feature of the teachers’ reflections after the follow-up discussion that they all focused on these few ideas, rather than disparate ideas.

At the beginning of the course I heavily scaffolded the teachers’ interactions in a structured format for social interaction in the follow-up discussion. This involved positive feedback, opportunity for the teacher to comment on the typicality of her lesson, and a discussion about main areas discussed by the group in reference to the course texts. In the early session I initiated an area to follow-up through discussion, directed teachers to use their course texts to ground their opinions, and initiated a procedural demonstration (after the lesson feedback)
The teachers’ perception of the follow-up discussion was as one teacher said dependent on knowing how to do it. It was appreciated that the feedback started with positive reinforcement of the teacher who had taught. It was also appreciated that the teachers who taught commented on whether their lesson was typical or not before any follow-up discussion ensued and if it did.

By the middle of the course in the follow-up discussions the teachers were learning that assisting the child in the RR lesson involved the use of specific language prompting. They were discussing classroom expectations and comparing these competencies with their RR children’s competencies and expressing disappointment in their teaching demonstrations. I continued to extend the teachers’ understandings by adding on to what they said, and bringing this follow-up discussion to a main conclusion. Late in the course the teachers were still expressing disappointment in their teaching lessons, although they could provide rationales for why they did what they did, and make suggestions, using the texts for their own improvements. I continued to orchestrate the interaction in the follow-up discussion format. I redirected the teachers to the session emphases, examples from the lesson observations and the course texts, as well as facilitated turn-taking between the teachers.

The teachers’ perceptions of using the RR texts was that this was difficult (finding pages quickly) so the Tutor’s scaffolding (guiding them to parts of the texts) and expectation that they would use the texts this way was instructive for their independence over time.

In summary from my perspective as the Tutor, the data from my research revealed that the teachers were systematically scaffolded in their learning by the RR Tutor, who leads and prods them collectively in their ZPDs towards enhanced and more flexible understandings of their moment by moment teaching. The Tutor’s role is to actively scaffold the teachers’ learning experience through the observations and discussions, and provide structures for their thinking about how to offer feedback to their peers to advance their learning. It is my view based on my extensive experience as a RR Tutor and through engaging in this research, that the teachers could not effectively learn how to become RR teachers independently. Teachers need a
facilitator to provide expert guidance of what needs to be achieved, how it can be achieved. In the sessions the facilitator can hold more in the memory to draw on for discussion and make links that the teachers come to make through scaffolded support. Nor could the teachers learn to become RR teachers by listening to the RR Tutor and answering questions (teacher centred learning) because RR learning involves teachers in changing their ways of interacting in relation to the performance of the children they teach, and their participation in achieving that level of active flexibility, rather than via a transmission of knowledge model. The RR Tutor therefore plays a critical role in scaffolding individual learning through each teacher’s ZPD. The eventual independence of the teachers is exhibited in their ability to teach RR without assistance in their schools unless they need to discuss more difficult cases.

5.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter answers Research Question One: What is the role of social interactions in a Reading Recovery Teacher Training session? and two sub-questions: a) What is the role of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in orchestrating the social learning environment in a RR Teacher Training sessions? and b) What is the role of the teachers’ peers social interactions in creating effective learning environment during RR Teacher Training sessions? Figure 3 summarises what occurred in the social interactions between a RR Tutor and group of RR teacher trainees in this RR training course, using video and audio transcript data available from five RR sessions (early, middle and later in the course).

In answer to the research question and sub-questions a summary that interweaves the respective roles in the social interactions is as follows:

In the introductory discussion the RR Tutor facilitated the group interaction and worked on the teachers’ co-construction of knowledge. Scaffolding took many forms to achieve this and that can be described as questioning, directing, extending and so on. In this analysis the over-arching scaffolding functions are: establishing the session emphasis (theme and focus for the teachers’ observations at the glass-screen);
linking the session to the teachers’ prior knowledge (for example common meanings of words before psychological meanings, and in RR teaching, what they have been working on between sessions); highlighting and influencing significant teacher knowledge (what was important to take note of when considering the session emphasis); and using course references (the guiding texts, references and guidelines) as a common point of reference to establish intersubjectivity.

During this social activity the teachers shared their current experience and knowledge as a collaborative act for each other; they worked on co-constructing knowledge by assisting each other to understand course references and the session emphases; and supported self-awareness, a realisation they did not quite know how to do things but they were learning.

In the observations and discussion the RR Tutor facilitated teacher contributions at the glass-screen (asking questions, calling people to respond, build on, extend and so forth). The Tutor also worked on co-constructing teacher knowledge by: directing their attention (establishing a joint point of reference for the teachers’ intersubjectivity); explaining and clarifying with reference to the course texts; highlighting what needed to be remembered in the session (particularly for reference in the follow-up discussion); highlighting what was important (messages the teachers needed to take away from the observation and discussion); and highlighting what needed to change in the teaching.

The teachers’ contribution was replaying their observations (speaking aloud what they saw and heard) and verbalising interpretations as an act of social collaboration. The teachers: reached agreement with the Tutor and each other; evaluated the child’s behaviour (against goals for responding in the lesson activities), the teacher’s behaviour (against how successful they were in assisting the child and the appropriateness of the choices they made in tasks or what they chose to say or do), whilst evaluating their own behaviour (measuring their performance against that of their peer teachers – often saying “it’s the same for all of us”).
In the follow-up discussion the Tutor: facilitated the teachers’ interactions by creating the structure for social interactions; assisted the teachers in giving each other feedback through a process of summarising their observations or ‘contextualising’ their feedback for benefit of the teacher who taught the lesson; used the course references as a joint point of reference, for the teachers to access the author’s words in RR; explained and clarified the meaning of the texts and language used; highlighted the aims, intentions and goals set forth by the author for RR; directed the teachers to make changes to their teaching where necessary, and demonstrated or modelled how to teach procedures (mainly early in the session series).

While this was occurring the teachers learned the discussion format (social interaction processes) taking a while to learn how to provide contextualised feedback to each other with assistance from the Tutor. They only achieved this more easily (if not effortlessly) late in the sessions. The teachers used the course references trying to use them in flexible ways in response to answering questions posed by the lessons they had observed; and learned to co-construct teaching strategies derived from RR theory and practices, when their practices teaching lessons were often led by their personal theories until late in the sessions.

An explanation of teacher learning through social interactions in RR teacher training is as follows:

Central to understanding the importance of social interaction in leveraging people to higher levels of understanding is the concept of the “zone of proximal development” (ZPD) Wertsch (1985). Vygotsky defined the zone of proximal development as the distance between a child’s “actual development level as determined by independent problem solving” and the higher level of “potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.” (Wertsch, 1985, p67-68) Within a social-constructivist theoretical framework RR Tutor scaffolding orchestrates the social learning environment for teachers learning. “Quality social interaction depends on establishing intersubjectivity or a joint point of reference in which the Tutor tunes into the
teachers current levels of understanding and leads them to higher levels of performance and understanding.” (Verenikina, 2012, p480)

A dynamic series of changes occur in the interpersonal level (socially between people) that in turn is reflected in the intrapersonal functioning (what is internalised or learned) (Wertsch, 1985, p159). By way of explanation of the importance of social interactions in learning, whatever an individual “sees” is a private affair (Gallagher, 2009) but when the person accepts the invitation to engage in shared dialogue they are jointly committed to a shared social world (Wertsch, 1985). The RR Tutor assists teacher learning in a transition from the social world (interpersonal) to the intrapersonal (internalisation) in the individual’s zone of proximal development (ZPD).

According to Wertsch (1985) there are levels of intersubjectivity. If applied to RR, teacher learning may be explained as follows:

The first level of intersubjectivity in RR teacher training is when the teachers begin their RR training and their prior teaching experience overlaps with their new experience. The teachers’ early written reflections after Session Two (following observing and discussing a video-tape of expert performance in early RR teaching) shows what the teachers think is importance for this new skill they will learn. As adult learners they identify early what is important and different (the speed of the interactions, the emphasis on precise language prompting, the focus on the child and his or her success). When the teachers begin their training they teach lessons behind the glass-screen, observe and discuss peer-teacher approximations as they are scaffolded in their understandings and future capability related to ‘what to do next?’ by the RR Tutor. This is the second level of intersubjectivity. The teachers’ understandings and achievements at this level are revealed when they say their lessons are not working, or working in part and they do not know what to do next or differently, as one teacher said, “I don’t know, what else can I do?” The teachers also revealed that at this level they were only, as one teacher said, “beginning to understand your language” – what the RR Tutor meant in the social world of RR teaching. The third level of intersubjectivity is when the teachers respond to the RR
Tutor’s language and directions by making appropriate inferences needed to interpret the observation and actions needed to be taken. The fourth level of intersubjectivity according to Wertsch (1985) is described as when the learner (teacher) takes over complete responsibility for carrying out the task (RR teaching). In RR teacher training this level of independence occurs in the teachers’ second year of teaching RR in his or her school, when the support of fortnightly sessions and regular Tutor visits is withdrawn. The teachers then attend “on-going professional learning” sessions less regularly (a minimum of six sessions during the year), with trained RR teachers, in similar group sizes, but in combinations of people who may know each other less well (from other training groups).

In RR teaching the group works collaboratively. However, learning about how to teach RR lessons to a range of children who have idiosyncratic confusions and diverse learning pathways is exacerbated by the complexity of the child’s learning and the complexity of the task (teaching). Individuals have multiple zones of proximal development (ZPD). In this study it was revealed that this group of teachers found the RR lesson’s first literacy teaching activity task ‘familiar reading’ easier to interpret and execute, than the ‘new book activity’ interacting with children’s most novel experience (reading a new book). This difficulty was a feature of the RR teacher learning for this group late in the series of training sessions, when the new book activity was not completed in the lesson time. Therefore, the complexity of the child’s learning and the complexity of RR teacher learning makes the RR Tutoring a complex task, which can be done well and less well at times.

RR teacher training is collaborative social learning in the company of peers and a more capable fellow teacher (RR Tutor). It is not based on learning from expertise. The aim of this study was to understand the role of social interactions in Reading Recovery Teacher Training Sessions, in which the zone of proximal development (ZPD) allows a study of learning that represents the ‘buds’ or ‘flowers’ of development rather than the ‘fruits’ of development (Vygotsky, 1978).

5 Part of the RR Tutor role is to teach two RR children daily.
Chapter Six

6 TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE ON THEIR READING RECOVERY LEARNING

The aim of this chapter is to answer Research Question Two: What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions? The two sub-questions that are answered in the conclusion are: 2a) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions? and 2b) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions? answered indirectly through interview questions about the school visits for ethical reasons.

The ten teachers on this Reading Recovery (RR) course were interviewed near the end of the course and after the course was completed, before the beginning of the teachers’ teaching of new children in RR in the year, after their first training year. The interview questions were designed to sample the teachers’ perspectives of learning with others on a Reading Recovery (RR) course, in the contexts available for the learning at RR sessions. These are: observing and discussing two lessons at a glass screen under the guidance of a RR Tutor; follow-up discussions facilitated by a RR Tutor; and teaching the lessons for the lesson observations (a teacher and child). Other questions sampled how this learning influenced the teachers’ teaching in their schools (daily RR lessons), how they approached difficult teaching situations independently, and whether they extended their learning by involving others outside of the sessions. The teachers’ perspectives of their learning included their opinions and their feelings about their learning. The impact of the Tutor on their learning was sampled through questions directly related to the one-to-one relationship on school visits.

6.1 Introduction
The main themes to emerge from these interviews were: *co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationship,* and *self-regulation.*

A social constructivist perspective is that individuals learn through their social activities and interactions. The co-construction of knowledge takes place through the interplay between social interactions and the individual (Palincsar, 2005, p286-287). In this research co-construction of knowledge is defined as learning that involves the teacher in learning with one or more teachers. This is different to scaffolding, which involves assistance provided to the learner by a more capable partner that enables the learner to complete a task they could not otherwise do unaided (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976).

The social construction of knowledge from group interaction is expressed thus by the teachers: “The most important thing I think is to learn with other people because you get their ideas and you get their feedback and what it’s all about.” (Jade) “I think those group discussions are really very helpful because I do take in everything that I hear, I do come back and try it on my children, and I get success from it.” (Maura)

‘Trust in the relationship’ in this research refers to characteristics of the social relationships that the teachers say allows their learning to occur. In a social constructivist approach learners learn when there is trust in safe and positive collaboration that allows them to reveal what they do and do not understand (Levykh, 2008). The peer support of learners at the same level of learning (in equal but different zones of proximal development) underpins the ‘gift of confidence’ (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2000) that teachers receive from each other in the RR learning experience. This is the emotional support of collaborators whereby the teachers provide each other with the great service of giving each other confidence to achieve what they could not do alone. It is expressed by Jade in this way: “I think that was probably the most valuable experience we had, the same group continuously, to get to know each other, and trust each other. It gave me more confidence in my own teaching, in talking to other people and realizing that yes they have the same issues.” This idea was also referred to by Maura in terms of the relationship with the RR Tutor on school visits: “Well I think that when you’re watching and you’re there I know that I’ve got the support from you”.
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In this research self-regulation refers to becoming conscious of where you are in relation to ideas, knowledge as part of your own learning. For instance, when working with other people Jade said, “[it] made me realise…how much you can learn from other people”. At the glass-screen Maura said, “you’re very critical of your own teaching while you’re watching it, because you just wonder and you see I’ve done that and that’s not right.” And in relation to the RR Tutor Maria said, “[I’m] willing to take on board what you’re opinion was, because I’m only still learning.”

**Figure 4: Teachers’ Perspective of Main Themes & Sub-themes in Teacher Learning**

The figure above (Figure 4) outlines the teachers’ perspectives of the importance of social interactions for their learning by main themes and sub-themes during the components: the introductory discussion, the observations and discussion and the follow-up discussion in the RR sessions.
6.2 Theme: Co-construction of Knowledge

Co-construction refers to the interdependence that contributes to building learning. It involves the learner and others (novice peers and the more expert other) (Palincsar, 2005). This theme is presented from an individual perspective of each teacher for how the ‘other’ (peers and or tutor) were involved in the teachers' learning. Co-construction involves intersubjectivity or a joint point of social reference, for instance Jade said: “I found watching people behind the screen... makes you clue into what other people are saying...Someone will say ‘Oh, I think this child... is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about”. Coded within this theme is the concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), the gap between individual’s ‘actual development’ in a given area, for example, in RR teaching (what is known, the learner’s skilled action, the learner’s problem solving capabilities) and what is yet to be known or accomplished (Vygotsky, 1978). To have shift in this area there is evidence that the learner’s development has moved forward or been extended (Bonk & Kim, 1998). The category of active participation in this study referred to the collaborative activity and what the participants say about that. Jemma said, “I found that observing other people and talking about it afterwards helped... to just unpick that and make comments... everyone would pitch in and build on ideas”. In Vygotskian theory the process of internalisation is not a transmission of the external activity (interpersonal) to the internal plane (intrapersonal) it is the process by which the internal plane is formed. “The student plays an active role and constantly informs the teacher as their mutual negotiation and collaboration build” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p197).

The theme co-construction of knowledge has five sub-themes that represented the social activity involved in the RR sessions. These are: actively observing with others, group feedback, learning by linking, learning by extending, and learning by clarifying. Through the process of the shared activities in the RR session the meaning of RR teaching is collaboratively constructed and negotiated. Learning therefore is not thought of as the transmission of knowledge but of transaction and transformation (Chang-Wells & Wells, 1993, cited in John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).
Actively observing with others as a sub-theme refers to social interactions (joint shared experiences) facilitated by the RR Tutor. A co-construction of knowledge occurs because the teachers listen to different interpretations, influenced by pre-stated emphases for the observations and contribute their own interpretations, thereby reinforcing and changing their thinking. The active nature of this involvement is that teacher responding is expected to be comparatively fast, synchronized with the ongoing lesson behind the screen. The group feedback during the follow-up discussions influenced the teacher’s construction of knowledge around her own lesson and the teaching she did the next day in her school. The teachers learned by being able to link their immediate observations at the glass-screen and the discussion of those with what they were reading in their course texts. The discussions of others in sessions (both at the screen observing) and in the follow-up discussions assisted the teachers to extend and clarify their making of meaning in RR.

6.2.1 Sub-theme: Actively observing with others

Actively observing with others is a main feature of the social environment in which RR teacher learning occurs. In a theory about the social construction of knowledge, an essential feature is the ZPD in which the learner is interacting with people in his environment and in co-operation with his peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p90). Involving active agents in the ZPD is a contemporary feature of collaborative classrooms and the reading comprehension strategy of “reciprocal teaching” (Palincsar & Brown, 1986). In expanding Vygotsky’s concept of the zone of proximal development to include artefacts (books and so on) as well as people this approach “…integrated Vygotsky’s analyses of tools and symbols with the roles played by the participants in the learning process” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p199). This section analysis only refers to peer-teachers as collaborators in the learning process.

The co-construction of knowledge through the opportunity to observe lessons was important for the learning of the teachers. The significance of this component for RR teacher learning was that observing how their peers interacted with the children during lessons was essential. This learning involved the teachers’ RR skill
development over time from teaching RR in their schools. The teachers explained through the interviews that observing without actively discussing what was being observed at the same time during a RR session would not have been as useful in the co-construction of their knowledge. This means that the teachers’ discussion is an ‘active discussion’ that makes a ‘co-construction’ accessible to all the teachers through their contributions to it. This sub-theme is highly significant for these teachers in the two contexts of observing at the screen and discussions of observing at the screen. All of the teachers spoke about how this social interaction assisted their learning.

In the context of observing lessons at the glass screen, four teachers explained that this experience was highly important for their learning. Belinda said that her learning worked from the basis of these observations, which gave a measure of comparison for her skill development as a RR teacher. “Well it worked because I was able to watch what other people were doing and listen to what they were doing, but also watch how they interacted with the child and how they were using what they were learning in the RR group and through their reading, and applying that.” This refers to how actively observing a demonstration of RR teaching assisted this teacher in her processes of internalisation in the ZPD (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).

Jemma explained that observing peer teaching was useful because teacher skill changed over the time of the course and importantly because the observations were not demonstrations of excellence or expertise but of learning where people do not always get it right in implementing the RR teaching procedures at the beginning of the course. Jemma said, “I found it very helpful to see two things: first at the very beginning it was good to see other people make mistakes that I had made,” which refers this teachers identification with her peer-learners in new learning. Then, at the end of the course she said, “…it was really interesting to see how they responded to the children and made an attempt to be flexible”. This refers to a shift in her internalisation processes from a concern about procedures to social interactions with children. Jemma felt that observing others struggle meant she gained confidence from “sometimes you don’t always get it right”.
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Lara said that she learned by comparing what the teachers said about their children’s learning (prior to their teaching) and how their interactions played out in the observed lessons. It was important for her “to see whether …what they had talked about married with what we were observing from the child as well.” This implies Lara’s awareness that the individual’s perspective of the child’s learning and the group’s perspective may be similar or may differ.

Mary-Lou explained that although she did not contribute a lot to these discussions her peripheral participation in the group still assisted her learning because by listening to others she could clarify her understandings of what was important to observe, thereby gaining a joint point of reference in her ZPD. She said the observations were important to: “clarify my observations, to make sure that what I was observing was what I should be observing, or was it like an accurate direction of where I was to observe, or what I was looking at, and to clarify my understanding of a particular point through what other people sort of had input to”.

The co-construction of knowledge through the opportunity to hear the interpretations of others as the teachers observed lessons (simultaneously) was important for the learning of the teachers. It was far more important to them than observing without this interaction. The teachers said that they could “clue into” what the others were interpreting to get feedback for their own thinking. The commentary of others brought to their attention what they may not have attended to or thought of, and this helped them to clarify their understanding of what they were observing. Theoretically ‘clueing in’ refers to making meaning in collaboration with others in the individual’s ZPD through language (a tool) which is incorporated in internalisation processes of the individual (thinking). The importance of learning from hearing the interpretations (language) of others that occurred at the glass screen was significant in making this a social interaction. Six teachers spoke about how this impacted on their learning. Jade said that this learning offers other points of view. She said, “that helps because it just makes you clue into what other people are saying. So, you know, other aspects...you might be looking at something and saying, ‘Oh, this kid hasn’t got enough visual [information]’, but someone else will say, ‘Oh, I think this child, you know, is being prompted the wrong way,’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about”. She also said that these points of view
were important because they may be different from your own. “So there’s no point really watching a lesson behind the screen unless you’ve got that conversation going because… you need to discuss it to learn don’t you? You need to. Well, I think you need to discuss your observations with other people, because their observations might be totally different”.

Lara appreciated the realism of the observations and the importance of the interpretations of them for her learning because this confirmed whether there was a consensus in the group about what they saw and what it meant. This was a form of feedback for learning. Lara said, “it was an opportunity to observe someone in real time, with the group, so we were able to make comments as we observed the lesson. It was a good way of bouncing your ideas, so you could verbalise what you thought you were seeing and to see whether the group felt the same way, or whether they saw a different aspect or saw something else. So it was just a good, yeah, a good experience to, you know, observe in real time, have an opportunity to voice your own opinions, and then be able to get feedback from your peers, as to whether what you were seeing was really happening.” The importance of observation is similar to that of face to face feedback. The learner can tune in to social cues and the facilitator can guide or redirect the quality of the feedback (Thurlings et al, 2012).

Maria said that discussing while observing alerted her to what she may not have thought about if she was just observing, “…it sort of brings things forward for you, in your mind that you maybe haven’t thought of before, and makes it so you’re seeing something in action and you’re talking about it rather than just looking.” This is the process of internalising in the learner’s ZPD. Mary-Lou thought similarly, she said, “I think that the group helped me see points, or the discussion around with the group, helped me see points that I wasn’t aware of before or I hadn’t actually observed, or taken notice of”. The collaboration of the group therefore assists the co-construction of knowledge. Lara said that the Tutor’s role in highlighting what was relevant in their observations assisted teacher learning by drawing their attention to what needed to be observed. She said, learning was enhanced by “having, you know, the tutor there to sort of direct the conversation and to draw your attention to other things that perhaps you may have missed, that were important, or relevant, or that showed a bit of insight as to what was happening with that child.” This is an example
of the importance of the Tutor in the social interaction, as opposed to just having peer-teachers discuss the observations. Vygotskian theory places great emphasis on the role of the teacher or more expert guidance through social interactions. This levers learners beyond their actual developmental level, so that “what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow.” (Vygotsky, 1978, p87)

The group emphases for lessons observations, such as ‘independence’ (Session Seven), supported the teachers in being focused in their teaching. These are examples of designed-in or macro-scaffolded by the Tutor in her planning (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Jemma commented that the group discussion that emphasised aspects of the observation, such as ‘making meaning,’ helped her learning. She said, “…the group I think helped me focus a lot on particular aspects, like working with the child to make meaning, which we have been working on. That was really helpful because I was trying to go ‘all over the ship’ and trying to do everything at once, and they focused my thinking for the next day, on one aspect, rather than trying to do everything on one lesson, which I was trying to do. So I found that really beneficial because they really focused me”. Learning in the ZPD is premised on the position that “Any learning a child encounters at school always has a previous history” (Vygotsky, p78, p84) because learning and development are interrelated. Jemma’s actual development level in understanding new learning in RR was that she did not know where to look during a lesson observation. Scaffolded support by the Tutor assisted Jemma to direct her attention to aspects of the observation, and to make meaning of what she was seeing.

The teachers’ discussions of what they were observing was made possible by their joint experience in participating in RR teaching at the same time as they were learning at RR sessions. This enabled the teachers to comment or learn from comparative experiences. Tracey said, “I think you can participate more in the discussion by having done a similar thing, or even on the opposite end of doing something totally different, and being able to bring that back together…[to] just the whole group’s perspective and experiences”. The process of internalisation of social experiences is a feature of individual teachers’ construction of knowledge (John-Steiner & Mahn. 1996).
Learning from the interpretations of others was also important when teachers participated in the follow-up discussions after the lesson observations. Two teachers commented on this aspect of their learning. In RR teacher learning the teachers are required to give their opinions rather than only listen to others, which is essential for social interaction. The articulation of different opinions supported the teachers in developing their learning. Jade said, “…the fact that in the group you did feel like you needed to let everybody have a say, as well as you had to add, I think that that was probably a better lesson. You weren’t just sitting there and listening. Whether you wanted to or not you had to put in your opinion, and put in what your observations were, or what you thought, and I think that’s very valuable, because some people from the group would sit back and not say anything if they were allowed to. It’s good to be forced to talk to the group, as well as some people would probably just talk non-stop, so it works both ways. I think that was very obvious from the start of our training that the group thing was about listening as well as what your thoughts were.” This teacher’s view emphasises that social interaction and collaboration involves hearing all the teachers’ voices. Similarly Jemma explained the importance of articulation of their thinking in terms of the teachers’ learning. This was because a public sharing of opinions allowed others to assist the learner to construct their knowledge. Jemma said, “…you felt that whatever you said… somebody would say … ‘did you think about it this way?’ ‘Or did you go to this part of the text?’”

In conclusion, ‘actively observing others’ in co-construction of knowledge including the observation of the lessons and the active discussion of that observation as it occurred was a highly significant factor in RR teacher training. Lara described the reality of the course as being like ‘life’ and ‘real experience’ in observing and discussing the actions of their peers that supported the learning. She said, “like it’s a life you know… being with other people, it’s a real experience and it’s more memorable sometimes than just reading something in a book to actually see it in practice, to … experience it with others, it creates more of a memory, so you’ve got that recall then...yeah.”
Mary-Lou explained that as a teacher it was important for her to ‘see it in action’ and to discuss this with the group, because she did not have the confidence that she would be able to interpret a ‘theory based’ course. She said, “I don’t have a lot of confidence in my academic ability, so it was vital to hear what other people were saying for things to become clearer to me, to see it in action so that I am more focused. I think everything has to work together, and I think if I just did it between the tutor and myself I don’t think I would be as effective as what I am now…There was a lot of times during the year that my interpretation was completely different to the interpretation that was meant.”

Each of the teachers grouped responses under this sub-theme enrich what it means to socially construct knowledge in one’s ZPD. The teachers could compare themselves with their peers (their interpretations and misinterpretations), what their peers said about the children they taught, and whether individual interpretations matched what the group observed. The teachers learned by listening to each other and clueing in to the opinions of others. The real-time observations allowed the teachers to socially connect with other opinions, including ideas the individual teacher may not have thought of before. Furthermore, ‘emphases’ for the observations, such as ‘making meaning’ designed-in by the Tutor focused the teacher observations.

### 6.2.2 Sub-theme: Group feedback

Feedback is an important feature of learning in the teacher’s ZPD. The teacher receives guidance as to where to go next. The literature on feedback indicates that goal directed, specific, corrective feedback balanced between positive and negative comments is effective, rather person-directed, general or vague, comments (Thurlings et al, 2012, p197). Feedback is to assist the learner with determining from the social interaction ‘how am I going?’ and ‘where to next?’ (Timperley & Hattie, 2007). In the Vygotskian approach to this research feedback is involved in the process of internalisation and occurs in the learner’s ZPD.

Co-construction of knowledge from group feedback for the individual’s teaching is highly important for learning in RR. Eight teachers spoke about this in two contexts:
teaching for your peers and the group follow-up discussion. In ‘teaching for your peers’ it was not the act of doing the teaching that assisted the teacher in the co-construction of knowledge it was the group feedback that came afterwards.

Six teachers spoke about how feedback assisted their learning. Jade explained that all the teachers were aware that they were learning. She said, “…when you come out [from behind the glass-screen] you need feedback and you need to want that feedback, because you’ve got to be …open to the idea that you probably didn’t do everything right. I mean everybody knows that they’re not doing the whole lesson correctly. So I liked the feedback and…just that…opportunity to show, ‘this is what I’m doing’ and ‘what do all you people think?’ ‘What does it look like from the outside?’ You know it’s the same as videoing yourself teaching is very valuable…but with other people watching they told you what their observations were. So I thought that was very valuable. And in that way that helped me because I …like people telling me that you could have done better.” This teacher’s response is two-fold, first: an appreciation of the designed-in experience in RR, for peers to view teaching from the outside their teaching situation. Clay (1982) wrote that this situation induced objectivity among teachers in evaluating their work. Second: the teacher expressed the desire to improve. Therefore the social interaction of receiving feedback provided the assistance in the teacher’s ZPD for what she would come to do independently tomorrow. Maura confirmed the importance of the feedback when she said that after teaching behind the screen, “even though I know that there are people watching me I just do my own thing and I think it’s good because then people are watching and they give you some feedback and I take it on board and I think it does wonders for my teaching.”

Shelley explained that in the act of teaching people did and said things they did not realise. The group feedback helped to bring that to their attention. She said, “It was always very helpful because quite often the teacher teaching does things that they don’t realise, does and says things that they don’t realise, and so it helps. The group discussion afterwards helps to, very nicely, point those things out… so you can keep it in mind when you’re teaching and adjust, or fix things as needed.” Feedback changes the teachers’ perspective from “inside” their teaching to receiving an
“outside” view. The social nature of the feedback received in the company of peer-learners supports development.

Jemma explained that while the teacher teaching was not a party to the discussion about her teaching, the feedback and support from the group would assist the teacher to change because of the collaborative disposition of the group. She said, “I knew that, what was being discussed was relevant to my teaching and relevant for my child, you always knew that on the other side there were people who were there to help. They weren’t there to criticise. They weren’t there to sort of unpick you to the point where you’d never go back there again. It was always ‘okay, yeah, we know you did a couple of things that you probably shouldn’t have, but you know, we’re going to now help you work through those’. Just that support that came through all the time and you know, I thought that was good”.

The feedback the teachers received from each other assisted their learning because it offered different points of view so the learner could add that to what she already knew (their actual development). Diane said feedback was important, “…because everybody can contribute something different perhaps, or another aspect of whatever you’re looking at and talking about. Someone would say A and someone else would say B and we’d all build on it and build up the picture, or what we should be aiming for. [This was] layering on what we had already experienced or what we already knew. Then…when we’d get to looking at the book too that would build up a few more layers on it (teacher learning). So [in] each discussion you’re at a certain point, you have the discussion and then you’ve got so much more input that you try to fit into your framework (your learning) and hopefully that it transforms you, the next time you have a go at it. [The group discussion is] making your learning more sophisticated, as we go along. It’s much better than just trying to do it by yourself.”

This detailed comment includes the course text and people as active agents in the ZPD (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996) leading the teacher to consider change to her practices. Tracey confirmed that the group feedback gave the teacher a broader perspective (Clay & Watson, 1982). Tracey said, “…by going into the group discussion outside of behind the screen you were able to reflect with a broader perspective…with everybody inputting into what happened.”
In the context of the question related to teaching the next day, feedback the teachers received for their teaching at the session was important for four teachers. In the co-construction of knowledge, feedback from one’s peers has an effect on learning that lasts longer than the time of the session. Maria explained that the feedback was influenced her teaching the next day. She said, “And that actually carries over, because when I used to come back to teach the next day, you’d be still sort of be in that frame of mind.” Lara explained that the importance of teaching for one’s peers was the feedback received from the teachers and the RR Tutor, because feedback offered a different interpretation of the child’s learning for the teacher, which gave direction for teaching the next day. Lara said, “Oh, not so much the actual lesson behind the screen but getting the feedback afterwards from the group was really, really good. Sometimes they may have seen different things that you hadn’t or were interpreting things in a different way that made sense…you also were able to give a lot of feedback and support, as to what we were seeing and then the group were able to give suggestions as to where to direct the attention next, how to lift that child for the following day. I had direction and I knew what the child had achieved, so it was supportive. So, I always felt that my lesson the following day lifted that little bit from having that feedback.”

In the same vein, Diane who taught behind the screen the day before her interview explained how feedback that she had from the teachers influenced her teaching the next day, “Well the discussion that we had yesterday I would certainly be working on my prompting…and being more precise about it.” Maura explained that receiving the feedback was trialled by the teacher the next day and it was important for the teacher to find out that suggestions worked in her own context and that was what influenced her learning. She said, ‘Well definitely I come back and the teaching changes because you’ve seen something that you’ve been doing and it’s not working and when you hear about it and people talk about how they’re doing things and things that are working for them you come back and try it, and I find that it does work.”

In conclusion concerning the importance of learning with other people, Jade said, “Oh… the most important thing I think is to learn with other people because you get
their ideas and you get their feedback and that’s important, that’s what it’s all about. You don’t become a better teacher by yourself … it depends on that discussion, you have to have feedback. I think that’s very helpful to have constructive criticism and also to have discussion about somebody else’s teaching.” Feedback and improvement are complimentary in the thinking of this teacher.

6.2.3 Sub-theme: Learning by linking

Linking refers to processes of internalisation which involves the gradual transformation of shared understandings (the interpersonal) into individual internal self-regulatory processes (the intrapersonal) levering shifts in the ZPD. The teachers linked what they observed, what they heard people say about what they observed (during and after lessons), and what they learned from their course texts. This helped them to internalise their RR knowledge. In the context of observing at the screen two teachers spoke about this linking. A major factor in the co-construction of learning is linking the observations to the speeded responses that were required from the teachers at the glass-screen. The teachers were expected to rapidly respond to RR Tutor questioning and direction by contributing answers and information about an on-going event, which the Tutor could frame towards a session topic or ‘emphasis’, such as ‘independence’ (Session Seven).

Shelley explained that her construction of knowledge was facilitated by this rapid linking. She said, “Oh yes, that was good [group learning at the glass-screen] because it made me think quickly, I had to think of things, and I guess it was like with the children, to make links, that we’re making links from the text, to your brain, to the lesson, to what people are saying. So, I think it helped clarify a lot of things.”

Maria explained that responding verbally to an observation at the glass-screen together, with the teachers rapidly talking about it, assisted her fix knowledge in her mind (internalisation). She said, “Well it brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it I guess. When you’re watching it it’s like watching television and you’re talking to someone when you’re watching television about something that’s going on. It sort of puts it more concrete in your mind.”
The importance of linking knowledge was also evident in linking the experience of the observation of the lesson with the follow-up discussion. Two teachers explained this. Jade said that the follow-up discussion ‘set in their minds’ what was previously observed. She said, “I guess it [the follow-up discussion]… just concreted what was said behind the screen while the person was teaching.” Maria said, “It [the follow-up discussion] helped me in that way because…I would be ticking off in my head points that I did while that person was teaching, and then when we come to discuss it afterwards it helps to solidify (the experience) in your mind more.”

It was extremely important in the teachers’ learning that they have opportunities to connect their learning from the immediate lesson observations, immediate discussions of the observations, to the content of their RR course texts. This was because the course texts were the source of mediated support (a tool) when the teachers were in their school settings, and its content needed to be meaningful to the teachers. The texts gained their meaning through the teachers’ use of them during their discussions about the teaching they had immediately observed in the sessions. Five teachers spoke of this connecting the texts to the group experience being important for their co-construction of knowledge.

Belinda said the text used in the context of the RR session assisted the teachers because it mirrored what they needed to do themselves when in similar situations. The text was a tool to be used to support the teachers’ independent teaching. She said, “Well I don’t think it would have worked as well if we didn’t have the discussion following the teaching, because it wasn’t being critical of what the person was doing behind the screen. It was looking at what they could have done, what they should have done, what they did do. So, what worked, what didn’t work. Why it worked or why it didn’t work. And then we would refer back to the text. So we would find that support. So if we were facing the situation ourselves, which we do, we’d know where to go in the text to get support.” In Vygotskian theory development is “…characteristised by unevenness in the development of different functions, metamorphosis or qualitive transformation from one form into another, intertwining of external and internal factors, and adaptive processes that overcome impediments the child encounters” (Vygotsky, 1978, p73). When the RR texts are
viewed as an active agent in the teacher’s ZPD they provide a social support for their learning as they encounter unevenness in their teaching of the children.

Similarly, Jemma explained how the experience of observing teaching and discussing the teaching with reference to the text helped in her construction of knowledge through linking these three aspects of teacher learning in RR sessions. She said, “It was …good to go back to the book, sometimes I had read things and they hadn’t sunk in and having the group discuss it really clarified…my initial response to the text and it refined it again, and the group seemed to be all about that, really focusing my thinking and my learning in response to whatever the topic was for the day. And I found that …made it more meaningful I think, because it was coming from the text, but [was also] related to what we had observed.”

Mary-Lou did not think that she would have understood the text without having teaching linked with the written word. She said, “I think that a vital part of my learning was the discussion afterwards because it brought us back to the book, and it brought us back to pages that I had already read in the book but sometimes didn’t quite understand, and through things that different people have said it actually made different points clearer, to me…and it sort of like gave me a better understanding of what Marie\(^6\) was trying to say in the book by having a physical example, to say ‘oh okay that’s what she was talking about when she said that particular point.’” In understanding the written word in RR teacher training, reading and comprehending the course texts becomes part of a natural process of learning through socially collaborative discussions.

This was further confirmed by Diane who explained that while the text was useful, the experience of ‘seeing it in action’ or having it illustrated for the teacher, thereby linking observation and discussion with the book, assisted in her construction of knowledge in the group. She said, “Well I think no matter what the area was about, whether it was familiar reading or the writing, whatever we were discussing, you know, whether we should let the child make errors or we shouldn’t let them make errors, whatever it was, or prompting, I always learnt something for myself that I

\(^6\) Marie Clay
could go away and work on, ‘cause I think, as I said, when you see somebody else doing things it kind of illustrates it for you, rather than just being somebody talking about it to you, or just reading the book. The book’s very helpful but when you actually see it in action it highlights what you should be doing or what needs to be done, for myself.” Therefore, it may be unlikely that Clay’s RR texts could be understood without examples from teaching and the social interactions (discussions) of the teachers.

The text was also a point of reference for the teachers to confirm or not to confirm their ideas and actions in teaching RR. Lara explained that the text acted in this way as a tool for reinforcement of teachers’ actions and ideas in RR. She said, “The discussion was always good because we tried to pull out some relevant points from our observations behind the screen and then we were able to again, like just talk and reflect about what we’d seen in the lesson, but then go back to the text, and find in the book the relevant sections that supported or didn’t support what we were seeing that was happening. So, it confirmed some ideas in some ways and reinforced them.”

In the sessions teaching points were made memorable for some teachers by having sayings that summarised the discussion. These assisted the teachers’ memory of what was important, thereby linking the experience of the session to their teaching in a school. Two teachers spoke about this way of learning through co-construction of knowledge, in two contexts. In the context of teaching for one’s peers, where the summary statements originated, Diane said, “I always found that when we were in the discussion there was always … somebody … maybe you as the Tutor would say something ‘short and sweet’, and …I would take them up and they’d stick with me like, ‘lift and support’ and ‘be better every day’… I know…those statements need unpacking with lots of stuff, lots of information around them, but those kind of ‘short and sweet’ things that came out of the group discussion stayed in my mind.” This illustrates ways in the social situation different Tutors make the RR sessions unique. Sayings and analogies were a habit of this Tutor, just as Clay (1991) uses car and driving analogies to explain concepts in her text which the teachers also had a reference. What is memorable is linked to the shared social situation whether it is explaining a psychological concept or giving a pithy comment in context for what needed to be remembered. Shelley also clued into these social connectors to guide
her learning. In the context of teaching the next day Shelley said, “Yes, the group discussion was always in my mind from the previous day…especially at the end of the discussion when we would talk about the key points and probably just bring it down to one or two key phrases, that was what stayed in my mind for the next day, for example, ‘make it better’, ‘always make it better the next day’, oh I can’t think of another one at the moment…that’s one that always stays in my mind, ‘make it better for the next day, ‘always lift’, ‘lift’.”

In summary, learning by linking ideas and getting new ideas was a feature of co-construction of knowledge in group learning. The teachers said that learning in the group was important because they could gain understandings that they had never thought of before or could not describe. Tracey said group learning was, “very important…I think just by having group discussions things pop up that you might not have thought about, things pop up that maybe you couldn’t put the words in, but it is happening to you as well.”

6.2.4 Sub-theme: Learning by extending

Extending refers to processes of internalisation within the individual’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) The quality social interactions in RR teacher training depend on establishing intersubjectivity or a joint point of reference in which the peer teachers tune into other teachers current levels of understanding and teaching which leads them to higher levels of understanding. (Verenikina, 2012) The importance of the co-construction was that the teachers learned more with each other than they could learn alone so the co-construction extends the teachers’ learning. This had importance for the teachers in two contexts: observing at the screen and in the follow up discussion. Four teachers spoke about this.

Jemma said that the extending of her learning came through the teachers building on to the ideas of others as they observed the lesson at the glass-screen. Jemma said, “With the discussion that was going on while the teachers were working [teaching behind the glass-screen], it …was nice to focus on one area and be able to just unpick that and make comments even if they weren’t …correct, it was okay, everyone would
pitch in and build on ideas, and I found that very helpful. I didn’t like being on the other side but … the discussion was really helpful to me.” In her interview Jemma’s remarks about correctness (observing at the glass-screen) and making mistakes, ‘although it didn’t matter’ (referring to misinterpretations), as well as her anxiety (teaching behind the glass-screen) is one example of new learning having a previous history (Vygotsky, 1978, p84). At the end of this section she describes herself as ‘not a group person’ but said learning in the group was essential for processing the information you needed to for being a RR teacher.

Jade spoke of having her learning extended in the follow-up discussion. “I guess it made me realise … how much you can learn from other people. So, for my learning… I guess it [learning in a group] would have extended it. I do think that I know that you learn from other people but because of that situation and because it was so regular, you know going into those Tuesday meetings, it was very encouraging because you knew you were going to come out with something else, or something new. So I think, you know, just that fact that…you knew that there was more coming, each week, I think, and that something different was to come every time.” Anticipation of learning something new at each session was a motivator for Jade in attending fortnightly RR sessions.

Shelley said that her thinking was extended by ideas she had not previously thought of. She said, “…there’d usually be a new idea brought up that I hadn’t even thought of, so it just helps to extend your thinking.” Tracey described herself as a hands-on learner in the interview. For her the follow-up discussion answered questions like ‘why did the teacher do it that way?’ and ‘why did the child react that way?’ before she incorporated new ways of teaching with her children at school. She said, “Once again it [group observation of teaching] enables you to see…that was a different way of doing something, why did the teachers do it like that, why did the student perhaps react in that way, can I take that back home with me, how can I do that with my own children?”

In summary, when people learn in groups they pick up different perspectives and the teacher in the group is supported in her construction of knowledge because of the
perspectives that she may not have noticed herself. Jemma said, “I think if I had been trying to do this on my own it would have been a mountain. I think that working with other people everybody picks up on different things. Everybody picks up on a point that jumps out at them and you may miss something very vital to your learning or to your teaching, whereas if you work with a group, if everybody is picking up on their thing that jumps out at them, and then they talk about it, everybody gets a lot of additional information, and you get …a nice balance, plus you get a very thorough understanding, and I’m not generally a group person, but I’ve found that I would never have survived without the group. I couldn’t have done it by myself. I would have got confused. I would only have picked up half the information when I was reading, even if I read things three or four times… by the time I’d read them three or four times and got all the information, in one session, with talking to other people I could get that information, all the information that I needed and then move on to something else, whereas on my own it would have taken me ages to read it and to try it and to take it all in. So the group really helped in that way.” Jemma’s view illustrates processes of internalisation where different voices and the text reference are linked into new knowledge about RR teaching.

6.2.5 Sub-theme: Learning by clarifying

The clarifications teachers received in the RR teacher training were grounded in their social interactions of observing and entering into dialogue with others. This was a feature of their movement through their zones of proximal development (ZPDs) from what they currently understood to what they had yet to understand (Vygotsky (1978). Clarification of understandings as a sub-theme of co-construction of knowledge was not a major ‘stand-alone’ sub-theme and themes under the theme ‘co-construction’ of knowledge can be viewed as intertwined as part of a dynamic process of internalisation. Clarification was implicit in learning through observing with others, gaining feedback in discussion and linking knowledge from various sources. Mary-Lou said direct observation assisted her to clarify what to take notice of in the teaching observations. In the follow-up discussions two teachers spoke about having their thinking about the prior observations clarified. Maria said, “…it helps you to clarify points that maybe you were talking about and things that you weren’t sure of
maybe.” Shelley said, “…working with the group after observing two lessons at the screen helped to clarify things, things that we had picked up during the lesson.”

In summary, the teachers said that learning in the group was extremely important for clarifying their interpretations of what they read through observation and discussion. Mary-Lou explained, “…talking about it you get that very thorough, I think, understanding of whatever you’re working [on], or whether you’re talking or whether you’re reading something, so I think it’s been very important. There was a lot of times during the year that my interpretation was completely different to the interpretation that was meant and the group discussions, or the observations…made that clearer to me than just reading it in a book, and then doing it, sort of like from the book. I’m not good at that”. She said that learning in the group was essential for her learning, “It’s vital. I don’t think I would have enough confidence that I was doing it the right way, or doing it well, or understanding it.” While Shelley said that learning in the group was an opportunity for the teacher to clarify and link understandings. She said group learning was, “Oh very important, just the opportunity to discuss what we had number one read, and then number two heard and observed. That discussion was an opportunity to clarify, because sometimes you do think one thing, you get one thing in your mind but it’s just not the right thing, you’ve just…misinterpreted, so that [the discussion] clarifies, even sections of …the lesson, the magnetic board, the magnetic letters…working with words on the board and I…misinterpreted what that was all about, so the discussion in the group helped me to clarify that.” Lara also commented on social collaborations helping her to clarify her understandings when she said, “We might have been making assumptions…incorrectly but we were all learning altogether, so it didn’t matter, and we learnt from each other that way, so anything that you did that may not have been right you learnt from.”

6.2.6 Conclusion

What typifies social constructivist theory is that learning and understanding is inherently social and cultural activities (such as teaching actions) and tools (language and artefacts) are an integral part of development (Palincsar, 1998). Sociocultural
theory is not about the transmission of culture from one generation to the next but has as its overarching focus the interdependence of individual and social processes in the co-construction of knowledge (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). From this perspective, people learn through social dialogue and interactions, and through processes of internalisation becoming thought. Internalisation involves a complex transformation and synthesis of the social (external) in the co-construction of knowledge that becomes (internal) (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The zone of proximal development (ZPD) concept is central to co-construction. It represents the potential of what we can do with assistance. The following summary is the teachers’ perspective of the co-constructive process of learning with others on this RR training course.

In RR teacher training the teachers emphasised that social interactions with others was very important for their learning in RR teacher training. Thus, the teachers’ perspective of learning supports the use of a social constructivist theoretical framework to interpret how they learn with others. The features of the RR sessions that allowed for this to occur were the observations and discussions at the glass screen and the follow-up discussions. The ways the teachers co-constructed their knowledge in these contexts involved learning through actively observing with other people. The teachers said that this made the other people’s thoughts available to think about and this shaped their thinking. The teachers thought that getting feedback from others in the group offered different perspectives that enriched their teaching. The teachers valued the fact that they received this feedback from peer-learners who had the same or similar experiences. The teachers learned in the social context of the RR sessions by linking in their own minds knowledge gained from three sources: the group discussion at the glass-screen, and the follow-up discussion, which they related to the RR course texts. The teachers’ perspective was that peer-group learning provided them with the opportunity to extend their learning to include thoughts they may have not thought of before. The different ideas helped the teachers to clarify their understandings. As new learners the teachers were aware that they misinterpret aspects of RR teaching and appreciated that the group helped them to clarify their understanding during the RR course.
6.3 Theme: Trust in the Relationship

Behaving in trusting and trustworthy ways is a feature of effective group collaboration and essential for social construction of knowledge and skills. Vygotsky discussed child learning with caring others, parents and teachers. Johnson et al (2007) refer to this form of collaboration as ‘promotive’ interaction. Promotive interaction involves people encouraging and facilitating each-others’ efforts to achieve the group’s goals. The core of promotive interaction is: effective communication, mutual influence and trust. Conversely ‘distrust’ in social groups arise from what Johnson et al (2007) call ‘oppositional interaction’, where individuals focus on their own performance, offer ineffectual or misleading feedback and seek to win in conflicts. As a definition of trust the following illuminates its meaning in group settings: “Interpersonal trust is built through placing one’s consequences in the control of others and having one’s confidence in the others confirmed…[and]…interpersonal trust is destroyed…[when]…they behave in ways that ensure harmful consequences for oneself” (Johnson et al, 2007, p25). Therefore trust is developed and maintained in collaborative social situations and it is absent or destroyed in competitive individualistic situations. To be a trusting collaborative group the members would need a common goal and the disposition of goodwill towards all members in the group achieving the goal.

The theme ‘trust in the relationship’ in this study has three sub-themes: constancy and intimacy, feelings of mutual support, and feelings of being comfortable and confident. Trust in the relationship refers to the ‘gift of confidence’ (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002) that peer-learners in a group can offer each other, as they emotionally scaffold each other’s learning. The themes that emerged from this interview data showed that ‘constancy’ as a sub-theme refers to the consistency in the meeting of people in RR sessions (fortnightly) and ‘intimacy’ refers to the size of the RR training group (ten teachers). These two factors are pivotal in enabling the peer-learners to build close social relationships with each other, which gives them feelings of trust and confidence to achieve on the RR teacher training course. Feelings of mutual support are the most important sub-theme under ‘trust in the relationship’. It is placed second because it unfolds from ‘constancy and intimacy’. Feeling confident (self-assured) which comes from feelings of comfort (security) and ease
(helpfulness) in their social relationships is important for the teachers in their learning, through the evidence of this interview data.

6.3.1 Sub-theme: Constancy and Intimacy

Constancy and intimacy of groups is a feature revealed in this study that supports trusting relationships. ‘Constancy and intimacy’ gives the teachers the social environment for developing ‘trust in their relationships’. This is important when learners take risks and reveal their thinking (Timperley, 2008). RR teachers in training teach for each other in an open and communal way, behind a glass-screen, that gives their peer-teachers the opportunity to closely scrutinise teacher-child interactions in the RR lessons. Also, when the teachers observe and discuss together they disclose to each other what they know, what they do not know, and what they may have misinterpreted. This risk is a challenge for the teachers to do. No teacher has been reported to have found it comfortable to teach behind the glass-screen, including report on the initial design of RR sessions (Clay & Watson, 1982).

The familiarity (acquaintance) the teachers had with each other and the rapport (affinity and empathy) that was built between the teachers in the group is implicit in all the teachers’ responses about their ‘feelings’ about their learning. Jade said, “I think that that was probably the most valuable experience that we had, learning as a group throughout the year, and that same group continuously, to get to know each other and trust each other and that. It helps a lot.” Constancy of relationship in a joint venture was important for trusting social relationships between these teachers.

Diane explained this in comparison to other courses she had done. She said, “…in the past I’ve done things by correspondence, or just once a week with a big group. I think there is that intimate contact and maybe because of the smallness of the group you got to know each other a little bit better. I think if you were just trying to do it through notes and the book there wouldn’t be that contact…even if [it was] occasionally. You know we’ve had a couple of weddings, and children’s weddings, and a few people have had problems, and …just sharing those things in the group makes a difference. Otherwise, I think I could be a bit lonely trying to do it by
yourself.” Diane’s comment links directly to the designed-in feature of RR sessions for informal interactions to precede the formal components. Meeting for thirty minutes in the RR discussion room as a group sharing lunch and anecdotes from between session teaching, allowed for teachers to also share celebrations in their lives as they felt comfortable to do so. The Tutor’s focus on social interaction for this training group supported their relationships for formalised teaching and discussion.

6.3.2 Sub-theme: Feelings of mutual support

Mutual support is a significant feature of trust in collaborative learning (Johnson et al, 2007). In this study ‘mutual support’ was the most significant sub-theme under ‘trust in the relationship’. It is evident in all three contexts sampled (observing lessons at the screen, the follow-up discussions and teaching for one’s peers) for all ten teachers. Mutual support indicates the care the teachers have for each other in providing for, sustaining and maintaining everyone’s learning in the group.

In the context of learning while observing at the glass screen seven teachers spoke of the mutually supportive relationship being important for learning. The teachers were aware that learning new things means that teacher skill will fluctuate and change over time (Vygotsky, 1978). It is therefore important to learn with people who are mutually supportive. The teachers were also aware that although their discussions at the screen were open and honest in a context where the person giving the lesson did not hear them, they aimed to be supportive of the teacher who taught the lesson afterwards.

Jemma said, “…it was nice to know that you know… when you’re learning new things… people were there to help and to get you through and be the best person you can be.” Belinda said, “I felt that our discussions were honest. I felt that people were being honest and that they were really trying to do the right thing by the person who was teaching and by the discussion, by each other.” And Maria said, “…you’re also feeling for the person because you know, ‘Oh God I did that!’ or whatever, so you don’t want to be critical, you want to … give positive reinforcement, you don’t want to let them down, you want to support them, so you give them supportive talk.”
When contributing at the glass screen, four teachers spoke about how that was a social skill they had to learn how to do. Teachers had to learn how to speak at the same time as they observed, in order to support the social interactions and co-operative learning. Initially teachers felt that they just wanted to observe for their own learning. Teachers also had to learn to take turns in making contributions to the discussion as the observation continued, which involved not only observing, but listening to one’s peers, and judging when to contribute or the relevance of their contribution.

Belinda spoke of being engrossed in her observations and that she needed to contribute more to the group to be mutually supportive. She said, “Sometimes I became so engrossed in watching that I wasn’t discussing enough myself, so that’s something that I felt that I improved with, that I was able to do better over the time.”

Jade spoke of her tension between her desires and the group learning. She said that when she only wanted to observe the discussion was a distraction. Jade said, “sometimes I felt a little bit frustrated… I felt that sometimes I couldn’t watch what I wanted to watch because we were discussing… which had to happen.” This is a tension in having all the teachers understand the purpose and goal of the task of observing and discussing at the glass-screen, as a social construction of learning for all the group members.

Shelley spoke about how the discussion at the screen kept her alert, but that she had to learn how to interact by being aware of others. Shelley said, “I felt like I really had to be on my toes… (laughs) … really focusing…and following the rules. I think once or twice I kind of started saying something but then I had to pull back because I thought ‘no it’s not my turn’, you know you have to be aware of other people, and what they’re saying, and you can’t jump in if they haven’t finished, and that sort of thing, so you have to be aware of the protocol.” Therefore, for trusting relationships all the teachers needed to be aware of the etiquette of social interaction in this new situation, which was explained to them by the RR Tutor and practised with them, for improvement from session to session.
Tracey spoke about learning through the assignment of roles in one session. She said, “I think... giving roles as you did helped everybody speak up and everybody join in the discussion. So I think if we didn’t have those roles initially then people would generally just sit back and listen. So there was a person that would think of initially the topic that we would discuss and then we would have some people following up on that. I think this happened because ...they could try this... and different [ideas] branch off that.” This was a case of giving people coloured cardboard squares and having a few people nearest the screen as initiators of conversation (before the Tutor needed to speak), people who built on and added to the comments, and people who linked the topic of conversation to RR theory and it’s specific language, in a one-off experience to encourage more teacher interaction at the glass-screen.

Seven teachers spoke about the follow-up discussions being mutually supportive, for instance Belinda said, “…I found that mutually supportive in...that we were teaching each other, we were learning from each other, and we were supporting each other.”

Four teachers of the seven teachers felt that they were supported by the group to extend, improve, and refine their teaching, through guidance for the next day. Belinda said, “Well, when it was my lesson that was being discussed I felt again that I was being supported and that my learning was being extended. So I felt that it was a positive experience for me, as a person who had been teaching”.

Diane commented on being the person receiving feedback after teaching behind the glass-screen. She said, “Oh I think that it’s a little bit different, and only a tidgy bit different if you’ve been teaching behind the screen... but I think everybody was... there together, trying to improve each other and through that to learn more about the whole process ourselves.”

Jade’s comment was that this may have been a one-off supportive group when she said she was lucky to have been in it. She said, “The group was very supportive, and I was very lucky to drop into such a supportive group...and...making a mistake in
answering something, sort of, not phrasing things well, or not making myself clear, was never a problem because someone would always pick up and support me through that…” Maria commented on the importance of supportive social feedback in helping her with new learning. Maria said, “[after positive reinforcement] …discussion would move on, so we’d sort of go further than just there, which was good, we’d sort of get an answer, if you like, and … [it would]…give you something to chew on when you go back [to the school] the next day.” The feedback moving beyond the positive and addressing areas for teaching change fits with Timperley and Hattie’s view on feedback (2007). Maria’s answer gives the teacher’s response on what she does with this feedback.

One teacher, Maura, she said that although she did not say what she was thinking (through lack of quickness), someone else would and she would be able to reflect on that. She said, “Sometimes you want to say something and someone else has said the same thing, but you also learn at that time from people because they say things…you say ‘yes, that’s right she shouldn’t be doing that…or yes she’s doing a good thing.’ And it starts making you think that…so I think our discussions are good too because we learn a lot from them, from each other.”

Three teachers said that they felt supported when they were not ‘threatened’, which speaks to the heart of trust. Jemma said, “I didn’t feel threatened. I felt supported.” Diane said that none of the teachers would feel as if they were inferior or upset from the follow-up discussion, because of the supportive nature of the group. She said, “So, yeah I always felt comfortable and I thought as a group we got on well together. Yeah. I felt that we supported each other. I don’t think anybody would have got the feeling they were an outsider or they weren’t up to scratch or they should feel wounded about their efforts, or whatever. I think it’s been very helpful. I’ve never felt uncomfortable in that group.”

Tracey commented on the relationship being respectful and this made it supportive. She said, “you always felt at ease I suppose is another word for it … you could walk into the group [after teaching behind the glass-screen] and you could see that everybody was willing to, not pay respects, but offer that positive criticism about
what had happened, and there was no reason to feel like that everyone was going to fire out all these questions at you. You always felt that they were always supportive of you. So no I was very at ease in discussions.”

One teacher described the supportive interactions during the follow-up discussion as ‘collegial’. Belinda said, “…I felt a great collegial feeling of discussion and that people were contributing and supporting. So I found it a very positive experience.”

In the context of teaching for one’s peers one teacher said that the feedback she received afterwards made this a worthwhile experience. Jade said, “The first time I didn’t actually enjoy teaching behind the screen but after that initial one I did. I did actually look forward to teaching behind the screen because I knew something much bigger was coming afterwards,” which was a supportive group discussion.

The opposite of trusting relationships would be conflict in the group interactions. The interview data was gained from carefully crafted questions aimed at ascertaining the teachers’ views on group learning and their feelings. The only negative feelings evident in this data was personal anxiety by one teacher teaching behind the glass-screen (Jemma) and one teacher’s (Mary Lou’s) personal apprehension of speaking in a group situation. Both teachers, however, are recorded commenting on their being in a supportive group. The responses of teachers in Compton-Lilly’s research (2011) where a teacher said after teaching behind the glass-screen, there was a fine-line between defending your craft and defending yourself, was not evident in this study. The result can reflect the limitations of this study (See: 4.12) in the interview data collection by the Tutor, or differences in RR groups based on how teachers form affirming social relationships.

**6.3.3 Sub-theme: Feelings of being comfortable and confident**

The teachers in this study overwhelmingly thought that they felt at ease in their group and that a feeling of being ‘comfortable’ (secure in the group) was important for their learning. This feeling was juxtaposed however by the teachers articulating
feelings they would not want in a social group. That is feeling hesitant (indecision from a lack of confidence), uncomfortable (distressed or awkward), or threatened (vulnerable) in some way, by having their mistakes exposed for a negative response from the group. This speaks to the core of trust or the belief in the disposition of the group that despite personal risk, the challenge for the teachers, the consequences would not be damaging or adverse towards any teacher who taught a lesson for her peers. Trusting teacher belief is grounded in ‘how people speak to each other’ (the words people choose) (Johnson, 2004), and in the Tutor’s organisation of social interactions in the session. The emphasis placed on positive commentary about peer teaching, thoughtful feedback linked to examples from the lessons to include the teachers who taught, and teachers knowing how the session works (the goals of the interactions) is supportive of trusting relationships.

‘Feelings of being comfortable (at ease) and confident’ were important in the context of observing at the screen but more so during the follow-up discussion. It was important for eight of the teachers. The feeling of comfort was described as being established in the first thirty minutes of the session, before the introductory discussion, observations of lessons and follow-up discussions (outside the scope of this research).

Two teachers spoke about the time for informal interaction (thirty minutes before the session components) time being important for establishing ‘trust in the relationship’ between the teachers. Jemma said, “I think it was just a really good mix of people…just personalities, I think worked very well together. I think that was important. And we seemed to come together and be quite happy and friendly to talk about things…at lunch-time … prior to us beginning sessions was always a great chat time and people just relaxed and for some reason we just clicked right from the beginning into a very relaxed and non-threatening group… and I thought that was really great.”

Mary-Lou said, “…it was conversation between the group members, but it was casual conversation, it wasn’t directed at anything… it was like, ‘oh, how did you go with that?’ ‘Did you have any problems with that?’ ‘Yeah, I had a problem with this’
…and I felt confident to just say it, but it was one on one… but as soon as the session started it was official. It was…like it was real stuff…you know, that was the training part of it …and then afterwards I would be more relaxed again, because you could confidently say ‘oh, I didn’t understand that before, but now I do.’” Therefore Mary-Lou perceived two levels of social interaction in RR teacher training: informal and formal, both of which influenced her relationships with group members and confidence. Further comments by Mary-Lou speak to her inherent lack of confidence in all formal learning settings as her learning history. In the development of her relationship with the Tutor she would stay behind all sessions share a coffee and ask questions for clarification of meaning of what had occurred. The willingness of the Tutor to give additional time to teachers at sessions and be available to them by phone and email is a feature of this group situation, explained at the beginning of the course.

Two teachers spoke directly about the feeling of comfort at the glass-screen talking about the lessons. Diane said, “I always felt comfortable. I don’t think … well speaking personally, I never felt uncomfortable with people discussing the lessons.” And Lara said, “…I always felt quite comfortable to have a bit of a say as to what I thought was going on… I really liked that, those opportunities to do that …so I always felt quite comfortable.”

In the follow-up discussion five teachers spoke about feeling comfortable in the learning situation. For instance, Jade said, “…the group dynamic in that particular group was very open and honest and there was a lot of trust there. You know no-one would feel intimidated or whatever.”

Jemma spoke about the social environment being non-threatening and the ease of contributing was supported by the RR text ‘in hand’. The text again can be seen as being an agent in the teachers’ ZPD (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The text made it easy because the teachers had something to refer to as they spoke and the content became more familiar to them over the time of the course.
Jemma reflected however that the group could have been hostile and what would have made it so. Jemma said, “I liked the fact that we all got to say something and it was a non-threatening environment… it was very easy… it was easy to sit back and listen but it was just as easy to sit back and to contribute as well, with the text at hand. It could have gone the other way and been quite scary… you could have had somebody who was a very dominant personality and every time you said something they’d shoot you down in flames.” She said, “I always felt comfortable enough to choose, and sit back and listen and learn that way or whether to contribute and to learn that way.” Jemma did not have feelings of pressure on her to contribute judging by this comment. Her comments about dominance of personality and ‘shooting people down’ speaks to oppositional groups based on individualistic intentions and behaviour rather than socially collaborative groups that are characterised by trust and mutual support. Jemma’s comment, however, implies that collaborative groups can be ‘undone’ by one dominant individualistic person.

The teachers presented different views about being comfortable. In the context of feeling comfortable Lara said she was comfortable contributing in both contexts (discussions observing the lessons and the follow-up discussions) to contribute or to listen because it was a comfortable setting. She said, “it was a good opportunity to sit back and sort of listen to what others have to say as well, so it was always a comfortable setting, again like I just sort of felt comfortable to discuss anything that I had seen.” In terms of what she meant one can assume that the atmosphere was calm and relaxed, rather than frantic and urgent. Mary-Lou however spoke of being comfortable as a personal emotion when she said, “I was more willing to take risks when I was more comfortable in the group.” Shelley attributed her feeling of being comfortable, it can be assumed as opposed to confronted, when the discussions by the teachers were organised in a way that was positive and constructive (offering feedback to move forward or the teacher to answer her own ‘where to next?’). This implies that leaving a session without a way forward in teaching would be unsatisfactory for the teachers. Shelley said, said, “I always felt comfortable, and I always knew that whether I was the person who had been teaching behind the screen or somebody else, that the discussion was going to be positive and constructive, so I think everyone felt comfortable in that situation, and I always did.”
The teachers spoke about their feelings of confidence in the follow-up discussion coming from knowing that what was discussed at the glass screen would be discussed in this context. This was part of the Tutor’s deliberate scaffolding that was shared with the teachers. Jade however, did say that sometimes did not contribute at the glass-screen when her thoughts were divergent from the group’s discussion. She said, “…sometimes I used to sit there thinking, I would have an idea in my head or a question or whatever and think, ‘oh no everyone’s going off on a different path’ so I wouldn’t ask, but usually, especially because of the discussion behind the screen, you’d feel quite confident that you know, what’s being discussed, so we could continue discussing it afterwards.”

Maria felt that she had more confidence in the follow-up discussion because the group knew the structure of how it was approached and that it came after positive reinforcement given by the group to the teachers who had taught the lessons. She said, “How did I feel? I felt a little bit more confident because we sort of knew how to approach it. We sort of had discussed that, and then we would give positive reinforcement to the person, so that was good.” Teachers knowing how the RR session work and the intentions for their effective social interactions seemed to give confidence.

Mary-Lou felt more confident to ask a question in the follow-up discussion when she knew more. She said, “…When I would understand something a bit better I would ask a question. That clarified that what I was understanding was [in] the right direction.”

‘Feelings of being comfortable and confident’ were significant in building trusting relationships in this study. By way of conclusion, Tracey said, “everyone was happy to talk with each other. Everyone was comfortable with each other, so I think that that really made a big difference … in my learning.”

6.3.4 Conclusion
‘Trust’ in the social relationship is an essential feature of socially collaborative learning (Johnson et al, 2007) which creates in the social and emotional climate for intersubjectivity and assisted learning by others in the individual’s zone of proximal development. In summary from the teachers’ perspective ‘trust in the relationships’ and the emotional aspect of their learning is a significant theme. All of the teachers spoke of this group being mutually supportive. Building their trusting relationships involved the constancy of the whole course and the intimacy of the group size, as well as the scheduled informal interaction time for the teachers (thirty minutes before the session components are organised to start). Mutual support refers to the care teachers have for each other. All ten teachers indicated that this was important for their learning in the contexts of: teaching behind the glass-screen; observing and discussing at the glass-screen; and in the follow-up discussions. Feelings of comfort and confidence have to be juxtaposed with the opposite when teachers thought they could not learn, that is, when they are anxious, stressed, intimidated or perceived that they could be ‘shot down in flames7 by dominant personalities. All are emotional or affect conditions for learning. Comfort has been chosen to mean feeling secure. Security with their peer-teachers enables them to risk revealing their developing RR teaching and knowledge to others. The challenge (personal risk) involved in this style of professional development implies that there must be trust between the group members. As Timperley (2008) wrote “…change is as much about the emotions as it is about knowledge and skill… … Trust and challenge are both requirements… [for]… change … [and] … before teachers take on that risk they need to trust that their honest efforts will be supported” (Timperley, 2008, p15-16). In RR teacher training the challenge is teaching for one’s peers in a very public way.

6.4 Theme: Self-regulation as a learner

The power of Vygotskian theory lies in the interdependence of social and individual processes when he conceptualised development as: the transition of socially shared activities into internal processes (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p192). This category relates to being aware of one’s learning in relation to others. People reference their
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1 Idiom: To bring about someone’s downfall involving strong criticism of the person’s efforts. (Jemma’s expression)
capabilities to the performance of others in the social situation. (Bandura, 1991) John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) argue that is a misconception of Vygotskian theory to assume that internalisation is a process of transferral of the external to the internal. It distorts the socio-cultural view of the roles of the teacher and the learner, and is a perception of what is social through one lens and the individual through another lens without making explicit that learning is a dialectic [interactive] process (John-Stein & Mahn). In their view internalisation is simultaneously an individual and a social process, for instance where learners are actively involved in collaborative classes. Furthermore, while Vygotsky (1978) wrote that every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, first on the social level and then on the internal level, he also wrote that “…the process of being transformed continues to exist and to change as an external form of activity for a long time…” (Vygotsky, 1978, p57). The theme ‘self-regulation’ refers to these processes of internalisation in the teacher’s ZPD that are influenced by the social interactions.

In explanations of learning in this study the teachers revealed characteristics about themselves as learners that impact on their learning. These were grouped under the main theme: self-regulation. This theme has the following sub-themes: comparing oneself with others, self awareness, moving forward, challenge, hesitation, self validation, and self belief. From the teachers’ perspective these sub-themes reflect how they learned on the RR teacher training course during RR sessions, involving the components: the introductory discussion, observation and discussion at the glass-screen, and the follow-up discussion.

6.4.1 Sub-theme: Comparing oneself with others

Comparing oneself with others is a very important sub-theme in teacher self-development and relates to the category of ‘evaluation’ in this study (See: Chapter 5) describing the teachers’ role during observations and discussion at the glass-screen. In terms of self-regulation, comparing behaviour refers to the influence of social standards. (Bandura, 1991) Six teachers spoke about comparing themselves with other teachers. The teachers said that they were doing the same work as their peers so they could ‘see themselves in what their peers were doing’. (Maria) It is therefore a
process involved in internalisation. The following examples illustrate the outside/inside perspective of the tutorial situation that supports teacher learning in RR teacher training (Clay & Watson, 1982). Teachers rarely have the opportunity to observe from the outside the teaching situation they are involved with daily. The difference between the real-time experience and using videos, for example, is that RR teaching behind the glass-screen is socially contextualised by the RR Tutor for both parties (the teacher and the peer-observers) and the participants are all active, thereby creating the opportunity for assisted learning through social interactions.

At the observation and discussion at the glass-screen Belinda said, “…I was able to…personalise it and see, reflect on what I was doing. So I could see myself in what the other person was doing. Or I could see myself in what they were doing or weren’t doing. So I could see what I was doing or not doing…I could observe myself in a way…So I found that really valuable.” This is an interesting idea to see your-self as the other person. The teachers, through their joint socially referenced teaching experiences, made connections that the person not involved in the RR teacher training would not make. The teachers’ social interaction is a key to their learning.

This is further exemplified in Diane’s comment, “Well what I found was that when I looked at the two teachers I wasn’t really conscious in the end of about what they were doing. I looked at what they were doing and thought what am I doing? And whatever actions they did or didn’t do made me reflect on what I do and what I don’t do?”

Jade’s comment added the idea of moving forward when you can see where you are going. She said said, “… I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable. So even the lessons where you could see things weren’t going the right way, I think that was very valuable too because you can then look at your own teaching, like that, and, you know, maybe see why some of your lessons don’t go the right way. Or that you don’t get the outcomes that you’re looking for, and to see very good teaching behind the screen is also important, and also very valuable, because that’s where you need to be heading.”
Maria said that the discussion at the glass screen was about comparing yourself with the other person. Her approach to comparison was like ticking off a shopping list. She said, “the talk is trying to work out actually, where that person should be, or where you are and you’re comparing yourself to that person…Well, in my head I was sort of going through what I would do in that situation and ticking off the pluses and the minuses. Yes I did that, no I don’t do that, and that’s something that I should do. So that’s how that helped.” This comment as well as Belinda’s, Diane’s and Jade’s confirms Timperley’s (2008) principles for effective teacher professional development. The teachers need to know ‘how am I going?’ and to know ‘where to next?’ The social experience of observing in RR teaching offers this as active learning in the company of peers.

Similarly Maura said, “…you sort of look at your own lesson and you think were you doing it the right way and if not then you come back [to school] and you correct yourself. So it’s like, you’re very critical of your own teaching while you’re watching it, because you just wonder and you see I’ve done that and that’s not right, so I come back and change my way of teaching then.” And Tracey concurred, “I think it helps you to sit back first of all I suppose and see if one of the practices that the teacher has done you’ve done as well. It brings it back to your own experience.”

As the teachers observed at the glass-screen comparing themselves with others they had certain feelings. Diane reflected, “I felt I went a bit quiet and I know you [the Tutor] would be trying to get us to discuss things, but I think it’s part of that process, where I see what they’re doing and I think ‘oh!’ I start examining what I’m doing. I’m not really caring particularly what they’re doing. I just see them as reflecting their idea of Reading Recovery and I see how that fits in with me.”

Jade said that the comparison made her a ‘bit nervous’ (probably ‘uneasy’) about her own teaching and how she could improve that. She said, “…it made me feel a bit nervous sometimes I think, just sometimes watching people, that were doing, you know, obviously doing a really good job and I guess that makes you feel a bit nervous about your own teaching. Oh, you know, something I should be doing that I haven’t been doing, just that, it really brings home that, you know, this person’s
doing that and that’s working and then suddenly you think about your own teaching and it sort of makes it feel a bit…’oh, I better start doing that tomorrow.’” Uneasiness does not appear to be a response that upsets the learning process. From this comment it is a motivator to improve as long as the teacher has a good sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1990).

Lara emphasised her sense of the teacher training being reality and not the opposite which one may suppose they may be with exemplary demonstration lessons. Lara said, ‘you could see others in yourself, like you could see other people doing things and you’d think, ‘oh I do that that way too!’ and it may not have been the best way, or the right way, or the right thing to say …[but]… it was…was really important because those experiences are real.”

Diane described ‘comparing yourself with others’ as fitting what they did and thought into your ‘scheme of things’ by which she probably meant your schema or sense of meaning making. She said, “Again seeing other people trying things and thinking about how that would fit in with your scheme of things’’” Whereas Maura was entirely practical when she said, ‘…and you hear how they tackle the situation and then you think, ‘oh I did it this way, she did it the other way, I wasn’t successful, she was, so maybe I should try her method?’ So by talking to others I think you learn a lot about their way of handling and tackling situations and how you’re going.” Maura thought that the group learning was very important for her learning by comparison with others socially. She said, “I think it was very important, because…you always learn from others, and when other people talk about certain things you put yourself in that situation and say ‘I’ve had a child like that, or that’s happened to me’ so you learn.”

6.4.2 Sub-theme: Self-reflection

In the social co-construction of knowledge through intersubjectivity the teachers’ in the teachers’ zones of proximal development (ZPDs), are active participants. The process of internalisation is socially interactive between the external (between people) and the internal (within individuals). Vygotsky (1978) rejected the view that
cognitive development (learning) results from the gradual accumulation of separate changes. He and his team of researchers believed development (learning) was firstly complex, and that it involved bringing together different forces or parts (interpreted as ‘integration’ in this study). Whilst learning is characterised by regularities, it could show unevenness in its development, and could completely qualitatively change, but it always involved an intertwining of the external social interactions and the internalisation processes of the child (Vygotsky, 1978, p73). In learning to become RR teachers this dynamic process can be applied. However, as adult learners the teachers had self-regulatory processes of self-reflection whereby “Self-monitoring is not simply a mental audit if one’s performances… [pre-existing understandings]… self-beliefs exert selective influence on what aspects of one’s functioning are given the most attention” (Bandura, 1991, p251).

Jemma thought that during the discussion at the glass screen she was good at describing what she observed but not as good at interpreting what she observed. She said, “I was really good at the first part of the discussion but not perhaps taking it to the next level … I was often tending to go more for a literal level rather than doing that analytical level. I would tend to do that at home, at night, when I was thinking about it. I wasn’t quick enough always to do the analytical part. I was very much working at the literal level.” This self-reflection came from the Tutor discussing with the teachers the difference between saying what one observed (literal in Jemma’s mind) and interpreting what this meant (analytical in Jemma’s mind) and this comment illustrates her processes of internalisation.

Maria commented on her learning as developing over time. She said, “you’re aware that you don’t know that much anyway … so you’re learning all the time.” In terms of Vygotskian theory learning spends a long time in the external social interactive plane before it is internalised (Vygotsky, 1978).

Maura said that the teaching behind the screen was easier for her than discussing someone else’s teaching. She said, “Well as I said once I’m behind the screen and I can’t see the other people, I know they’re there but I just become the teacher, and I’ve got my student there, and I’m there to teach him and do my work, and that’s
what I do. I know I’ll get feedback later on, and that’s okay … before that I do tend to, you know, I think anyone would feel, ‘Am I doing the right thing?’ ‘Am I going to have the right prompts? and say the right thing’, but I think once you’re behind the screen it just starts coming natural.” Maura’s interpretation of her own performance was that before teaching in front of others it was a normal thing to be concerned that you will do what you have been thinking about (consciously), but when you teach you put that aside and teach the way you do (unconsciously). She did not consciously think about the prompts she would say. She said that her prompting came naturally in the way she would interact with the child, saying the prompts she had spent time thinking about. Maura thought that this was the way she could operate as a training RR teacher, even if it was imperfect, because she would get feedback from her peers. Her comments were an indication of her reflection of herself in a socially interactive learning process.

Shelley felt that she had to take the most from this opportunity for her learning. She said, “…I felt I just I had to make the most of that opportunity because learning at the screen you just have to try and take in as much as you can at that time, because that’s the real learning.” The ‘real learning’ comment that came from Shelley and Lara. This refers to the social interaction between the teacher and the child being genuine or authentic. The only way to have this authenticity is through attending in the observations at the glass-screen. Shelley was aware that this is where she needed ‘to take in as much as you can’.

In the context of the question related to ‘teaching for one’s peers’ an awareness of ‘self’ in terms of improvement was very important. Six teachers said that this context made them self-aware. Belinda said that being involved in teaching for her peers made her conscious, analytical and critical of her own actions. She said, “…you are thinking ‘I need to be very conscious of what I’m doing.’ So it made me analyse myself, instead of just ‘doing’ I had to consciously think ‘what I was doing, why I was doing it and how I was doing it’. So I was thinking that before I taught and then I was doing that after I had taught. So I think that was valuable for me to be more critical and analytical of my own teaching.” Being aware of one’s own actions and performance was a result of the social nature of the RR teaching experience where
other people were scrutinising what the teacher said and the influence of that on the child’s performance.

Lara spoke of being conscious of her actions and language. She said, “… it just made me extra conscious of what I was saying, what I was doing and it, … really made you think about different episodes that you were doing, the purpose behind them, and why it was that you chose those books for that child. So it was good, a whole good process to go through.” This comment illustrates that Lara’s self-regulation in her social interactions with the child are heightened behind the glass-screen. Mary-Lou said a similar thing and compared this with her teaching at school where there are no observers. She said, “I think I was more focused when I needed to teach for my peers. I was more focused on where we were as a group and the types of things that we had discussed previously and being aware of what actually came up in a lesson you were more aware of taking advantage of every teaching point rather than just maybe in a closed lesson, where there wasn’t observers…I was more aware of the prompts I was using and a little bit more focused on doing everything the right way.”

Maria like Mary-Lou felt that her learning behind the glass screen was more alert and focused on her RR teaching. She said, “I would know on the other side of the screen they would be saying now why isn’t she doing this and why do you think she did that? So you’re sort of in two minds, you’re sort of looking at it from afar but you’re involved in it. So that makes it more alive to you. You’re sort of more on the ball, more on the spot. You’re looking and you’re seeing yourself doing it… you’re standing back and you’re watching yourself doing it, even though you’re there, because you know that someone’s saying why is she doing this…[so] …you’re sort of doing it and you’re thinking, ‘Oh God she’ll be thinking she’s not doing this.’”

To be consciously aware of one’s actions is self-regulation. The self-reflection exhibited by the teachers (Belinda and Maria) is an example of how adults regulate their behaviour. Wood (1988) writes that Vygotsky’s view was that childhood speech serves two functions: one, communication and secondly, it transforms the way children think, learn and understand. Language therefore becomes “an instrument or tool of thought… [language not only provides]… a system or code for representing
the world but also the means by which self-regulation comes about… For Vygotsky a child who is talking to himself is planning and regulating his own activities in ways that foreshadow verbal thinking” (Wood, 1989, p27).

Diane’s example indicates that change through self-reflection takes time in the social external plane (talking about this with others) before she realised herself what her actions were. She said, “…you kind of reflect on what people are saying and what you feel like you did yourself. I know time and time again we’ve said…you must prompt the children to those sources of information, and you [reach] a point where you think, ‘you weren’t prompting for those’ and ‘you need to do that.’”

While Jade stoically said, “I learnt that you can only do what you can do (laughs). So … I learnt that you just have to do your lesson exactly the same. And just be very open-minded that you know that your teaching is for their benefit as well as your own.” This meant that the teaching interaction was a measure of the teacher’s internalisation of what RR teaching means ‘so far’ and that demonstration is made available for others to learn from.

In the context of teaching the next day self-reflection was very important. Five teachers said that the context made them self-aware. Belinda said that she tried to manage how she changed her teaching the next day by taking one thing forward from the session to incorporate in her teaching. The teachers therefore planned to change or regulate their own RR teaching. She said, “I would try to take one thing on board. At first …I was trying to take too many things and I wasn’t being very clear. So what I then did was take one thing and make sure that I applied that the next day.” Similarly Jemma also managed her teaching the next day by incorporating one new thing for her teaching and one for the child. She said, “So I found… [from]… the exposure to the group and their teaching, it was easy to find something… for yourself and one thing for the child, to use the next day. And I made [that] commitment from the first day I saw a lesson.” Planning for change is a feature of learning in RR teaching.
As a feature of her self-regulation Jemma said that her teaching changed from being prescriptive. Prescription perhaps refers to consciously attending to, concentrating and remembering the tasks in RR, which she was influenced to change by the social assistance of others. She said, “I was trying to be very prescriptive…especially at the beginning. Then someone would do something or say something, even just the way they’d phrase things a little bit differently, and I’d think, ‘oh well maybe that might work for whoever I was working with.’”

Mary-Lou was influenced by social assistance in the sessions the next day. She focused on an aspect of the teaching that she said had been highlighted as a weakness (a fault) for her own teaching. She said, “I…looked at an area of weakness that had been pointed out through the training session and made that sort of like something I focused on for that day, and became more aware of what the children were doing in that area. For Mary Lou this was in the child’s learning and how she could influence a change in what was a feature of her own children’s learning. The group pointing out and suggesting help the teacher to perform things she could not do alone until such times as she “…becomes familiar enough with the demands of the task at hand to develop local expertise and try things alone” (Wood, 1988, p77).

Tracey had a similar planned action for her teaching the next day. She said, “The next day, I think I always tried something new the next day…I would generally go and do a bit more reading that night about the particular practice or whatever that I would like to try, for example, the card behind words to gain fluency. I went home and read that and I tried it the next day.” Diane described her learning as being very tentative at the beginning of the course and that over time she became more conscious of what she needed to do the next day. She said, “…when we first started … [I]… was very tentative but …you try it and gradually we’re getting more and more sophisticated.” “Vygotsky … argues that such external and social activities are gradually internalised by the… (teacher-learner)… as he comes to regulate his own intellectual activity. Such encounters are the source of experiences which eventually create the ‘inner dialogues’ that form the processes of self-regulation” (Wood, 1988, p77).
6.4.3 Sub-theme: Moving forward

‘Moving forward’ in this study refers to the process of internalisation in the zone of proximal development (ZPD). To have shift in the ZPD there has to be evidence by speech, or action that the learner’s development has moved forward or been extended (Bonk & Kim, 1998). For example, one teacher said teaching at the glass-screen gave you the sense that “OK, you’re on the right track for where you’re heading so you can get better. It just kind of lifted you and pushed you further.” The ability to regulate one’s own thinking as Jade did is a feature of self-regulation that arises out of social interactions. (Wood, 1989, p196).

In the context of teaching the next day the sub-theme ‘moving forward’ was important for six teachers. Jade said that knowing that you can improve was motivating for her learning. She said, “I think it was very motivating actually, because I know that every time after going behind the screen, the next day you would, I would, just want to do it better (improve)” and that the feedback led her to improve. In this way RR sessions were motivating not only for the next day but for the next weeks. “It just kind of lifted you and pushed you further.” Bandura (1990) writes, “Self beliefs of efficacy play a central role in the self-regulation of motivation” (Bandura, 1990, p141). Motivation in Jade’s case is guided by the expectation that particular actions will produce valued outcomes and she has the capacity to achieve them.

Maura spoke of one example from the session that helped her to move forward in her teaching. This is an example of shift in the ZPD influenced by the social interactions at the RR session. She said, “…for example, the last in-service when we were talking about the careful selection of books, and I came back and that’s exactly what I did because I realised, yes it’s not a test…the child has to be put at ease and he has to be successful…I found that my little boy from seventeen could read a nineteen [books levels] because of my careful selection of the book, and I thought wow…So the inservices are brilliant.” The teacher’s capacity to exercise self-influence by her
personal challenge (to try what she learned in the session) and to evaluate her own attainment is a major mechanism for motivation (Bandura, 1990, p141).

Further examples of moving forward involve teachers’ belief that suggested changes to their teaching was the direction they needed to pursue and their willingness to attempt, make changes, or search for another approach. The next day Jemma moved forward in her teaching in a planned way. She said that if what she planned to teach did not work for her she could modify what she had tried. Moving forward was equally important for Maria who said, “…you come back the next day and you know how it works and that sort of brings you to go forward [so] you’re not just stuck in the one spot. You’re either going forward or finding something else.” While Lara left sessions understanding that she could improve. She said, ‘I always went away [from sessions] really motivated for the next lesson… because you felt good about what you had done so far with that child.” Tracey explained that learning in a group was important for her improvement as a teacher the next day, “learning in group situations definitely benefits my learning…I’m a hands-on learner, so by first of all by listening and discussing with the group I was then able to transfer that into my form of learning which is doing it the next day.”

Finally, Maria explained the importance of ‘moving forward’ or improvement in relation to whom you learn from, i.e. people who know as much or more than you. This is a self-evident but critical comment about learning in the ZPD being levered to higher levels of internalisation and independent self-regulated activity through talking with people who can be of assistance. She said, “…communication’s vital with other people, but people who know as much as you do and people who know more than you do and so you can go forward.”

6.4.4 Sub-theme: Feelings of being challenged

In this study the teachers’ feelings about challenge related to how to perform their expected task at the glass-screen. It is a small sub-theme that refers to two teacher’s learning. In the context of discussing while observing at the glass screen one teacher
spoke directly about feeling challenged to verbalise her thinking, and one teacher spoke of this indirectly when she said that she could sometimes make connections quickly and sometimes could not. Belinda said, “I felt that it was challenging to be verbalising and bringing together what you were observing, what you were thinking, what you’d been reading, and to carry on the discussion while you were still observing. So I felt that was challenging but it was also a worthwhile thing.” Jemma said, “…there were other times when things popped into my head really quickly [fingers click] and I was… ‘oh, okay, I can make that link and I can make that connection’… but it was sort of… it was a real mixed bag.” The ‘challenge’ is benign in terms of positiveness or negativity. It was just ‘hard’ for these teachers to learn but they had the resilience to persevere which is a feature of self-regulation (Bandura, 1991).

6.4.5 Sub-theme: Feelings of Hesitation

Hesitation refers to feelings of indecision, rather than teacher reluctance or unwillingness to participate in social interactions. The four teachers who spoke about hesitation in their learning described these feelings being a feature of their own personality (Jemma and Maura), prior learning experiences (Mary-Lou), or because hesitation to contribute to discussions is a feature of learning something new (Jade). In the context of discussing observations at the glass screen one teacher spoke of apprehension or nervousness. Mary-Lou said, “I felt very apprehensive to put my point forward unless I knew that I was right. And there would be times when I was more confident with the group situation. I would actually say things that weren’t quite right…then that would actually make me step back and not say anything…just in case I wasn’t… I preferred to sort of listen and then only put my opinion forward if I knew that it was the right one…I don’t know, right’s not the right word… something that’s going to help, be helpful, maybe?” Mary-Lou said that she felt ‘very apprehensive’, which is strong language and significant for her learning in RR sessions because emotionally this could close her down from contributing in the group discussions.
Jade said that she felt ‘a little hesitant’ and so she waited to see where the discussion was going or how she could contribute to it. She said that she felt, “…probably a little hesitant I think, yeah. I didn’t feel, ‘oh look I know all the answers, what you’re supposed to be doing is right or wrong or whatever’… I definitely think I waited for the discussion to start first to see where it was going, and probably just… yeah… felt … a bit hesitant … when I shouldn’t comment … and what I should comment on … I think it’s because sometimes I would think something and then, you know, the discussion would go somewhere else… and then I’d realise ‘oh, no I’m on the wrong track’ … so I’d move on.” Social interaction in groups involves knowing how to participate and ‘keeping on track’ (with the topic under discussion). Jade’s hesitation was in understanding the ‘track’ to be on and aligning what people were discussing with her own thoughts. Jade’s comment shows that her thinking was being influenced by the group discussion because she ‘moved on’.

Maura hesitated in contributing in the follow-up discussions because she explicitly said that she did not want to be wrong and described herself as a reticent person, which may have been influenced by her cultural background. It is a feature of RR training that teachers of different cultural backgrounds come together socially and they may have different norms of social behaviour. Maura said, “Well … sometimes you feel that if you say something it might be wrong and then the group might think… on the other hand the group is not like that. When I want to say something I sort of, I don’t blurt it out at once, I sort of wait, and then someone else says something and then I say ‘yeah, well that’s what I was thinking but I didn’t say it.’ So I do hesitate sometimes to give my opinion. The opinion is there but I hesitate.” Maura explained further, she said, “Well the feeling is because I might be wrong. And what if I’m wrong? Are they? And then I think well if I’m wrong maybe I’ll learn? But then I don’t want to be wrong. I just don’t want to, you know. That’s why I hesitate sometimes.” In describing hesitation Jemma, who was not of a different cultural background, said, “I didn’t feel confident at all [in the follow-up discussions] …because that’s not my personality.”

Mary-Lou spoke of her personal fears learning in a group situation. This changed when she was more confident with the group. She said, “…in that situation where everyone’s listening … you’re in a situation where every single person there… is
listening, you just feel like … that everyone’s going to hear you and, I don’t know, it’s just a different situation to be in. If I was confident that what I was saying was, was you know, like sort of, like the right thing, then I would join in but… I think … at the very beginning I didn’t say hardly anything. …I’d speak before we started [the session] and after we finished… I wouldn’t say very much at all [in the session]…towards the end…when I was more confident in the group situation, I was more confident to… I was more willing to take risks when I was more comfortable in the group.”

In the context of teaching for one’s peers’ two teachers spoke about their feelings of stress and anxiety. The teachers spoke about this feeling differently. Maura explained that she was stressed before she went behind the glass-screen, while Jemma said teaching behind the glass-screen was exceedingly stressful for her. Maura said, “Well when I was teaching I just felt I’m not the only one doing this. The whole group goes through it… once you’re behind the screen…you forget… [whereas] …before you go there you are a bit stressed out.” She reiterated, “I’ll have to say that… once you’re behind the screen and you’ve got your child there and you start teaching, I know for me, I just forget about everything.” (The group observing and discussing the lesson). The apprehension before performing in front of peers was extreme for Jemma. She said, “I was terrified every time I taught behind the screen…every single time I was absolutely horrified.” However, of the group support for her learning she said, “When I came out I was pleased it was over. I knew I could walk back into a group that would say ‘thank you for what you did. Thank you for sharing.’ And then when we talked about it, again that whole support system [was there]. [But] it’s never, sort of eased on the day.”

6.4.6 Sub-theme: Self validation

Self-validation is also a minor sub-theme under the theme ‘self-regulation’. The interview questions were created to answer the research question on social interactions and the teachers’ perceptions of how these influenced their learning in the group. Two teachers’ responses fall under this sub-theme. Maria said, ‘… well I felt you feel good about the fact that you actually know what they’re doing’, and
Shelley said, “it [the follow-up discussion] helped to affirm what I was thinking. A lot of the time I was thinking things but sometimes, maybe not courageous enough to say it, but then when someone in the group would say it I’d think ‘okay, yes, I did think that’, so that helped to affirm.” Affirmation and validation of oneself is motivating. “Perceived self-efficacy contributes to motivation. It is partly on the basis of self-beliefs of efficacy that people choose what challenges to undertake, how much effort to expend in the endeavour, and how long to persevere in the face of difficulties” (Bandura, 1990, p143). In terms of the theoretical framework for this study the teachers gained their affirmation and self-validation from the social interaction.

6.4.7 Sub-theme: Self-belief

Self-belief is also a minor sub-theme in this study based on the teachers’ responses to the interview questions but it is evident. In the context of teaching the next day one teacher said that, as a learner the individual has to have the belief that they can learn. Jade said this after teaching behind the glass screen, “You didn’t sort of walk away, or I didn’t walk away from teaching behind the screen thinking you know ‘I can’t do this’, which you know, like with the kids, I think the teacher just has to believe that they can learn.” Maura expressed this as a ‘willingness to learn’ in the context of the follow-up discussions after teaching behind the glass screen. She said, “if there is something that needs to be changed with my teaching it’s always with [in] a very positive way… the group is very supportive so I like that.”

Johnson (2004) writes that developing a sense of agency is important for children. “When they face difficulties, they become confused, lose concentration, and start telling themselves stories about their own incompetence… Children with strong belief in their own agency work harder… [and]… focus their attention better” (Johnson, 2004, p40). The teachers in this course, by these few comments, showed a strong sense of agency (self-belief) despite their anxieties, fears and hesitation.
6.4.8 Conclusion:

Self-regulation as a theme encompasses the sub-themes of: comparing oneself with others, being self-reflective about one’s performances and thinking (how you are improving), moving forward as a learner (which refers to the interdependence of social and individual processes in processes of improvement), as well as the minor sub-themes of challenge, hesitation, self-validation (feeling that you are doing a good job) and self-belief (the teachers’ self-efficacy), which refer to the learner’s sense of agency in the social interactions.

The emotional challenges the teachers spoke of in relation to the components in this research study (teaching behind the glass-screen, and participating in discussions at the glass-screen, and in the follow-up discussion) related learning a novel task (when to contribute, what was important to contribute, and how to divide their attention in the social interaction), and for three of the ten teachers their emotional responses can be interpreted as relating to their personality or temperament. For example, Maura said, “I don’t blurt things out.” Jemma spoke of a response to revealing her own teaching that “didn’t go away on the day”, and Mary-Lou spoke about withdrawing when she perceived that she was wrong.

This section of emerging themes: Co-construction of Knowledge, Trust in the Relationship and Self-regulation as a learner, answers Research Question Two: What is the teachers’ perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions? sub-question 2a) What are the teachers’ perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions?

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of social constructivism has been expanded and interpreted over the past 40 years (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). At its heart is the dynamic interdependence of the social and individual processes in learning. In this study a group of RR training teachers are the focus for understanding a) what happens in this socially interactive learning during training sessions (the social roles of the Tutor and the teachers (See: Chapter Five) and b) the teachers’ perspective on their learning in
this context. These findings indicate that the co-construction of RR teaching understanding occurs between the peer-teachers and is underpinned by ‘trusting relationships’ which are foundational for ‘promotive’ collaboration (Johnson et al, 2007) and the teachers’ self-regulation points to their fairly healthy sense of ‘self’.

In the process of learning teachers do have feelings. Vygotsky theorised emotion as being integral in ZPD (Levykh, 2008). Therefore, it is important to think of emotions such as unease or discomfort as indicators of teacher learning and address them through emotional scaffolding so that they have the ‘gift of confidence’ (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002). Johnson (2004) writes about child learning and supporting their sense of agency or confidence in themselves. In dealing with feelings Johnson explains, “Often, we smother these feelings rather than deal with their source, such as when we witness a social wrong” (Johnson, 2004, p19). In terms of children’s learning Johnson (2004) maintains that, “Marie Clay points out that attending to these feelings is also about building internal control and a self-extending system – a learning system which is self-motivating and self-checking” (Johnson, 2004, p19). Levykh, Mahn, John-Steiner, Johnson, Clay acknowledge the feelings of the learner. This means the RR Tutor needs to socially assist in teacher confidence-building (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002) and that supports their independent self-extending learning (Johnson, 2004). When teachers enter RR teacher training they all have learning history (Vygotsky, 1978), as it had for Jemma, Maura, and Mary Lou, that can impact on their new learning.

6.5 Summary of the teachers’ perspectives on the role of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions (sub-question 2A)

The teacher interviews and the themes that emerged in this study answered Research Question Two: What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions? in relation to sub-question 2a) What are the teachers’ perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions? The teachers’ comments resonate with the comments of teachers from the inception of RR teacher training which are: the sessions extend and consolidate teacher understandings, they keep the
teachers thinking about ways of improvement, and the observations and discussions were valued by teachers (Clay & Watson, 1982, p197-198). This research on the teachers’ perspective of their learning through their social interactions broadens understandings about the RR teachers’ learning. Social interaction with peers highly influences their co-construction of RR understandings.

The analysis of the teachers’ interview data was based on emerging themes under a social constructivist paradigm. The teachers’ responses to the carefully crafted questions (See: Appendix C) were aimed at discovering their perspective of learning in groups in all the social situations that occur in RR teacher training. The boundaries of this study within social constructivism are the social interactions that occurred and how they influence learning. These teachers’ responses revealed three main areas of importance to them: the co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationships with their peer teachers and self-regulation. Therefore learning in groups through collaboration highly influenced their learning. In order for this to be effective the teachers spoke of their learning through their own efforts and active participation while observing (all the teachers contributing to each other’s learning); from feedback from their peers about their efforts; how they linked they observed, heard and what is already known (from the RR course texts); extended their ideas based on what their peers said and that they had not thought of; and their peer-teachers help to clarify their understandings.

Co-constructivism has two points of view in adult learning. The more capable person’s (The Tutor’s) and the learner’s (the teachers’). These teachers supported the premise that they could learn more through social interaction than they could learn alone. Vygostky (1978) was concerned with the interdependence of learning and development. He proposed that “an essential feature of learning is that it creates a zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and with his peers. Once these processes are internalised, they become part of the child’s independent developmental achievement.” (Vygotsky, 1978. p90) Application of the social constructivist model in learning communities such as RR (Schwartz, 2006) is that expertise is characterised not by individual knowledge but by the ability to engage in discourse,
norms and practices of the particular community of practice and that learning occurs through practices of interaction, negotiation and collaboration. (Palincsar, 1998) This study is a contribution to understanding these processes.

The theme ‘trust in the relationship’ refers to conditions that are necessary for effective collaboration (Johnson et al, 2007) and this case supports research in the area of group collaboration. In social interactions the feeling of having mutual support from their peers was highly valued. This support comes from the constancy built in to the RR teacher training through the regular scheduled fortnightly sessions that allow the teachers to build supportive social relationships, and the intimacy of the group size. The extent to which teachers can equally contribute and form relationships is determined by group size (Imel & Tisdell, 1996) which may dramatically influence teachers’ feelings about ‘trusting relationships’. Reference to feelings of being comfortable and confident aligns with the feelings of security gained from an intimate group that will help them and reflects how the teachers emotionally scaffold peer learning. Clay (2009) writes that one’s peers are one’s best supporters in RR teacher learning, especially when lessons do not go as anticipated, for example, when the child ‘plays up’. Mahn and John-Steiner (2000) write that extended collaborations between people offer them ‘the gift of confidence’ to achieve what they may not have the confidence to achieve alone. Levykh (2008) writes that Vygostky emotion is included in the Vygotskian conceptualisation of the zone of proximal development (ZPD).

The third main category of teacher responses in this study refers to the learner not being a passive recipient of the process. From a social constructivist perspective learning is a collaborative dialogue between teacher (RR Tutor) and peer learners (teachers) in a culturally specific context, and movement through the ZPD involves the learner in self-regulatory processes that are tied to how the teachers compared themselves, thought about their own learning and expressed their self-belief as learners, which points to their agency as teachers (Bandura, 1990, 1991, Johnson, 2004). Self-regulation refers to how the teachers compared themselves with others, their self-reflection as learners, their comments about their learning moving forward in the zones of proximal development, their feelings of challenge and hesitation, and their expressions of self-validation and self-belief.
6.6 The impact of the Tutor on the learning of the teachers in RR training

This section answers Research Question Two: What is the teachers' perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions?” sub-question 2b) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions? The interview data was collected from the following interview questions:

| Question 8 | Think about me working with you at the school. How did you get the most out of this kind of learning? |
| Rationale  | A question designed to sample the impact of the Tutor on the participants’ learning without asking about the impact during a RR session re: ethical considerations. |
| Question 9 | How did you feel during your discussions with the Tutor on school visits? |
| Rationale  | A question designed to sample participants’ feelings about the impact of the Tutor on their learning without asking about their feelings towards the Tutor during a RR session re: ethical considerations. |

Figure 5 below refers to the teacher’s perspective on the role of their social interactions with the RR Tutor. The analysis of the impact of the Tutor on the learning of the teachers fell under the same main themes as the learning of the teachers in the group. These were: co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationship and self-regulation.

The sub-themes that were evident in the one-to-one relationship between the RR teacher and the RR Tutor were: scaffolding, getting feedback, constancy and intimacy in the relationship, support, comfort (security) and confidence in the relationship, self-reflection and moving forward (improvement).

The additional sub-theme under co-construction was scaffolding, referring to the teachers’ perception of the Tutoring role. Scaffolding is an act of tuition that supports the learner to do a task independently (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). In this research
it is what the tutor is interpreted as doing by the learner and included demonstrating, for example, modelling how a procedure is taught and highlighting salient features.

Figure 5: The Teachers' Perspective on the Role of Social Interactions with the RR Tutor

6.6.1 Introduction

The teachers received six individual school visits over the year, one in the first school term, and five in the second and third school terms. The duration of the main format of a school visit is one hour. The format of the school visit followed the structure of a session: an introductory discussion about the child being taught in the lesson; observation by the Tutor of a thirty minute lesson; and a follow-up discussion for twenty minutes. The visit can be extended by teacher requested demonstrations and meeting with other personnel involved in the school implementation of RR.
6.6.2 Theme: Co-construction of knowledge

6.6.2.1 Sub-theme: Scaffolding

Scaffolding has been referred to since the term was coined in the seminal paper by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976). The analogy is based on support structures for reaching high places such as in building work or painting murals that human-beings cannot reach alone. The analogy is further developed to mean “scaffolding and fading” (Wood, 2003) because the structures are slowly dismantled and the tall building or artwork stands alone. “Researchers agree that it is the emphasis on the quality of adult-child [more capable other-learner] interaction which makes Vygotsky’s ZPD so unique and valuable for understanding successful educational instruction. This type of interaction is often referred to in educational literature as “scaffolding”. (Verenikina, 2012).

Quality interaction in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) comes from establishing intersubjectivity or a joint point of reference. “Intersubjectivity exists when interlocutors [speakers] share some aspect of their situation definitions [meanings]. Typically this overlap may occur at several levels, and hence several levels of intersubjectivity may exist” (Wertsch, 1985, p159). Any situation (such as RR teaching lessons) can have many possible interpretations. It is the language in which the RR lesson is discussed by the RR Tutor and the teacher that creates a temporary shared reality. When the RR Tutor and the training RR teacher enter into their discussion, they may have different perceptions of the lesson (one has taught and the other observed), however through mediated “negotiation” they create a temporary shared social world, which Wertsch calls “a state of intersubjectivity” (Wertsch, 1985, p161). It is because the RR Tutor and the training teachers are operating on different zones of proximal development that they may have problems in establishing and maintaining intersubjectivity. However, when the RR Tutor tunes in to the teacher’s current understandings she can lead the teacher to higher levels of performance and understanding. There are many different techniques of scaffolding, which are not included in this study, such as questioning, modelling, and suggesting strategies (Verenikina, 2008). What is important about scaffolding is that techniques
occurring are contingently applied. Contingency is defined as “…pacing the amount of help children are given on the basis of their moment by moment understanding…[and] …when they do understand the teacher steps back and gives the child more room for initiative,” (Wood, 1988, p81), which is referred to as ‘scaffolding and fading” (Wood, 2003).

In the context of school visits and the impact of the Tutor, nine teachers spoke about scaffolding being most important feature of the Tutor’s role. In the follow-up discussion six teachers explicitly spoke about this as ‘giving direction’ and one teacher explicitly included giving reinforcement; two teachers included demonstrating, with one teacher explicitly speaking about demonstrating being important for her learning. When describing scaffolding and ‘getting feedback’ on the school visit, the difference between the two is close because by the nature of the interaction it occurs after the teacher has taught a lesson in the follow-up discussion period. Scaffolding was how the RR Tutor influenced where the teacher would go next in her teaching, rather than feedback about her teaching. For example, Belinda said, “…and you were able to give me direction.”

Lara felt that the impact of the Tutor occurred because the scheduled visits were close together and the learning was therefore incremental (scaffolded over time). She said, “…sometimes you need a little top up and then because we were learning and it was our first year we were learning the where to next, so it wasn’t too much all at once. It was just nice little, little bits, and I just you know, and when the tutor came out I just sort of, it was just a nice little top up, you know, to just sort of lift you, a little bit.”

Jade said that the Tutor helped her to change direction with her teaching the next day. She said, “You know, you’re going on this track with this child and you’re thinking, ‘I’m doing the right thing, I’m doing the right thing’ and ‘we’re going OK’ but when you come in and you say ‘well why don’t you try this?’ and you try it the next day and it works and then it sets you on a different path.”
Mary-Lou said that the discussion afterwards with the Tutor also showed her different ways of teaching and reinforced what she was doing. She said, “the discussion afterwards became vital for my learning because it was something that you saw and you responded to and sort of like showed me a different way to go about it, so, the discussion afterwards became vital for my learning because it was something that you saw and you responded to, or reinforced that what I was doing was the right thing, it sort of gave me a little bit more confidence afterwards so that I knew that I was headed in the right direction from that discussion.”

Maura said that the impact of the Tutor was to shape how she catered for their individual learning needs and helped her to become flexible in her teaching. She said, “You can see my child, you know, because all four of them are different…you’ve told me how to individually cater to their needs, and I’ve done that and I see them really blossoming in their reading and writing. So it’s good, yes … after that I just teach the way you’ve told me to and I find that it works. So I find that you coming and supporting me in school has also worked for me because I like that you tell me were the things that I’ve done right, and the things I’ve done wrong. I take them both on board and then I sort of change my way. I get very flexible.”

Shelley said that the Tutor highlighted salient points in her teaching and made suggestions that she found successful for her teaching. She said, “…because you always picked up things that I wasn’t aware of and you always had good ideas for solutions, for maybe a child who maybe wasn’t progressing particularly well in one area you had a suggestion. Then I can say honestly that every time I tried that suggestion it worked, so it was very beneficial.”

When she was asked about her feelings on school visits Maria spoke of her confidence in the Tutor’s knowledge. She said, “[I’m] confident in you because I know you’ve got lots of answers that are going to help people, and that’s your job, so I mean, you’ve got to have confidence in the person that’s going to be your Tutor.”

Maura’s feeling about the school visits were that they gave her direction and she said that was based on both the Tutor and the teacher having notes. She said, “…you have
all your notes there and you tell me what I should have done and what I did do that was right, what I should have done that I didn’t do, and all that is very helpful. So I just take my notes and I think about them and the next time I teach I think about those things and I think my teaching has improved so much.”

Two teachers said that the Tutor’s main impact on their learning was in giving demonstrations of teaching. Jemma said, “The thing, the top priority thing that I got the most out of was when you would demonstrate a component of a lesson. I watched and I learnt so much just by watching and I thought that was a really valuable thing to be able to say to you was: ‘look would you do this part of the lesson? Or, will you jump in at any time through the lesson?’ So I found the demonstrations really excellent.” Jemma also spoke about visiting the Tutor in her school to observe two lessons back to back early in the training year. She said, “I found that very helpful, because it helped me…with timing and being flexible in the sequencing of the tasks throughout the lesson. I found that beneficial too. But the demonstrations definitely helped me the most.”

Diane said that demonstrations assisted her learning when she had ‘harder to teach’ children. She said, “I found it very good…especially with the harder to teach children, the couple that I had, when…you listened and you suggested things, but then occasionally you just said ‘stop!’ and you demonstrated how to do something. I found that very helpful.”

On the basis of these teachers’ perceptions of their scaffolded support the features of that were important to them were: guidance as to where to go next (you gave me direction), delivery in manageable steps (a nice little top up), making suggestions of alternative ways to interact with the child (setting the teacher on a different path), modelling teaching techniques, reinforcing what was going well, directing, highlighting what the teacher was not yet aware of, suggesting strategies, modelling evidence gathering and interpretation. The impact of scaffolding that was most influential for these teachers was: demonstrating and directing where to next. The teachers’ perceptions of scaffolding from their perspectives and current understandings (in their zones of proximal development) are not an analysis of
scaffolding. However, this theme emerged as an important feature of the Tutor’s social role for their learning.

6.6.2.2 Sub-theme: Getting feedback

In the context of the school visits, the impact of ‘getting feedback’ was important for four of the teachers. While ‘getting feedback’ is similar to scaffolding it is predominantly what the teachers spoke about as in ‘you gave feedback’ and it involved discussion of ideas rather than the suggestion or direction to ‘actions’. Feedback addresses a learning context and according to Timperley and Hattie (2007) must answer three questions: where am I going? (what are the goals), how am I going? (progress towards achieving the goal), and where to next? (activities that need to be undertaken to make better progress) (Timperley & Hattie, 2007, p86). Furthermore, each feedback question works at four levels: task (how well tasks are understood and performed), process (the main process needed to understand or perform the task), self-regulation (the learner’s self-monitoring and regulation of actions) and the person (personal evaluations and affect (usually positive) about the learner). The least effective feedback in terms of achieving teacher change is feedback to the person. The difference in the case of the school visit is the Tutor gives feedback to the teacher. The following is not an indication of the type of feedback that occurred but rather the teachers’ perceptions of it.

There was no requirement for the teachers to explain the type or quality of feedback they received because this is a study of the social interactions in the RR session and this research question (2b) asked for the teachers’ perceptions. Feedback emerged as a sub-theme of the co-construction of knowledge. The teachers’ views of feedback were: it was a discussion about whether the teacher’s view of what would happen in the lesson when she introduced the child to be taught in terms of their current literacy processing actually happened (Belinda), it involved articulating what needed to be worked on (Belinda), it was valued for the immediacy of the feedback (Maria) and constructive criticism of what (the part) that was going well and what could improve (Jade), as well as giving direction for where next (Jade). The teachers’ words below express these ideas:
Belinda said that the feedback was essential after the Tutor’s observation of the lesson. She said, “…I could follow that up by speaking to you afterwards so that that was either confirming what I was predicting was going to happen with the lesson or it would confirm what I predicted you would observe, but then we could discuss it. Whereas, if we had just had the first part, me saying this is what I’d like you to observe, this is what I think is going to happen and then we had no discussion, that would have been useless because the discussion afterwards was really invaluable for me to verbalise what I thought had happened, what I thought I needed to work on.”

Shelley, Maria and Jade also spoke about the feedback. Shelley said, “I really liked it when you observed and I just asked you to, just to, you know, comment afterwards.” Maria said, “Well, the feedback. You would give feedback, straight afterwards, which is good.” Jade said, “So I think that the most helpful thing is just that constructive criticism after the lesson. That’s what helps me is to say this is the part that’s going well but you can do this right or shall we do this right? But yeah … just the ideas that came out of it afterwards. This is what you’re prompting but you should be going in this direction with this child. Because it just how can I say it just ah…kind of wakes you up a bit.”

These teacher comments basically fulfilled the three facets of effective feedback according to Timperley and Hattie (2007) although some teachers did not elaborate on what feedback was (Maria) other than being timely and good.

6.6.3 Theme: Trust in the Relationship

The school-visit is a one to one interaction between the more expert (RR Tutor) and the learner (teacher) during which the teacher teaches a lesson with one child for half of the time allotted. Trust in the relationship is a feature of effective collaboration (Johnson et al, 2007). This was a main theme that emerged when the teachers were asked in the interviews:

Think about me working with you at the school. How did you get the most out of this kind of learning?
How did you feel during your discussions with the Tutor on school visits?

The limitations of the tutor/researcher asking the teachers questions (See: 4.12) were considered when crafting the interview questions. This was a study of social interactions in RR sessions (what occurred, in Chapter Five) and the teachers’ perceptions of those interactions for their learning (Chapter Six). Therefore the impact of the Tutor was asked indirectly as this was not a study aimed at evaluating the Tutor or the tutoring style. Furthermore, the theme ‘trust in the relationship’ emerged from the data. The teachers’ comments fell under three sub-themes that supported trust in the relationship: constancy and intimacy in the relationship, general support, and feelings of being comfortable (secure).

### 6.6.3.1 Sub-theme: Constancy and intimacy of the relationship

In the context of the school visits, the impact of the Tutor’s ‘constancy and intimacy in the relationship’ was important for two of the teachers. Lara and Tracey (the youngest teachers in the group) spoke about the one-to-one nature of the school visits which made personalised (in terms of asking individual questions, and feeling more comfortable in your own school than at the RR Centre). The constancy of the visiting is a newer feature of RR teacher training than the original conception of RR when: “the tutor paid on-site visits to programs running in schools as often as her busy schedule allowed” (Clay & Watson, 1982) which could not have been often when one tutor supported 48 RR teacher trainees, in the replication study (1979) (Clay, 1993, p72). The intimacy of the relationship refers to the one-to-one relationship.

Lara said, “Oh, just to be able to talk to you one on one. To be able to you know, ask any questions that you may not have felt comfortable in the group, although I don’t, did not ever not feel comfortable just to ask things about a particular child, because you know, you didn’t always get that opportunity in a group setting, to ask about your particular child, unless someone’s was similar.” Lara also said that the teacher’s school setting was important. She said, “I think it makes a difference being in the setting, your actual own school environment. You just sort of felt comfortable to do your lesson and get feedback on you know, the different children that were here.”
Tracey said, “It was more personal based I think and I could reflect with you exactly what was happening in my situation.” Lara spoke about the regularity of the visits as getting ‘top-ups’. She said, “it was our first year [so] we were learning the where to next, so it wasn’t too much all at once. It was just nice little, little bits, and …when the tutor came out… it was just a nice little top up, you know, to just sort of lift you, a little bit.”

6.6.3.2 Sub-theme: Support

This sub-theme is linked to the words of the teachers, in their perception of the role of the RR Tutor. Support refers to care of the teacher in the learning context where despite the outcome of the lesson the teacher perceived the follow-up to be sympathetic and helpful (Jemma and Maura), whereas Belinda thought that her voice was heard and valued (deemed to be important) as opposed to feeling patronised (where the person is treated as less knowledgeable than yourself). Belinda was a very experienced teacher and on the school leadership-team.

In the context of the school visits, the impact of the Tutor’s ‘support’ was important for three of the teachers. Jemma and Maura explicitly described the school visits as offering ‘support’. Jemma said, “I found the discussions afterwards really really supportive, even when there was something I’d done really badly…you were always saying to me, ‘it’s okay, we all do that’, there’s the support, go back and look at the book, try it again, and so I didn’t feel at all threatened by you.” Maura said, “Well I think that when you’re watching and you’re there I know that I’ve got the support from you.”

In terms of her feelings Belinda said that the supportive nature of the impact of the Tutor was in offering honest appraisal and support that valued her experience as a teacher. She said, “I found that was supportive too…I felt this is a good thing for me. I felt that I was being valued. My teaching was being valued, my opinions and my observations were being valued, and I felt that I was being spoken to honestly and
not being patronised…I felt that it was an honest appraisal and honest support and I felt valued as a teacher.”

6.6.3.3 Sub-theme: Feelings of being comfortable (secure)

In the context of the school visits, the impact of the Tutor’s ‘feelings of being comfortable in the relationship’ was important for seven of the teachers. This is interpreted as feeling relaxed during the Tutor-teacher interactions rather than anxious. The teachers expressed the meaning of this sub-theme through their words: never feeling uncomfortable (awkward, embarrassed), and feeling relaxed, at ease, not intimidated (afraid, overawed or unsettled), or apprehensive (fearful). Within the context of the one to one visits the teachers’ perception was that they could: follow their own agenda for learning.

Jemma said, “I was actually more comfortable when it was just you and I and the child, and then our discussion afterwards. I felt more comfortable then than sometimes I felt the group. I never ever fuzzed when you were coming.” In terms of her feelings she said that she felt, “comfortable, very, very comfortable. I never once, as I said, I never once fuzzed that you were coming, I never once. If I made a mistake, I made a mistake, get over it, we’ll talk about it, fix it the next day, or in the next lesson with that child or in the next lesson with another child. I never felt uncomfortable.”

In the context of the school visit Mary-Lou said that she felt comfortable because of the personalised nature of the relationship. She said that she felt, “very relaxed, very comfortable, being able to bring up whatever I needed to bring up, getting the answers, knowing...where it was in the book and how to understand what was in the book.’

Shelley said that after she had given the lesson she felt comfortable. She said, “afterwards I always felt comfortable because I knew that whatever discussion came about it would be constructive and it would be designed to help me, and to help me progress with my teaching, which it always did, so that was great.” Similarly Tracey
said, “So during discussions… I was comfortable, at ease, I didn’t feel like I couldn’t ask any questions.”

Jade said that she was more confident because it was her lesson and that she could control the discussion of her lesson. She said, “they’re good because I knew what I had taught, and I normally know the lesson had gone well or badly…I guess just because it was my lesson and it was just me I knew I could take that conversation wherever I wanted, so I felt very confident… well, just more confident probably. Not because the group discussion is… intimidating or not because people aren’t easy to talk to, but just because you feel you’ve got a bit more focus because it’s about your lesson… [I feel] probably just more confident to direct the discussion and ask questions.”

Diane said that she did not feel apprehensive in any RR situations and Maura attributed her feeling of being ‘at ease’ because the Tutor made her feel that way. Diane said, “I don’t feel apprehensive in that group situation. I don’t feel apprehensive when I teach behind the screen or when I’m talking to you.” Maura said, “Oh I felt very at ease, because you put me at ease.”

In summary nine of the ten teachers made comments that came under the theme ‘trust in the relationship’ which made it a significant element in the interaction between the teacher and the Tutor on school visits.

6.6.4 Self-regulation

Learning through social interactions is actively influenced by self-regulation. In social constructivist theory Vygotsky argued that “…schooling and instruction… inculcate in children the development of ‘self-regulation’” (Wood, 1989, p161). Therefore, “One of Vygotsky’s theoretical arguments is that ‘self-regulation’ is discovered and perfected in the course of social and instructional interactions” (Wood, 1989, p196). This means that the learner can regulate their thinking and their behaviour. Self-regulation is described (Bandura, 1991) as a multifaceted concept that includes self-monitoring one’s behaviour or checking on oneself, making
judgements about one’s behaviour in relation to personal and social standards (self-appraisal), and affective (emotional) feedback. The features of self-regulation are according to Wood (1989) ‘intellectual achievements’ that “arise out of social interactions between ‘novices and those more expert.” (Wood, 1989, p196)

6.6.4.1 Sub-theme: Self-reflection

In order to regulate thinking and behaviour the learner needs to be reflective. Mary-Lou reflected in the planning of her lessons and on her understanding of the child before a school visit by the Tutor. She said that this was more so than when she normally taught lessons. She said, “…I think I was more prepared and made sure that the child I was teaching I had a really good understanding of, had an expectation of what they were likely to do with their learning in the situation, and had an idea of what I’d like you to help me become a better teacher at.”

Belinda said that the Tutor visit made her more critical and reflective about her teaching, because she had to explain herself to the Tutor. She said, “That was good for me again because I had to be very clear when I was speaking to you about what I thought I was doing and I what I thought was the difficulty or the good thing that I was doing, that I was teaching. I had to be clear about that when I was speaking to you before the lesson. So again it made me more critical and reflective of my own teaching.”

Jade said that the impact of the Tutor visit was to make her flexible in her understandings, which suggests that she could think of different ways of working. She said, “So, it just wakes you up to the fact that just because you’ve been teaching him the whole time doesn’t mean that you’ve got the right idea or, it doesn’t mean that just because you’ve been teaching them all that time and you’ve done the assessments that the road that you’re heading down with that student is the right road for the student all the time. I guess that flexibility, of just because that worked for one week doesn’t mean it’s working next week.”
Jade reflected that the length of time teaching a child does not equate with the appropriateness of the teaching. The impact of the Tutor was to help her to think about this. She said, “I think …as teachers you get this idea…especially when you’ve been with one student for a long time, this idea of…where the problems are and where you’re going, and you coming in… just showed me that I was probably pushing the wrong aspect. For example, you know with one of the students I just kept going to the visual [information] and thinking that he couldn’t break the words and all this sort of stuff and…within a few minutes you probably realised ‘no, it’s the meaning’. So it just made me aware that my prompts in that case…were on the wrong track.” Seeking reformulations is an intellectual achievement of self-regulation that arises out of social interactions between novices and those more expert (Wood, 1989).

Maria said that her feelings about the school visit were nervousness but willingness to learn. She said, “When you come and see me? Well [I feel] nervous, but willing to learn, willing to take on board what your opinion was, because…I’m only still learning and I’m going to keep on learning. I think it would be pretty bad if I didn’t think I learnt something…you’ve also got to have confidence in yourself that you’re going to learn something and hope that you move on.” Monitoring the affective reaction is a feature of self-regulation (Bandura, 1991).

### 6.6.4.2 Sub-theme: Moving Forward

The sub-theme of moving forward refers to the teachers’ self-appraisal and reflection of their learning, a facet of self-regulation. In the context of the school visits, ‘moving forward’ was important for three of the teachers. Maria said that the impact of the Tutor was to hopefully assist her to improve. She said, ‘… [the Tutor feedback] sort of carries you until the next time you come, because you take on board, well I used to anyway, take on board what you say, and then try to do the same as I’m going along; and then the next time that you come, hopefully I’ve moved on from the horror spot I was in from the time before. Like I’ve fixed that up and can go forward.” Therefore the Tutor had a role in assisting her to make reformulations of her teaching which she could ‘take on board’. Recognising that the
first thing that comes to mind or what one is doing is not always correct is self-regulatory (Wood, 1988).

Lara said that the impact of the Tutor visits were motivating for improvement when they were regular and offered a small amount of input each time. She said, “I always came away feeling really motivated again… it sort of topped you up… it was a nice period, about two weeks, I think it was a good amount of time, not being too long yet not too short either, so I think that sometimes over that two weeks you’d try different things.” Therefore the motivation to regulate her learning as a result of the Tutor visiting was to try different solutions to the problem.

6.7 Summary of the teachers’ perspectives on the role of social interactions with the RR Tutor (sub-question 2B)

The impact of the Tutor on school visits came under the themes of co-construction, trust in the relationship and self-regulation. These were the same themes as for learning in the group. The sub-themes were similar to the group learning. Under co-construction of learning ‘getting feedback’ was evident but a new sub-theme ‘scaffolding’ was more important. It was difficult to separate these two sub-themes as they occurred after the teacher had taught her lesson and were incorporated in discussion. However, scaffolding was classified as involving direction to ‘action’ by the Tutor whereas ‘getting feedback’ was a discussion between the Tutor and the teacher about the lesson. Belinda explained that this was in relation to her predictions about how the lesson would proceed.

Trust in the relationship was an important theme. Sub-themes were: constancy and intimacy (the one-to-one relationship that occurred regularly); support (that came from the suggestions of the Tutor) and feelings of comfort or ease in the relationship. This is juxtaposed with feelings of unease or hesitancy or apprehension that was evident in the group learning situation.

Self-regulation was the third theme. Self-reflection on the part of the learners and how they need to change was an important sub-theme. ‘Moving on’ to reach other
solutions were intellectual achievements that were reached through the social interactions of RR Tutor and teacher. “Self-regulation is usually a private, invisible and inaudible activity” (Wood, 1989, p197). These teachers’ reflective comments indicate that this is a feature of their learning. It is however, a minor sub-theme.

6.8 Main Conclusion: Themes and sub-themes from the teachers’ perspective within the components of the RR sessions and in outside contexts and social interactions

This chapter provides answers Research Question Two: What is the teachers’ perspective on the importance of social interactions within the different components of RR Teacher Training sessions? which has two sub-questions: 2a) What are the teachers’ perspectives on the importance of social interactions with peer teachers in RR sessions?” and 2b) “What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions?” The data was collected from the teachers’ responses to interview questions. The questions were specifically designed to explore how the teachers learned in RR teacher training through their social interactions, and included questions related to their emotional responses to their learning.

There are two main contexts in RR training – observation of two lessons at the screen taught by the peer-teachers and a follow-up discussion. The introductory discussion prior to the observations was not included in the interview questions and neither were a discussion of procedures or implementation issues that follow the follow-up discussions. The teachers were also asked about other contexts when they may have learned with others (See: Appendix C, interview questions). This included: car pooling by one group of three teachers; talking with colleagues at school; and what impacted on their learning the day after a RR session. In the contexts of the observation discussions and the follow-up discussions the three main themes were co-construction of knowledge, trust in the relationship, and self-regulation as a learner and the sub-themes represented in Figure 6 (below).
Figure 6: Most important themes and sub-themes from the teachers’ perspective

6.8.1 Co-construction of knowledge

The theme co-construction of knowledge has five sub-themes: actively observing with others; group feedback; learning by linking; learning by extending; and learning by clarifying. Observing at the glass-screen was an example of ‘actively learning with others’. This was regarded by the teachers as pivotal for their RR teacher learning. However, it was not a co-construction of knowledge with other people unless there was an on-going discussion about the observations facilitated by the Tutor. When the teachers ‘actively observed others’ they learned from how their peer teachers interacted with their children, what they were using from their developing RR knowledge, what they were saying, and how they responded to the children. The discussion of the on-going observations made a co-construction possible. The teachers reported that what was said was far more important than just the observation itself. They could think about other people’s interpretations about the same observation. This gave them input for their own thinking. Others could bring to their attention what they were not noticing, as well as help them to clarify their understandings. When the Tutor had a particular emphasis for the observation, this assisted the teachers to focus their attention on those aspects in the lesson. The emphases set by the Tutor for observations at sessions were therefore important for a co-construction of knowledge.
Co-construction of knowledge – at the glass screen

In the context of learning at the glass screen through observation and discussion, ‘learning by linking’ was important because the teachers linked what they observed, what they heard people say about that and the knowledge from the RR course texts. Some teachers described this as making their learning more memorable. It was highly important to the teachers that this linking occurred because the RR course text was the only ‘mediating tool’ they had when they taught individually in their schools. They said that they needed to understand the course texts, and did so by linking the text to their own experiences and discussions. Reading a course text in isolation was not viewed by the teachers to be beneficial for their learning. They needed to have the text illustrated to them or ‘to see it in action’. The teachers also said that they learned by ‘extending’ their ideas. This came from building onto the ideas of others. The ‘extension’ involved linking new ideas in their own minds. The teachers explained that in an observation there can be many individual perspectives, but through sharing in discussion the teachers had additional information to help them to develop their knowledge and to ‘clarify’ their understandings.

Co-construction of knowledge – the follow-up discussion

In the context of the follow-up discussion ‘actively learning with others’ was said to be an expectation in RR learning from the beginning of the training course. The expectation that teachers would participate was thought to be important because if this did not occur some teachers would not contribute to the co-construction of learning and just listen to others. In this setting ‘group feedback’ was highly important for the teachers’ learning. The teachers said that to learn the teacher had to be open to feedback and to want to improve their own teaching through changing what they said and did. The different views offered in the feedback were explained as ‘layering’ by one teacher. Different people helped the teacher build a ‘big picture’ of what had occurred so that her learning could become transformed (changed) and have with greater sophistication (refinement). The teachers said that becoming a better teacher required ‘feedback’ from others who were as experienced or more experienced than them. This seems to mean that they appreciated learning with peer-teachers and the more knowledgeable and capable person (the RR Tutor).
In the context of the follow-up discussion the teachers ‘learned by linking’. They said that getting new ideas that they had not individually thought of before was a feature of group learning. From the teachers’ perspective they would discuss their lesson observations with each other with reference (linked) to the RR course texts that supported or did not support their interpretations. Some teachers said that final summaries in the form of ‘sayings’ stayed in their minds for their teaching the next day, for example, for daily improvement the teachers remembered ‘always make it better the next day.’ The teachers also said that they ‘extended their learning’ by learning something new regularly at each session. Ideas would come up that they had not thought of and they would try them the next day with their own children. The teachers said that they were ‘extended’ by the different perspectives of others. They said that while the individual will notice things that are pertinent to them it is in the group that the individual gains the benefit of multiple perspectives. This adds to their own construction of knowledge. Furthermore, the teachers learned by ‘clarifying’ their understandings. One teacher explained that during the year her interpretations were different to the group’s interpretations. The discussion helped her to clarify her understandings in a way that she said reading the course text would not do. Another teacher said that she had misinterpreted RR procedures and it was the discussion that assisted her to clarify her understandings.

**Co-construction of knowledge – teaching for one’s peers**

In the context of teaching for one’s teacher peers behind the glass screen, the teachers said that the value of doing this for the teacher who taught was the ‘group feedback’ afterwards in the follow-up discussion. It was clear to the teachers that no teacher delivered a ‘perfect’ lesson. There were always areas for improvement. The purpose of the ‘group feedback’ from the teachers’ perspective was to share with the teacher who taught what they could do better. This was often because the teacher who taught did not always realise what she said and did as she taught. The group feedback offered a broader perspective for the teaching of the child and for change. Therefore, the next day (after teaching behind the screen) the ‘group feedback’ gave the teachers new directions and new frameworks for their teaching. The teachers would trial what had been suggested. The teachers said ‘getting feedback’ was pivotal because ‘you don’t become a better teacher by yourself.’
Co-construction of knowledge – social interactions outside sessions
In the context of extending one’s learning to include others outside the sessions the teachers explained their learning to other teachers, including previous RR teachers; their own parents and spouse as well as other adults, for example, one teacher was a Suzuki violin teacher and she shared her RR learning with the parents of her students. The discussions with school colleagues were mainly to compare how the children they were teaching were learning in the classroom. The discussion with previous RR teachers made one teacher conscious of the questions she was asking before she asked them. She said that the feedback she received was mainly to read a section in the RR texts. Another teacher said her grade-partner (a trained RR teacher) helped her to clarify her learning, and she actively sought her opinions to confirm her own interpretations about child learning. A group of three teachers travelled together to and from sessions. They discussed the sessions ‘on the way home’ as a form of debriefing. They discussed the emphasis of the session and how they might change their way of teaching. Learning with others outside of the sessions continued to be important for all of the teachers except one, who said that may have been because of relationships at her school.

6.8.2 Trust in the relationship
‘Trust in the relationship’ was important in the context of the observations and discussions at the glass-screen. Trust built confidence between the peer-teachers. The features of the RR teacher training experience that allowed for trusting relationships were: constancy in the regularity group meetings and intimacy related to the size of the group. Furthermore, the teachers felt that the peer-teacher group provided mutual support for one another. Thus, the teachers had feelings of being comfortable (secure) and confident.

Trust in the relationship – at the glass-screen
When the teachers observed and discussed at the glass-screen it was important to them that they be mutually supportive. The teachers were aware that their learning fluctuated and changed over time, therefore it was critical to them that they learned a context that was accepting. For example, the teachers were supportive of the person
who had taught the lesson by giving ‘positive reinforcement’ afterwards. The teachers’ supportive relationship and care for one another came from knowing that no matter what the teachers who taught did in their lessons, the teachers who were observing did similar things when they taught RR lessons in their schools.

The teachers explained that discussing while observing was a learning experience for them on the RR course and their ability to contribute developed over time. At the glass screen the teachers said that they had to be alert, not only to the on-going observation and the discussion but also the rules of social interaction. This involved listening to one another and turn-taking. The mutually supportive learning came from the teachers offering their contributions and other teachers’ ideas branching off the initial ideas. The teachers also said that they were supported by the other teachers to extend, improve, refine and explain their understandings. ‘Mutual support’ was viewed by the teachers as being the antithesis of a ‘threatening’ relationship. The teachers felt that this particular group was supportive because no teacher felt excluded or unappreciated for their efforts, that there were respectful relationships, and that the teachers offered positive criticism. The teachers appreciated supportive ‘feedback’ after this experience.

**Trust in the relationship – in the follow-up discussion**

Feeling ‘comfortable’ in the relationship was important in both the context of observation and discussion and the follow-up discussion, although the teachers mainly spoken of this during the follow-up discussion. The teachers said that this feature of their social relationship was established during the informal interactions they had in the first thirty minutes of the session, which was outside the parameters of this research. One teacher felt more comfortable in these informal interactions than in contributing in the more formal contexts of the sessions. To feel comfortable in the learning context from the teachers’ perspective meant that the teachers had a choice to contribute or to listen to others. There was no dominant personality in the group, the teachers knew that what was discussed at the glass screen would be re-discussed or clarified in the follow-up discussion, and that this discussion would be positive for their learning. The teachers felt more comfortable in the follow-up
discussion when they knew ‘how to approach it’. This was the structure for the social interaction that started with positive reinforcement of the person who had taught.

**Trust in the relationship – social interactions outside sessions**

In the context of extending one’s learning to include others under the theme ‘trust in the relationship’ teachers mainly sought and received support from other teachers at the school, previous RR teachers, RR Support Teachers (teachers on the school leadership team who oversee the RR implementation)\(^8\) and Principals. One teacher said that previous RR teachers were always interested in her learning and comparing that with changes from when they learned. The mutual nature of the support between the RR training teachers, classroom teachers and previous RR teachers was in their joint realisation that they had the same teaching issues. This referred to either the children responding in the same or similar ways in RR and the classroom, or that the other teachers had encountered the current RR training teachers’ situation before. After Tutor visits the RR Support Teacher and the Principal enquired about how the visit went, what the Tutor had said and offered any support the teacher felt she needed.

### 6.8.3 Self-regulation

Self-regulation as a learner refers to the individual in the learning process and their perceptions of their own learning. The sub-themes were: comparing oneself with others; self- reflection; moving forward (improvement); challenge; hesitation; self validation; and self-belief.

**Self-regulation at the glass-screen**

From the teachers’ perspective comparing themselves with others when observing and discussing at the glass screen was highly important for their learning. The teachers were doing the same work and they could ‘see themselves in what their peers were doing’. This made them more self-aware and self-critical of themselves as

---

\(^8\) Role description in Wollongong Diocese, Catholic Education Office ‘Reading Recovery Guidelines’ (2009)
teachers. They said this was an impetus for personal change. One teacher described the outcome of comparing herself with the others as asking whether what they said and did fitted into her schema of how to teach RR. Her questions were: does it fit, does it not fit, and how would you change? In the context of observing and discussing at the glass screen one teacher said that she experienced ‘self-validation’ when she knew what the teacher teaching behind the screen was doing.

The teachers were aware of themselves as learners at the glass-screen. The teachers knew that it took them time to learn how to observe a lesson and discuss it with others at the same time. Furthermore, they knew that they had to be alert, think quickly, and make links rapidly between what they heard others saying, what they saw, and what they had read, in order to make their contributions. One teacher said that she was good at the literal level (replaying what was observed) and not so good at the analytical level (interpreting what was observed); and one teacher said that learning these levels of contribution (description and interpretation) was important in the context of the Tutor transparently arranging for this to be learned.

In the context of observing and discussing at the glass screen a few teachers spoke about feeling personally challenged by learning how to observe and contribute at the same time. This was because it involved making links between what they were observing and what they knew. At the beginning of the course a few teachers spoke of only wanting to ‘watch’ and not discuss. One teacher spoke about her personal apprehension about contributing at the glass screen because of prior learning experiences and the feeling that she did not want to say the wrong thing. She said she would only put forward her opinion if she was sure that it was ‘helpful’, and when she was more confident in the group.

**Self-regulation – in the follow up discussions**

In the follow-up discussion the teachers said that you always learn from others because you put yourself in their situation and you reflect on similar experiences you have had, thus comparing yourself with others. A few teachers also said that there was ‘self-validation’ in the affirmation they received that confirmed their own
thinking. One teacher said that teachers had to have ‘self-belief’ that they would learn from the follow-up discussion.

In the context of the follow-up discussion a few teachers spoke about their hesitation about making contributions. One teacher said that she followed the way the discussion was going before she contributed so that she knew she was on the right track because she often had different ideas to the others. Two teachers spoke of their individual personalities in not wanting to be wrong in what they said, and one teacher said that she was not comfortable in contributing until she was more comfortable with the group. Hesitation affected one teacher who said that she thought of contributions to make but often others would say them before she did. She said that she was a ‘considered person’ who did not ‘blurt out’ her opinions.

**Self-regulation – teaching for one’s peers**

In the context of teaching for one’s peers behind the glass screen the teachers said that they were more conscious of their own teaching actions and the purposes of each literacy activity in the lesson. From the teachers’ perspective they may have been slightly apprehensive before they taught the lesson (about what they would say and do) but once they started their attention was on their own lesson, knowing that they would get constructive feedback afterwards.

**Self-regulation – teaching the next day**

In the context of teaching the next day the teachers spoke about how they planned change for themselves by taking forward one aspect to change for their teaching or the child’s learning. In this context ‘moving forward’ or ‘improvement’ was important for the teachers. The teachers felt positive about what they had achieved so far with the children and motivated to change. In making changes to their teaching when back at school this was mainly said to be successful or if it was not, one teacher said that modifications were made for incremental change. One teacher said learning from people who know what you know and more than you was what was important for personal ‘improvement’.

**Self-regulation – social interactions outside sessions**
In the context of extending one’s learning to include others previously trained RR teachers at the schools were supportive. They were a source of ‘self validation’ for teachers to know they were ‘on the right track’. The RR training teachers also asked them for specific advice with aspects of the teaching, to get advice for ‘where to go next’ and for emotional support. One teacher who had an adverse reaction to teaching behind the glass screen and who was hesitant about making contributions in the follow-up discussion sought emotional support from her grade partner who was a previously trained RR teacher. She said that she ‘downloaded’ on her. The response from the other trained RR teacher in the school was to refer her to the Tutor’s advice and then to offer support with that advice.

6.8.4 Discussion

6.8.4.1 The teachers’ perspective of group learning

From the teachers’ perspective it is very important to work with others in a group in RR teacher training: Mary Lou said that the group interactions were a vital part of her learning; Jemma said that working with the group who were also learning gave her confidence; Lara thought it was good to be able to voice her opinions and get feedback from her peers about her interpretations; Maura felt that the feedback was always positive and respectful; Shelley said the group helped her to clarify and extend her understandings; Diane said she could never had learned by herself; Belinda found the group mutually supportive when they were teaching for one another; Tracey felt that that she could participate in discussions with the group because of her similar experiences; Jade said that the group offered her the outside opinion on how well she was going on the inside and after teaching she needed their feedback; while Maria said, the group helped her to solidify things in her mind and move forward in her teaching. All of these positive comments relate to the teachers’ perspective of teaching behind the glass-screen and the follow-up discussion. The RR teacher training setting allows for a co-construction of knowledge through social interactions. In this approach learning occurs through the interdependence between social interactions and the individual. It is through this relationship that the co-construction of knowledge is encouraged (Palincsar, 2005, Wood, 2003, Wood 1988).
The teachers spoke of learning through social interactions as a positive experience because of the trust they developed in their relationships. For example: Mary Lou said she would not say much at the beginning because she might not be saying the right thing or what was helpful and did not want a ‘backlash’ for her whereby people would think she was stupid. However, as she grew more confident in the group, especially during the informal social interactions, she was willing to take risks. Jemma felt that despite her own feelings of anxiety when it was her turn to teach behind the glass-screen or sometimes feeling inadequate in the discussions because she was a person who needed time to mull things over, in the group setting she felt supported. No teacher spoke negatively about their social relationships. Diane was sure that no-one would have felt ‘wounded’ by their efforts. Personal feelings related to all learning having a learning history (Vygotsky, 1978) including emotional feelings related to these (Johnson, 2004). The trust in the relationship is linked to the main sub-theme of the constancy and intimacy of the RR teacher training group setting, being the same group with the same tutor over a year.

The minor theme from the teachers’ perspective of their learning in a group referred to their self-regulation. Self-regulation involves the ability of the teacher to regulate her own thinking and actions (Wood, 1988). Unlike Brown and Palincsar (1986) who externalised the process of self-regulation in the “reciprocal teaching” reading method, the teachers’ capacity to change direction, think of different answers to problems, understand that one’s first idea may not be correct, and the ability to reform their thinking is an inaudible part of their processes of internalisation. These teachers mainly spoke of self-regulation arising from social interactions when they had the opportunity to compare themselves with their fellow learners, to regulate ‘how am I going?’ Underpinning self-regulation is self-appraisal, self-belief and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1990, 1991). Jade said that you have to believe that you can learn and be better because that is what learning is all about.

The interpersonal relationships between the group members and the RR Tutor were foundational to their positive experience with each other. Johnson et al (2007) describe such groups as “promotive”, and their functioning is based on social
collaboration, rather than oppositional where the positioning of group members is individualistic. Jemma surmised that the group could have been different if a member of the group was what she called a ‘dominant personality’ with an individualistic rather than collaborative approach.

6.8.4.2 The teachers’ perspective of the tutoring

Sub-question two: b) What are the teachers' perspectives on the importance of social interactions with the Tutor in RR sessions? was not asked directly in the contexts of the sessions for ethical reasons. The question could be posed: can RR teacher learning in training sessions occur without a RR Tutor, with teachers bouncing ideas off one another and reading the course texts together? This however would deny the carefully thought out design of the sessions that allows the social interactions to occur, and the role of the RR Tutor as the more experienced and knowledgeable partner who facilitates the teacher interactions (given that the teacher acknowledges that without an expectation to articulate their ideas some would not) and this provides the context for learning from the RR Tutor’s scaffolding as well as shaping by the differing contributions of the peer teachers.

From a Vygotskian perspective, the Tutor is important in assisting to improve learning, extending the teachers’ zones of proximal development (ZPDs). It is implicit in this study that the RR Tutor influenced the teachers’ co-construction of knowledge in the group sessions and provided structures for the trust that developed in their relationships with one another (informal and formal interactions, positive reinforcement, ways of interacting with each other).

The teachers’ perspective of the RR Tutor’s role in the social interactions was similar to those of their peer-teachers prompting their co-construction of knowledge, through trust in the relationship and influencing their self-development as learners. Scaffolding, however, was difficult to unpick as separate from ‘getting feedback’ from what the teachers said. This is because it was inferred from the social interaction after the teachers completed the lessons. In this study the category refers to the direction the teachers felt that they received from the RR Tutor rather than the general discussion.
Chapter Seven

7 THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN READING
RECOVERY TEACHER TRAINING

The purpose of this chapter is to bring together my perspective, as the RR Tutor, on the importance of social interactions in the RR teacher training course based on this study. My extensive experience as a RR Tutor and my knowledge of the teacher training course designed by Clay formed the initial basis for the perspective I have taken in this research. Vygotskian social constructivist theory which was selected as a theoretical framework to underpin this study served as a catalyst for re-conceptualisation of my experiences and hence my evolving perspective. When I discussed my RR work with colleagues prior to undertaking this study it was based on my knowledge of, and extensive experience in the field of RR, and my intuition. This theoretical foundation has served as a tool for generalisation and systematisation of my experiences and understanding in greater depth the importance of social interactions and emotional relationship in learning.

Documenting the ways that the RR teachers in my class engaged in interactions with others, and gaining insights into their opinions and feelings took my understanding of the role of the Tutor to a new level. Looking at the data of this study through the theoretical lens revealed what shapes teacher interactions within the structures for interacting that is provided by RR, namely observation at the glass-screen and discussion in the circle. This includes my role, as a RR Tutor, in scaffolding teacher’s feeling about their experience, as well as carefully supporting and shaping their voices at the glass-screen, as the means of learning.

The social constructivist framework has re-framed my experience in order to understand co-construction of teacher knowledge in RR through social interaction. RR teacher learning is based on active collegial participation built on their own RR teaching experiences while learning. It is the role of the Tutor to carefully scaffold the teachers over the time of the RR course to becoming independent reflective practitioners while capitalising on the wealth of knowledge and support of the group.
The way I view RR teacher training through social interaction was well put by a RR teacher who referred to Vygotsky by saying “The ways in which we talk and interact with other people become internalised and change the ways we think” (Barnes, 1996, p286). Any group experience can be different for different people and this chapter is aimed at bringing together six principles based on theory and this research data that explain what was important for this group of RR teachers in their learning through social interaction.

Research in the area of the training RR teachers in sessions is scant, and mainly related to early implementations of RR that are difficult to source. The thrust of RR research is more specifically in the area of child learning and implementation. It is important therefore that an internationally delivered early intervention like RR, that is reliant on the skills of teachers, brings its attention to how the teachers learn beyond learning the technical language used in RR and being able to act in the style of the RR teacher, or referring to RR content and pedagogical knowledge. In my view, understanding the structure of RR teacher learning (which allows classroom with additional training, to operate effectively and individually in their schools, with children at the lowest end of the achievement distribution after twelve months at school, designing and delivering specialised individual learning interventions) can allow RR entry into a dialogue with other teacher professional development providers and researchers. Furthermore the role of the RR Tutor needs to be explained as highly skilled providers of adult learning under a social constructivist theoretical framework.

The earliest research on teacher learning in RR gave an explanation of tiers of observational scaffolding (Gaffney & Anderson, 1991) involving the teacher teaching the lesson, observing the child and interacting with his or her behaviours (behind a glass-screen), the teacher group observing teacher-child pair and learning from those interactions (at the glass-screen), then an outside layer of RR Trainers observing the RR Tutor interacting with the teacher group and the group with each other (behind the teaching group), as they observe the teacher and the child. This operates in RR teacher and Tutor training to this day. The scenario allows for multiple perspectives for observing interactions, if in a somewhat unnatural way. Developing interest in teacher learning focused on social interactions where the
boundaries of inquiry became delineated as acquiring the technical language of the expert group, for instance the Beth case-study (Lyons, 1993b), and used a neo-Vygotskian perspective, in particular Tharp and Gallimore’s model (1988) of intersubjectivity and internalisation, which largely focused on individual teacher learning and understanding of RR language in the group. Language is a major part of social interaction RR teacher training because the teachers learn through dialogue with one another and the RR Tutor (Vygotsky, 1986). This study has used Vygotskian and neo-Vygotskian conceptualisations of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), intersubjectivity, scaffolding, internalisation, and self-regulation to understand the meaning of the social interactions through observation and discussion, rather than being an analysis of teacher language acquisition reflecting the theoretical concepts of early literacy acquisition (Clay, 2001) and ways of scaffolding this (Clay, 2005b, Phillips and Smith, 1997).

In early research the nature of the interactive dialogue at the glass-screen was explained as developing “chains of reasoning” (Lyons, 1994). Teachers built on to or add on to what each person was saying around a theme e.g. using visual information when reading, and a ‘chain’ was delineated as three teacher utterances uninterrupted by the Tutor. This probably helped RR Tutors (such as myself) to think about encouraging teachers’ voices, as well as teacher appropriation (adoption through usage) of RR theory underpinned by specific language. In RR, language was regarded as the essential condition of knowing (Rodgers, 2000), and the discussions (dialogue) in RR (at the glass-screen and in follow-up discussions) were viewed as how teachers went beyond their present understandings to take on-board new pedagogy and theoretical ideas (Anderson, 2011).

The RR language was further explained as both a ‘psychological tool’, to make sense of social experience; and a cultural tool, to share experience and collectively make sense of it (Moore, 1997, 1998). The main thrust was to separate RR teacher training from transmission models of teacher education, e.g. presentations and lectures, as well as collaborative workshops of teacher peers, without the guidance of a Tutor. Transformations of knowledge during RR teacher training were described as “shifts” (Moore, 1998) a term first used by Clay and Watson, (1982) in teacher up-take of RR language and teaching style.
In the 1990’s a social theory of learning called “communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, Wenger, 1998) was used in the RR community (Schwartz, 1998, 2006) to describe RR teacher learning. This involves teachers making meaning through their collective experience of RR teaching with a particular perspective on early child literacy learning and teaching, in communities (groupings) that give people a sense of belonging and identity. There are tensions inherent in this social concept of learning for teachers (Schwartz, 1998, 2006) who are used to adapting new teaching ideas and styles to their own ways of operating and their pre-existing ideas (Fullan, 1991) or “craft knowledge” (Timperley, 2008) which can undermine change processes. Schwartz wrote that the RR community had fidelity to the new teaching approach, and adaptations were for teaching individual children using the procedures available in RR, or with RR Tutor guidance. Furthermore, “inquiry” that is central to RR teacher-learning focuses on usage of RR course texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b) in social discussion. Teachers in the RR community constantly meet to observe and discuss with others, revisiting these texts for re-interpretation and new interpretations, in regards to individual children’s behaviour that puzzles them.

What RR-based literature did not do was address teacher emotion involved in this style of training where teachers take turns teaching children who are the most difficult to teach behind a glass-screen to be observed by peers and their Tutor, in a context where the teacher does not know what is being said (Barnes, 1996-97). This did make teachers scrutinize and regulate their own actions. However, no-one liked this experience that was reported by teachers as a valuable aspect of their training (Clay & Watson, 1982).

Barnes (1996-97) wrote that her experience of RR teacher training was that prior teaching experience and pedagogical knowledge teachers bring to RR training was not valued by RR Tutors when this background could, “…expand the resources that the group brings to learning…” (Barnes, 1996-97, p287). Barnes wrote that there was distrust of colleagues in reference to teaching behind the glass-screen when teachers do not know what is being said. Furthermore, it was her view that RR teaching was a skill-based teaching approach (requiring acquisition of a specific language and style within a set lesson framework). The opposite view is expressed in the literature, in
reply to Barnes, from people who said this was not their experience, giving a different picture from the RR teachers’ perspective (Browne et al, 1996-97). However, fifteen years later, extreme emotions of teachers involved in RR training appear again in the literature (Compton-Lilly, 2011). For example the voices of RR teachers say that their RR teacher training could be: ‘nerve-wracking’, ‘sleep-depriving’, ‘terrifying’. This emotive response is confirmed by one teacher in this study, “I was terrified every time I taught behind the screen. I was absolutely horrified” (Jemma).

Compton-Lilly’s sample of sixteen teachers from RR training groups across a mid-western state (independently interviewed) showed that eighty-eight per-cent felt extreme emotion. My study involving ten teachers interviewed by the RR Tutor/researcher showed one teacher (ten per-cent) exhibiting an extreme response. This result may be influenced by limitations in my study (See: 4.12), although the opportunity was made available through the carefully crafted questions for teachers to talk about their ‘feelings’ in all the training settings (when teaching behind the glass-screen, observing at the glass-screen, in follow-up discussions, when the Tutor visited the school). One teacher spoke about her reluctance to speak until she was comfortable with the group (Mary-Lou) and another about not wishing to be wrong or wanting to ‘blurt things out’ without forethought (Maura). These were not extreme emotions because the teachers said that they had trusting relationships in their group, and “no-one would be wounded by their efforts” (Diane).

Hargreaves (1998, 2002) has researched teacher emotions in relation to reform agendas in education. Hargreaves wrote that ‘conflict’ was the strongest source of negative emotion amongst teachers and “…its wounds can be deep and lasting” (Hargreaves, 2002, p522). In response to ‘conflict’ teachers tend to mask their emotions, avoid interactions, or engage in superficial politeness. Yin and Lee (2011) write that teachers can feel many mixed emotions in their interactions with trainers as a consequence of the interplay of emotional geographies (Hargreaves, 2002) and concluded that only when three emotional conditions were present were there positive relationships: some desirable professional orientation of the trainer (professional geography), equal power relationships (political geography), and the consensus on moral purpose between the trainer and trainees (moral geography).
Furthermore the teachers in this study have reinforced my understanding for working with any learners, which is that all learning has a history (Vygotsky, 1978), which teachers (Jemma, Mary-Lou, Maura) explained to me in respect to how they felt about themselves, that it is linked to emotion (Levykh, 2008). I therefore understood more about adult learning. Whilst adults have greater degrees of emotional self-regulation than children, unease and anxiety exits in RR teacher training. In terms of educational research, there is a developing interest in the area of scaffolding emotions in classrooms (Meyer & Turner, 2007), including relations between student achievement goals and emotion, and the design of emotionally sound learning environments that have yet to be tested in empirical investigation studies (Schutz & Pekrun, 2007). For adult learning, in my view, RR can provide a case for inquiry into the roots of the unease of teachers as learners, how this influences their learning of new ideas, theories and skills in a way that places them at risk of not achieving their goals or being found wanting ‘in front of others’, and teacher acceptance for themselves, that learning as a process can have unevenness, with peer-feedback in trusting relationships being intended for joint improvement.

The theoretical framework that I have appreciated more in understanding my work as a RR Tutor places importance, not only on the Tutor’s role in RR teacher training but the role and accountability for teachers to help each other through sharing their thoughts, opinions and ideas, in dialogue with one another. In the Vygotskian framework teacher learning occurs within each teacher’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Wertsch, 1985, Wood, 1988, Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). This is the gap between what one knows and what one has yet to know, or learning, that occurs through social interaction. All members of the teacher group have different ZPDs (know more or less than each other based on their previous knowledge and current RR learning) and therefore have contributions to make. Similar to the “reciprocal teaching” model of teaching reading comprehension (Palincsar, 1984) makes ways and results of ‘thinking’ (internalisation) demonstrated by a teacher and of peer-learners socially accessible (Glaser and Bassok (1989) RR teacher training, through RR Tutor scaffolding and the voices of the teachers, levers the individual teacher’s understandings in his or her ZPD. The teachers enter into conversations, at the beginning of their training that is initially ahead of their specific RR knowledge. The intersubjectivity of the group is their joint point of reference (observing the same
lessons and referring to the same parts of their course texts, while discussing what this means) (Daniels, Cole and Wertsch, 2007, Gallagher, 2009). Internalisation (between the external social world and the internal personal thought) takes time (Vygotsky, 1978). Learning in the Vygotskian framework is not a matter of transmission (Mahn & John-Steiner, 1996).

Teachers in this study were still grappling with their teaching decisions, how to use RR language prompts and how to interact successfully with children near the end of the year-long course. This is because RR teaching does not involve learning a “task” or a “program” but how to socially interact differently and contingently with different children moment by moment, within the RR lesson framework (Clay, 2005a) and the parameters of the daily tasks the teachers have personally selected for each child (books selected, topics to write about, letters to sort, words to break and construct) based on the teacher’s analysis of the child’s prior learning (the day before), with a teacher eye towards improvement in learning (for the next day), all confined by the timing that is allowed for a literacy lesson, with eight literacy activities to be addressed, for a six year old (a young child) in thirty minutes. Why teacher timing prevents full lessons during sessions and at school was said by Diane in this study, to be because teachers persist when things are not working, rather than change direction.

Given that emotion has been a factor in RR teacher training from its inception (Clay & Watson, 1982), the unnerving factor for teachers is having a group of peers observe you closely through a glass-screen, when you cannot “plan” the social interaction. As one teacher told the group in this study, “the child is just not consistent… what can go well one day may not the next… what can you do other than say: re-read and think what makes sense that looks like that and have her say that?” (Belinda). Hence the teacher persists before changing, and whilst RR teacher training, like RR teaching can be unpredictable, it is always socially interactive.

7.1 Introduction
This final section of the thesis represents my current philosophy about RR teacher training as informed by my experience as a RR Tutor and this research. It therefore speaks to my future in the role and the insights I have gained which I can share with my RR Tutor colleagues. I decided to summarise what I have learnt in this study through formulating a number of guiding principles for my own tutoring. In a similar way, Fountas and Pinnell (2009) have published some principles of RR Tutor role, but these related mainly to their work in supporting RR Teachers in the one-to-one situation of “coaching” and implementing Reading Recovery in schools in the United States (as opposed to Reading Recovery sessions at the RR training sites).

The principles that I present below relate to conceptualising RR Tutoring in the RR session developed by Clay, which is conducted in a group situation. These guiding principles are influenced by my extensive experience teaching RR continuously over twenty six years, including contemporarily training and advising teachers as a RR Tutor over eighteen years; the empirical findings of this research, and the theoretical framework for this study which involves learning through social interactions. My experience offers credence to these guiding principles because the teachers I have worked with have constantly achieved an eighty-nine to ninety per cent success rate for their RR children in the Wollongong Diocesan RR implementation after the start-up period of the first five years and have referred approximately one to two per cent of the children in the Year One cohort for long-term literacy support (the next wave of a systemic literacy intervention).

The empirical findings of my study helped me to understand how I interacted with the teachers and the way I helped them to interact with each other. I found that as the RR Tutor I effectively scaffolded teacher learning at the beginning and middle of the RR sessions, and needed to reflect more on social interactions near the end of the course in terms of “scaffolding and fading”, or self-inhibition (Wood, 2002). From the teachers’ perspective it was important that they learned with their peers through a

---

9 ‘Waves’ of support refers to levels of specialisation (class teacher, RR teacher, specialist, e.g. child psychologist), previously called primary, secondary and tertiary levels on intervention. The RR teacher has an added layer of specialisation onto his/her classroom teacher training, but does not have the discipline of a child psychologist or a speech pathologist, or a special education teacher (for hearing impaired, vision impaired, intellectually disabled etc).
co-construction of knowledge, and their own self-reflection of their learning, supported by the trust they placed in the social relationships developed on the course.

The social constructivist framework assisted me to interpret and explain the RR teachers’ learning in this RR training group. The teachers internalised their interpersonal social experiences involving observations and discussion. Initially the teachers’ learning interactions were heavily scaffolded by the RR Tutor, for instance explaining the literacy activities they were observing and encouraging them to contribute their ideas about their observations. The teachers’ learning was also shaped by their peers, as they compared themselves with them and listened to their ideas. The teachers’ learning (thoughts, language and skills) became internalised as teachers as constructive learners assisted themselves through their self-reflection of their learning development. According to the theory this process never stops. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) explain that there is a recursive loop in the stages they outline for learning progression through the zone of proximal development (ZPD). “Even for an adult, the effort to recall a forgotten bit of information can be aided by the helpful assistance of another, so that the total of self-regulated and other-regulated components of the performance once again resembles the mother-child example of shared functioning. Even the competent adult can profit from regulation for enhancement and maintenance of performance.” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p39).

Clay has revision and review built in to the RR teacher training. The teachers observed the same phenomenon (literacy processing) in the same contexts (literacy activities) enacted by different peer teachers for different children. This helped the teachers to achieve flexibility and successful outcomes for the children. In Clay’s original design (Clay & Watson, 1982) the discussion at the glass-screen involves the teachers in problem-solving difficult cases in the second part of the year. Currently, the observations are approached through disclosed and previously discussed ‘emphases’ or themes in relation to literacy processing. Continuously revisiting previous learning in RR sessions through different examples supports teacher development of independent RR knowledge. Tharp and Gallimore (1988, p39) refer to this type of revisiting of learning as the hallmark of excellent teaching. The RR course is therefore not a ‘beginning to end’ course. The aim is for the teachers to become independent in their RR work and more independent in their social interactions in RR sessions. Therefore, it is desirable that teachers keep
communicating about their teaching and there is space for this in the structure of RR, namely regular sessions, which they have to attend as part of their continuing professional learning. The value and significance of such on-going conversations should not be overlooked.

The following are guiding principles for RR Tutoring during the RR sessions’ introductory discussion, observation and discussion at the glass-screen and the follow-up discussion. These principles are: 1) RR teachers learn through their social interactions scaffolded by the RR Tutor and shaped by their peers’ contributions to teaching and discussion. 2) RR teachers learn through language is the main way of communicating with one another. Tone, physicality and gesture are other features of communication. 3) The RR teachers become independent in RR sessions as well as in their teaching in schools when the scaffolding by the RR Tutor fades over time but is always available to be supportive of their discussions. 4) RR teachers learn when differences of opinion are aired, recognised, thought about and valued. 5) RR teacher learning involves the affective as well as the cognitive domains - the emotional and the intellectual aspects of learning, which are intertwined.

The principles are based on the findings of this research and the observational analysis, the teachers’ perspectives and theory explain each principle. I also include my after-thoughts on the future of my tutoring which will further my search into understanding the role of the RR Tutor in influencing social interactions in RR Teacher training.

Within each tutoring principle are guidelines for teacher interactions that are also supported by the research data from this study and which underpin social collaboration in RR teacher training. See: Figure 6, for a diagrammatic inclusion of these principles within a preliminary model of RR teacher training through social interaction.
7.2 Principles of Social Interaction

7.2.1 Principle One: Encourage them to interact

**Principle One:** Learning in RR teacher training sessions occurs through social interactions between members of a group and the RR Tutor. Through this process RR teachers are able to internalise what they learn when working together. (‘Encourage them to interact’)

Learning through social interactions is the main principle from which the other principles unfold. It refers to the RR Tutor’s role working in assisting teachers to interact with each other and with the RR Tutor. This occurs through carefully guided
scaffolding and assisted learning by the RR Tutor, and is built on the trust the teachers have in their relationships with one another. The evidence from this research is that the teachers find it easy to interact in discussions about topics they are familiar with (such as themselves and their own teaching), they are less conversant when new ideas and expectations occur, which include the middle sessions and relatively more independent in the late session, meaning that RR is not scaffolding as heavily in relation to the RR knowledge base as in the early sessions. These early sessions are more explanatory linking RR teaching to the teachers’ knowledge of classroom teaching.

Expertise is not a feature of RR teacher learning. Peer-teachers learn through their own development (practice in the field) and observing and discussing their teaching development with peer-learners. The teachers expressed the opinion that observations would not be significant for their learning without the opportunity through social interaction to discuss what they saw and heard. The teachers appreciated that what they were observing and discussing was ‘real’. They could “clue into” what others were saying and compare opinions guided by an ‘emphasis’ (theme) to focus their observations and thinking. In the follow-up discussions the teachers were open to feedback because they were learning and acknowledged that feedback was intended to be supportive. The opinions of others were welcomed because it was the feedback that was most influential in terms of their teaching outside the session, which was described as constructive.

Theoretically it is the social interactions that are appropriated by the teachers in the context of the RR sessions. RR Tutor facilitation of RR teacher learning through scaffolding (including explanations of meaning and procedures) helped the teachers as one teacher said, to “know how to do it.” The RR Tutor role is to assist the teachers internalise the teaching expected in RR. This occurs when the teachers are heavily scaffolded in their efforts at the beginning of the training course in ways where they understand the purpose of their social interactions. Independence (internalisation) is achieved when the teachers can observe and discuss together in aspects of the lesson observations with less or different RR Tutor support.
This research shows that the Tutor assists the teachers by facilitating their discussion and scaffolding on two levels: the macro-level (the design of the sessions – content and sequencing) (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005) and the micro-level (interactions). The careful crafting of the social experience of the teachers by the Tutor allows them to internalise from the social plane to their own self-regulation (the internal). This involves linking experiences and content knowledge from session to session, and explaining, rehearsing and building over time the social interactions that occur at the glass-screen. Encouraging teachers to interact involves Tutor skill. Teachers may simply talk more if Tutors talked less, however the quality and frequency of teacher talk is influenced more by the social environment. This involves the Tutors in spending time from the first sessions and in continuing sessions explaining the purpose of the social interactions (goals) and what they can be like incrementally during the course (expectations), and continuously evaluating the group’s interactions collegially, including areas of need and ways of improvement. The social interactions, and change in the ways Tutor’s talk, therefore need as much Tutor attention as the course content and the lessons taught behind the glass-screen.

At the glass-screen the Tutor encourages teacher ability to describe what is being observed to make that public for others (a joint point of reference) and confidence to reveal to others what they think this means, for example: in terms of the session emphasis or what the teacher who is teaching has revealed what she is thinking about for this lesson. The research showed that over time with less scaffolding by the Tutor the teachers managed ‘replaying’ and ‘interpreting’ (See: 5.3). The teachers said that they knew that they were expected to articulate and add on to what others were saying, including being more interpretive, even if this was challenging, and that they did this more when they were more confident in the group (their social relationships and interactions).

Therefore the Tutor not only scaffolded the teachers’ knowledge (use of RR language which is not the focus of this study) but created the social environment for the different opinions (voices) to be heard. This study revealed that from the teachers’ perspective comparing oneself with others is the most important sub-theme in self-regulation. This includes both the teaching actions and the teachers’ opinions
in the reality of teaching, which was commented upon as making RR training authentic.

It is particularly important for the Tutor to scaffold the social environment for the follow-up discussion, so that teachers talk and the positive remarks are emphasised when teachers who teach the lessons behind the glass-screen are essentially asking: ‘how am I going?’ with suggestions for ‘where to next?’ embedded in a receptive learning context. RR teachers receive useful feedback about ‘where to go next’ designed to take them forward in ways that they could learn how to problem-solve and regulate their own actions in their schools. Jade was adamant that if you teach, you have to have feedback, and you have to want to improve. However, whilst the teachers want the feedback they do not want to in Diane’s words, feel ‘wounded for their efforts’. The ‘words’ make a difference (Johnston, 2004). How feedback is directly linked to examples from the lesson makes the feedback immediately accessible to the teacher who taught, rather than being the recipient of vague comments. The Tutor therefore has a role in scaffolding the social context and the language interactions in which giving feedback occurs, that includes shaping a positive emotional environment (Schultz & Perun, 2007).

The teachers’ role is to be active participants in the social interactions, which needs to be understood by them and evaluated collaboratively. Whilst the teachers consider ‘where am I going?’ ‘how am I going?’ and “where to next?” (Timperley & Hattie, 2007) in their teaching and give fellow teachers feedback, the same questions can apply to social interactions in RR teacher training sessions: where are we going? how are we going? where are we going next? as a joint social ‘emphasis’ with content ‘emphases’ for sessions. The teachers’ role is to contribute co-operatively. Tutor scaffolding of people who do not contribute much, or who are reticent (unsure, not confident) involves Tutor skill just as the teachers in the classroom find the opportunities for all children, including the least able to be leaders in discussions and encouraged by their classmates (Meyer & Turner, 2007).

Actively observing with peers at the glass-screen was highly significant in the teachers’ learning because the teachers could compare themselves to others who
were learning alongside them. They recognised this was an experience where “you
don’t always get it right.” However, they expressed the view that observation without
discussion would not have been useful for their learning. The teachers said that by
hearing other people’s interpretations they got feedback that informed their own
thinking. This feedback brought to their attention what they may not have attended to
or thought of, and it helped clarify their understanding of what they were observing.
The emphasis of the sessions scaffolded by the Tutor was an important feature of the
learning environment (making contributions) because it made their observations
easier to give than, as one teacher said, “Trying to do or think about everything at
once.”

The teachers said that feedback was essential for their learning and in order to benefit
from feedback you had to be open to considering the opinions of others about your
teaching and have a desire to improve. Feedback was said to be important for
transforming the teacher’s approach to teaching the next time she taught the child. It
is the feedback, according to the teacher in this study that remains in the teachers’
minds after the sessions for teaching the next day. While the observations and
discussions were significant for teacher learning, the teachers said that their learning
was shifted by the feedback they received because this was most memorable for
them.

To benefit from hearing the opinions of others and receive feedback (which was
useful when it was constructive and linked to a few things they could change)
requires active teachers contributing co-operatively. This means: willingly,
accommodatingly and supportively, for the others in the benefit of the group. It is a
social disposition to be encouraged and to take in to RR teacher training, on behalf of
the group.

In the future, as a result of engaging in this research, I am going to value the
teachers’ social interaction as much as content knowledge, and the improvements for
the lessons for children. It is through adoption of ways of socially interacting in RR
that the teachers develop professionally, in their individual thinking and how they
assist each other. Internalisation of the social interactions in the session builds the
teachers’ capacity for learning through independent group action that requires small incremental input of information and shaping of ideas near the end of the course and in later years by RR Tutors.

7.2.2 Principle Two: Scaffold them into talking

*Principle Two: Value language interactions between RR Teachers and the RR Tutor. (‘Scaffold them into talking’)*

Principle One refers to the social environment from which the rest of the principles unfold. Principle Two refers to language because language is the main medium of social interaction, although it is important to remember that communication between people includes tone, expression, and gesture, and conveys excitement, thoughtfulness, and genuine support. It is the main way the external social plane becomes internal thought (Vygotsky, 1986). The sense of language is more than the words, although it includes the meaning of the words (Levykh, 2008). The evidence of this study is that language is essential for the teachers’ co-construction of knowledge. The teachers understood that talking was expected of them for learning in the RR sessions to work; however they needed to be scaffolded into making their contributions. There was evidence of increased skill in contributing over the time of this course. The teachers were very aware of themselves as contributors to the language interactions. One teacher said that she found describing her observations of teaching easier than interpreting her observations in terms of literacy processing. Another said that in the discussions she sat back more and listened to the others but she did have opinions. Her cultural perspective was not to ‘blurt out’ what she thought without consideration. Two teachers in the group said that were motivated by wanting to be right. This was motivated by not risking shame and an attack of their self-esteem. These teachers recognised their feelings about this were based in their prior experience (Mary Lou) or culture (Maura).

Social-constructivist theory maintains that the transition between the interpersonal and the intrapersonal through the zone of proximal development occurs through language, from a sharing between peers and more capable partners, to a conscious
reminding and thinking about how to work, before what is being learned becomes automatic. In this way the learner is transformed with new ways of thinking. The importance of this principle in RR is for the RR Tutor to facilitate ways of having the teachers talk rather than talking at them, in a community of equals led by a RR Tutor who consciously adjusts the support during sessions. When teachers learn a new skill as they do in RR training they need a lot of support to develop their own voice. This includes the use of RR language for discussion in sessions as well as RR teaching. Caring and respectful ways of socially interacting are essential for the sharing involved in RR which occurs in a close and public way, and involves teachers in evaluating peer teaching when they give feedback. It is a different way of speaking, not only in terms of Clay’s theory and procedures but also in how to support each other. Therefore, encouraging talk is more involved than ‘just talking’. It cannot be expected to happen naturally or easily, but has to be carefully scaffolded by the RR Tutor.

The scaffolded support teachers give to peer-teachers so that they can develop their ‘voice’ is skilled and needs to be adjusted to the social interactions in the group. As a result of this study I think that teachers develop a voice when the social environment allows for their voices to be heard, beyond simply requiring teachers to speak, or nudging and prodding them to shape their understandings. This comes from teachers understanding the learning intentions of RR teacher training (how teachers contribute and learn in each session component) and the success criteria (Hattie, 2012) for teacher and tutor roles and their talk in each component through their constant evaluations. When intentions are discussed and supported across many sessions with genuine group review, and each remembering to play their part (tutor and teachers) the voices of the teachers can be heard more, and there are times quite early in the sessions that do not require Tutor input, for example: teachers giving each other detailed positive feedback, linked to examples in the lessons, and with rationales, and teachers given time to talk positively about their efforts, the child’s efforts and where they may be thinking of going next. This requires carefully scaffolded social interactions by the Tutor that includes acting to exercise moderation (if teachers veer towards too negative to focus only what went goes wrong, sharing with teachers the fluctuations of teacher learning and teacher interactions, and ways of guiding these towards success for themselves and the child).
In the RR lesson there are times for child independence (when the teacher takes a behavioural record of reading and when the child reconstructs the cut-up story) from the beginning of the lesson series, that allows the RR teacher to reflect on the child’s learning and similarly there are times within the social environment when teachers talk independently and the Tutor reflects on how to support them to change or lift their ways of talking. The teachers, in my view, often only need the social structures and parameters in which to display and develop their adult social skills as experienced teachers, mediated by the RR Tutor.

The teachers’ role under this principle is to share their ideas and their experiences. This study showed that for teachers to do this requires their confidence, willingness and care for their fellow teachers. The teachers’ view that: “You don’t always get it right” keeps coming up in this research. If teachers don’t have the social relationships that make it comfortable to share half-formed views, and the communicative skills to discuss them together, they may not talk about their ideas. Teachers are very willing to share their teaching experiences from ‘outside’ the RR sessions in the RR sessions. Opinions about their own teaching and the teaching of their peers ‘inside’ RR sessions needs to be heavily scaffolded from the beginning and then less scaffolded by the RR Tutor whilst teachers have a role in encouraging each other within the sessions. Without the teachers talking they could not get what they valued from the social interactions. As one teacher said, teachers were able to gain understandings that they had never thought of before themselves or through what they could never individually describe, particularly at the glass-screen.

As a result of having engaged in this research, I am going to think more about how to have the teachers talk more often and freely within the components of the RR session. Discussing learning with teachers does not seem to be divorced from pedagogical knowledge for working with children – talking more about what we do and why, so teachers know how to participate, and can compare their efforts socially with reference to collaboration can allow the teachers to be more self-regulatory (Bandura, 1990, 1991). I think being transparent with teachers about social intentions and social success criteria (Hattie, 2012) can assist teachers to enter into more collaborative relationships with the RR Tutor and each other.
7.2.3 Principle Three: Scaffold their interactions

Principle Three: RR Tutor scaffolded support that fades over the time of the course is essential for teachers’ learning through their social interactions with each other and the RR Tutor. (‘Scaffold their interactions’)

Scaffolding implies more than shaping the opinions of the teachers in RR sessions. It involves the RR Tutor assisting teachers with varied levels of support to eventually be able to operate their discussions (observation and follow-up) once ‘emphases’ for their observations are determined and understood, more independently, and the teachers knowing how to participate in the interactions. Scaffolding involves fading (Wood, 2003) and is probably my greatest challenge as a RR Tutor. Wood wrote there are many aspects of tutoring that can be difficult, such as ‘perspective taking’ (whereby if you are unable or unwilling to try to see the learner’s point of view your assistance may not be that helpful) and ‘self-inhibition’ (leaving enough space for the learner to demonstrate that he can carry out the task – for example, in RR teacher training, of talking at the glass-screen and giving feedback to each other afterwards).

“…. When we ask someone, politely, and they don’t do it, we tend to get annoyed, especially if we ask two or three times. If they still don’t do it, you tend to do what you asked…I think tensions come into play when, in tutoring, you suggest actions to the learner but refrain from doing what you yourself suggest…I think, in fact, self-inhibition is a fundamental problem in teaching…” (Wood, 2003, p8)

Timing, according to Wood, is another challenge in tutoring, and this is especially so at the glass-screen. How does the RR Tutor judge when the teachers need to move along quickly with their contributions and when they need time to thoughtfully observe or consider the feedback they will offer their peers? (Wood, 2003, p9) Tutor fading, for me now, has to be a deliberate response to teachers knowing more about RR theory, how the social interactions operate, as well being more experienced in
RR teaching. I have to think about doing it all the time, and test it to see how it works.

The RR Tutor did scaffold the teachers’ learning in the sessions by: linking new learning to teachers’ prior knowledge, directing their attention to what they needed to observe, explaining to the teachers and clarifying their misconceptions. The RR Tutor also highlighted aspects of the teachers’ observations: what was important for their teaching, what needed to be remembered to bring to the follow-up discussion, what they needed to remember, and what needed to change in the teaching. The RR Tutor further scaffolded the teachers’ learning by summarising discussions and contextualising (providing examples) in the follow-up discussions. The RR Tutor’s scaffolding throughout the session involved influencing teacher contributions, and in early sessions involved demonstrations.

Tutor’s scaffolding helped teachers become more skilled in communicating in RR from the beginning to the end of the course. The teachers enjoyed social interactions in the group discussion, however the teachers were not asked to reflect on the way the RR Tutor scaffolded those interactions as they were involved in the discussion at hand and it could have been distracting asking them to reflect on this aspect. RR Tutor scaffolding was strongly evident in the school visits. The importance of the RR Tutor’s influence was described by the teachers. This involved: giving direction in how the teachers might teach next, feedback about what they requested from the RR Tutor observations of their lessons, and reinforcement of their teaching efforts. The scaffolding on school visits developed to higher levels of teaching competency and discussion because the visits were scheduled regularly in the latter part of the year. The regularity of school visiting was important in building a trusting relationship between the RR Tutor and the teachers.

From the teachers’ perspectives the discussion with the RR Tutor after the visit was as crucial for their learning as the follow-up discussions were during the sessions. The visits provided opportunities for feedback that gave the teachers confidence to know how to move forward or improve. According to the teachers they benefitted from the RR Tutor being the more experienced person in the relationship, because
the RR Tutor brought to the teacher’s attention aspects of her teaching she was not aware of (highlighting) and provided suggestions for solutions that worked for them. The RR Tutor also demonstrated procedures or worked hard to teach children on school visits.

Scaffolding is clearly associated with Vygotskian theory and involves three characteristics: it is a social process, it is primarily mediated by language, and external support is eventually withdrawn because the learning process is appropriated by the learner/s. Therefore, it is the role of the RR Tutor to lead the teachers in their learning by carefully and consciously organising the scaffolding so that appropriate levels of support are offered during sessions. This involves scaffolding (including explanation and rationales) for ways of interacting during the session components, and expectations made clear for how the group helps one another take over more and more of the social interactions over time, with change from early to middle to late sessions. RR Teachers need to consciously act on valuing two sources of learning support in RR sessions shared by the RR Tutor. That is, from their peer-teachers as well as from the RR Tutor.

The teachers’ role as the Tutor works to scaffold their interactions is to actively participate. This is different to co-operative participation. Active learning is what the teachers require and encourage in the children from the beginning of their RR lessons, with passivity considered to be problematic. Learned helplessness is a characteristic of struggling learners. Clay wrote:

“Most children respond to most teaching in active ways. They search for the links between the items, they begin to thread the items together, putting letters into words, words into sentences, and they make new discoveries. They operate on print as Piaget’s children operated on problems, searching for relationships, and they find some order in the complexity of print. Their active minds are making discoveries and they even direct their minds to things that their teachers’ programmes do not stress. … [whilst for]… poor readers …instruction has confused them more than it has helped them. As a result they often become passive, waiting for the teacher to ‘put the learning into their heads’. Reading Recovery teachers have to change
passive poor readers into readers who search actively … Two things help: they try out possible responses, and they learn how to verify their decisions.” (Clay, 2005b, p101-102)

The intention of the training experience is not to personally receive input but to actively co-construct knowledge with others, and over-time teachers can then continue their active interactions with one another, not only in sessions but also in opportunities (after the year of training) when they have visit one another to observe and discuss teaching of RR children they find perplexing (colleague visits). Two things that will help the teachers in their training year are: the confidence to try saying what they are thinking in an accepting social environment, and to be able to collaboratively search for new or different answers to their problems.

Understanding RR teacher training within a Vygotskian framework for me now, is more about developing independence in social interactions of the sessions and in the teachers using the meaning of the language of RR, as they come to acquire the content knowledge and specific wording of this specialist group, modelled by the RR Tutor and read in their course texts.

For the future I now believe that my role is to adjust my support of teachers, within sessions and over sessions, to lead them towards becoming an independently functioning learning group. It was not a conscious intention on my part to prepare teachers to independently manage their learning in RR sessions before I undertook this study. Now I think that my scaffolded support for RR Teachers in sessions should be continually and consciously adjusted to promote their independence in discussions around observations, and in giving feedback in the follow-up discussions, while facilitating this within the RR framework of theory, teaching and learning.

7.2.4 Principle Four: Value peer learning

Principle Four: Teachers learn as much from each other as they do from the RR Tutor. (‘Value peer learning’)
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This principle refers to the teachers learning as much from each other as they do from the RR Tutor scaffolding their learning. The teachers shared experiences of a similar kind and at the same level in their zone of proximal development as they are social peers, and talk from the same perspective, as learners and teachers in RR. The teachers share their thoughts with each other at the glass-screen and formulate those thoughts to share main ideas with their colleagues who taught in the follow-up discussion. In the “reciprocal teaching” model of learning through social interactions in a group setting, the students learn from hearing the views and comments of their peers when predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarising, as much as they do from the scaffolded support of the teacher (Glaser & Bassok, 1989). What this model does is make social through teacher modelling and child participation what are essentially internalised processes for reading comprehension. What the teachers are being asked to do in RR teacher training is make their internalised processes public for their social co-construction of knowledge which this research shows that they valued.

From the teachers’ perspective observing demonstrations of teaching at their level was important for their learning, for example, they spoke about comparing themselves to their peers and how this assisted their learning. In the follow-up discussions they provided contextualised feedback for each other by giving examples, using the RR texts as a reference and developing their knowledge of teaching strategies together. The interview evidence was that the teachers respected one another and highly valued the opinions of their peers and learning together.

When RR Tutors value training RR teachers as co-learners and a resource for each other they do this by recognising that the teachers relate to each other’s learning because they have parallel ‘zones of proximal development’ (ZPDs). The teachers are all learning in different ways. This means their collective shared experience is important for each person. Peer-teachers can understand each other well, including their anxieties about teaching behind the glass-screen. The RR Tutor’s job includes explaining and discussing with the teachers how everyone has the same feelings about new learning and encouraging supportive relationships that can reduce their tensions in teaching for one another.
When the Tutor value’s the peer-learning (learning through collaborative effort) the teachers role is to collaborate in partnership with their peers. This is different from being co-operative (helpful and supportive). Collaboration is based on positive social interdependence (when reaching ‘goals’ is dependent on the actions of others) (Johnson et al, 2007). There are two types of social interdependence: co-operative (positive) and competitive (negative). In positive social interdependence people need to perceive that their goals are socially linked. Then they promote each-others’ efforts. The RR training group operates on the basis of joint or mutual interest not self-interest. According to Johnson et al (2007) mutual interest is encouraged in co-operative situations through emotional investment in openness to be influenced by others. A group’s positive social interdependence is based on a number of variables including: mutual help and assistance, mutual influence, trust, and constructive management of conflict.

RR teacher training is about learning how to become a ‘RR teacher’, supported by a person who is already an experienced and effective RR teacher (the RR Tutor) and the author’s guiding texts (Clay, 2005a, 2005b). There is less opportunity for group conflict, other than considered and respectful differences of opinion in interpretation of ‘how the teacher is going’ and ‘where next?’ which involves debate based on two forms of ‘evidence’ (joint agreement about what was observed) and how to proceed (available in text form). Differences of opinion are to be encouraged, reviewed, and analysed. The teachers valued learning from each other – how they taught and what they thought about teaching because they expressed the view ‘you don’t always get it right’ and their aim was to improve in their teaching interactions with children within the parameters of RR teaching.

Clay (1982, 2009) wrote about teaching for one’s peers being stressful, that it forced the teachers to think about their actions, and that it is one’s peers who are most supportive if the lesson does not go as one expects. As a RR Tutor I am now consciously thinking much more about how to allay teachers’ fears engendered by teaching in such a public way (behind a glass-screen) and in contributing to discussions in a more relaxed way. To do this I think is not only about trust in the teachers’ relationships with one another, but how the RR Tutor can support every
member of the group by structuring the session in a way that what occurs and how it occurs is not fearful for the teachers. For me, as a RR Tutor, this involves explaining the intentions to teachers more, and my structuring the social interactions from the beginning of the course, in ways that involve each teacher, while following through on expectations by being prepared to wait and discuss reasons for reticence. I also need ways of managing the a-typical lesson that is understood by the group, such as ‘letting go’ or moving away from group feedback to group instruction by the RR Tutor (Timperley & Hattie, 2007). There is a time for feedback and a time not to give feedback.

The Tutor role is also to support the teachers and the group by other instructive means, for example: demonstrating how to introduce a book that is written in repetitive refrains, having fun with language, compared with a way of introducing a narrative text. To do this the Tutor needs to be prepared. On the table in the middle of the group are artefacts of RR teaching (books, letters, sound-cards, pens, alphabet book, and so on) that can be used at any time for Tutor demonstrations.

7.2.5 Principle Five: Listen to Individual Voices

Principle Five: It is essential to value differences of individual opinions and allow teachers to express them even if at the beginning of the course they differ from RR theory and practices. (‘Listen to individual voices’)

Valuing different opinions and voices involves bringing teachers from their varied understandings of literacy processing to a common understanding of RR literacy processing theory and practices, nurturing different interpretations within that theory, as well as RR Tutors listening to and asking teachers genuinely why they hold the opinions they do. In this study from the teachers’ perspective the teachers were respected in their opinions and they learned from each other. As Clay (1982) stated, the RR training course starts with the views, understandings and teaching skill the teachers bring to RR. The teachers in this study were clear that they liked having their opinions and their teaching approaches discussed, explained and clarified so that they could become more effective.
Theoretically, different views strengthen the individual teacher’s understanding in their zone of proximal development and this allows them to develop flexibility in their RR teaching. In social interactions in RR it is the Tutor role to listen to different voices, and pose problems to find ways of settling differing views into or in relation to RR theory, and teachers have a role in being respectful of different views, and of trying to incorporate different voices into general group understandings.

In RR Clay wrote that her literacy theory was about the construction of what she called “inner control” and children extending their “inner control” through their contingent social interactions with their teachers in a co-construction. This can be viewed as self-regulated internalization. Clay’s theory gives all teachers the opportunity to observe (from their current perspectives) and explore with their peers what their observations and ideas might mean for literacy processing.

Clay wrote: “Observable reading behaviour provides evidence of all the things teachers have always thought it did – knowing words, getting meaning, using a sense of story, and working on unknown words in some way… [and]… Such behaviours signal that, inside the child’s head, other kinds of activity have possibly occurred like: anticipating what would follow, searching for more information in print, self-monitoring, evaluating and correcting responses, linking to prior knowledge, lining up a new item with an existing general rule and perhaps extending that rule.” (Clay, 1991, p321)

Listening to all of the teacher voices as they come to understand RR’s literacy processing theory and practices does not change the theory or the practices, it just involves all of the teachers, who one must assume come to RR teacher training because they have a desire to learn more about it and to be successful teaching it. As a result of this study and this principle, as the RR Tutor I have to assume this, and not make assumptions about what people think without genuinely asking them about their meanings. I also need to be accepting of RR teacher learning fluctuating, because it is developmental and dynamic (Vygotsky, 1978). Teachers’ views and
understandings over the year are evolving. Thus, teachers may have an ‘interpretation for now’ (what they currently understand), or a misinterpretation that can only be clarified in a sharing and accepting group where they are prepared to talk because they are listened to. Similarly Clay wrote advice to teachers for their interactions with children: “Teach most new things by demonstrating slowly. Prompting helps when the child is more competent. Question the child when you need to understand what he is doing [thinking].” Clay (2005a, p38). Quite often the teacher’s reason of view may not be held for the reason I thought it was. The position is therefore: if I don’t understand I will ask teachers why you do what you do or what you are thinking about.

The teachers’ role under this principle is to be respectful of the opinions of others. Without each teacher understanding that their opinions, which teachers in this study knew were evolving over the time of the course, would be respected, teachers may cease to share them. This would be to their detriment and that of the group. Respect is fundamental for mutual support and collaboration (Johnson, et al, 2007).

As a result of this research as a Tutor I am going to listen more within the parameters of these tutoring principles of: creating the environment for social interactions, scaffolding teachers into talking, scaffolding their interactions with each other, and valuing peer learning. I would want the teachers’ perspective of their training to show less views like: “Sometimes I felt inadequate. I couldn’t always gather my thoughts and get them clear in my own mind. I needed more time.” (Jemma) Or, “If I get it wrong, I tend to close down and think I’m stupid. So I don’t really like saying anything… in front of other people… but as I was more confident in the group I knew they wouldn’t think that…they would just think that I was learning the same as them.” (Mary-Lou) These were two voices out of ten, but twenty per cent of the population, is a large number of teachers to be concerned about, which could be larger if we add Maura’s voice, who did not want to ‘blurt things out’ or ‘feel wrong’ either.

7.2.6 Principle Six: Include emotional scaffolding
Principle Six: Teacher learning involves the affective domain (‘Include Emotional scaffolding’)

The affective domain in RR child learning, although understood by RR Tutors and teachers, was never discussed as an influence based on research until the work of Lyons (2003) became widely known to the RR community. In this research it was shown that the affective domain is just as important in RR teachers’ learning. In the group situation the teachers felt for example that they were trying to do the right thing by the person who was teaching and in the discussion at the glass-screen. They spoke of wanting to give positive reinforcement and supportive talk for their peers. Some group members felt apprehensive and nervous when teaching in front of each other, and hesitant in the follow-up discussions. However, when they knew how to approach their social interactions this was helpful. One teacher said, “We were there together trying to improve each other and through that learn more about the whole process ourselves.” Another teacher said, “…there was a great collegial feeling of discussion and that people were contributing and supporting.” This made the teachers feel comfortable in contributing to the discussions. The affective domain is important in the work that teachers do but it may not be overt and therefore not readily observed. As a RR Tutor I need to be alert to and aware of the emotions experienced by the teachers as they learn.

Emotional scaffolding by RR Tutors and by teachers as they interact with each other offers the individual teacher the gift of confidence to participate (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002). Recent research agrees that affect or emotion is linked to brain structures (Lyons, 2003). Negative emotions such as distress can be influenced by new social interactions, such as speaking to a group and teaching for a group; with people one has yet to build trusting relationships with. Therefore, it is necessary to have a positive emotional climate in RR sessions to sustain the co-operative construction of RR teachers’ understandings. The RR Tutor has a leading role in nurturing the emotional aspect of the relationship between the teachers, and may need to consistently and explicitly encourage the teachers to provide the ‘gift of confidence’ to each other. The teachers cannot learn when they are under pressure, or when they approach teaching for their peers and discussing their ideas as “stressful” or a “nerve-wracking experience.” (Clay & Watson, 1982, Compton-Lilly, 2011,
In Vygotskian theory the affect and the intellect are inseparable mental functions in the zone of proximal development (Levykh, 2008). “The [learner’s] positive relation with a teacher or an able peer allows him or her to feel safe revealing what he or she does not know or understand” (Levykh, 2008, p97).

The responsibility of teachers under this principle is to build trusting relationships. The features of trust that were highly valued by the teachers are designed-in (macroscaffolded) in RR teacher training – constancy and intimacy. Constancy refers to the regular meetings (fortnightly) and intimacy (the group size of ten teachers and one RR Tutor). The sustained contact of the group and the managed social environment meant teachers relationships were personal and professional, for example Diane said, “we’ve had a couple of weddings, and children’s weddings, and a few people have had problems, and just sharing those things makes a difference.” Teachers having feelings of ‘mutual support’ was most influential in developing trusting relationships in this study. The teachers were aware that they were learning and therefore it was important to them to learn with people who are mutually supportive. The teachers were attentive to the idea that they were open and honest when observing and discussing lessons, and they also needed to be supportive of that person in the follow-up discussion. The teachers had an empathetic and compassionate relationship because of their shared experiences. Teacher feelings of ‘comfort and ease’ were identified as being important for teacher learning had as a requirement ‘risk-taking’ (teaching publically when you cannot predict the outcome) and sharing partially formed opinions. The teachers juxtaposed what they would not want to feel in a RR group situation: hesitant, uncomfortable or threatened. One teacher said this could come from ‘dominant personalities’ and if people ‘shot you down in flames’ you would not want to teach behind the glass-screen again, or come back to RR teaching.

As a result of this study, as a Tutor I am thinking more about scaffolding the emotions of the teachers by talking about emotion and learning, and not ignoring or trivializing it in any way (Johnson, 2004). As a teacher myself, ‘emotion’ is hard to deal with, and I would prefer to ignore it or get passed it quickly. I have observed emotion and distress (crying and shut-down) in RR teacher training in the past when I have been a RR Tutor (Australia in the early start-up of the intervention only –
within the first three years). I have also discussed emotion with RR Tutor colleagues, not only emotions of the teachers, but also our own. I am hopeful that the principles I am outlining here for myself mean that there is a positive emotional climate in my teacher training sessions for the teachers and myself. My view is that feeling less stressed comes from understanding how RR is designed for teachers to learn from their social interactions with each other, and that learning always fluctuates. This study therefore activated my comprehension of the emotional aspects of tutoring in the zone of proximal development (ZPD), categorized as ‘emotional scaffolding’ in the research literature (Roseik, 2003, Meyer & Turner, 2007). I have been more conscious that “Teachers initiate and sustain learning goals by scaffolding “positive affective classroom environments” through instructional practices… [Emotions are not simply motivational ‘add-ons’ or ‘afterthoughts’ – they are major influences in the initiation and shaping of goals and personal agency belief patterns…” (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p250).

Scaffolding emotions is linked to the interpersonal space the zone of proximal development (ZPD) in the Vygotskian framework (1978), where the teacher provides support as needed while negotiating the gradual transfer of responsibility of learning to the learner.

“Achieving the multiple goals of scaffolding during whole-class instruction, providing assistance only when needed and increasing independence, means inviting students to take risks publically. Furthermore, classroom-level scaffolding requires a broad context of trust and support for every student’s well-being…one of the greatest challenges for teachers, yet a necessary prerequisite for effective scaffolding, is creating intersubjectivity…” (Meyer & Turner, 2007, p245).

Intersubjectivity is more easily created in one-to-one contexts (the shared understanding between teacher and child). To be established in the classroom according to Meyer and Turner (2007) mutual trust, respect and communication skills are necessary to bridge the distance between expert and novice. These are
features of positive collaborative groups (Johnson et al, 2007). In this regard as adult-learners teachers have a role in being mutually supportive of each other, cognitively and emotionally, as they were in this group.

7.2.7 Conclusion

In summary, these six principles highlight a social constructivist nature of RR teacher training that values the co-construction of knowledge of people through their social interactions involving ongoing conversations. The structure of RR teacher training by Clay is for teachers to learn in this way, allowing for RR Tutors to encourage teachers to interact with one another. The critically important role of the RR Tutor is to scaffold the teachers into talking with one another by valuing and facilitating their participation in language interactions.

Central to RR teacher training is scaffolding by the RR Tutor. The purpose of scaffolding is to lead to teacher independence, not only in the field, but also within the RR sessions. This involves the RR Tutor in making adjustments to the scaffolded support offered, and encouraging teachers to take-over aspects of the conversations in components of the sessions. Clay’s expresses this view on independence for children:

“A Reading Recovery position on independent activity would be an activity the child initiates and carries out on his own. This is encouraged from the very beginning of lessons… Where teachers share and help to complete a task, the child is expected to carry out whatever he can do independently…[This] independence is not taught. It is an outcome of activity when a child controls a bit…and the teacher knows she can hold off that emphasis and move on to another” (Clay, 2005a, p61).

Similarly, RR Tutors can view the purpose of their tutoring as greater RR teacher independence in their social interactions within the social structures made available for them to learn in sessions.
Valuing and consistently supporting peer-learning is important in RR teacher training, particularly as it has been designed to incorporate learning with, and from others. From a social constructivist perspective people learn better through their relationships including those with peer learners that include different voices. Barnes (1996-97) was insightful when she wrote that the collective experiences and prior knowledge of group members enhance teacher learning. People bring prior understandings and knowledge, which in turn brings depth to the collective understanding of RR knowledge and practices.

Finally, ‘emotional scaffolding’ recently discussed in the literature in relation to teaching is significant for the role of the RR Tutor. People’s emotions from a social constructive perspective lie in social interactions with one another and are intricately linked to learning. RR teaching behind the glass-screen is a feature of what is a very successful approach to teacher education for the teachers, probably because of the proximity of the observers and the unpredictability of the children. However, the RR Tutor has a role in sensitively caring and supporting RR teachers in their risk-taking in a very public manner, which is not expected in other teacher training models.

RR is set up by Clay to achieve not only outcomes for children, but also peer-teacher learning through social interactions. Clay (1982) has written that the RR Tutor has a pivotal role in teacher training and support. These principles are based on my study and underpinned by Vygotskian theory. They might provide guidance for myself and other RR Tutors supporting RR teacher learning and allow this vital and effective professional development opportunity for teachers to enter into a dialogue with other providers. The critical core of RR teacher learning is that it is based on collaborative observations and discussion, within a researched literacy learning theory for children that is adaptive to new research (texts are updated regularly by academic consultations within an international community). RR teacher training has a less articulated theoretical framework. A social constructivist theoretical framework for understanding teacher learning assists me in moving forward as a RR Tutor towards an ideal where teachers observe teaching and discuss in collaborative ways.
Models and guidelines or principles (maxims) are useful for assisting our understanding, when based on theory and research: for how to approach one to one teaching interactions (Phillips & Smith, 1997), and for effective professional development (Timperley, 2008). Figure six is a preliminary model for bringing together all the elements of what I have learned conducting this study that has involved analysing what happens in RR sessions and the teachers’ perspective of their learning experience during RR teacher training, with the six principles of social interaction (above) involving the Tutor and the teachers’ role central to RR teacher training.

In constructing a preliminary model I am influenced by: Tharp and Gallimore’s (1988) model that shows four stages of the zone of proximal development for a teacher’s work with children, from social assistance provided by others (peer-teachers and the RR Tutor), self-guidance, to internalisation when evidence of self-regulation has vanished or when learning is beyond social control, and recursions back through the zone of proximal development when some information is forgotten or there are new environmental factors that require social assistance from others; Wood’s (2002) model which addresses one to one tutoring interactions involving contingent scaffolding (responsive to the learner’s actions), self-inhibition of the part of the Tutor (to allow the learner space to ‘go it alone’), and the contingency of timing (when it is more appropriate to assist than at other times), as well as adjusting in levels of support given from greatest support (demonstration) to least support (hinting) to no support; and the teaching principles of Phillips and Smith (1997) where teacher attention is directed towards the importance of self-regulation when interacting with children, leading the child towards independence through what is said and done.

This model (Figure 6) is specific to social interactions for adult collaborative learning in the RR teacher training context. As the RR Tutor I am guided by the purpose of the training, which is: to assist teacher learning in ways that they can become independent and flexible in RR teaching, within a clear understanding of the Clay’s theory (2001) that supports child learning and the judicious selection from many procedures (2005b) that which is most suitable for a particular child at a particular time, and appreciation and skill in guiding RR as an early literacy
intervention in their particular school settings, for the purpose of preventing literacy failure in higher grades.

I am now guided more by focusing on the learning of the teachers involving their participation and independence during the RR training sessions. During each stage of Tharp and Gallimore’s model there is “a steady declining plane of adult [Tutor] responsibility…and a reciprocal increase in the learner’s [teachers’] portion of responsibility…Bruner’s fundamental “handover principle”…” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p35).

The social interactions in RR teacher training occur around four main activities: teaching for one’s peers behind a glass screen, observing peer-teaching, discussing observations and RR interpretations with peers based on Clay’s theory, and the importance of feedback given by peers and gained after teaching for one’s peers. These are powerful ways of teacher learning. Teaching for one’s peers requires thoughtful teacher self-regulation in relation to the on-going responding of the child based on knowledge of how to interact within RR. Discussing what one is observing with peers and the Tutor makes the views of others available to influence teacher learning and how and what to teach when, and feedback information on how one is going and where to go next is a very effective means of providing assistance to the leader (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p54).

7.3 Limitations and Future Study

The limitations of this study are explained in 4.12 in relation to data collection (interviewing the teachers as the Tutor/researcher and dependency considerations between participants in a long-term social relationship). However, replication could easily involve sampling sessions across the duration of a RR course, asking the same research questions, using the interview questions, and analysing the data in similar ways, if researchers thought this was useful to understand RR teacher learning through a social constructivist framework.
The focus for future research in RR could change direction from research concerns about individual learning (child and teacher) to teacher learning in social groups, and change from concerns about language usage, or positioning RR in a social constructivist framework as a learning community, to concerns about teacher social interaction, teacher collaboration and feedback processes. Developing a preliminary model (Figure 6 above) could be a resource of further research. Furthermore as the teacher learning is tied to child outcomes it may inform professional development generally through the meaning of the social interactions.

The effectiveness of RR and the future of RR as an early intervention, used as a preventative strategy, are dependent on teachers and school principals, in today’s educational climate supporting self-managing schools and educational accountabilities. RR is a teaching intervention and its primary purpose in this regard is professional development. Clay has designed professional development for teachers around their social interactions (observation and discussion). In her last posthumous contribution (Watson & Askew, eds, 2009) Clay writes: “This book says very little about a) implementing effective interventions or b) teaching teachers, or c) teaching practices, all of which are essential for the success of any early intervention. The book’s focus is on children’s learning (which of course can never really be separated from these other aspects)” (Clay, 2001, p4). These are four areas for theoretical development, of which ‘teaching teachers’ has probably received the least attention in RR.

Further leading research questions could be to ask: “how do you know these principles have been achieved?”, and “how important are they to the teachers?” Answering such questions would involve observations in RR teacher training sessions, and interviewing and surveying of teachers through carefully crafted questions, across countries, by RR Tutors themselves and independent researchers. It is worthwhile research because of the unique contribution this in-service teacher training (rather than pre-service teacher training, in the main, offered by universities) can offer the area of adult learning and professional development opportunities.
This thesis began by me reflecting on the best ways that RR teachers become successful in their RR work with children. As a result of this study, I now think about RR teacher learning from a social constructivist perspective. It is evident that learning with, and from, each other is highly valued and appreciated by RR teachers in their endeavour of self-development as successful reflective RR practitioners. Clay reiterated in her work that learning with each other allows RR teachers to achieve what they could never achieve alone within the RR teaching community. She designed the RR teacher training course to enable teachers to learn through social interactions by embedding into the organisation of the course the structures that are inextricably based in peer interactions. However, to make these structures work effectively, both cognitive and emotional support needs to be provided to the teachers as they bring to the course a diversity of experiences, values and expertise. It is the role of the Tutor to carefully orchestrate the RR teachers' interactions and provide a ‘gift of confidence’ developed in long-standing trusting relationships to enable productive teacher collaboration as they co-construct their knowledge in becoming successful RR teachers. This can only be beneficial for the diverse group of young children taught in RR, as the learning experiences of RR teachers paves the way for the learning experiences of children.
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## 8 APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND QUOTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration</td>
<td>Refers to the ‘rate of learning’ (progress) made by a student. The RR student, from the bottom of the achievement group, must make learning gains faster than classroom peers in order to catch-up with average achievers. This is supported by daily incremental individual instruction designed by the RR teacher in a ‘series of lessons’, with instructional adjustments made daily and within lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity (lesson or literacy)</td>
<td>Parts of the RR lesson are called ‘activities’ in this research. Not to be confused with components of a session. Terminology used variably is ‘lesson activities’ and ‘literacy activities’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>Student status when he or she successfully completes a series of lessons and is recovered to the average of their class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>The topic of theme of a RR session. These are linked to literacy processing. For example: strategic activities, independence, teaching decisions, change over time. Suggested emphases are recommended for RR Sessions One – Eight in RR Tutor Information Guides. RR Tutor’s determine emphases for further RR sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Follow-up discussion              | Terminology used in this research for discussion that occurs after the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation and Discussion component at the glass-screen. The third component of a RR session. See Appendix: Session Outline.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass-screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidesheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery (RR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
discussion room. These are usually situated in primary (elementary) school sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Teacher</td>
<td>A trained RR teacher. In NSW this refers to one year completion of the RR training course and one year’s successful practice independently in the field. Completion results in registration as a ‘RR Teacher’ to the school system that trains them. In RR a teacher does not progress to become a Tutor or a Trainer. These are three separate courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Trainer</td>
<td>Academic and professional leader of RR for a state, province or a country. Oversees the implementation of RR at this level, trains and provides on-going professional learning for RR Tutors. Has completed a two year course: one year training and one year supervised in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Training Teacher</td>
<td>Classroom teacher (with recent successful experience in K-2 teaching) training to become a RR Teacher in the year-long RR course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery Tutor/Reading Recovery Teacher-Leader</td>
<td>Academically and professionally accredited person to train RR and support a school system implementation of RR in a cluster of schools or region or small school system. Has completed a two year course: one year training and one year supervised in the field. Referred to as a ‘RR Teacher leader’ in North America. The RR Tutor is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RR Tutor Information Guide</strong></td>
<td>Notes and suggestions given to RR Tutors during their training course to support their independence in managing a RR training course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Recovery Centre</strong></td>
<td>The site where RR teachers meet. The facilities include a teaching room with a glass-screen and a discussion room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RR Session</strong></td>
<td>Terminology used in this research for a RR training session. Teachers meet for sessions fortnightly at RR Centres over the year-long course. There are eighteen sessions in a course. In RR documentation this is alternatively called an ‘in-service session’. It is a session for previously trained classroom teachers; therefore the teacher is ‘in-service’, as opposed to being ‘pre-service’ (when teachers train at universities to become classroom teachers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Session Component</td>
<td>In this research parts of the session are called components. These are: introductory discussion, observation and discussion and follow-up discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR School Visit</td>
<td>The RR Tutor visits training teachers at their school site on 5-6 occasions during the training year. The school visits run concurrently with the RR sessions. They are referred to but not included in this research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRNZ</td>
<td>Reading Recovery New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRNSW</td>
<td>Reading Recovery New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes:

Clay’s Definition of Reading

“I defined the reading of continuous text as ‘a message-getting problem solving activity which increases in power and flexibility the more it is practised.’” (Clay, 2005b, p 103-104)

“I define reading as a message-getting problem solving activity which increases in power and flexibility the more it is practised. My definition states that within the directional constraints of the printer’s code, language and visual perception responses are purposefully directed by the reader in some integrated way to the problem of extracting meaning from cues in a text, in sequence, so that the reader brings a maximum of understanding to the author’s message.” (Clay, 1991a, p6)

Independence

“A Reading Recovery position on independent activity would be an activity that the child initiates and carries out on his own. This is encouraged from the very beginning
of the lessons in that the teacher never does anything for the child that he could do for himself. Where teachers share and help to complete a task, the child is expected to carry out whatever he can do independently and he knows this is expected of him.

Independence is not taught. It is an outcome of an activity when a child controls that bit of processing and the teacher knows she can hold off that emphasis and move to another… The teacher cannot ‘teach’ independence. She sets up fail-safe situations within which the child can initiate successful activity!” (Clay, 2005a, p61)

“Reading Recovery sets the highest value on independent responding, and it must involve risks of being wrong. Children should gain some measure of independence on their tasks at each book level, even novice readers.” (Clay, 2005b, p116)
## Appendix B: Audit Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Assigned Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/3/06</td>
<td>RR Session Three (video and audio tape) 3 hours</td>
<td>PO Video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/5/06</td>
<td>RR Session Seven (video and audio tape) 3 hours</td>
<td>PO Video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/6/06</td>
<td>RR Session Eight (video and audio tape) 3 hours</td>
<td>PO Video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/6/06</td>
<td>RR Session Nine (video and audio tape) 3 hours</td>
<td>PO Video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10/06</td>
<td>RR Session Sixteen (video and audio tape) 3 hours</td>
<td>PO Video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/10/06</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Jemma)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/10/06</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Jade)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/06</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Diane)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/06</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Maura)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/06</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Belinda)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/07</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Mary-Lou)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/07</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Shelley)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/07</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Tracey)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/07</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Maria)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/1/07</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (Lara)</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assigned codes:**

SSI – Semi Structured interview
PO - Participant observation (video and audio)
10 APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Semi-structures Interview Questions

Q1. In this course you have observed teaching with the group, discussed teaching in a group, read texts, how important was it for you to learn with other people?

Q2. a) Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the observations of two lessons at the screen?

Q2. b) When you learn you know that you think about things, analyse things and you also have some feelings. Tell me, how did you feel during discussions at the screen?

Q3. a) Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the discussion following the teaching?

Q3. b) How did you feel during discussions of lessons after the observations?

Q4. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of teaching for your peers?

Q5. Did you discuss your learning in RR with other people outside the session? Explain.

Q6. When you come to teach the next day or even maybe later on, or when you have a tricky situation, do you feel that what was discussed in the group, or with the Tutor, or what you read in your texts comes to your mind?

Q7. When you leave RR training and move into independent practice in the field what do you think will influence your thinking?

Q8 Think about me working with you at the school. How did you get the most out of this kind of learning?

Q9 How did you feel during your discussions with the Tutor on school visits
APPENDIX D: TEACHER REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Teacher wrote for 5 minutes immediately after the follow-up discussion (Sessions 2-17)

Response was to the following stimulus questions:

a) What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?

b) How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about one particular child?
APPENDIX E: EXAMPLE –
TEACHERS REFLECT ON RR SESSION CONTENT

The example analysis below shows the topics the teachers reflected on, their written reflections, and traces the reflections to the verbal transcription of the RR session. It shows that the development of teacher content knowledge is inextricably linked with the RR session interactions.

Session Seven Data Analysis: Reflections and Transcriptions

A) Topic: Magnetic letters can be used for explicit demonstrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant reflections:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria: Mary-Lou’s use of three words with etc brought home to me the problem I am having with E doing the same thing with have, help, has etc. I have tried to explain about searching to her and will make it more explicit with the use of words in magnetic letters on whiteboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara: From today I am going to go away to ‘think’… what I am doing with magnetic letters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example from transcriptions:

Discussion 2

Tutor: Can I ask you [about] the work you were doing on the whiteboard. Explain for us your rationales…

T1: My rationale is that she is confusing words that look similar and sort of like the initial letter of with and wish and whatever is the same, so I decided to give her words in her book that she had previously sort of like just confused, get her to look at the end of the word, so that she could see that it had the same beginning so that she’d know that there was a different part that she had to check.

B) Topic: When there is a problem students and teachers work at the level of word solving.
Participant reflection

Maria: Maura’s problem with the word level leads me to the levels of scaffolding…

Example from transcriptions:

Lesson Observation 1

Tutor: Where do you think he thinks he has to solve?

T1: The word

T2: Look at the word then goes to the meaning

Tutor: Yes that’s what he thinks, but what we want is the prediction of meaning and then the checking of visual information. He should always be predicting the meaning first.

C) Topic: Scaffolding student problem solving involves starting with the more open prompting and gradually restricting the degree of freedom.

Participant reflection:

Maria: Maura’s problem with the word level leads me to the levels of scaffolding (diagram ) to make use of this more.

Examples from transcriptions:

Lesson Observation 1

Tutor: If you’re going to prompt for independence what is the most open thing you can say?

T1: Try that again and think what would make sense.

Tutor: OK, if that’s not going to help him, you could say ‘try that again and think what would make sense and say the first part. And if that does not help you’re going to have to say the first part and the last part. You don’t have a series of things to say.

Discussion 1
Tutor: When I do this triangle for you (in the air) it’s a scaffold.

Tutor: You say a prompt and it doesn’t work, then what do you do?

T2: Tell them.

Tutor: We’re going to have a series of things to say. So what I would like you to think when you go away from here today is, I will say the broadest thing first, then I will restrict it, then I will restrict it…You should be able to do it in three.

T3: Three prompts.

Tutor: If you can’t get it in three you’ll have to say I lost this battle…but at least I don’t want you to give up on the first try.

D) Topic: Independent problem-solving by the student is of key importance in RR.

Participant reflection:

Maura: The key understanding of RR is the importance of independence.

Example from transcriptions:

Introduction

Tutor: But first of all we need to think about the key understandings of RR... can you remember what it was? (pause). Independence. So we are working with children, not so they are going to be with us forever, but so that we are going to make it so that they can operate in the middle of their classrooms. What does that mean?

T1: They can problem-solve

T2: They can monitor

Tutor: They have to know what to do without being prompted. This takes us to what the discussion is about today…it’s about independence.
E) Topic: Independence is facilitated by teacher wait-time (waiting to give the student time to respond to their problems).

Participant reflection:

*Jade: Still need to build ch’n independence, need to work on wait-time…*

Examples from transcriptions:

*Introduction*
Tutor: Quite often children don’t get the opportunity to notice mistakes and they don’t get the opportunity to self correct and it seems that they don’t get the opportunity to become independent, and why do you think they might not?
T1: *Because we jump in.*
Tutor: One of the things in a good tutor is wait-time.

*Discussion 1*
Tutor: If you are a teacher butting in all the time, their longest utterance is probably ‘yes’, ‘no’…but *if you’re a teacher that has good wait-time,* and creates a conversation, you are getting longer and longer utterances.

F) Independence is facilitated by explaining to students why they need to act in certain ways.

Participant reflection:

*Jade: …need to explain to child why they must do the things I am telling them to.*

Example from transcription:

*Lesson Observation 1*
*(Observing work with magnetic letters)*
Tutor: Do you think this would be a useful strategy for him to know about?
Group response: *Yeah.*
Tutor: OK. *How does he know it’s useful?*
T1: *He doesn’t.*
Tutor: No, because no-one has ever told him why. We have children who we dance around lessons… and they never have any idea as to why.

G) Topic: Independence is facilitated by teaching students how to problem-solve

Participant reflection:

Belinda: I need to be looking at what I am doing/saying that is helping my children to be independent. I need to examine what I am doing that shows them how to do what they need to do to become independent. What I am not doing that I need to do is to support the children to be independent. I need to know the book!

Examples from transcriptions

Introduction
Tutor: It is our job to teach for strategic activity, not for items of knowledge, that means we are to teach children how to do things…it’s always how to…I’m going to teach you how to do this, how to drive a car, how to wash the dishes, how to make your bed, how to do it, so that then you will be able to do it by yourself.
Tutor: How to monitor his reading and message making because he was taught how to… children won’t do it necessarily unless they are taught how to… so we don’t just sit there and wait for it to happen.

Introduction
Tutor: On this page …are all the aspects of story production that the child has to control. Independent control of all those aspects for this lesson series to be discontinued. They have to know how to think of an idea...how to construct a message orally, how to search for ways to record it, how to monitor their message production that they’re involved in. How to check that message is the one they thought they wrote. So if you want to put how to in front of every one of them you know what it is that you’re teaching that child to do, to be independent.

Lesson Observation
Tutor: What is our job? To help him to become independent!
T1: So he knows the how tos.
Tutor: Does that involve not doing anything?

Group: No.

Tutor: It means showing him how, all the time, consistently showing him how.

H) Topic: Oral language development is a feature of RR teaching.

a) Oral language is developed during the conversation before writing.

Participant reflections:
Maura: For story writing create a conversation before starting to write.
Jade: Work on building oral language through writing.
Jemma: The need to develop oral language though conversation…
Diane: I learnt today the importance of conversation. It has particular importance for me when I think of W. His oral language is poor so I have to have some ideas on how to work with him. He has improved though. Of all the children I need him to converse with me.

Example from transcriptions:
Discussion 1:
Tutor; Why do we have the conversation?
T1: So they know the focus of what they want to write about.
Tutor: Not for the story per se
T2: For their oral language.
Tutor: It’s to develop their oral language because out of their oral language will come what they can write about.

b) Oral language development leads to more complex sentences to write

Participant reflection:
Jemma: The need to develop oral language though conversation in order to prompt for more complex sentences. Lachlan writes well because this has developed quickly but Hannah needs more work on this activity.
Example from transcriptions:

**Discussion 1**

Tutor: … what I suspect is happening is that the kids can say fabulous things and then they write ‘I rode my bike’. So the link for us is to get them [sentences] from their oral language and capture that in their written language.

* T1: Because we often cut them off because we think they can’t write that.

Tutor: We go for the simple things … so what we are suggesting is how we can shift oral language and how we can come to have a more complex sentence.

**Lesson 1**

* T1: One thing she wanted was a complex sentence.

Tutor: Where do you get a complex sentence from?

* T2: Join two simple sentences.

Tutor: The development of the child’s oral language. If you think it’s just getting a story… well, wrong… you’re developing the kid’s oral language and from that you can get a complex sentence can’t you?

**c) Oral language utterances by the student are to be recorded by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant reflection:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Jade:</em> Start recording the longest utterance.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example from transcriptions:

**Discussion 1**

* T1: …this little boy just managed to make a simple sentence.

* T2: It was his longest utterance.

Tutor:…have you been writing down the children’s longest utterance throughout the lesson series?

* T1: No.

Tutor: Well, you better write that down, something like once a week. Now if you have a teacher who’s butting in all the time, their longest utterance is probably ‘yes’, ‘no’ ‘uh’… but if you’ve got a teacher who has good wait-time, and creates a
conversation, you are getting longer and longer utterances… From time to time what you need to do is write down the sentence that the child wrote and compare it with the utterance…

d) Oral language development is facilitated by teachers creating a conversation with the student.

Participant reflection:
Maura: For story writing create a conversation before starting to write.

Example from transcriptions:

Lesson Observation 1
Tutor: What is your role? Your role is to create a conversation. Is this a conversation?
T: No.
Tutor: What is the difference? What is this?
T1: It’s like asking questions.
T2: It’s hard to do quickly.
Tutor: What do you do to create a conversation with anybody quickly?

Discussion 1
T1: We talked about creating a conversation.
Tutor: Go down [the page] procedure for eliciting a story. You’ve got to give some prior thought to what it’s going to be…

Discussion 1
Tutor: Tell me what creates means?
T1: Something from noting.
Tutor: You bring it forth, is that to create?
T2: Yes
Tutor: What else could it be?
T3: Initiate.
Tutor: It’s more than initiate…you build it, you sustain it.
T1: You bring it into being, you put it out there
Discussion 1
Tutor: How on earth do you create a conversation?
T1: You ask a question...
Tutor: I don’t think it’s ask a question…
T2: Genuine questions
Tutor: …it could be a genuine question, what else could it be?
T3: A mutual topic
Tutor: How long have you been with this child?
T4: 11 weeks.
Tutor: Do you know them? Do you do things in common? Do you know what happens in their classroom?

Discussion 1
Tutor: What is a conversation? It’s speaking and listening right? The biggest problem we have is that teachers don’t listen to kids, they just want to get through their lesson…
Tutor:…there were a lot of questions, you see? …It’s about saying ‘gosh there are lots of interesting rules in football aren’t there? I saw this happen and this happen…and….’ He’s invited in to something you have created.

e) Oral language conversation is worked naturally into the lesson

Participant reflection:
Lara: During my visit by C… and since I have tried to develop my skills at creating a conversation and working this naturally into the lesson the moment we walk away from the magnetic board (even as he enters the room).

Example from transcription:
Lesson Observation 1
Tutor: Where does your conversation with the child start for writing?
T1: When they come in the door.

Discussion 1
It’s about saying ‘gosh there are lots of interesting rules in football aren’t there? I saw this happen and this happen…and….’ He’s invited in to something you have created.

I) Topic: Using meaning as a source of information (cues) is important in problem-solving

Participant reflection:

Tracey: Reading for meaning. I am going to work really hard in ensuring that my children are able to use all the skills in order to problem-solve and read for meaning.

Lesson Observation 1
Tutor: What did she say he has to do? She said he has to read for meaning. Is he reading for meaning?
T: No.
Tutor: Listen to see if she’s teaching him for that…Where do you think he thinks he has to solve?
T1: The word.
T2: Look at the word then does the meaning.
Tutor: Yes that’s what he thinks, but what we want is the prediction of meaning and then the checking of visual information. He should always be predicting meaning first.
T1: I think it’s the same for all of us, getting that meaning activity going.
Tutor: If it’s not meaningful is it reading?
T1: No

Lesson Observation 1
Tutor: What do you think is a common area of language that teacher’s focus on?
T1: The word level.
Tutor: So the idea is to possibly take yourself back to where she knows she should be which is reading for meaning and comprehension.
J) Topic: Reading for meaning involves re-reading when the student makes an error in order to predict possible words and then check visual information (cues)

Participant reflection:
Maura: To read for meaning they must re-read to predict and check visual information.

Example from transcription:

Discussion 1
Tutor: …what’s the main thing to talk about?
T1: Reading for meaning...
T2: Re-read. He needs to re-read instead of trying to work it out at the word level. You need to go back and re-read the sentence to get the meaning.
Tutor: To predict the meaning and then check the visual information. So why is it difficult for him?
T2: Because he’s just stopping at the word.
T3: And he’s not thinking of meaning.

Lesson Observation 2
Tutor: You see, quite often the kids think they’re working on their problem and they’re not, the error came before…Did you notice that?
T: Yeah.
Tutor: So definitely if they re-read they’re going to pick up where their problem was.

K) Topic: Re-reading by the student should be self-initiated.

Participant reflection:
Tracey: They are re-reading, some only through prompts, but I am slowly fading out.
Example from transcription:

**Lesson Observation 1**

T1: He puts his finger on it.

Tutor: Right.

T1: *He doesn’t re-read.* He just keeps looking at the word.

L) Topic: Reading for meaning involves the student in listening to himself in order to monitor his meaning making.

Participant reflection:

Tracey: *I need to especially work on helping the child understand that they listen to themselves.*

Example from transcription:

**Lesson Observation 2**

Tutor: Now what’s going to be really important for him is to *hear the language* …while he’s doing it [reading], what’s he going to need to do? It’s more than just re-reading.

T2: Think about the story.

T1: *Listen* to himself.

Tutor: Think about the story, *listen* to himself, always be active, never stop.

M) Topic: Teachers need to have analysed how the student has responded in order to prompt for appropriate student action.

Participant reflection:

Tracey: *You have to analyse what the child has done in order to use the correct prompts.*

Example from transcription:

**Discussion 2**

Tutor: It’s up to you. You have to *analyse what the child did in your head before you say anything.*
T1: You have to do it quickly.
Tutor: That’s the same as what you are asking them to do.
Tutor: So, you’ve got to have a mind like a running record haven’t you?

N) Topic: Teachers select a prompt to action that will help the student solve the word

Participant reflection:
Mary-Lou: Look at the prompts and analyse the error to choose the prompt that supports the strategic activity required to solve the word.

Example from transcription:
Discussion 2
Tutor: So, if you just leap in and say anything, what happens to the processing system?
… so you’ve put a little spanner in the works, and she thinks she’s not doing that when she is doing that and she’s not doing something else.
T1: She just has to check the ends.
Tutor: So what you say has to be something that’s going to get her there very quickly. It has to be pertinent for what she needs to do.
T2: And you run the risk of really breaking down a link that she’s made that’s a good link. It’s been corrupted by what you say.
Tutor: And talk about losing confidence in herself. If …someone tells you to do something you were doing, you’d think, oh my gosh, am I doing that? I don’t know what I’m doing!

O) Topic: Teachers need to work on knowing their choices of prompts for student action

Participant reflection:
Lara: From today I am going to go away and to think and work on my prompts.

Example from
Tutor: So what is the best thing to say?...I know you are grappling with prompts, but any prompt will not do it. Try that again and think what makes sense, sounds right and looks right. That might help but she’s tried that. Check the ends of words! Can you see that? You’ve got to bring it down…What do you get out of that one example of teaching?

T1: It’s so crucial what you say.

**Lesson Observation 1**

Tutor: If you’re going to prompt for independence what is the most open thing you can say?

T1: Try that again and think what would make sense?

Tutor: OK, if that’s not going to help him? You could say Try that again and think what would make sense and look at the first part. OK? And if that doesn’t help him you say, well you’re going to have to say the first part and the last part. What I am trying to say …is that I’ve noticed in your teaching that you don’t have a series of things to say.

P) **Topic: Prompts stimulate strategic activity**

**Participant reflection:**

*Jemma: Prompts stimulate strategic activity*

**Example from transcription:**

*Introduction*

Tutor: So, there you are, you uncover the word and say: Check it! Run your finger under it. Pull it together. Does it look right and sound right? Now you see, the child has to make the judgment, it is not us.

*Introduction*
Tutor: You know, the child says something …and they’ve checked it, you say ‘Were you right?’ You have to ask children ‘were you right?’ …when they are right and you ask them when they are wrong. So they will make a judgment.

Q) Topic: Writing topics are not discrete to one RR lesson.

Participant reflection
Maura: …we could work on one idea for a few days.

Example from transcription:

Discussion 1
Tutor: Next day! You can still write about soccer.
T1: So you can still keep writing about the same thing the next day?
Tutor: Of course you can.
T1: is that OK?
Tutor: Why not?
T1: I didn’t know that.
Tutor: Is that a good idea?

R) Topic: The role of the RR teacher is to make the task easy for the student.

Participant reflection:
Maura: Today I learnt how to make the task of reading easier for children on RR.

Example from transcription:

Discussion 1
T1: …he switches off and doesn’t concentrate of what he is doing and I could see that was happening to him as we were going along. He just wasn’t interested in reading and that was it.
Tutor: So that’s one of the questions – how do we keep the task easy?

Topic: Knowing the RR Books
Participant reflection:
Belinda: I need to know the book!

Transcription
Throughout the session there was reference to the RR Books
EXCERPTS:

Training Course Objectives

The objectives of the course are that teachers:

- Develop their understanding of reading and writing processes
- Become skilled at using a range of systematic observation techniques to assess and guide children’s reading and writing progress
- Become competent at using specific Reading Recovery procedures
- Are able to design individual instruction that assists the child to produce effective strategies for working on text
- Are able to critically evaluate their work and that of their peers
- Are able to guide and report regularly on its operation in their schools

The Training Course

The Reading Recovery training course is a one-year apprenticeship course. This means that it requires full participation at all in-service sessions and daily teaching of a minimum of 4 children.

2006 In-service sessions

a) There are 18 3 hour fortnightly in-service sessions
b) Teachers teach children concurrently with attending in-service sessions
c) Reading Recovery procedures are gradually introduced and incorporated into the teacher’s teaching over the first half year.
d) The teaching is refined as the teachers work with at least 2 intakes of children (a minimum of 8 during the year).
e) Teachers need to be open to new learning and be aware that it is a process for everyone. This means that it will take at least a year to refine skills and understandings.
f) The training group professionally supports one another in their learning. This involves participation in discussions and critical evaluation of teaching.
g) The teaching requires the teacher to be systematic, analytical and well organised. The paper-work required is that expected of an intervention
that has credence at a university level. Teachers can expect to gain credits towards Masters Courses in Literacy in some universities.

h) Teachers teach for their peers, that is, the other teachers in their training group. This course is not based on modelling expertise, but rather on collaboration, as individual members of a group develop their own expertise.

i) After the main procedures are introduced into the teaching the emphases in in-service sessions are designed by Tutors to meet the needs of the individual group.

j) The teacher has 0.1 FTE available to them on top of teaching time for paper-work, travel and attendance at the in-service session.

2006 In-service Dates

VENUE: RR Centre

Assessment Training: arrival time 8.30am for 9.00am start

Session 1 February 2 9.00-12.00pm
Session 2 February 8 9.00-12.00pm
Session 3 February 10 9.00-12.00pm
Session 4 February 14 9.00-12.00pm

Initial Meeting for trainee teacher and his/her school Principal or RR Support Teacher at the RR Centre:
February 14 following lunch: 1-2.30pm

In-service sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 March</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>12.30-3.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9  27 June      12.30-3.30pm
10 18 July      12.30-3.30pm
11  1 August    12.30-3.30pm
12 15 August    12.30-3.30pm
13  29 August   12.30-3.30pm
14 12 September 12.30-3.30pm
15 26 September 12.30-3.30pm
16 17 October   12.30-3.30pm
17 31 October   12.30-3.30pm
18 14 November  12.30-3.30pm

GRADUATION: 12 December CEO Offices 12.00-3.00 pm

Note: Times or dates may be changed by the Tutor and teachers will be notified.”

APPENDIX G: READING RECOVERY SESSION OUTLINE
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Source: RR Tutor Information Notes (NSW, 2010). This is the general outline followed in 2006 when the data for this research was collected. Times of the components of the session are inserted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in Outline (see below)</th>
<th>Renamed for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Introductory discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Observation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Follow-up Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Follow –up Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inserted</td>
<td>5 minutes immediate reflection time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information below shows the suggested ‘guide’ for organising a RR session and the inserted adjustments made by the RR Tutor (myself as the researcher).

**GUIDE TO SHAPING AN INSERVICE SESSION**

“A general shape of an Inservice Session is outlined that can be kept in mind or worked around to ensure balanced quality teacher training leading to independent Reading Recovery teachers by the end of the year. Aim to establish the format as soon as possible in the year.

12.30pm     Informal interaction (lunch, coffee, catching-up, filling in child progress graphs, discussion with RR Tutor)

12.55pm     Prayer (ethos – Catholic School System)

1.00pm

**A The Introduction**

A variable lead into the session including sharing the emphasis of the session. This emphasis, prepared for in advance, builds around information from a
number of sources about where the teachers are at and where they need to go next in relation to the time of the year. Links may be made to previous sessions and visits, building on these.

1.15pm

II Moving quickly into introducing the children in flexible ways, particularly concentrating on what the teachers who are teaching have been working on. Crucial information about number of lessons/weeks, entry level in book reading and writing, and where the child is at now in terms of responding to the teaching is communicated orally and in a succinct way. Seeking help from the group is a major intention. Encouraging teachers to be self-reflective, both those teaching that day and the rest of the group, will improve the success of this portion of the Inservice Session.

B Teaching Section
The observation of and talking about the two half-hour teaching sessions with attention to careful timing (best in the hands of the group of teachers themselves)

Lesson One: 1.20-1.50 pm
Lesson Two: 1.55-2.25pm

C Discussion

2.30pm

I Acknowledgement (4-5 minutes)
Aim for the group to acknowledge the teachers for the opportunity provided by the lessons and to begin interacting with them, without tutor prompting, in the two following ways:
(In either order)

. the group and tutor provide informal supportive comments about the style of the teachers’ teaching (such as teacher-child interactions, appropriateness of choice of materials),
AND

. the teachers who taught are invited to share briefly their view of the lessons.
Move quickly into:

2.35pm

II Specific discussion of the lessons with each teacher (20 minutes)
Arrange for ten minutes to be allowed equally for each teacher. It is useful to have the group take responsibility for this timing. The teacher is sharing with the group (and the tutor) about the lesson – seeking their assistance.

The aim is for the group to dialogue supportively with the teacher who taught about the lesson and what was talked about behind the screen. All of the group, including the tutor, should be sharing comments, questioning, providing rationales, tussling with issues and challenging each other. Ensure teachers use Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals to support all their comments and that both reading and writing are attended to.

Suggestions for starting may include:

Let’s begin with the areas (questions) you asked us to think about. .
Where would you like us to start? (to teacher). 
The most interesting things observed were …

Can the group quickly bring _____ up-to-date with the areas that we talked about while we observed (_____ is the only one who hasn’t heard this talk.)

(Discussion of main ideas used in this research – 10 minutes per lesson covering reading and writing)

Research time finished

2.55pm
Inserted 5 minute immediate reflection time.

Follow on with:

3.00-3.20pm

III General discussion
Usually this is worked with the whole group, although here, as elsewhere, pairs or small groups may be useful for short periods only.

Issues would come from different sources e.g.

a) arising from each lesson
b) relating to both lessons
c) relating to children the group is teaching
d) that the tutor wishes to raise
e) raised by the group. (Earlier in the year this part of the session will involve introducing new material and may need a little more time.)

Move on to:
3.20—3.25pm

IV Implementation Issues
Most Inservice Sessions will include a short discussion by the group related to learning more about operating Reading Recovery. Topics such as the team approach, parents, liaison in schools, discontinuing children’s series of lessons, on-going monitoring, reporting to the school etc. are covered.

3.25–3.30pm (evaluation is built in to the session)

V Evaluation

Evaluation should be planned for and built in to every Inservice Session. To be effective it must be genuine and thorough, open and relative. It may occur spontaneously, it can be in different parts of the session and achieved in different ways throughout the year, but it must be a part of every session.” NSWRR 2010
APPENDIX H: EXAMPLE OF READING RECOVERY TEACHER HANDOUT

Handouts are given to teachers for early sessions and at sessions near the end of the course for, for example: ‘Continuing in Reading Recovery the next year.’ The example below of “Key Understandings” is started to be reviewed by RR Tutors and Teachers at Session Six.

TEACHER HANDOUT: EXAMPLE

Key understandings: Teacher Guidesheet Excerpts

“Individual instruction
Individual instruction allows teachers to adjust for the idiosyncratic learning needs of each child. Teachers are able to design each part of the lesson for the cutting edge of the child’s learning. No time is wasted on teaching what he already knows. A particular advantage is that it allows any appropriate attempt by the child to be reinforced immediately by the teacher. Literacy Lessons (one) p. 20.”

“Independence
Highest value is set on independent problem-solving. Children should gain some measure of independence on some tasks from the start. Independent activity is that which the child initiates and carries out on his own. One cannot ‘teach’ it. Situations need to be set up within which the child can initiate successful activity. Literacy Lessons (one) p. 44, p. 60.”

Reference: NZRR 2008 (in a draft form in 2006)
APPENDIX I: EXERPTS FROM A SESSION OUTLINE

RR Tutors have suggested session outlines for RR Session One to Eight. RR Tutor Information Guide: Development First half of the Year – A Guide.

The outline below is of excerpts of a suggested session for the components of the session in this research.

“SEVENTH INSERVICE SESSION

Emphasis: Developing independence”

“Introduction: Explore how the child being independent is integral to the notion of strategic activity introduced previously and essential when thinking about ‘discontinuing’.”

“TEACHING SECTION: Observing and talking about lessons

Continuing to strengthen understanding of strategic activity while exploring the concept of ‘developing independence’

- Examining behaviour illustrating the child is initiating learning and where the teacher is fostering it
- Identifying opportunities for developing further independent activity.”

“THE DISCUSSION

Discussion with the teachers

- Sharing insights gained from lessons about the notion of independent activity linking to the list on p.53 (One).”

Reference: NZRR 2006
APPENDIX J: EXAMPLE ORGANISATION OF A READING RECOVERY SCHOOL VISIT

Time allowed:
Maximum time at the school: 1.5 hours

A. Introductory discussions: 10 minutes

- Student background introduction
- What teacher is thinking about for this lesson in reading and writing (intentions)
- What teacher would like the RR Tutor to observe and why

B. Observation by RR Tutor of a timed 30 minute lesson

- RR Tutor takes detailed notes of behavioural evidence from the lesson to inform feedback and discussion

C. Follow-up Discussion (approximately 20 minutes)

- RR Tutor reflects the teacher’s intention for the RR Tutor’s observation and the RR Tutor’s observations
- RR Teacher reflects on her own lesson, and discusses with the RR Tutor possibilities for where next
- Both RR Tutor and RR Teacher refer to course texts to support views in their discussion
- RR Tutor and teacher take their own notes during the discussion.
- The RR teacher determines where she will go next

D. Further (approximately 20 minutes)

- Additional demonstrations requested by the teacher (same or other children) as requested
- Meeting with school staff (RR Support Teacher, Principal) concerning school RR implementation as requested or initiated
## APPENDIX K: READING RECOVERY LESSON FRAMEWORK

Literacy activities that develop over time in complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson activity</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiar Reading</strong></td>
<td>Books previously read in RR lessons – usually within one or two levels of current new book level. Read easily. “Volume of reading practice, speeded recognition, acquaintance with a wide range of texts, structures and meanings, orchestration of understandings, and the understanding of stories.” (Clay, 2005a, p48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Re-reading familiar books’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yesterday’s New Book</strong></td>
<td>“A behaviour record is taken of yesterday’s new book, that is now being read for the second time with no teacher input.” (Clay, 2005a, p49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Re-reading yesterday’s new book’</td>
<td>Teacher takes a running record and teaches after to sure up literacy processing. (Detailed analysis before next daily lesson).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnetic Letter Work</strong></td>
<td>Learning letters leading to speeded recognition of all shapes in all combinations and closer spatial arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Letter identification and breaking words into parts’</td>
<td>Breaking known words by letter, base word and inflection, onset and rime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of letter clusters in different words leading to work on analogies between words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity supporting breaking words to solve in flexible ways on the run in reading continuous text. (Clay, 2005b,p49-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>Child is assisted to compose a message to write based on topics that interest the child and working towards complex sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) ‘Writing a story or message’</td>
<td>Learning: directional rules, spatial layout, linking phonemes to letters, monitoring all aspects of the task, building a writing vocabulary, learning spelling patterns, leading to messages that are complex and varied, and independent phonological and orthographic analyses of words involving trialling words and breaking words into suitable chunks to write. (Clay, 2005a, p50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>Occurs during writing. Minimum of 2-3 words chosen daily for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ‘Hearing’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and recording sounds in words’ activity. Sound-to-letter linking becoming consistent and rapid in all positions in words, through developing links and sequential linking with the teacher supporting the discovery of inconsistencies in the written code. Use of Elkonin sound boxes. Progression from phonological to orthographic features in words. Teacher input of new features of English as needed. (Clay, 2005a, p50)

| Cut-up Story | Child reconstructs own written message written by teacher on a light card strip and occasionally cut into parts teacher determines (e.g. words, onset and rime breaks, base word and inflection breaks, etc.) Child monitors own meaning of story and checks at the word level, showing faster perception over time, problem-solving, and flexibility in the reconstruction including pulling words into phrases. (Clay, 2005a, p51) |
| Cut-up Story c) ‘Reconstructing the cut-up story’ |

| Book Introduction | The text is not read. Teacher and child discuss plot and vocabulary, and rehearse language structures. The child has a greater contribution over time and eventually learns many aspects of orienting himself to many new aspects of the new text. (Clay, 2005a, p51) |
| Book Introduction ‘Sharing the introduction to the new book’ |

| New Book | This is the first reading of the new book which has been carefully selected by the teacher. The child should be successful reading this book with a minimum of scaffolded language prompts and short demonstrations. The teacher helps. The child monitors, searches, discovers, cross-checks, repeats to confirm and self corrects. The new text helps to reveal what is challenging the learner’s processing system over time. Children at the end of the lesson series solve new challenges using multi-syllabic words in more difficult texts at speed, working with clusters of letters. Smoothly operating reading systems provide evidence of how the system is becoming self-extending. (Clay, 2005a, p51) |
| New Book ‘Attempting the new book’ |

Reference:

APPENDIX L2A: SAMPLE IN PROCESS OF DATA REDUCTION

Sessions Seven to Nine

Sessions seven to nine were midway through the RR course (18 sessions). The teachers had been introduced to the main procedures in their texts ‘Literacy Lessons Parts One and Two’. They were starting their second turns in teaching behind the glass screen. During Session eight Lara was teaching for the second time and during session nine Tracey was teaching for the second time (Session Three). In Session Seven the teachers were Mary-Lou and Maura. By this time on the course they had taught children in their own schools daily for 11-12 weeks.

5.2 Session Seven (audio taped)

5.2.1 Session Seven (audio-taped): Introductory Discussion.

Session Seven started in the circle with the teachers facing each other and with their texts books and notebooks on their knees. The session was introduced by the Tutor as being about one ‘Key Understanding’ for RR teaching: ‘independence’. The information on the draft ‘Guidesheet’ handed to the teachers was:

“Highest value is set on independent problem-solving. Childs should gain some measure of independence on some tasks from the start. Independent activity is that the child initiates and carries out on his own. One cannot ‘teach it’. Situations need to be set up within which the child can initiate successful activity.”


The Tutor asked the teachers what they thought ‘independence’ would mean in RR teaching. Lara said that children would be able to ‘problem-solve’ and Jade said that they would be able to ‘monitor’.

The Tutor then gave the group a handout with two quotes about ‘independence’ from the texts ‘Literacy Lessons’.

“Independence is encouraged from the beginning of the lessons in that the teacher never does anything for the child that he could do for himself ...the child is expected to carry out whatever he can do independently and he knows what is expected of him.” (ref: ‘Literacy Lessons, Part One’, p61)
"Reading Recovery sets the highest value on independent responding and this must involve risks of being wrong.

Children should gain some measure of independence on their tasks at each book level, even novice readers.

The goal of the teaching is to assist the child to construct effective networks in his brain for linking up the strategic activity that will be needed to work on texts, not merely to accumulate items of knowledge.

It is necessary to develop self-correcting by allowing room for self correcting initiated by the child. A teacher who only allowed for correct responding would not be allowing the child to learn self correcting behaviours.

Any theoretical position that includes self monitoring and self correcting as significant behaviours in reading and writing implies the existence of near misses, approximations, responses not corrected and sometimes corrected responses. The important thing about the self corrections is that the child initiates them because he sees that something is wrong and calls up his own resources for working on a solution. This is one kind of critical literacy!" (ref: ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’, p116)

After this reading Jade commented that child ‘independence’ would involve teachers having ‘wait-time’ (not jumping in to fix mistakes before children have the opportunity to solve them). The Tutor emphasised that teaching ‘for independence’ would involve teaching for ‘strategic activities’.

The Tutor linked the concept of ‘strategic activities’ to the long-term learning goals called ‘Predictions of Progress’ that the teachers had learned to write before starting a child’s lesson series based on the preliminary ‘Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement’. The teachers had written on the basis of a range of assessments what the children needed to learn. The strategic activities include: self-monitoring; cross-checking information; searching in word sequences and letter sequences to solve problems; and self-correcting independently, as they read continuous print (books).

The Tutor asked the teachers to refer to a section in their texts on ‘self-monitoring’ and invited Maria to explain how she had been using a procedure from this section, which had been previously demonstrated and discussed on a school visit by the Tutor. Maria, however, was somewhat confused in her explanation and demonstration:

Maria: I’ve been doing it to help them in what to expect at the beginning. You put your thumb over it and if you were going to say it, say it was ‘nut’ and they say ‘not’, put your thumb over it. You said ‘n’ what would you expect to see if you were going to say ‘not’? Oh, I can’t remember which way. You’re going to say you thought it was ‘nut’ but it was actually ‘not’. What did you expect to see? And they’ll say ‘u’. And you’ll say, well what did it actually say? And you move your finger away and they say...no well it wasn’t.

The Tutor clarified Maria’s explanation for the group, to which Maria commented:

Maria: I find it very powerful when you say that to them because as soon as you move your finger away they’re taken aback, you know, and then they hurry up and they get that next letter. What should it be?

The Tutor referred to the text to explain that self-monitoring would involve teaching the children how to determine whether they were right or wrong themselves (independence).

Tutor: Unless you are working towards that dissonance, self-realisation, that ‘I am not right, there is more work to be done’, we’re not going to have problem solvers and independent readers.

The teachers thought that the children they were teaching were not independent.

Maria: They just sit there and wait for you to tell them. They fuss and fuss around and it doesn’t happen. And Diane: we’re not waiting for them either, to have a go.

Maria: Well I’m just jumping in and telling them because I just don’t know any other way.

Diane: I’m the same.

The Tutor concluded this section of the discussion by saying that this was a year long course for them to learn what to do with different children and introduced the writing activity in RR lessons. The Tutor linked writing to independence through classroom practice\textsuperscript{11}. ‘So in the classroom what does the child have to be able to do?’ The teachers agreed that ‘independence’ was the expectation of classroom teachers, that they should be able to ‘have a go’ (an Australian colloquial expression that indicates the ‘initiation’ of some ‘action’ by the children using their current resources). The Tutor explained what ‘have a go’ might mean in RR, using ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’ (p59-60), to structure her explanation:

\textit{Tutor: He [the child] has to think these things: Can I spell it? Yes, I’ll write it. Could I think of the sounds in that word? Yes, I’ll do that. Do I know another word that sounds like that? OK, I’ll do that.}

\textsuperscript{11} RR lessons include reading and writing activities.
Do I know the spelling pattern for ‘ing’ or something like that? Yes, I’ll do that. These are questions he has to have in his mind because we taught him how to think that way.

In response to this discussion before the teaching, some of the participants reflected on their own teaching.

Lara: In want to say... I’m just getting used to the language and your expectations I’m already questioning myself at the end of each lesson now. Is what I’m doing, in this lesson, helping the child Belinda: To become independent? Whereas I wasn’t.

The Tutor’s social interactions in the introductory discussion were directed towards establishing knowledge prior to the lesson observations. The teachers’ social interactions were mainly in response to the Tutor questions and directions. The teachers occasionally built on to the thinking by their peers, such as the interaction between Diane and Maria (above) where the problem was teacher frustration when children do not initiate or do not have ways of initiating problem-solving, so the teachers tell the children the ‘words’ because they do not know what to do. There were a few examples of teachers repeating each other:

Tutor: So in the classroom what does the child have to be able to do?
Mary-Lou: They’ve got to be able to do it themselves.
Diane: Do it himself.

Lara said the language and the expectations in RR were different for her.

Tutor: Now you can see that in terms of independence, I think our job is much more complicated than we might have originally thought. So what is your reaction to that before we need to move on?
Lara: I want to say...just getting used to that language and your expectations.

5.2.2 Session Seven (audio-recording): Lesson Observations

The main characteristics of the Tutor’s role during this episode in the Session Seven ‘lesson observations’ were: to shape teacher knowledge in relation to RR teaching practices and literacy learning theory; to highlight what was salient in the observations and to link the observations to the teachers’ child introductions; the session theme/s; and RR knowledge.

5.2.2.1 Shaping Teacher Knowledge:
During discussion at the glass screen, the Tutor shaped teacher knowledge around: book choices (when ‘new books’ were selected); how children acted on their own theories about reading (e.g. trying to decode words at the point of difficulty); that reading in RR involved comprehension; that the ‘familiar reading’ activity was to be fluent and ‘orchestrated’; that the child had to monitor his/her own reading for error; and that opportunities for independent action involved allowing children to be wrong, so that they could detect their errors and correct them. In writing activities the main ideas were that: teachers were responsible for creating conversations with children to elicit ideas for what they were going to write about and the child’s independence in writing was taught through what teachers say in interactions.

Table 1: Shaping Knowledge Across Two Lesson Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main idea</th>
<th>Social Interaction (data)</th>
<th>Tutor role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are better ‘New Book’ selections</strong></td>
<td>Lesson 1/7: Tutor: Why do we need to suggest this is a better book? [than the previous book not read well] Tutor: [It has] More words. He can predict. He can use natural language. Reread and think what would make sense.</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children have their own theories about reading</strong></td>
<td>Lesson 1/7: Tutor: Where do you think he [the child] thinks he has to solve? Tutor: Yes, that’s what he thinks... what we want is the prediction of meaning and then the checking of visual information.</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading is about comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Lesson 1/7: Tutor: If you’re going to make a judgment [about how to assist the child] what is the first basis that you’re going to make it on? Tutor: That’s right.</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Familiar Reading’ is for ‘orchestrated reading’</strong></td>
<td>Lesson 2/7: Tutor: OK. In Reading Recovery there is no holding the child up for words in ‘Familiar Reading’... the purpose is orchestrated reading. It’s not to fix up error, because the error shouldn’t be there. OK. Can you see what happens? As soon as you focus on error what do you do to the process? Tutor: What else do you do?.</td>
<td>Directing (telling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The child monitors his/her own reading</strong></td>
<td>Lesson 2/7: Tutor: What’s happened here? Tutor: Why would she do that? (Observing the teacher say: That didn’t make sense, go</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interactions show that the Tutor mainly led phases of speaking through: questioning, directing the teachers’ observations, or telling, and explaining. In response to a teacher’s contribution the Tutor expanded or confirmed the teacher’s ideas. Additionally the Tutor linked the observations to the course texts.

Further examples of the data reduction process that was further reduced to summaries to form the story of what happens in RR sessions can be found on the attached
## APPENDIX M1: SAMPLE OF PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW CODING

### Interview: Jade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Raw data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category – input on learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the observations of two lessons at the screen?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher:</strong> Ah I think that that was probably the most valuable experience that we had, learning as a group throughout the year, and that same group continuously, to get to know each other and trust each other and that. It helps a lot. And … I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable. So even the lessons where you could see things weren’t going the right way, I think that was very valuable too because you can then look at your own teaching, like that. And, you know, maybe see why some of your lessons don’t go the right way. Or that you don’t get the outcomes that you’re looking for.</td>
<td>The teacher thought that observation at the screen was the most valuable experience and the continuity of the group membership helped for a context of trust. The teacher thought that observing at the screen precipitated comparing of oneself self with others or a self-reflective practice that is between the present and the past (–recursive)</td>
<td>Trust in the relationship. Reflection Co-construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And to see very good teaching behind the screen is also important and also very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading.

Tutor:
Can you think about the group setting and the group dialogue when you were watching the lessons, how did that help your learning?

Teacher:
Ah right!
Yeah that helps because it... just makes you clue into what other people are saying.

So, you know other aspects of ...you might be looking at something and saying ‘Oh, this kid hasn’t got enough visual [information] ’, but the actions of others in her learning.

The teacher thought that observing at the screen precipitated an awareness of quality in others in comparison with self and this shows the learner the way forward – to self improvement.

Shifting the ZPD.

Co-construction
Co-construction

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen draws teacher attention to other points of view (the other/s) a sense of co-construction

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen brings the an
someone else will say ‘Oh, I think this child, you know, is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about.

So there’s no point really watching a lesson behind the screen unless you’ve got that conversation going because… you’re not really going … you need to discuss it to learn don’t you? You need to…Well, I think you need to discuss your observations with other people…because their observations might be totally different.

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen makes the learner aware that there are multiple perspectives (understandings) of the meaning of an observation (event).
# APPENDIX N: EMERGING THEMES FROM INTERVIEW DATA

Emerging themes in relation to the theoretical framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vygotskian Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersubjectivity and internalisation</strong></td>
<td>Intersubjectivity refers to shared understandings between people at a particular point in time. It is achieved through social interaction and it is important for internalisation to occur. (The interpersonal)</td>
<td>Context: Observing lessons at the glass screen. You’re seeing something in action and you’re talking about it rather than just looking. It brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it ... it’s like watching television and you’re talking to someone when you’re watching television about something that’s going on. It sort of puts it more concrete in your mind. (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalisation</strong></td>
<td>Internalisation refers to the gradual transformation of shared understandings into individual internal self-regulatory processes. (The intrapersonal).</td>
<td>Context: What comes to mind when teaching in a tricky situation. When I’m teaching sometimes I kind of think, now if...was watching me, or if I was behind the screen in this situation and the lesson wasn’t going well, or whatever, what would they be saying? It’s helpful to put yourself in that situation in your own room and hear those voices. I think that you can kind of imagine what people would say in that situation, but only because you’ve been on the other side in the conversation, watching other people. I think the main voice is yours. (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and Development in the Zone of Proximal [Potential] Development</strong></td>
<td>It is the distance between what the individual can do with and without help. What the individual can problem-solve independently (actual development) is ‘the yesterday of development’ and the higher level of potential development ‘the tomorrow of development’ is determined through problem-solving under guidance or in collaboration with more capable peer. (Vialle, W., Lysaght, P., Verenikina, I (2000) <em>Handbook on Child Development</em>, Social Science Press, NSW Australia, 33)</td>
<td>Context: What influences your teaching the next day. You think how she did so-and-so, maybe I could try that. I’ll try this and see how it works, and that sort of brings you to go forward. You’re not stuck in one spot. You’re either going forward or finding something else you can talk about.’ (Maria) So it [teaching behind the screen] gave you the sense that ‘OK you’re on the right track for where you’re heading, so you can get better. So, I think [it’s] motivating the next day and the next week. It just kind of lifted you and pushed you forward.’ (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-construction</strong></td>
<td>Individuals construct their own learning with the assistance of other more capable persons in social interactions (through social relationships) in their Zone of Proximal [Potential] Development.</td>
<td>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen. I did actually look forward to teaching behind the screen because I knew something much bigger was coming afterwards... not that you got to watch yourself, but with other people watching they told you what their observations were. (Jade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Interaction and assisted learning

Co-operatively achieved success through social interactions lies at the foundation of learning and development and how the learner is assisted is a key feature of modern interpretations, e.g. modelling, coaching, scaffolding…

**Context:** How important is it for you to learn with other people

*I think that it is very important to have that contact that input, from somebody else that knows what you’re doing. So that you can then go forward yourself* (Maria)

**Context:** Teaching behind the glass screen

*You’ve got to be open to the idea that you probably didn’t do everything right. I mean everyone knows that they’re not doing the whole lesson correctly. That helped me because …I like people telling me I could have done better.* (Jade)

**Context:** Tutor Visit

*I guess just because it was my lesson and it was just me I knew I could take the conversation wherever I wanted.* (Jade)

**Context:** Other experiences to assist learning

*I know myself if something is demonstrated to me I learn it much better than talking about it. It would just kind of concrete it that this child could do better if you were doing something different* (Jade)

**Context:** The Tutor Visit

*Well the feedback. You would give feedback straight afterwards which is good. And that sort of carries you until the next time you come… because you take on board what you say and then try to do the same as I’m going along* (Maria)

**Context:** Other interactions teachers felt would be helpful

*I don’t think I saw you teach at all [a whole lesson] so perhaps that would be helpful. I could observe what you mean instead of just talking about it.* (Maria)

**Context:** Other interactions teachers felt would be helpful

*[Demonstration] would just kind of concrete it, which it did that time you worked with one of my students … it just kind of made me believe this child can do it if I just do something different.* (Jade)

### Scaffolding

Scaffolding refers to the changing quality of support offered by the more capable peer which is adjusted to fit the learner’s current level of performance

**Context:** Other experiences to assist learning

*I know myself if something is demonstrated to me I learn it much better than talking about it. It would just kind of concrete it that this child could do better if you were doing something different* (Jade)

### Cognitive Apprenticeship

Cognitive development is an ‘apprenticeship’ occurring through guided participation in social activity with companions who support and stretch one’s understanding and skill in using the tools of the culture.

Rogoff 1990

**Context:** Other interactions teachers felt would be helpful

*I don’t think I saw you teach at all [a whole lesson] so perhaps that would be helpful. I could observe what you mean instead of just talking about it.* (Maria)

**Context:** Other interactions teachers felt would be helpful

*[Demonstration] would just kind of concrete it, which it did that time you worked with one of my students … it just kind of made me believe this child can do it if I just do something different.* (Jade)
## Emerging Themes and examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the Relationship</td>
<td>Context: Feelings during the discussion after lesson observations</td>
<td>I felt a bit more confident because we sort of knew how to approach it. We sort of had discussed that. (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: What will influence learning next year</td>
<td>Communication with other people that know what you’re talking about I think will be very important and I look to that (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: Discussion after lesson observations</td>
<td>The group dynamic in that particular group was very open and honest. There was a lot of trust there. No-one would feel intimidated or whatever (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection - comparing oneself with others</td>
<td>Context: Observing lessons at the glass screen</td>
<td>I was sort of going through what I would do in that situation. Yes I do that, no I don’t do that, and that’s something I should do… I would be ticking off in my head points that I did while that person was teaching. (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: Discussion after lesson observations</td>
<td>Even when the lessons weren’t going the right way, I think that was valuable too, because you can then look at your own teaching like that, and maybe see why some of your lessons don’t go the right way (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting thoughts in your mind</td>
<td>Context: Discussion after lesson observations</td>
<td>…and when we come to discuss it afterwards it helps to solidify in your mind more (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen</td>
<td>It just concreted what was said behind the screen (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self validation</td>
<td>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen</td>
<td>I learnt that you can only do what you can do [laughs], (Jade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Context: Discussion after lesson observations</td>
<td>It helps you to clarify points you were talking about and things you weren’t sure of (Maria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self monitoring – detachment</td>
<td>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen</td>
<td>I would know on the other side of the screen they would be saying now why isn’t she doing this and why do you think she did that. So you’re sort of in two minds. You’re sort of looking at it from afar but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness to Change</td>
<td>Context: What influences teaching the next day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think how she did so-and-so, maybe I could try that... I'll try this and see how it works. (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: The Tutor Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And then the next time that you come hopefully I have moved on from the horror spot I was in from the time before (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: The Tutor Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you come in and say 'Why don’t you try this?', and you try it the next day and it works, and then it sets you off on a different track (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self belief</th>
<th>Context: What will influence learning next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been doing ... teaching for ten years and its so similar in this ongoing professional development... I just know myself that it doesn’t matter if you’ve been doing it for ten years there’s still a better way to do it (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Tutor Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m only still learning and I’m going to keep on learning and I think it would be pretty bad if I didn’t learn something... you’ve got to have confidence in yourself that you’re going to learn something and hope than you move on. (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving forward</th>
<th>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To see good teaching behind the screen is very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it. (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Teaching the next day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll try this and see how it works and that sort of brings you to go forward. You’re not stuck in one spot. (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Tutor Visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the next time you come hopefully I’ve moved on... like I’ve fixed that up and can go forward (Maria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-construction – involving others in your own learning</th>
<th>Context: Teaching behind the glass screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think you need to discuss your observations with others because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding learning in the ZPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Tutor Visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And you coming in a lot of the time for me, it just showed me that I was probably pushing the wrong aspect (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It just made me aware that in that case my prompts were on the wrong track (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But when you come in you say ‘why don’t you try this?’ (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…it doesn’t mean that just because you’ve been teaching them all that time, that the road you’re heading down with the student is the right road for the student all the time (Jade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An informed approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> Major insight you gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of the child, any little bit, any little thing, that you can look at and hear from them, or see, is very important. I’m looking differently at the child. I’m more detached. I’m looking more, not critically, but analytically I think. So being more analytical and more insightful about what they’re about. (Maria)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An emotive response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context:</strong> What comes to mind when teaching in a tricky situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to search back and see…mostly I just panic, and I need time to chew over it, but I think that time’s passed on. I think I will be slower to panic and more reflective. First of all I was ‘Oh God, I’ve got to fix this, like what’s happening?’ (Maria)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O: EXAMPLE OF COMBINED AND REFINED CATEGORIES FROM THREE INTERVIEWS

(Jade, Maria, Maura)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self to other/s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending e.g. ‘at the screen you clue into what others are saying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the other aspect e.g. ‘someone else will say…and that brings the other aspect to think about’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering different views, e.g. ‘their observations might be totally different’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning action e.g. ‘I think about what I’m asking first’. Considering own actions e.g. ‘I think about Am I going to have the right prompts?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking knowledge e.g. ‘I might go back to the book to have a look to see…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking evaluation e.g. ‘opportunity to show, ‘this is what I’m doing’ and ‘what do all you people think?’ ‘What does it look like from the outside?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self evaluating/comparing</strong> e.g. ‘In my head I was going through, yes I do that, no I don’t do that.’ ‘You’re comparing yourself with that person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting e.g. ‘I would know on the other side of the screen they would be saying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathizing e.g. ‘You’re also feeling for the person because you know ‘Oh God I did that’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Other/s to self** |
| Extending e.g. ‘it makes you think that little bit more’ |
| Reminding e.g. ‘it did help in the way that it reminded me just to go back to the book’ |
| Validating e.g. ‘Communication [is important] with other people that know what you’re talking about’ |
| Providing knowledge e.g. ‘…you get their ideas and you get their feedback and what it’s all about’ |
| Evaluating e.g. ‘Constructive criticism…[is] a different pressure, you can just discuss what you do, your observations’ |

| **Self-self** |
| Linking experience e.g. ‘I’ve discussed it a lot with teachers and parents of my violin students’ |

Co-construction is about constructing or building learning that involves two points of reference the self and the other in a dynamic relationship between them. It is a category with many sub-categories. This is because learning is being built in different ways by comparing, providing alternatives, offering points of evaluation. It is not scaffolding. Scaffolding is an act of tuition (tutor-learner). Co-construction is a dynamic occurring in the interaction. It is evidenced by the learner indicating that the ‘other’ through speech, action or word (written) is being ‘involved’ in their learning by themselves. The involvement is for different reasons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clarification</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge – course</strong> e.g. Discussion following the teaching – ‘It helps you to clarify points that maybe you were talking about and things that you weren’t sure of maybe.’</td>
<td>This category refers to speech or actions that make knowledge understandable. In the interviews the participants talk about what makes for clarification and this comes from the outside to the inside for the learner, i.e. through scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge – students</strong> e.g. Discussing with others ‘…it helps to clarify at any given time where they [the students] were at and what problems they were having.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Learner characteristics</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What you say you should be like</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-minded</strong> e.g. ‘just be very open-minded’</td>
<td>Learners by speech and action say and show characteristics about themselves that they think or shows that they are beneficial to their new learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self belief</strong> e.g. ‘…you’ve also got to have confidence in yourself that you’re going to learn something’/ ‘…you’ve got to have that expectation of yourself’ and expectation of the lesson series that you are going to achieve that level that you’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to learn</strong> e.g. ‘you need to want that feedback,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What you say you think you are like</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to learn</strong> e.g. ‘[I felt] well nervous, but willing to learn, willing to take on board what you’re opinion was.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief – change is possible</strong> e.g. ‘[I know] this child can do it, if I just put in something different.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to improve</strong> e.g. ‘I just know myself that it doesn’t matter if you’ve been teaching for ten years there’s still a better way to do it.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self belief/ Confidence in self</strong> e.g. ‘I think it would be very bad if I didn’t feel I learnt something.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief in the other (tutor)</strong> e.g. ‘you’ve got to have confidence in the person who is going to be your tutor.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledge change</strong> e.g. ‘I’ll never be the same teacher that I used to be.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acceptance of the views of others e.g. ‘they give you some feedback and I take it on board and I think it does wonders for my teaching.’

Take two viewpoints e.g. ‘It’s like you’re guardian angel’s standing there and you’re sort of doing it and then you’re thinking ‘Oh God she’ll be thinking she’s not doing this.’

Preparedness to trial e.g. ‘I do come back and try it on my children.’

Preparedness to change e.g. ‘I’m always glad to take it on board.’

Belief – how I learn e.g. ‘I know myself if something’s demonstrated to me I learn it much quicker than talking about it.’

Confidence in self e.g. ‘I’m going to keep on learning’

Emotions

Apprehension e.g. ‘…before the visit I do panic a bit. Is my child going to come to school? And ah is he going to, you know, be normal? Or is he just, you know, just going to do something on that day something that he doesn’t really do?’

Wanting to be right e.g. ‘…but then I don’t want to be wrong. I just don’t want to. You know, that’s why I hesitate sometimes.’

Hesitancy e.g. ‘I sort of wait, and then someone else says something and then I say ‘yeah, well that’s what I was thinking.’

Emotional response e.g. ‘…it is exciting to see from the outside …to see what’s happening’/ ‘I try to search back and see[but] mostly I just panic!’

What you indicate that you need

Need for validation/Acknowledgement e.g. ‘…when you come out you need that feedback.’

Familiarity makes for ease e.g. ‘The first time I didn’t actually enjoy teaching behind the screen but after that initial one I did.’

Need for support e.g. ‘…the tutor, the other teachers, my peers, all would be there to support me so I think I should be okay.’

Evaluation e.g. ‘…your teaching is for their benefit as well as your own, and when you come out you need feedback.’

Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflecting about:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Others (adults)</td>
<td>the present (viewing, listening, talking, acting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Self</td>
<td>the past (saw, heard, they did)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection is evident of thinking that involves taking what is seen or talked about in the present and relating it to the past and it can be
**Other/s present > Self past**

**Seeing and comparing**

‘I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable. You could see things weren’t going the right way, I think that was very valuable too because you can then look at your own teaching, like that’

‘…when other people talk about certain things you put yourself in that situation and say ‘I’ve had a child like that, or that’s happened to me’ so you learn.’

**Comparing**

‘Well, in my head I was sort of was going through…Yes I did that, no I don’t do that, and that’s something that I should do.’

**Other/s past > self-present**

**Hearing (other voices) > own actions**

‘I would feel very confident in knowing that there’s a way … those voices saying [to you] … you know just like the prompts even coming into your head …’

**Self-past > self present**

**Comparing**

…’ it helps me when we are talking on the other side of the screen about how the lesson’s going because then we know what to do and what not to do … and then you sort of look at your own lesson and you think were you doing it the right way and if not then you come back and you correct yourself.’

‘I think I’ll be slower to panic and more reflective’

**Self belief**

I’ll get more [of the] trail, see what the trail has been and be more … thoughtful about that the trail of what’s being happening … to pick up the problem. I’ll go back and… automatically be more …methodical

**Self-present > Others past**

‘I do think back…now what did we discuss? You know, maybe something that we discussed might come to me.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student present actions &gt; student past actions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unpicking</strong></td>
<td>'You know there’s this problem there and I’ve got to go back and figure it out, what’s been happening, why have I missed that?‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzing</strong></td>
<td>‘I’m sort of more detached. I’m looking …more analytically.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparing</strong></td>
<td>‘I’m looking differently now at that child [to] what I would have been last year …’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouragement to self</strong></td>
<td>‘…when a student is introduced and they’ve come on at a certain level and you can see what they’re doing now ten weeks later. I think that’s very encouraging whether it’s your student or not.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouragement to other</strong></td>
<td>‘…you don’t want to … let them down, you want to support them, so you give them supportive talk.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmation of self</strong></td>
<td>‘…you feel good about the fact that you actually know what they’re doing.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmation to other</strong></td>
<td>‘…we would give positive reinforcement to the person, so that was good…’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolding act taken on action of the group (observing, discussing)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redirecting attention</strong></td>
<td>‘I couldn’t watch what I wanted to watch because we were discussing… at the same time…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction maintenance</strong></td>
<td>‘Sometimes I would think something and then, you know, the discussion would go...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reinforcement for learning is speech or action that strengthens learning, and /or affirms learning and/or makes it desirable to repeat the speech or action that warranted the reinforcing response. In the future.

Scaffolding is an act of tuition that is usually tutor-learner but may involve the group acting as the tutor.

This involves many actions or speech that impact on the learner – it is what the tutor does or
somewhere else… and then I’d realize, oh no, I’m on the wrong track.’

**Motivating**
‘…it was very motivating every time after going behind the screen, the next day you would … I would just want to do it better…’

**Marking critical features**
‘I come back and the teaching changes because you’ve seen something that you’ve been doing and it’s not working.’

**Demonstrating**
‘… that was brilliant too, because you know, each one [demonstration] is different and they teach differently but you’re doing the same thing, you’re there to help the child, but you learn different ways of helping the children which is really good’

**Maintaining own direction**
‘…even though I know that there are people watching me I just do my own thing and I think its good because then people are watching and they give you some feedback…’

**Evaluating**
‘…they give you some feedback and I take it on board and I think it does wonders for my teaching…’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolding by the tutor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You have all your notes there and you tell me what I should have done and what I did do that was right, what I should have done that I didn’t do, and all that is very helpful.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recruitment** – enlisting interest |
| **Reducing degrees of freedom** – simplifying the task |
| **Direction maintenance** – motivation, making it worthwhile to take the next step |
| **Marking critical features** – accentuating relevant aspects of the task |
| **Frustration control** – involves assistance/can create dependence |
| **Demonstration or modeling the task** e.g. often involves idealizing the act to be performed/the tutor is imitating the idealized act |
| (Wood et al 1976) |
| Other aspects can be included that involve direct action on the learner in the task. |

Scaffolding is an act of tuition that is usually tutor-learner but may involve the group acting as the tutor.
‘…it [tutor discussion] just showed me that I was probably pushing the wrong aspect…..it just me aware that my prompts in that case … were on the wrong track.’

**Extending knowledge**
‘…[it’s] just the ideas that came out of it afterwards. ’

**Marking critical features**
‘…you’re thinking ‘I’m doing the right thing, I’m doing the right thing’ and ‘we’re going OK’ but when you come in and you say ‘well why don’t you try this?’’

**Creating Flexibility**
‘… [it’s] going back to that diversity and I guess that flexibility of just that because that worked for one week doesn’t mean it’s working next week.’

**Demonstrating**
‘…maybe watching you teach our students for a little bit afterwards…which you did do on one occasion with one of my students.’

**Maintaining direction – how to do it**
‘…[ I felt] a little bit more confident because there was um… more… well we sort of knew… how to approach it. We sort of had discussed that.’

**Maintaining direction – motivation**
‘I knew what I had taught because it was my lesson and it was just me. I knew I could take that conversation wherever I wanted, so I felt more confident.’

**Directing**
‘I just teach the way you’ve told me to and I find that it works. So that I find that you coming and supporting me in school has also worked for me because I like that.’

**Evaluating**
‘You would give feedback, straight afterwards, which is good.’

**Maintaining interactive ease**
‘Oh I felt very at ease, because you put me at ease’

**Self awareness**

This involves many actions or speech that impact on the learner – it is what the tutor does or is interpreted as doing by the learner. The process of scaffolding learning involves different aspects: for example

- **Recruitment** – enlisting interest
- **Reducing degrees of freedom** – simplifying the task
- **Direction maintenance** – motivation, making it worthwhile to take the next step
- **Marking critical features** – accentuating relevant aspects of the task
- **Frustration control** – involves assistance/can create dependence
- **Demonstration or modeling the task** e.g. often involves idealizing the act to be performed /the tutor is imitating the idealized act

(Wood et al 1976)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Realisation – come to understand</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>About Others</strong></td>
<td><strong>where you are in relation to ideas, knowledge and your own learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much you learn from others</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I guess it made [you] realise that … or I think I already knew that … it made me realise that you can … how much you can learn from other people.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Everyone knows you don’t always get it right</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘… everybody knows that they’re not doing the whole lesson correctly…’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About self</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You don’t always get it right</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘… you’ve got to be open to the idea that you probably didn’t do …. everything right.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning of an item of knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I came back and that’s exactly what I did because I realised, yes, it’s not a test. It’s not a test and the child has to be put at ease and he has to be successful too you know.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What you know</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I learnt that you can only do what you can do.’ (laughs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning takes time</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘… you’re also aware that you don’t know that much anyway … so you’re learning all the time.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consciousness – awareness of self (thoughts, actions, feelings)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. ‘… you’re involved in it… so that makes it more alive to you. You’re sort of more on the ball, more on the spot.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Own reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. ‘I think once you’re behind the screen it just starts coming natural…’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Own abilities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e.g. ‘....in my head I was sort of was going through what I would do in that situation …and ticking off the pluses and the minuses...’” ... I’m only still learning’.

**Your Own actions.**
e.g. ‘You’re looking and you’re seeing yourself doing it, if you know what I mean, like you’re standing back and you’re watching yourself doing it, even though that you’re there, because you know that someone’s saying why is she doing this.’

**Your Own thoughts**
e.g. ‘I’m being more analytical and insightful...’ /‘I think [I’m] being more analytical and more insightful to what they’re about’

**Your Own thoughts and actions**
e.g. ‘you’re very critical of your own teaching while you’re watching it … because a…you just wonder and you see I’ve done that and that’s not right’

**Your Own actions and/or thoughts – to make change**
e.g. ‘I come back and the teaching changes because you’ve seen something that you’ve been doing and it’s not working.’

**Awareness**

**What is coming next – context**
e.g. ‘…you knew you were going to come out with something else, or something new…something different was to come every time’.

**Setting in the mind**

**What sets thoughts in the mind**

**Discussion**
e.g. ‘… then when we come to discuss it afterwards it helps to solidify in your mind more’.

**Reflection**
e.g. ‘…because you think what they would they say? And then where would that go? Now what would they say?’

The category of ‘setting in the mind’ refers to what the participants say about their learning as it is firmed up, settles in their knowledge and it prefers to part of the process of internalization.
## Shifting the ZPD

### What the group/tutor provides for the shift

#### Direction

e.g. ‘…to see very good teaching behind the screen is also important and also very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading.’

#### Ideas for Improvement

e.g. ‘…if you extend that part of the lesson or if you go further with that idea, then you can improve.’

‘You would give feedback…that sort of carries you until the next time you come’

‘…something to chew on when you go back the next day’.

#### Confirmation

e.g. ‘…it gave you the sense that ‘OK, you’re on the right track for where you’re heading so you can get better’

#### Lift

e.g. ‘It just kind of lifted you and pushed you further.’

#### Discussion

e.g. ‘and then discussion would move on … so we’d sort of go further than just there, which was good,’

#### Experiential knowledge

e.g. ‘…communication’s vital with other people, but people who know as much as you do and people who know more than you do and so you can go forward.

### What the learner does/has for the shift

#### Verbalises

e.g. ‘…it brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it’

#### Disposition – quality of mind

The ZPD is the gap between individual’s actual development in a given area, e.g. RR teaching (what is known, the learner’s skilled action, the learner’s problem solving capabilities) and what is yet to be known.

To have shift in this area there has to be evidence by speech, or action that the learner’s development has moved forward or been extended.

Moving forward, improvement and extension will need to be in expressed or shown.

Within shift in the ZPD will come other features such as co-construction but not scaffolding because scaffolding is an act of tuition (or an outside influence on the learner by the tutor or group). Scaffolding does not refer to learning within the person or the process of
e.g. ‘when I used to come back to teach the next day, you’d be still sort of be in that frame of mind.’

**Trials**
e.g. ‘I’ll try this and I’ll see how it works and that sort of brings you to go forward’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Trust in the relationship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features of the other/s (group/tutor)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e.g. ‘I think that was probably the most valuable experience we had, the same group continuously, to get to know each other and trust each other.’

| **Quality group interaction (dynamic)** |
e.g. ‘that particular group was open and honest.’

| **Credibility - believability** |
e.g. ‘I think talking to people doing the same job at the same time is the most important thing.’

| **Identify – to see, make, treat the same** |
e.g. ‘Well when I was teaching I just felt I’m not the only one doing this.’

| **Support – to give help, strength, courage etc** |
e.g. ‘Well I think that when you’re watching and you’re there I know that I’ve got the support from you.’

| **Indication of context of trust** |
‘I liked the feedback.’
‘…it gave me more confidence in my own teaching, in talking to other people and realizing that yes they have the same issues.’
‘I knew I could take that conversation wherever I wanted.’
‘…probably the most important thing in any sort of teaching, or any sort of learning is that group dynamic.’
‘I would know on the other side of the screen they would be saying now why isn’t she doing this and why do you think she did that?’
‘Well I find that discussion is good because the group is very supportive of each other.’

**Respondent indicates that a context of trust exists in the relationship between learners or learner and tutor explicitly or implicitly (for the action to occur and be accepted)**

internalization.
‘…even though I know that there are people watching me I just do my own thing.’

## Active participation

### Contribution to the group dynamic

### Sharing

e.g. ‘…you did feel like you needed to let everybody have a say as well as you had to add.’

e.g. ‘…the group thing was about listening as well as ….what your thoughts were.’

e.g. ‘So by talking to others I think you learn a lot about their way of handling and tackling situations and how you’re going, and you can also share with them, I think, your experiences, and maybe teach them a few things as well as learn’

### Expectation

e.g. ‘…you had to put in your opinion and put in what your observations were or what you thought.’

e.g. ‘…some people from the group would sit back and not say anything if they were allowed to.’

e.g. ‘It’s good to be forced to talk to the group’

The category of active participation in this context refers to what the participants say about it. It is a given in all the activities of the RR training that people engage and actively participate in teaching and discussion.

---

**APPENDIX P1: SAMPLE OF COMBINED EMERGING THEMES**  
**(INTERVIEW DATA)**

399
Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the observations of two lessons at the screen?

Theme: Co-construction

Categories: Co-construction

- **Learning from observing how the other interacted with the child**

Well it worked because I was able to watch what other people were doing and listen to what they were doing… but also watch how they interacted with the child and how they were using what they were learning in the RR group and through their reading, and applying that.

OK, in the group setting, in terms of observing the lessons, I found it very helpful to see two things. First at the very beginning it was good to see other people make mistakes that I had made and towards the end it was really interesting to see how they responded to the children and made an attempt to be flexible and that helped me with ideas and um… confidence too, that sometimes you don’t always get it right.

and to see whether what the focus of the teacher behind the screen, or what they had talked about married with what we were observing from the child as well.

- **Learning through group dialogue**

  - **Clueing into what others are saying and interpreting and getting feedback about your own thinking**

Yeah that helps because it… just makes you clue into what other people are saying. So, you know other aspects of… you might be looking at something and saying ‘Oh, this kid hasn’t got enough visual [information]’, but someone else will say ‘Oh, I think this child, you know, is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about.

So there’s no point really watching a lesson behind the screen unless you’ve got that conversation going because… you’re not really going …you need to discuss it to learn don’t you? You need to…Well, I think you need to discuss your observations with other people… because their observations might be totally different.

Um, well it was an opportunity to observe someone in real time, with the group, so we were able to make comments as we observed the lesson. It was a good way of bouncing your ideas, so you could verbalise what you thought you were seeing and to see whether the group felt the same way or whether they saw a different aspect or saw something else.

So it was just a good, yeah, a good experience to you know, observe in real time, have an opportunity to voice your own opinions and then be able to get feedback from your peers as to whether what you were seeing was really happening, yeah.
Oh, alright. OK. Um, well it sort of brings things forward for you, in your mind that you maybe haven’t thought of before, and makes it so you’re seeing something in action and you’re talking about it rather than just looking. Mar

Um I think that the group helped me see points, or the discussion around with the group, helped me see points that I wasn’t aware of before or I hadn’t actually observed, um or taken notice of … Mar

and then also having you know the tutor there to sort of direct the conversation and to draw your attention to other things that perhaps you may have missed, that were important, or relevant, or that showed a bit of insight as to what was happening with that child. L

The group I think helped me focus a lot on particular aspects…um… like working with the child to make meaning, which we have been working on. That was really helpful because I was trying to go all over the ship and trying to do everything at once… and they focused my thinking for the next day, on one aspect, rather than trying to do everything on one lesson which I was trying to do. So I found that really beneficial because they really focused me. Je

○ Learning through building on ideas of group members

With the discussion that was going on while the teachers were working it was really um… it was nice to focus on one area and be able to just unpick that and make comments even if they weren’t… correct, it was okay, everyone would pitch in and build on ideas, and I found that very helpful. I didn’t like being on the other side but … the discussion was really helpful to me. Je

○ Learning through talking about the common experience

and I think you can participate more in the discussion by having done a similar thing or even on the opposite end of doing something totally different T

I think you can participate more in the discussion by having done a similar thing or even on the opposite end of doing something totally different and being able to bring that back together and [to] just the whole group’s perspective and experiences. T

○ Learning through what others think

um where… and also clarify my observations to make sure that what I was observing was what I should be observing or was it like an accurate direction of where I was to observe or what I was looking at …um…and to clarify my understanding of a particular point through what other people sort of had input to. Mar

Theme: Comparing Oneself with Others

Categories: Comparing Oneself with Others

• Learning Through Identifying and evaluating oneself against what the other person is doing

And I was able to also personalize it and see… reflect on what I was doing. So I could see myself in what the other person was doing. Or I could see myself in what they were doing or weren’t doing. So I could see what I was doing or not doing. So I found that really valuable to be able to watch someone doing something and following it through. And I could observe myself in a way. I could personalize it. So I found that really valuable. B

APPENDIX Q: SAMPLE EMERGED MAJOR THEMES

(INTERVIEW DATA)
In the analysis of teachers' responses (interview data) the following major themes emerged:

6.1 Co-construction of knowledge when learning with others (content-wise knowledge)

- Learning through group feedback
- Intersubjectivity and internalization
- Learning through linking knowledge and experience
- Learning to set things in your mind (internalization)
- Scaffolding
- Learning through linking what you have seen and discussed in the group to guiding texts, to your own experience
- Learning to understand the guiding texts through observed examples
- Learning through contributing to the discussion and listening to others
- Learning with a group extends your thinking
- Learning to set things in your mind (internalization)
- Learning through discussion helps clarify what you are unsure of

6.2 Trusting Relationship (‘gift of confidence’ that others give you to support your learning)

- The emotional response: feeling apprehensive before teaching behind the screen
- Learning from how others interacted with the child
- Learning through group dialogue
- Learning with the same group
- Learning with a group that is there to ‘see you through’
- Learning when you don’t feel intimidated or threatened
- Learning with a good mix of people who are happy, friendly and relaxed (set up in first 30 minutes of a session)
- Learning without a dominant personality in the group (emotional support)
- Learning that is mutually supportive
- Feeling supported by the group – to extend, to improve, to offer positive reinforcement

6.3 Self-development as a learner (self-awareness, self-wise, about your professional development e.g. self-confidence, hands-on practical skill)

- Learning through being conscious, analytical and critical of one’s own actions
- Learning through two minds – the actor and the viewer
- Self-validation: learning to understand that at any time you are only as good as you are
• Comparing oneself with others: learning through identifying and evaluating oneself against what the other person is doing
• Self-validation – learning that helped affirm thinking
• Self-motivation – willingness to take on board positive criticism

The impact of the Tutor (in the interactions between the teachers – guidance)

• Scaffolding
• Learning to understand the guiding texts through observed examples
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THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONS ON ADULT LEARNING DURING READING RECOVERY TEACHER TRAINING

CATHERYN SALE

This research project, The Influence of Social Interactions on Adult Learning during Reading Recovery Teacher Training is for Catheryn Sale’s PhD study, supervised by Dr Irina Verenikina and Dr Jan Turbill, at the Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong. The purpose of this research is to explore the role of social interactions in adult learning.

The project will be run over one school year, the duration of the 2006 Reading Recovery Training course, in the Wollongong Diocese, facilitated by myself, the Reading Recovery Tutor.

In my research I am going to study how adults learn new skills through social interaction, such as listening and talking with one another; reflecting immediately on what is important for the teacher’s own learning; and the teacher’s reflection on his/her learning during a school visit with the Reading Recovery Tutor.

During the Reading Recovery sessions the teachers will not be required to do anything additional to the normal Reading Recovery course; the Reading Recovery school visits will be conducted as normal and the interviewing of the teachings following the course will be conducted outside working hours.

I will need the following data collection for this research project: 1) video-taping part of the in-service sessions where teachers talk about lessons they are observing behind a glass screen and when they discuss the lessons just observed, in order to record “teacher talk”; 2) immediate short written reflections at the sessions; 3) an open-ended interview at the completion of the course; and 4) to use field notes from teacher school visits.

Teacher participation in the study is voluntary. Teachers are free to withdraw from the study at any time. The data collected will be used in a manner that maintains confidentiality at all times. The identities of all the participants will not be revealed. The videotapes, transcripts, interview forms, and documented data will be used for the sole purpose of the PhD study. This information will be held securely (electronically or in paper files in locked file cabinets) for seven years. None of the data/information will be used in the evaluation of the teacher’s teaching or the students’ performance.

If you require any further information or have questions about the study, you can contact me at the numbers and addresses given below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the way the research is or has been conducted, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Irina Verenikina, on +61 2 4221 4285, e-mail irina@uow.edu.au.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Catheryn Sale
20B Alvan Parade
Mount Pleasant
New South Wales 2519
Phone: 02 42857148
Email: catheryn@hotkey.net.au
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THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONS ON ADULT LEARNING DURING READING RECOVERY TEACHER TRAINING

CATHRYN SALE

I am Catheryn Sale’s supervisor at the Catholic Education Office, in the Diocese Wollongong. Reading Recovery teacher training and support are part of her workplace role as the Reading Recovery Tutor.

I have been given information about this research project and have discussed it with Catheryn Sale who is conducting this research for a PhD supervised by Dr Irina Verenikina and Dr Jan Turbill in the Faculty of Education, at the University of Wollongong.

I have been advised on the nature of this research, which includes 1) videoing parts of the training group sessions in order to be able to transcribe group oral language interactions; 2) short written reflections immediately after this experience; 3) an open-ended interview at the end of the course; and 4) the use of field notes the RR tutor normally takes on school visits.

I understand that during the Reading Recovery sessions the teachers will not be required to do anything additional to the normal Reading Recovery course; the Reading Recovery teacher school visits will be conducted as normal and the interviewing of the teachers following the course will be conducted outside working hours.

I understand that teacher participation in this research is voluntary and teachers are free to refuse to participate and free to withdraw from the research at any time. Teacher refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not affect their relationship with the Reading Recovery Tutor, or the course members, or their accreditation as Reading Recovery Teachers.

If I have any enquiries about the research, I know that I can contact Dr Irina Verenikina, (+61 2 4221 4285, Email: irina@uow.edu.au). If I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the research is or has been conducted, I can contact the Complaints Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 42214457.

By signing below I am indicating my consent for Catheryn Sale conduct her research project with the 2006 Reading Recovery training group entitled The Influence of Social Interactions on Adult Learning During Reading Recovery Teacher Training as it has been described to me by Catheryn Sale. I understand that the anonymous data collected from teacher participation will be used for the PhD study and publication of journal articles.
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APPENDIX S: INFORMATION USED IN READING RECOVERY
TEACHER TRAINING FOR SELF-MONITORING

This is an outline of the information discussed by teachers on teacher self-monitoring during the RR Training course that supported their interactions with children (scaffolding). The RR Tutor (researcher) has sourced this information and has used it over many training groups to assist teachers in their work. It is based on research on effective teacher actions and understandings when working with the hardest to teach RR children.

The following are principles for teacher understandings in their interactions with children.

“Maxim 1: The teacher must clearly understand and have a consistent focus on the task to be learned by the child.

There is the potential for the child to become confused: what does the teacher want of me? What does she want me to search for?

Maxim 2: The teacher must act consistently across interactions

When a child participates in recurring interactions involving the same words in the same context with the same meaning, learning is made easier and clearer. Inconsistencies have the potential to confuse the child and make the learning harder

Maxim 3: The teacher must assume that the child is making sense in terms of his/her current understandings

This involves the teacher in a constant search for the child’s point of view, particularly when discrepancies occur between her intentions and the child’s understandings. Discrepancies can occur between the child’s responses to the teacher talk or to the task itself, and those expected by the teacher – ambiguity in the teacher’s requests leads to discrepancies between the teacher’s intention and the child’s interpretation of her text related talk.

Maxim 4: the teacher must check that her prompts function as intended
What is the intention of the prompt and is it used appropriately in this context?

The intended function of prompts to find is to alert the child to the fact an error has been made and to help the child learn ‘how to’ search for and find the undetected error. To function correctly the prompts must be used in specific physical and linguistic settings. When the prompts are not used as intended the teacher

- Found the error for the child through the use of voice and actions and denied the child the opportunity to search and find by intervening too quickly
- Focused on fixing before finding the error
- Used the prompts in linguistic settings that robbed them of their power

**Maxim 5: The teacher must carefully select places to intervene**

Self monitoring adapts over time as the child becomes more independent. Consequently the child will not necessarily gain equally from all errors and working on too many errors is likely to disrupt the child’s sense of phrasing and his/her meaning making.

If the teacher has made a careful book choice the challenges will be manageable on the run and prompts will be needed infrequently. Even so, to avoid disruptions some errors may well be reworked after the completion of the reading. In other cases, especially if the error is well beyond the child’s current processing, errors may be dealt with in some other way by the teacher. The teacher must:

...*select the clearest, easiest, most memorable examples with which to establish a new response, skill, principle or procedure.* Clay, 2005a, p 23”

**Reference:**

APPENDIX T: INFORMATION ON READING RECOVERY BOOK LEVELS

Reading Recovery Book Levels

Books used in Reading Recovery come from a wide range of publishers and book series. They represent books that are available to be used by teachers in their schools. The books are ordered into a gradient of difficulty after trialling and evidence (from running records) that the level is appropriate for use by the RR teaching community. These books are sometimes referred to as being useful in teaching literacy processing for early, middle and late in the learning capabilities of five to seven year old children. Early, Middle and late does not refer to time on RR. These broad categories can be described by this RR Tutor (researcher) are:

- Early approximately Levels 1-6
- Middle approximately Levels 7-14
- Late approximately Levels 15-26

Other descriptions used for broadly categorising books are: emergent, early and fluent reading and may refer to different ways of reviewing the suitability of books for teaching.

Reading Recovery’s Position on Book Levelling

The following quotations are sourced from a RR Tutor Information Guide. (RRNZ, 2009).

“It is inappropriate for book publishers and distributors to use Reading Recovery text levels in any of their advertising or to promote and sell books with Reading Recovery book levels printed in them.”

The reasons are:

- “This group of children requires a finer gradient of difficulty than is necessary or appropriate for children making average or above average progress. The selection of books to use with this special group of children is a decision for Reading Recovery personnel and is not one that publishers can make.”
- “It is not possible to level books for Reading Recovery prior to publication. Reading Recovery levelling is a complex process whereby many Reading Recovery teachers working with children having difficulty trial a newly published book for 12 months or so using running records to capture in detail children’s responses to the challenges of the texts. A level is then proposed for trialing amongst the extensive Reading Recovery community.”
- “It is most important that teachers buy and use books from a wide range of sources in the best interest of a child’s progress. That is why there is no ‘set’ of Reading Recovery texts.”
5.1 Session Three

5.1.1 Session Three: Introductory Discussion

Session Three was the first time the teachers had taught for each other behind the glass screen. The draft ‘guides’ suggested that the Tutor was to provide guidance and support for their teaching using ‘Literacy Lessons, Parts One and Two’. It was suggested that the group have opportunities to ‘articulate, interact and evaluate throughout the session’. When observing the lessons the aim of the Tutor was to have the teachers ‘talking about what they are seeing and thinking’ in relation to what the child and the teacher were doing and to notice the teacher decision-making, building on the child’s strengths. It was suggested that the discussion following observing two lessons was to lead to an exploration of the teacher decision-making and their rationales.\textsuperscript{12}

The session started with the Tutor and the teachers seated in a circle facing one another. The context was that teachers had started teaching RR children in their schools. The Tutor started with an expectation and explanation for the teacher to contribute to the discussion: ‘...to begin with, I like everyone to contribute and to have thought about their teaching, so I’m asking: ‘What am I thinking about in my teaching and why?’ That means: try to say something where everyone makes a contribution’.

One teacher started with this contribution:

\textit{Lara: I'm really starting to think ahead...so where do I want them to go...so what do I have to do in order to get there? That’s what I’m looking at with each of the children...’}

\textsuperscript{12} Draft ‘Third Inservice Session’, NZRR, 2006
The Tutor thanked Lara, smiled and looked around at the group and did not ask for further contributions. She waited. The pause was followed in a quick succession of six contributions by the teachers explaining to each other their personal experiences. For example: Diane said, ‘I’ve just had my first RR lesson today and I planned it on the sheet [RR lesson record]...and then I thought I’ve got to do all this note-taking while I’m actually working so that will be a challenge for me in the next week or so as they [the children] all come on.’ This teacher’s personal disclosure stimulated three teachers to talk about the same thing, with the last teacher Jemma saying, ‘I found that it was easier once the children had a routine...they would just automatically get up and go and sort the letters and I was one or two steps behind them..’

After another considerable pause, Shelley changed the topic bringing into the discussion a school visit she had just had with the Tutor: ‘I’m thinking a lot more about phrasing since C’s visit... because I actually thought my little fellow was going quite well with his solving of words...and now I realise that he has to put them together, so that’s what I’m working on.’

Four teachers contributed in quick session after this change of direction. Mary-Lou said she was working on another part of the lesson that she found challenging, the conversation ‘...with children who don’t want to converse with you and actually encouraging them to give something and then trying to get them to compose a story...that’s what I’m finding challenging.’ Tracey added on to this idea commenting that her children ‘keep to themselves a lot’. Maura continued with the same link of ‘challenge’ and offered that her challenge was ‘time management’ (doing the RR lesson in the 30 minutes allowable). Belinda then turned to face teachers in the group on either side of her and said and named them: ‘...what you said Lara is what I have to keep reminding myself of where I want each child to go next..’ and turning to Jade on the other side, ‘...and that’s what I’m trying to record... is what’s happening next.’

The teachers thus linked their contributions around the topics they knew about: their immediate experiences. It was the beginning of their turn-taking and publically sharing about their own teaching.
The Tutor used the common experience between herself and a teacher to add to their conversation: ‘Could you share with the group Shelley, what you learned about use of the lesson record?’ Shelley could immediately relate to her experience. The Tutor then explained further about how they could use their lesson records’. This interaction took six minutes of the session time.

The next movement was the teachers having their books ‘Literacy Lessons, Parts One and Two’ on their knees when they had discussions. The expectation was that they would be used: ‘...when I come to visit they [the books] should be on your table...I hope you’re starting to write in them, to highlight them, to write in the margin... have little coloured pieces sticking out of the side, so you know where you are if you need to open them up to where you need to go...’

The Tutor directed the teachers: ‘Let’s look at re-reading 2-3 familiar books, where are you going to find that? A teacher asked: ‘Is it in this one?’ The Tutor directed: ‘No, it’s in this one’, as the teachers searched for a page reference, where she concluded ‘Thank you. See we all help each other.’

The Tutor elicited teacher contributions, evaluated them and shaped the individual teacher’s RR knowledge. This is the interaction in the ‘introductory discussion’ for Session Three around the purpose of the ‘familiar reading’ activity in RR lessons preparing the teachers for their observations at the glass screen.

**What the reading ‘sounds like’:**

*Tutor: Could someone put that in your own words?*

*Jade: It sounds good.*

*Tutor: Can you unpick ‘sounds good’?*

*Jade: It sounds confident and phrased and the intonation is correct at the end of the sentences, and taking note of the punctuation, and the pausing is correct for punctuation.*

*In phrasing would it come in at Level 3 when children are putting two words together?*

*Tutor: Anyone else?*

*Shelley: The linking words together, that’s flow.*

**What the teachers teach for:**
Tutor: So what are you teaching for at this time?
Tracey: fluency.
Tutor: Yes you are (a confirmation), what else are you teaching for?
Belinda: Success
Tutor: We’re already successful, it’s a familiar book.
Belinda: Oh. OK.

**Eliciting further contributions:**
Tutor: So you have to be teaching for something. What is it do you think?
Maria: Practice.
Tutor: Yes, she’s got reading practice, lots of volume.
Lara: To gain orchestration in the reading.

**Taking a teacher’s contribution further:**
Tutor: Now that’s an important word we all have to have in our understanding ‘orchestration’ – what do you think it means?
Shelley: Bringing everything together.
Tutor: If it was not orchestrated what would you hear?
Diane: Disjointed.
Maria: Hesitation.
Jade: Unnecessary pausing, extra pauses all the time.
Lara: It could be robotic.
Tutor: If there was an over-attention to visual information what would you hear?
Belinda: That it’s stilted.
Lara: Lots of sounds.
Tutor: Yes, breaking down.
Maria: It’s not like talking.
Tutor: So you’re expecting it to sound like talking to be smooth. That means the eye is looking quickly. Look down here [a reference to the book] we can see we’re getting speeded recognition of the words.

This was followed by a similar rehearsal for what the teachers would expect to see during the literacy activity involving the children independently reading ‘Yesterday’s New Book’ as the teacher took a behavioural record. Tutor: ‘what are you expecting to see then?’ Following this exchange the two teachers teaching children that day introduced their children to the group. The way of introducing children based on what the children ‘can do’ was briefly discussed with the Tutor before the session. The teacher introductions were brief and gave a context for the teachers’
observations: who the child was; their age; how long they had been on RR; and what the children could do.

Lara: The child I’ve brought today, his name is P… He’s 6 years 2 months. This is his sixteenth lesson in the lesson series and we’re in Week 3. He started on a Level 1 and he’s now working on a Level 3. He’s starting to use visual information. He is one to one matching just about all the time. He’s got the left to right and the return sweep. He does have some confusions with letters that have a tail. He’s extremely enthusiastic and he loves to have a chat. He’s a very social child. We’re looking at the initial letter to predict and my expectations are that what he says should match the text.

Tracey: OK, my little girl is called O…. She’s six years old also. She started on Level Zero and she’s now on a Level Three. She is progressing well with her reading and slowly with her writing. She’s got one, to one, left to right and return sweep, no problems there, usually. She’s in lesson 19, Week 4, and has had eleven ‘Roaming Around the Known’ lessons. Her Letter ID is going really well. She knows most of her letters. Yeah…and that’s all!

5.1.2 Session Three: Lesson Observations

5.1.2.1 Session Three (audio-recording): Lesson One Observation

The Tutor’s social interactions were:

Eliciting teacher contributions

What have you seen so far?
What can he do?
Someone else?
What else does it sound like?
What do you hear then?
What’s your job during familiar reading?
Something else?
What else?
Why do you think it goes like that?
How can you tell?
What did she say? What do you think is holding him up?
What would you teach for?
Is this what you’re doing here?
If you wanted to improve that what would you be doing?
So what would you say was really good about that teaching?
Drawing out Teacher knowledge

We had washing over cleaning, what information did he use?
Do you think he’s reading for meaning?
What’s the purpose of this activity?
How do you position the letters on the board?
Why must he say the next word in writing?
What does the child expect to know at the end of the book introduction?
Who’s read this book before? How does it work? What’s the structure?

Directing teacher attention

Does he look to the picture when he comes to a difficult word or does he look when he turns the page?
Now here comes the second text, watching...
Look at the way he’s holding the book...
Listen to this...what does it sound like to you?
Can you see where you’re getting into problems... if he has a M/W confusion you need to prevent that (saying ‘Mum’ for ‘Wake’).
He did a little bit didn’t he?
Now, let’s look.
So what about that teaching? Her teaching was focused. She was persistent, She was consistent.
That’s what she needs to be in RR.
Did you see her prompt him with the first sound of the word.
Listen to him now...what do you think of that?
Where is his attention going now?

Evaluating

That’s a problem isn’t it?
That’s right. Fast visual perception.
She’s working quite well with that isn’t she?
And now we’re seeing her at the board, isn’t that good?
Now she’s looking efficient isn’t she?
She’s in charge – that’s good, you’ve got a feel for it.
That’s good.
So what’s he showing that he can do?
Good. Now we’re getting more talking.
Excellent. That’s what Clay says...he composes it, he writes it, he owns it.
Yes. That’s important.
The finger pointing has to go.

Explaining
The eye is wandering. When he turns the page we want him to look at the picture and then read the text, not for the eye to wander when he gets to a difficult word.

OK you can say turn the page quickly at Level 3 but not after Level 3 because you have taught him to do that.

If you question the child, the child could be wrong, you lose motivation.

Your job is to speed this up...it has to sound good.

He is ready for Level 3 we’ve got to use the structure to help him move quickly.

Every page starts ‘I can see my...’ does he know that?

That’s how the book works, so someone should tell you that.

Wherever you direct the child’s attention that’s where they’ll go.

We expect him to use the meaning and the structure and read it quickly.

She doesn’t have to do that because it’s about the fast recognition of letters.

Maybe too much work at getting the links rather than visual discrimination.

There’s a lot of talking isn’t there? We really want the hands moving and visual discrimination. Lots of looking.

So you have to know that to read the book. It’s a question and answer book?

It’s smoother. The words are coming together.

That’s right, he’s going to predict and he’s going to cross-check with the visual information. Has he done that?

So you have to know that to read the book.

**Highlighting**

Would you hold on to that Jade and we’ll come back to how to do that? Just make a little note.

Mmmmm word by word... do you think he’s reading for meaning?

No more than three minutes. What do you think is making it a longer activity?

OK can you remember that? We need to talk about that as a group.

So what about that teaching? Her teaching was focused. She was persistent, She was consistent.

That’s what she needs to be in RR.

Who said the next word? We’ll have to listen to that...so the child says the next word.

**5.1.2.2 Session Three (audio-recording): Lesson Two Observation**

The teachers at this session were starting to articulate what they were observing as they were observing it; and they responded to the Tutor’s question or elicitation for comment about the observation. The teachers’ task was multifaceted: a) to observe (see and hear the interaction between a teacher and a child); b) to comment on what they were observing; and c) to listen to the Tutor; d) to listen each other; e) to synthesise this information; d) to share their thoughts with the others and e) to
evaluate the observation and what others were saying. The following are examples of the talk by the teachers during this lesson observation. The talk follows how quickly the lesson progresses. This means that contributions are fast or what is being commented on has passed.

**Commenting on what was being observed**

*Lara*: She’s noticing the initial letter.

*Shelley*: She’s got it.

*Lara*: So she’s starting to notice the punctuation.

*Mary-Lou*: She was quicker on the next page...

*Diane*: She’s making it go quickly.

*Mary-Lou*: Now she’s picked up in ‘come’.

*Lara*: She’s modelling.

*Diane*: She’s articulating it isn’t she?

*Lara*: She’s making the word left to right.

*Diane*: Getting her to re-read what she’s written.

*Jemma*: Tracey is letting some things go...rather than trying to teach everything all at once.

*Lara*: She’s always enthusiastic.

**Answering the Tutor**

*Tutor*: She really has to search.

*Diane*: Yes, because she made a mistake in it.

*Tutor*: What do you like about the teaching you’ve seen?

*Shelley*: It’s quick.

*Tutor*: What else do you like?

*Lara*: Ownership given to the child.

*Tutor*: What is she learning?

*Shelley*: Put two words together.

*Tutor*: Something else you like about the teaching?

*Lara*: The links.

*Tutor*: What is she doing there Diane?

*Diane*: She broke the word into two.

*Tutor*: What’s the main idea of the book?

*Mary-Lou*: Billy doesn’t want to have his photo taken and they convince him to have his photo taken.

*Tutor*: If you tell someone the main idea of a book what are you giving them?

*Shelley*: The meaning

*Tutor*: You are actually teaching for tomorrow. When the child reads it tomorrow what will it tell you?

*Lara*: It’s going to tell you whether she took it in, whether it was taught well.
Asking a question

Diane: I have a question C... where do you get an idea for the sentence from?
Lara: Should she pick up a main word that might be tricky like ‘photo’?

5.1.3 Session Three (video-recording): The Discussion

The discussion time started with an acknowledgement of the teaching by the teachers and the teachers gave a general comment about their own lessons.

Shelley: Thank you Lara for going first and being brave enough to teach in front of us...and you were really good...and what I really liked about your lesson was how you were in control, you stuck to your plan, you stuck to your time really well. You made sure that your child used what they knew, you made good links from the board back to the writing and from your reading...and referring to your notes for teaching points...we appreciated that.

Maria: Thanks Tracey for your enthusiasm and a well planned lesson, and for going second. It was a brave thing to do and you had such a lovely rapport with the little girl...and you were really teaching...you had a plan in mind and you kept to it which was great.

The teachers who taught briefly commented on their lesson in terms of how well they thought it went before there was a discussion about the lessons. Both teachers thought that their lessons went well.

The topics for the discussion were elicited by the Tutor from the group. The Tutor explained to the teachers who taught: ‘So when we were at the screen talking, we try to come up with a summary for what will be beneficial for the whole group.’ Then she turned to the group to ask: ‘so when we’re behind the screen talking we try to come to a summary for what will be beneficial for the whole group. What were we thinking about for Lara’s lesson?’

The teachers tried offering samples of what they had seen and remembered talking about. They had difficulty getting from an observation to main ideas for a discussion.

Tracey: we talked about one to one matching. Maybe try to get him away from that?’
The Tutor tried to get them to ‘main ideas’ and the right lesson, when Shelley mentioned: ‘letter sorting’. She said: ‘wrong lesson’. Mary-Lou determined the main idea as: ‘phrasing and fluency’.

The Tutor therefore modelled how the teachers could talk to their peers in the group:

‘Lara, we were wondering about, how to teach for phrasing and fluency on early levels’. That was a question we brought up. Then you could say: ‘the little boy seemed to have phrasing in some parts and we’d like to see him have more phrasing. Is that alright for the group? Did I say it well?’ Lara responded: Yes. Then the Tutor said to Lara: I didn’t offend you? Lara said: ‘Oh, gosh’. And the group laughed.

The Tutor then directed the group to think of another main idea for Lara’s lesson. Mary-Lou asked: ‘Was it how you chose topics for writing?’ Shelley responded: ‘No, introducing the book.’ The Tutor re-directed the interaction: ‘You go Shelley, try to say to that topic we were interested in and why.’ After a pause, Shelley replied’ ‘Sorry, I can’t.’ So the Tutor turned to Lara and continued modelling:

‘We were really interested in thinking about how you introduce a book and what were the important things, because we saw you doing a lot of lovely things... talking to him about how the book works, and we’d like to have a look at that in a little more depth.’

Lara asked: ‘So that’s for everyone?’ Determining the topics for the lesson discussions was negotiated by the group members. The Tutor explained that the discussion was of main ideas (summarised) for the group to discuss. The Tutor confirmed: ‘That’s for everyone because it’s gone quite well and we’d like to explore that further. Lara asked; ‘so this is for me to respond to?’ The Tutor replied to Lara: ‘It’s for the group. The main idea. So do you think that in your teaching and thinking further, that thinking about phrasing and fluency and also introducing books, so the next day he’s to be phrased and fluent would be beneficial?’ Lara replied: in the affirmative.

The Tutor re-directed the group to the second lesson by Tracey. ‘We had a lovely discussion about her lesson and we were thinking about...what?’
Diane followed the modelling: ‘One of the things we were thinking about was where you got the idea from to tie the sentence writing up with the book.’ The Tutor quickly shaped the interaction by saying: ‘OK, but we’re not going to ask her to answer. That’s our question. We thought it was very clever so we’d like to know about how you work it out and how we can all think about getting topics for writing.’

The teachers all offered ideas from the lesson observation and the discussion: : Mary-Lou: ‘How we get fluency’. Belinda ‘How you link the letters with the words’. Shelley : ‘What we’re doing with magnetic letters.’ The Tutor directed Belinda to speak to Tracey: ‘We thought that was very good and about how we could use that’. To which Maria added: ‘How we could explore that further.’

This interaction showed a disconnection between knowing how the discussion would unfold (as it was the first time doing this) and knowing how to summarise their experiences of observation to share with the teachers who taught.

The Tutor modelling for the teachers continued linking what people spoke about with their texts ‘Literacy Lessons’: ‘So from your lessons you’ve given us all these good ideas for where we’re going to go now. We get out our books and start thinking about these topics.’ The teachers got their books from under their chairs.

Once the topics for discussion were determined the teachers helped each other to find places in the books for the discussion. They had been receiving draft ‘Guidesheets’ which outlined parts in the books they were to be reading before sessions. This interaction occurred around finding where to read about how to establish fluency in ‘familiar reading’ as the teachers searched for the page references. It is an example of social co-operation between the group members in locating procedures to match their main ideas and in sharing what they had tried.

*Tutor: So the first part is ‘familiar reading’ and how we teach for it. Where are we going?*
*Lara: To page 87*
*Tutor: Are we?*
*(Group looking in their texts including the Tutor)*
Lara: No. Is this the new story?
Tutor: Well, we’re wanting ‘familiar reading’
Diane: ‘page 48...48 and 49...’
Tracey: ‘In Part One’.
Tutor: We’re looking at page 48 and 49 in Part One are we?
(group keeping looking for references and laughing)
Tutor: We’ll get good at this! OK Diane, why did you want to go there?
Diane: Why did I want to be there?
Tutor: Why did you take us there? We’re talking about familiar reading?
Diane: Because we are wondering how we should be establishing fluency and orchestration. I haven’t heard of that word until today, even though I’ve read it... ‘orchestration in processing.’
Tutor: Does that tell us how to do it? Just look there under one, does it tells us what it how to do it? I think it tells us what it should be like but it doesn’t tell us how to do it.
Diane: No. Sorry.
Mary-Lou: ‘I think its page 98.
Tracey: Page 98 in the other book.
Diane: That’s what I said before.
Tutor: Does it tell us how to do it there?
Diane: I think it makes points that I found interesting when I read it. The familiar book is not to be memorised and it can still have teaching points in it.
Lara: So the child can notice some things they might not have noticed before.
Tutor: It’s got...careful weighing up between keeping a book for the enjoyment or the fluency practice...But is this telling us how to do it? It’s telling us what to do. It’s telling us what the child will be doing...is it telling us how to teach for fluency ...and pace? It’s says we’re supposed to be encouraging it.
Tracey: ‘I’ve read it somewhere on how to do it.’
Mary-Lou: ‘Do you think its 150-157?’
Tutor: Do you think its page 150? That’s a good topic. Thank you Mary-Lou. So what are we going to think about when we come here? Who’s read this part before?
Tracey: I have.
Tutor: You tell us Tracey.
Tracey: There’s a lot of really good strategies to encourage phrasing...in which I have tried one of them...
Tutor: Where are you?
Tracey: page 153.

Tracey explained a procedure she had used with one of her children. Tutor then encouraged others to share what they had been trying: Shelley, Jade and Mary-Lou explained three procedures they had tried.
The Tutor role in the exchange was to: clarify meaning (the difference between putting two or three words together and ‘phrasing’); link to her own teaching (what she had done with L… today and how he would practise that in familiar reading); link to books they used and how they could explain to children (this is where Father Bear starts talking and this is where he finishes talking); highlighted the intention of the author of RR; and had the teachers make links e.g. ‘if we want children to read at a fast pace what are we going to have to do? To which Lara replied: Take away the finger.

The Tutor then initiated another discussion around what can happen if finger-pointing is allowed to persist in reading; linking to how the author writes to advise their teaching: ‘if Clay writes anything in italics it means sit up and take notice.’ The tutor talk was to explain the text to the teachers, to pose questions and to help them search further. E.g. ‘Early on you might take the finger away for familiar reading but it would be appropriate wouldn’t it to come back on the new book, because it’s more difficult? But we need another reference for that. Let’s look up directionality.’ Another period of explaining the text unfolded and directing to important ideas: ‘Read the sentence underneath’. Lara: ‘No pointing’. Tutor: and when? Lara: ‘when it becomes consistent.’

Mary-Lou asked a question: ‘Is it appropriate to like run your finger under the word…like when you’re trying for fluency? Like when you’re going word by word, just run it along the text?’

The Tutor did not answer the question. She redirected to the text ‘Look on page 153.’ And the group collectively searched for whether this was a procedure in RR, and Mary-Lou learned that a procedure for fluency was using a card rather than running fingers under words. The conclusion for Lara by the Tutor in this session was: ‘so your little boy was doing bits of that but he’ll be able to do more with that teaching, wouldn’t he?'
The discussion was redirected by the Tutor to the main idea of ‘introducing books’. Lara led the group to the page references for this topic, while the Tutor redirected first to choosing the most appropriate book.

The Tutor role repeated under the new topic around: clarifying meaning; linking (to her own experience and to the teacher’s experience in classroom practice); highlighting (goals and aims for teaching; important words that change the meaning of the text e.g. the word ‘might’ in suggestions for how to introduce a new book).

The teachers showed that they had also started linking between their prior experiences; their interactions with children and the Tutor. This interaction with Diane shows Diane linking her current reading where the text asks that children hear and use new language structures they are expected to read in new books.

*Diane: Now I remember when you came to see me you said ‘you get back what you put in.’*  
*Tutor: Did I?*  
*Diane: Yes. It was very appropriate. I’ve written down that you’ll get back what you give out. It’s rehearing isn’t it?*  
*Tutor: You can’t ask questions or whatever if the child can’t do it. It’s probably what I was trying to say.*  
*Diane: I think that what you were meaning was that you have a good book introduction. If you don’t rehearse the structures they can’t give it back to you.*

At times the Tutor called for an alignment of ideas: ‘What are we wanting children to do, the main thing, from your own personal theory, what is the main thing you’d want children to read with?’ Shelley: A flow. Lara: Confidence. Mary-Lou: Meaning.

In this way the Tutor elicited ideas to extend the discussion. Meaning was linked to prediction as part of the literacy processing and explained in terms of what that would mean for early reading. The discussion was then redirected by the Tutor to: ‘what are these little ones using in terms of visual information?’ Diane contributed: initial letter; and Lara: known words. These teacher contributions were adopted by the Tutor and linked ‘visual signposts’ in early reading. The Tutor made the concept accessible to the teachers by partial story analogy using ‘foot-holes’ when mountain climbing, as navigating one’s way through text, and took the persona of the child: ‘I
can look at those initial letters, I’ve got a few words that I know and a powerful prediction about meaning, that I can confirm as I read with what I know; and the more I practice the more I notice.’

Shelley followed this explanation with her experience which was a delayed comment relating back to Diane’s comment about children ‘hearing and using new structures in texts, so teachers thinks does not always keep a-pace with the discussion: ‘you...cleared up a lot for me yesterday. C... came and she demonstrated how to rehearse. We had a book called ‘Kitty Cat and the Fish’ or something...and C... was rehearsing that structure: ‘Come here Kitty’ and I had to repeat in the same way, and I tried it today with a little boy and it was really successful.

A similar experience unfolded for a discussion of the second lesson. The main idea for the discussion was re-established and the teachers found references for the discussion in the texts. There was laughter amongst the group in the act of locating information in the text rather than the teachers talking about their ideas without referencing to the text which links ideas to theory and rationales for practice, rather than intuitive teaching actions suggested by Maria.

_Tutor: We’d like you Tracey to show us those interesting things you were doing in the book with the letters and ‘come’

_Tracey: Where I found it? I don’t think I found it C...!

(Laughter)

_Tutor: Where is it? That’s what we need.

_Maria: Sometimes it’s what you do. Do you know what I mean?

_Tutor: Yeah, but it has to be in Reading Recovery somewhere.

(Laughter)

_Tutor: I’m sure it’s in Reading Recovery somewhere!

(Group looking through the text)

_Tutor: Who can help us?

_Mary-Lou: Breaking letters out of words.

_Tutor: Where’s that?

_Mary-Lou: Page 19, Part Two.

_Tutor: Thank you.

_Tracey: Oh yeah!
This was followed by explanation and extension for another reference and modelling for the teachers through role-playing a teaching procedure:

*Tutor: OK Tracey, you’re going to have to be the child.*

*Tracey: OK.*

*Tutor: Oh, I don’t have enough letters (moves to a table at the back of the room that has magnetic letters on it in trays). Can you make a three letter word while I find some more letters? A word the child might know?*

*Tracey: Him.*

*Tutor: Oh ‘him’s’ a bit hard. I doesn’t matter. Now the hard part about this is ...oh! You’re going to have to look on page 19 to make sure I do it right. You’re going to have to check me out! The child is to stand to the left... here Tracey over here... the child is on my left... we’re teaching about visual perception.*

*Diane: That’s interesting because I have them on the right.*

*(the demonstration proceeded)*

*Tutor: No you watch me Tracey. (Moves letters one by one to the left). Now you do that. (Tracey does this). What’s the child learning?*

*Lara: Left to right.*

*Mary-Lou: What comes first.*

*Maria: So you don’t say anything?*

*Tutor: No. You’re doing sequence and how to train the eye to look. It’s about visual perception.*

*(Further demonstrations are shown).*

*Shelley: Did he have a chance to do it again?*

*Tutor: Yes, but he doesn’t have a chance to do it wrong – ever!*

*Mary-Lou: So you have a word that they’re familiar with reading, like, to do it? If they’re going to be writing it...like to teach them to write it?*

*Tutor: You’re going to have to read that Mary-Lou. I think Clay says choose from writing because then you’ll know they know it. What does she say?*

*Jemma: (Reads from the text).*

*Tutor: Well. There you go - I was wrong!*

*Jemma: (Continues reading).*

*Diane: What page is that?*

*Jemma: Page 42.*

*Tutor: Thanks. This is something everybody is trying to get a handle on. Trained teachers don’t know how to do this – they’re just working with it.*

*(Further demonstrations occurred for breaking words into base word and inflection breaks)*

Teachers took themselves further from the demonstrations. Lara wanted to know about cutting words parts in ‘the cut-up story’ and Jemma told the group how she
had done ‘book and the look ending’. The final explanation by the Tutor was that teaching RR children how to look quickly was important for their success.

5.1.4 Session Three: Written Reflections

The five minute reflections without consultation with each other showed what the teachers believed they learned from the social interaction and they summarised the main discussion points of the session.

The guiding questions for their reflections were:

a) What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?

b) How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about teaching one particular child?

Lara wrote that she took the following away to inform her teaching:

I am now thinking more about having P...’s reading sounding smooth and fluent and what I need to do in order to get him there. This will be my expectation during his familiar reading for the next few sessions. This is something I feel could also be a focus for my other child, especially H...who is reading at Level 5. I think I need to look at and work on some of my letter work, making it flow quickly (less drill!!) The words selected for magnetic work do not just have to come from the reading books they can come from the child’s writing. I still need to look ahead at where the children are now and what to do next to where I want them to be with reading.

This is positive and forward looking for change in her teaching. Tracey wrote a list about what she would take away for her teaching.

Use of magnetic letters – appropriate use, not using sounds
Purpose of it is to promote instant recognition of letters
Make new word appear – don’t need to connect sounds with it at this stage
Promote fluency and phrasing in reading, especially in familiar reading
Strong introduction – need to supply structure
Meaning structure and visual information all need to be addressed
And concluded with: ‘I really appreciated the discussion that took place after my teaching – helped reinforce things that were strengths and perhaps weaknesses’.

Maura wrote:

*I will work towards fluency in reading and how to introduce the new book. Make sure I give a proper introduction before the child begins reading the new book. Show the child a pattern in reading, e.g. after speech marks you nearly always find the word ‘said’. Use magnetic letters quickly. Try not to talk too much during the lesson. Keep to the point and manage time well.*

This shows that as an adult learner Maura could summarise what was discussed and what meant something to her teaching as well as those who taught most. The written reflections, at this point in the teachers’ learning, are more about how to do things and what to do. Diane wrote:

*I’ve learned today more ways of encouraging phrased, fluent reading when reading familiar texts. I’ve also had reinforced more ideas about how to introduce a new book. From watching the teachers behind the screen I have more ideas about how to use the letter-work at the board. I was not aware of what C... demonstrated for us – training the children to see – silent manipulation of the letters singly and eventually in clusters. I will have to read up how much support to give to the children in composing their sentence.*

These examples represent the themes of the teachers’ written reflections. Mary-Lou gave herself sections of the text to read as well as a focus for her teaching. Conversation before composing was her interest as she expressed her difficulty with this in the introductory discussion. Hence she wrote: ‘Be more effective in my conversation to enlist an easily constructed story from the child.’ Shelley’s written reflection linked her personal school visit with the Tutor with the discussion at this session. So it is important to acknowledge that the ‘school visit’ which is not part of this analysis is an added social dimension in teacher learning.

*I’m thinking about the fluency of the reading and how important it is especially after C...’s visit yesterday. I didn’t really realise how important it was for the child to be reading quickly and for their eyes to be looking ahead. Now I do understand. It has been really helpful to go over ‘Introducing the Book’ both with C... during her visit to school and during the tutorial. I now realise that the introduction must be very full and that structures need to be rehearsed so that the child is not bogged*
down by these, thereby inhibiting fluency. I have already tried a much more full introduction and rehearsal of the structures with one of my children and it was successful.

Another category of learning was in Jemma’s written reflection: ‘I need to focus less on letter formation and more on writing quickly and accurately’, as well as the need for trying a variety of strategies (methods) for each component. Belinda included: ‘I need to make sure they are focusing on beginning letters as a strategic activity as well as being confident with the little words they know. Maria wrote: ‘Orchestration, a great word and visual image for the way reading is supposed to sound and is something to hold and to work towards each day.’ While Jade’s first comment was: ‘I need to read and re-read and re-read MORE! Jade’s final comment was that she felt that there needed to be more time to ask questions during the session. Jade’s question in her written reflection was about her understanding of ‘how quickly to move children’. She also wrote reminders for herself about her note-taking: ‘I need to work on my note-taking so as to not interrupt the flow of the lesson. Remember to note-take three times – before, during, after.’ And Jade acknowledged the benefit of observing teaching to her own teaching: ‘Watching Lara and Tracey’s lessons, was very beneficial as it made me think of my own teaching and how to improve it’.

5.1.5 Session Three: Conclusion

1 a)
What are the major characteristics of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in the group that unfold during a RR session?

The Introductory Discussion

The Tutor facilitated oral language interactions from the teachers during this part of the session. She disclosed the expectation that the teachers would try to make a contribution and initiated an open question: ‘What am I thinking about in my teaching and why?’, to invite active participation from the teachers whereby they could contribute from their personal experiences in teaching RR in the first three-four weeks of the children’s interventions. The Tutor thanked the first teacher for her
disclosure and waited for teachers to make contributions. The Tutor also linked to common experiences she had with the teachers during the school visits to encourage their participation:

The Tutor prepared the teachers for the lesson observations by developing a meaningful context for the observations that were about to occur. She directed them to a text reference and elicited teacher understanding of the meaning by asking them to explain in their own words, e.g. familiar reading would ‘sound good’, what does that mean?

The Tutor highlighted what would be importance for the teachers and how to evaluate whether the observation matched the expectation e.g. having an understanding of the meaning of ‘orchestration’ so they would know how to evaluate what they saw in the lessons. The Tutor asked what ‘orchestration’ would be like and also what reading would be like if it was not ‘orchestrated’. The Tutor implied what would contribute to reading not being orchestrated, e.g. an over-attention to visual information.

The Tutor shaped the teachers’ contributions by requiring teachers to extend their thoughts: can you unpick ‘sounds good’? ‘what do you think it means?’; confirming what the teachers were saying ‘yes you are’; and by offering some dissonance when the teacher said she was teaching for ‘success’ and the Tutor said ‘it is already successful if it is a ‘familiar book’.

**The Lesson Observations: (Lesson One)**

The Tutor led the lesson observation discussions. She elicited teacher contributions by asking questions – what (what have you seen so far?); why (why do you think it goes like that?); how (how can you tell?). She called for further contributions (someone else?) and did ask for teachers to reflect on what they would do (if you wanted to improve that what would you be doing?)
The Tutor elicited RR teacher knowledge in relation to the lesson observations (what’s the purpose of this activity? why must he say the next word in writing? do you think he’s reading for meaning? who’s read this book before? how does it work?)

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention for what to be noticing during the observation. This was in a focused way (look at...listen to this...does he look at the picture when...did you see her do this...listen to him now); and in a way to have the group re-attend to the action of the lesson (now here comes the second text, watching...Now, let’s look.)

The Tutor evaluated the lesson observation thereby modelling the teacher’s observations (that’s a problem isn’t it? She’s working quite well isn’t she? Good, now we’re getting more talking. Excellent...that’s what Clay says...Yes, that’s important)

The Tutor explained to the teachers thereby building their knowledge. These explanations were varied and led by the observation. They related to eye-movement in poor reading (a wandering eye); changes that needed to occur e.g. your job is...; independence (in managing the task); the amount of talking in the lesson; how the book worked that the child was reading (a question and answer book); when reading was smoother the words were coming together.

The Tutor highlighted what needed to be remembered and elicited the assistance of a group member to help do that (make a little note); the management of activities (time); aspects of the teaching that made it good; and word by word reading not being a feature of ‘reading for meaning’.

**The Discussion**

The Tutor managed the teachers’ social interaction during the discussion. This involved establishing the social etiquette of the discussion time whereby the teachers were thanked; they had the opportunity to comment of the typicality of their lesson (so that an a-typical lesson was not discussed in detail); that the teachers would talk
with each other about main ideas that arose in the lesson observations what would be useful for everyone’s teaching; and finding book references in ‘Literacy Lessons’ to supplement the teaching experience and the observations.

The Tutor shaped the discussion format. She assisted the teachers to manage their thoughts and how to express them; to arrive at the main ideas that arose during the lesson observations and to link their ideas with the right lesson. The novelty of the situation was pronounced in the discussion. The teachers initially could not follow the format.

The Tutor modelled how teachers would speak with each other during the interaction on more than one occasion because the teachers were trying to recall what they had observed and how they communicated that was in disconnected ideas that the teachers who taught could not follow. This involved tone; directing your talk to the person who taught and the language to use, e.g. we were wondering. After the Tutor had modelled once she asked a teacher to develop her idea for the teachers who taught. The teacher passed and said she was sorry that she couldn’t.

The Tutor helped the teachers locate relevant references in their texts ‘Literacy lessons’ by leading an exploration of the text. The Tutor participated with the group members in locating references for the main idea ‘how to teach for fluency in familiar reading’. The teachers discovered many references to ‘familiar reading’ but they were redirected by the Tutor to their topic: ‘how to teach for it’. The Tutor then directed the teachers to evaluate whether they had located the useful reference for their exploration of their topic against what they were looking for. In this way the Tutor enacted a hands-on experience with the course texts.

The Tutor shaped the teachers learning. She clarified meaning for the teachers (explaining the difference between a procedure of ‘putting two words together’ and the meaning of ‘phrasing’); linked the procedure under discussion to her own teaching (what she did with her child today); used the books the teachers knew to explain; highlighted the intention of the author of RR’ the aims and goals of reaching sections and the importance to attach to the words of the author (the storybook introduction section was prefaced by what the teacher ‘might’ do); and the Tutor
helped the teachers articulate links themselves as part of the discussion (what had to change if children were to read at a fast pace).

The Tutor linked topics that arose in the discussion. One discussion flowed through connected topics: fluent reading – finger pointing – what happens if it persists – directional movement, with reference to the texts. Another followed through the connected topics of: meaning – prediction – early reading – oral language – use of visual information (visual signposts) – rich storybook introductions. This flow developed versatility in the teachers’ use of their texts that are their reference for their teaching.

The Tutor created meaningful references for the teachers by the use of story analogy or partial analogy when she linked ‘visual signposts’ in early reading to using ‘foot-holes’ when mountain climbing, as navigating one’s way through text, and took the persona of the child to explain the literacy processing: ‘I can look at those initial letters, I’ve got a few words that I know and a powerful prediction about meaning, that I can confirm as I read with what I know; and the more I practice the more I notice.’

The Tutor gave a demonstration of procedure and role played with a teacher in the group. The other group members followed the text and the action and evaluated whether the actions matched the text. The Tutor explained as the role play continued what the purpose of the activity and modified what she thought about the activity as a teacher read from the text.

1 b)

What are the major characteristics of the teachers’ social interaction that unfold during a RR session and how are they orchestrated by the Tutor?

The Introductory Discussion

The teachers contributed to the discussion by following the Tutor’s request to participate and could do this because the request was related directly to their
experience. The teachers disclosed that they were thinking ahead about how the children would achieve as in ‘where next?’; and what were challenges to them at the beginning of the course (e.g. using lesson records, timing the lessons’ having conversations with the children). One teacher shared with the group about a school visit she had had with the Tutor after being asked to do so by the Tutor.

The teachers related their own understanding of language, and their teaching experience to the meaning of the text. This became their expectations for their lesson observations. In the exploration of meaning there was no right or wrong, all the teachers could contribute.

The Tutor managed contributions from the teachers by relating her questions to what they already knew: their personal experiences and their understanding of language; and also by being open about eliciting contributions: e.g. ‘try to say something’; ‘could you share with the group Shelley’; ‘could someone put that in your own words?’; ‘anyone else?’

The teachers introduced their children being taught that day after the Tutor had shaped the way they would do that outside the session. Their introductions were brief and contextualised the observation for the group members in relation to their own teaching. The emphasis by the teachers was on who the children were and their ages, what the children could do, and their personalities.

**The Lesson Observations (Lesson Two)**

The teachers had a multifaceted task that they were new to in Session Three. This involved: observing; commenting on observations; listening to the Tutor and each other; synthesising information; sharing their thoughts with others and evaluating the observations and what others were saying. The Tutor orchestrated the teachers’ social interactions.

As novices in the observations the teachers mainly commented directly on what they saw (articulating their interpretations) or answered a question from the Tutor. The second category was more varied, in that it involved interpretation, evaluation and
articulation of main ideas, e.g. linking making mistakes and searching behaviour; what was good about the reading being observed and the teaching by the teacher; and what they valued (e.g. ownership of the task by the child).

There were few questions in the interaction as the teachers followed the format of keeping up with the Tutor and the lesson, as well as working as a group.

**The Discussion**

The Tutor orchestrated the teachers’ participation in their social interactions during Session Three as they were learning how to use their texts independently for problem-solving and how to relate what they observed; what they were teaching and what this meant in RR.

The teachers learnt the social etiquette of the interaction of the discussion around the lesson observations they had taught, for the first time. This involved them in thanking one another. The features of the teaching the two teachers who thanked highlighted were: bravery (going first); their enthusiasm; their rapport with the children; how planned the teachers were; their time management; how they used what the children knew in their teaching; made links across the lesson; used their written notes for their teaching points and were in control of their lessons.

The teachers were confused when they tried to recall the lessons they had observed and the main ideas discussed during the lesson observations. They did not give any feedback to the teachers who taught when they were trying to agree to what they had talked about and which lesson the topic belonged to. The teachers learnt how to interact with each other in the discussion through the modelling by the Tutor. One teacher picked up on how to do this quite quickly.

The teachers acted co-operatively when they searched for references in their texts ‘Literacy Lessons’ although it took them quite a while to find the relevant section they wanted rather than sections that referred generally to the topic. This was directed by the Tutor. It is a demonstration of how to find what answers to your questions as a teacher; how to be independent; and how to be versatile in managing
the texts. When the teacher asked a question of the Tutor the direction was back to the text (is it appropriate to run your finger under the word when you’re trying for fluency?).

The teachers could relate quickly to their own experiences. Therefore they could explain to each another how they had tried to use procedures in the texts; and also their experiences in their schools when the Tutor visited them to observe and give guidance around a lesson.

The teachers could quickly align their ideas around a topic when the Tutor brought the discussion together based on the previous discussion. However they did not always follow the flow of the discussion ideas, for example when Shelley related her experience about teaching for structure in written text with Diane’s comments, which has a Tutor explanation on another topic in between.

The teachers would participate in role-play and demonstrations learning through concrete examples of how to manage teaching procedures. During the demonstrations they evaluated it against the text and could clarify any questions they had for their learning.

What the teachers said they learnt in their independent written reflections were all linked to the observations and discussions in the session, with only Shelley referring back to her school visit with the Tutor. The topics covered in Session Three that are mentioned in these reflections are: fluency in familiar reading; letter work on the magnetic whiteboard; strong story introductions; teaching for all sources of information; teaching for use of punctuation; talking less during the lesson; time management; not focusing on handwriting; use of initial letters and known words in reading; working towards ‘orchestration’ in reading; and how to take notes (not interrupting the lesson flow and working on them on three occasions: before, during and after the lesson). Jade reflected that she had to re-read the texts; wondered about having more time in sessions to ask questions during sessions; and acknowledged the benefit of observing others teach:
‘Watching Lara and Tracey’s lessons was very beneficial as it made me think of my own teaching and how to improve it.’
APPENDIX L2: DATA REDUCTION

Sessions Seven to Nine

Sessions seven to nine were midway through the RR course (18 sessions). The teachers had been introduced to the main procedures in their texts ‘Literacy Lessons Parts One and Two’. They were starting their second turns in teaching behind the glass screen. During Session eight Lara was teaching for the second time and during session nine Tracey was teaching for the second time (Session Three). In Session Seven the teachers were Mary-Lou and Maura. By this time on the course they had taught children in their own schools daily for 11-12 weeks.

5.2 Session Seven (audio taped)

5.2.1 Session Seven (audio-taped): Introductory Discussion.

Session Seven started in the circle with the teachers facing each other and with their texts books and notebooks on their knees. The session was introduced by the Tutor as being about one ‘Key Understanding’ for RR teaching: ‘independence’. The information on the draft ‘Guidesheet’ handed to the teachers was:

“Highest value is set on independent problem-solving. Child should gain some measure of independence on some tasks from the start. Independent activity is that the child initiates and carries out on his own. One cannot ‘teach it’. Situations need to be set up within which the child can initiate successful activity.”


The Tutor asked the teachers what they thought ‘independence’ would mean in RR teaching. Lara said that children would be able to ‘problem-solve’ and Jade said that they would be able to ‘monitor’.

The Tutor then gave the group a handout with two quotes about ‘independence’ from the texts ‘Literacy Lessons’.
“Independence is encouraged from the beginning of the lessons in that the teacher never does anything for the child that he could do for himself ... the child is expected to carry out whatever he can do independently and he knows what is expected of him.” (ref: ‘Literacy Lessons, Part One’, p61)

“Reading Recovery sets the highest value on independent responding and this must involve risks of being wrong.

Children should gain some measure of independence on their tasks at each book level, even novice readers.

The goal of the teaching is to assist the child to construct effective networks in his brain for linking up the strategic activity that will be needed to work on texts, not merely to accumulate items of knowledge.

It is necessary to develop self-correcting by allowing room for self correcting initiated by the child. A teacher who only allowed for correct responding would not be allowing the child to learn self correcting behaviours.

Any theoretical position that includes self monitoring and self correcting as significant behaviours in reading and writing implies the existence of near misses, approximations, responses not corrected and sometimes corrected responses. The important thing about the self corrections is that the child initiates them because he sees that something is wrong and calls up his own resources for working on a solution. This is one kind of critical literacy!” (ref: ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’, p116)

After this reading Jade commented that child ‘independence’ would involve teachers having ‘wait-time’ (not jumping in to fix mistakes before children have the opportunity to solve them). The Tutor emphasised that teaching ‘for independence’ would involve teaching for ‘strategic activities’.13

The Tutor linked the concept of ‘strategic activities’ to the long-term learning goals called ‘Predictions of Progress’ that the teachers had learned to write before starting a child’s lesson series based on the preliminary ‘Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement’.14 The teachers had written on the basis of a range of assessments what the children needed to learn. The strategic activities include: self-monitoring; cross-checking information; searching in word sequences and letter

---

13 Strategic activities’ in RR theory refer to brain function that is inferred by observable behaviour. These include storing information, connecting, linking, self-monitoring, searching, correcting etc. through neural pathways.

sequences to solve problems; and self-correcting independently, as they read continuous print (books).

The Tutor asked the teachers to refer to a section in their texts on ‘self-monitoring’ and invited Maria to explain how she had been using a procedure from this section, which had been previously demonstrated and discussed on a school visit by the Tutor. Maria, however, was somewhat confused in her explanation and demonstration:

*I’ve been doing it to help them in what to expect at the beginning. You put your thumb over it and if you were going to say it, say it was ‘nut’ and they say ‘not’, put your thumb over it. You said ‘n’ what would you expect to see if you were going to say ‘not’? Oh, I can’t remember which way. You’re going to say you thought it was ‘nut’ but it was actually ‘not’. What did you expect to see? And they’ll say ‘u’. And you’ll say, well what did it actually say? And you move your finger away and they say…no well it wasn’t. (Maria)*

The Tutor clarified Maria’s explanation for the group, to which Maria commented:

*I find it very powerful when you say that to them because as soon as you move your finger away they’re taken aback, you know, and then they hurry up and they get that next letter. What should it be? (Maria)*

The Tutor referred to the text to explain that self-monitoring would involve teaching the children how to determine whether they were right or wrong themselves (independence).

*Unless you are working towards that dissonance, self-realisation, that ‘I am not right, there is more work to be done’, we’re not going to have problem solvers and independent readers. (Tutor)*

The teachers thought that the children they were teaching were not independent.

*They just sit there and wait for you to tell them. They fuss and fuss around and it doesn’t happen. (Maria)*

*And we’re not waiting for them either, to have a go. (Diane)*

*Well I’m just jumping in and telling them because I just don’t know any other way. (Maria)*

*I’m the same. (Diane)*
The Tutor concluded this section of the discussion by saying that this was a year long course for them to learn what to do with different children and introduced the writing activity in RR lessons. The Tutor linked writing to independence through classroom practice. ‘So in the classroom what does the child have to be able to do?’ The teachers agreed that ‘independence’ was the expectation of classroom teachers, that they should be able to ‘have a go’ (an Australian colloquial expression that indicates the ‘initiation’ of some ‘action’ by the children using their current resources). The Tutor explained what ‘have a go’ might mean in RR, using ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’ (p59-60), to structure her explanation:

He [the child] has to think these things: Can I spell it? Yes, I’ll write it. Could I think of the sounds in that word? Yes, I’ll do that. Do I know another word that sounds like that? OK, I’ll do that. Do I know the spelling pattern for ‘ing’ or something like that? Yes, I’ll do that. These are questions he has to have in his mind because we taught him how to think that way. (Tutor)

In response to this discussion before the teaching, some of the participants reflected on their own teaching.

In want to say… I’m just getting used to the language and your expectations (Lara)
I’m already questioning myself at the end of each lesson now. Is what I’m doing, in this lesson, helping the child to become independent? Whereas I wasn’t. (Belinda)

The Tutor’s social interactions in the introductory discussion were directed towards establishing knowledge prior to the lesson observations. The teachers’ social interactions were mainly in response to the Tutor questions and directions. The teachers occasionally built on to the thinking by their peers, such as the interaction between Diane and Maria (above) where the problem was teacher frustration when children do not initiate or do not have ways of initiating problem-solving, so the teachers tell the children the ‘words’ because they do not know what to do. There were a few examples of teachers repeating each other:

Tutor: So in the classroom what does the child have to be able to do?
Mary-Lou: They’ve got to be able to do it themselves.
Diane: Do it himself.

RR lessons include reading and writing activities.
Lara said the language and the expectations in RR were different for her.

_Tutor: Now you can see that in terms of independence, I think our job is much more complicated than we might have originally thought. So what is your reaction to that before we need to move on?
_Lara: I want to say...just getting used to that language and your expectations._

**Teacher Introductions of children:**

_Maura: My little boy is T...He’s been on the program for 11 weeks and he’s reading Level 13. He’s using visual help well but he has to read for meaning and to write quickly and accurately and to write more complex sentences._

_Mary-Lou: OK. Georgina is on her 47th lesson in Week 12 and she started on level 3 and is now on level 12. In order for her to discontinue with reading I expect that she’s consistent and flexible. In writing I expect her to be quick and writing all the sounds in the correct sequence._

**5.2.2 Session Seven (audio-recording): Lesson Observations**

The main characteristics of the Tutor’s role during this episode in the Session Seven ‘lesson observations’ were: to shape teacher knowledge in relation to RR teaching practices and literacy learning theory; to highlight what was salient in the observations and to link the observations to the teachers’ child introductions; the session theme/s; and RR knowledge.

**5.2.2.1 Shaping Teacher Knowledge:**

During discussion at the glass screen, the Tutor shaped teacher knowledge around: book choices (when ‘new books’ were selected); how children acted on their own theories about reading (e.g. trying to decode words at the point of difficulty); that reading in RR involved comprehension; that the ‘familiar reading’ activity was to be fluent and ‘orchestrated’; that the child had to monitor his/her own reading for error; and that opportunities for independent action involved allowing children to be wrong, so that they could detect their errors and correct them. In writing activities the main ideas were that: teachers were responsible for creating conversations with
children to elicit ideas for what they were going to write about and the child’s independence in writing was taught through what teachers say in interactions.

Table 1: Shaping Knowledge Across Two Lesson Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main idea</th>
<th>Social Interaction (data)</th>
<th>Tutor role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are better ‘New Book’ selections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>Tutor: Why do we need to suggest this is a better book? [than the previous book not read well] Tutor: [It has] More words. He can predict. He can use natural language. Reread and think what would make sense.</td>
<td>Questioning Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children have their own theories about reading</td>
<td>Lesson 1/7 Tutor: Where do you think he [the child] thinks he has to solve? Tutor: Yes, that’s what he thinks… what we want is the prediction of meaning and then the checking of visual information.</td>
<td>Questioning Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading is about comprehension</td>
<td>Lesson 1/7 Tutor: If you’re going to make a judgment [about how to assist the child] what is the first basis that you’re going to make it on? Tutor: That’s right.</td>
<td>Questioning Confirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Familiar Reading’ is for ‘orchestrated reading’</td>
<td>Lesson 2/7 Tutor: OK. In Reading Recovery there is no holding the child up for words in ‘Familiar Reading’… the purpose is orchestrated reading. It’s not to fix up error, because the error shouldn’t be there. OK. Can you see what happens? As soon as you focus on error what do you do to the process? Tutor: What else do you do?.</td>
<td>Directing (telling) Directing (attention) Re-directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child monitors his/her own reading</td>
<td>Lesson 2/7 Tutor: What’s happened here? Tutor: Why would she do that? (Observing the teacher say: That didn’t make sense, go back and reread.) Tutor: If she [the child] is monitoring her reading, if she is listening to herself. And she’s made an error to do with meaning she has to pick it up, doesn’t she?</td>
<td>Directing (attention) Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence involves allowing children to be wrong</td>
<td>Lesson 2/7 Tutor: What did Clay say about a process that values self correction? Tutor: It means that you have the right to be wrong without a teacher who picks up at every error. You’re going to have to let them go.</td>
<td>Linking Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are to create a</td>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interactions show that the Tutor mainly led phases of speaking through: questioning, directing the teachers’ observations, or telling, and explaining. In response to a teacher’s contribution the Tutor expanded or confirmed the teacher’s ideas. Additionally the Tutor linked the observations to the course texts.

5.2.2.2 Highlighting Salient Points in the Observation

In Table 2 (below) are examples of when the Tutor highlighted salient points in the on-going observation. The teachers were directed by the Tutor to: what was important; what needed to change in the teaching; what was to be remembered for possible future discussion; and what was problematic in the teaching being observed. Teachers in the group was delegated the role of summarising the discussions, e.g.

So what did we get to as main areas for the reading part Jemma? (Tutor)
Not interrupting. The re-reading. Conversation. That rising voice. (Jemma)

The content knowledge that the Tutor highlighted that was important was that: the ‘familiar reading’ by the child had to be phrased and fluent; the ‘new book’ activity was the most important activity so adequate time had to be allowed for it to be completed; when the teachers talked about reading they were talking about
‘processing’ that involved the ‘integration’ of many sources of ‘information’; the teachers were to teach children how to be independent through open questioning and refining their ‘prompting’; ‘new books’ needed an appropriate introduction by the teacher to facilitate the child’s successful reading; child independence involved children knowing ‘how to’ problem-solve; the child’s reading of the first page of the ‘new book’ facilitated successful reading because it provided the ‘setting’ for the story; independence in writing involved the child monitoring the meaning of his/her message; children understood more about words when they were taught using words they knew; independence involved improvements from day to day; and the teachers’ approach to the teaching needed to become more flexible.

What needed to be **remembered** by the teachers in Session Seven was that: phrasing in reading was important; the ‘familiar reading’ should not be interrupted by the teacher; the child needed to be an active participant in the lesson; and that the child in one lesson was reliant on one source of information for solving while the other child was capable of integrating all sources of information to solve.

What was to **change** was: a primary attention by the child and the teacher to decoding; a lack of trust of the child’s ability to act on what had been taught which involved giving ‘wait-time’; and that the teachers were not to read to the children during a RR lesson.

What was **problematic** was: the first action at difficulty by one child was to decode (sound out); teacher interruption of reading did not allow for child self-monitoring and independent solving; neglecting to teach the child to re-read so that he could locate his own errors; having a ‘rising voice’ on the first word of a page or sentence (inappropriate stress); reliance on slow articulation of words to write rather than chunking sounds; and the way the teachers managed time in the literacy activities across the whole lesson, to allow for the reading of a whole ‘new book’.

Highlighting salient points was the way of shaping the teachers’ teaching practices. This was mainly achieved by the Tutor through directing the teachers’ attention to observe what was salient; directing them in what to do in their teaching; and making
links during the lesson observations to the ‘themes’ for the session which were: ‘independence’ and discontinuing the lesson series.

Table 2 : Highlighting Salient Points Across Two Lesson Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlighting</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Tutor role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>Familiar Reading is to be phrased and fluent</td>
<td>Directing (telling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>So her focus is still on visual information and what you’re saying for him to be better...his phrasing has to be quicker and it has to be smoother and flowing. That’s fluency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>The ‘new book’ is the most important part of the Reading Recovery Lesson (Observing the start of the New Book: Pepper’s Adventure PM (L13). The teacher’s book introduction).</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Now this is the most important part. Has she got 10 minutes to go?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>Teachers are to talk about ‘processing’ that involves an integration of information</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>OK. What can you tell me about her processing?</td>
<td>Confirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Yes she’s monitoring. Is the processing integrated? We would say that it is.</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>Teachers are to teach children how to be independent through their scaffolding</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Look what happens? ...if you’re going to prompt for independence what is the most open thing you can say?</td>
<td>Directing (telling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>...OK, if that’s not going to help him? You could say ‘try that again, think what would make sense and say the first part’. OK?</td>
<td>Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>...what I’m trying to say is that I’ve noticed in your teaching that you don’t have a series of things you say. You have one thing ... and then you just stop, you know. Can you sort of rationalise for yourself where you’re going because you want the child to know how to do it independently?</td>
<td>Re-directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>If you want to change his behaviour how else are you going to do it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1/7</td>
<td>‘New books’ need an appropriate introduction to facilitate the child’s successful reading and independence involves knowing ‘how to’ problem-solve</td>
<td>Directing (attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Would you change the way she’s introducing the book?</td>
<td>Directing (telling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>I think he’s going to need more of the meaning?</td>
<td>Directing (telling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>OK. Can you see that Clay was saying...that you’re doing a lot of scaffolding at the beginning of a new book level? So you’re never going to say: ‘Oh, I’m going to do minimal book introductions now!’ Or “I think you should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 ‘Discontinuing a lesson series’ refers to when it is decided by the teacher and her school colleagues, guided by the Tutor, that the child is independent enough not to require the individual intervention of RR lessons. Therefore the lessons are ‘discontinued’ and the child is thought of as being ‘discontinued’.
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be independent so I won’t do anything.’
Tutor: But it’s what [we] understand independence to be. What’s our job? To help him to become independent?
Tutor: We have to teach him how to be independent. Does that involve not doing anything?
Tutor: It means showing him ‘how’ all the time, consistently showing him ‘how’.

**Lesson 2/7**

Reading the first page of the ‘new book’ well is important for successful reading
Tutor: No matter what sort of introduction you did, the child has to be able to read the first page.
Tutor: No, because the introduction hasn’t emphasised that..
Tutor: Why do you think the first page is important?
Maria: Because it gives them confidence to go on.
Tutor: That’s it! That’s the rationale. The setting is in the first page.

**Lesson 2/7**

Observing writing

Independence in writing involves the child monitoring the meaning
Tutor: So where does she have to go to be more independent? What do you think might happen in the classroom?
Tutor: So what part is she not keeping together?
Tutor: The monitoring of the meaning of her message. She’s not doing that.

**Lesson 1/7**

Teachers teach children about words when they know the words
Tutor: Can you see? [The children] cannot do things they do not know how to do.
Tutor: Well, you’re in a problem now aren’t you? I would suggest that you teach him more there
Tutor: Where is a good place for a kid to understand what you’re doing?
Tutor: It’s easier for him to understand what you’re talking about.

**Lesson 1/7**

Independence involves improvements
Tutor: So although we’ve seen him being independent we’re not seeing the teacher helping him be more independent and better tomorrow. That’s what he has to be.

**To remember**

**Lesson 1/7**

Phrasing is important
Tutor: So what needs to be improved?
Tutor: The phrasing, Can you hold onto that?

**Lesson 2/7**

‘Familiar reading’ should not be interrupted by the teacher
Tutor: OK? Nice. Someone needs to be writing this down. Can you do this for me Jemma? Can you just put down ‘not interrupting the familiar reading’?

**Lesson 1/7**

Children need to be active participants
Tutor: OK can you put this down. He has to be active all the time. There’s nothing that’s going to annoy a classroom teacher more than a child who stops and starts because that’s not good processing. He has to keep active.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1/7</th>
<th>Lesson 2/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The child being reliant on one source of information</strong></td>
<td><strong>The child is integrating information to solve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: OK, put that down for as Lara. He just relies on the one thing It’s good to have one recorder, so we can get back to it.</td>
<td>Tutor: Nice. Did you see that? That’s what we want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(observing child read) ‘I wish/I wish/I will…I will help you now’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Can you write that down for us? She didn’t stop. So the process [is being] integrated at this time...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1/7</th>
<th>Lesson 2/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To change</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teachers do not read to the children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher attention focused on one source of information the word level for solving</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teachers do not read to the children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: If you’re going to come in with your own personal theory of how children learn to read. What level of language would you focus on? What do you think is a common area of language that teachers focus on?</td>
<td>Tutor: You are not here to read to the child. Can you direct children to do things without reading to them? You must be able to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Yes, it’s here</td>
<td>Tutor: It’s not your job to read. If you do, all [the children] do is copy you...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Yes, so she’s focusing on the word and getting the word right... it’s [about] using the continuous print and being able to work it out. It’s not uncommon [what the teacher is doing] would you agree?</td>
<td>They copy your voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: So the idea is to possibly take yourself back to where [this teacher] knows she should be which is reading for meaning and comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Because you don’t trust them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: You don’t trust them to work it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: If you’re going to come in with your own personal theory of how children learn to read. What level of language would you focus on? What do you think is a common area of language that teachers focus on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Yes, it’s here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Yes, so she’s focusing on the word and getting the word right... it’s [about] using the continuous print and being able to work it out. It’s not uncommon [what the teacher is doing] would you agree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: So the idea is to possibly take yourself back to where [this teacher] knows she should be which is reading for meaning and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Because you don’t trust them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: You don’t trust them to work it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: If you’re going to come in with your own personal theory of how children learn to read. What level of language would you focus on? What do you think is a common area of language that teachers focus on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Yes, it’s here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Yes, so she’s focusing on the word and getting the word right... it’s [about] using the continuous print and being able to work it out. It’s not uncommon [what the teacher is doing] would you agree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: So the idea is to possibly take yourself back to where [this teacher] knows she should be which is reading for meaning and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: Because you don’t trust them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor: You don’t trust them to work it out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 2/7</th>
<th>Lesson 2/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers interrupting for accurate reading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teachers interrupting for accurate reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Did it sound right? It could do! But the teacher said, try that again it doesn’t look right. What does the teacher mean?</td>
<td>Tutor: Did it sound right? It could do! But the teacher said, try that again it doesn’t look right. What does the teacher mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Can you put down: ‘Luca fell over his bike for Luca fell off his bike’. And did it make sense?</td>
<td>Tutor: Can you put down: ‘Luca fell over his bike for Luca fell off his bike’. And did it make sense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: And [the child] had used visual information?</td>
<td>Tutor: And [the child] had used visual information?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The child’s reliance on one strategy (trying to decode)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: Now that’s problematic. What would you expect him to automatically do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: What does he do every time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The main characteristics of the Tutor’s role during this episode in the Session Seven ‘lesson observations’ were: to shape teacher knowledge in relation to RR teaching practices and literacy learning theory; to highlight what was salient in the observations and to link the observations to the teachers’ child introductions; the session theme/s; and RR knowledge.

5.2.2.3 Interactions during the Reading Activities in Lesson One

The following are examples of the Tutor and teachers’ interactions during the lesson observations of the reading activities in Lesson 1. These are clusters of discussion. Some clusters are led by the teachers commenting on their observations, but they are mainly led by the Tutor. They show how the Tutor orchestrated the teachers’ interactions.

Example of interactions: Familiar Reading (Lesson 1)

The Tutor worked on shaping teacher knowledge in this cluster of talk. It involved the teacher choice of books for children to read and what they offered the reader, in
an intervention where prediction is valued an important strategic activity because the child can enact the current competency of his own oral language.

_Tutor:_ That is a better book. Why do we need to suggest that? Why do you think it might be better?

_Diane:_ Because it has a story.

_Tutor:_ More words. He can predict. He can use natural language.

In this cluster of talk the teacher started a series of interactions which the Tutor commented on in relation to the themes of the session: independence and discontinuing the lesson series because the children have been prepared to work without the extra RR teacher assistance in their classrooms. The teachers articulated that independence is a self initiated act and the child would have more than one choice of behaving because he is flexible. The Tutor highlighted the salient point of ‘flexibility’ to be remembered by the teachers.

_Lara:_ He knew that part. He knew that it didn’t have meaning.

_Tutor:_ And he solved on the run...so that bodes well for the classroom.

_Belinda:_ Yes, because he did that totally without referring to the teacher.

_Lara:_ That also shows that he’s not relying solely on one strategy to solve a word. Like he doesn’t always re-read. He goes somewhere else.

_Belinda:_ He covered the ‘a’ and said ‘gain’ and then ‘again’

_Tutor:_ Hold on to those examples because if he only does it one way, that’s not the flexible independent reader we want in the classroom.

In this cluster of talk, the Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to RR knowledge about fluent reading where the teachers linked their current RR knowledge to the current performance linking fluency and ‘phrasing’ as part of ‘orchestrated reading’.

_Tutor:_ Is that fluent reading?

_Maria:_ It’s very static.

_Tutor:_ So what needs to be improved?

_Jade:_ The phrasing.

_Tutor:_ The phrasing, can you hold on to that?
The Tutor modelled for the group how to summarise their observations and defined the meaning of ‘fluency’ in orchestrated reading as part of RR knowledge.

*Tutor:* So her focus is still on visual information and what you’re saying for him to be better...his phrasing has to be quicker and it has to be smoother and flowing. That’s fluency. Can you write that down? Lara you can be our recorder.

The Tutor highlighted salient points in the observation (in this case as being ‘problematic’) and re-directed the teachers to what they would expect to observe when a child came to a difficulty in reading. The Tutor lifted this understanding to the case uninterrupted reading and solving, or children needing to be ‘active’ and ‘fast’ as this would be appreciated and valued in the classroom by classroom teachers as ‘good processing’. The Tutor brought the literacy activity to a conclusion by highlighting what was to be remembered by the teachers.

*Tutor:* Now that’s problematic...what would you expect him to automatically do?

Teacher: Re-read.

*Tutor:* Re-read and think what would make sense. OK. Can you put this down...he has to be active all the time. There is nothing that is going to annoy a classroom teacher more than a kid who stops and starts, because it’s not good processing. He has to keep active. That mean if he can do ‘again’ on the run, that’s good. But he didn’t stop for it did he?

*Lara:* So pulling the strategies together quicker...like try re-reading.

*Tutor:* I’ve made a decision I don’t know that word...so I’ve got to re-read and think what makes sense that looks like that and I’ve got to do it fast. Put that down. It is fast!

**Example of interactions:** Yesterday’s New Book – child reads independently and teaching after (Lesson 1)

In this cluster of talk the Tutor highlighted the problematic in relation to the child’s independence, linking this to classroom expectations of the children. The teacher talk teased out that independence for the classroom would mean that the child was prepared for decision-making on the basis of alternate choices of action.

*Tutor:* What is he doing that’s not helpful?

*Maria:* He’s looking at her for confirmation.

*Tutor:* Yes and what else...that’s not going to help him in the classroom?
Belinda: He’s focusing on the miniature.
Tutor: The part, that’s right.
Belinda: To work it out.
Tutor: Would you like that if you were the classroom teacher? He’s out with his fingers trying to do things. Would you think that’s good?
Belinda: Not every time, in every situation.
Tutor: He has to make a decision doesn’t he? It’s his decision. I can’t get to it by doing that...I’ll have to re-read and think again.

In this cluster of talk the Tutor highlighted patterns in the child’s behaviour when he came to a difficult word to solve (using his fingers to expose parts of the word). The teachers interpreted this as reliance on one action to solve; that he read on from having solved without integrating meaning as a source of information and one teacher compared the quality of this reading the familiar reading. The Tutor linked child behaviour and teacher behaviour. The teachers in this situation focused on their teaching agreed with this link.

Tutor: What does he do every time?
Maria: He puts his finger on it.
Tutor: Right...
Maria: So he’s just relying on one strategy.
Tutor: OK put that down for us Lara...he just relies on one thing.
Maria: And he doesn’t re-read, he just keeps on looking at the word.
Belinda: He’s good on the familiar reading.
Maria: But we’ve moved on now.
Belinda: He’s not on this one.
Lara: He’s reading on from the word rather than going back.
Tutor: He reflects on the way you have taught. If you have taught that he has to make it right each time...that’s what he’s doing. If you have said to him, when you are in trouble the first thing you do is re-read and think what would make sense and keep going ...that’s what the child will do. They’re just a little reflection of us.
Belinda: Very true.

This cluster of talk illustrates that while the teachers follow the observation and the talk they are not versatile enough to hold onto thoughts and information from other parts of the same session. They could not recall within approximately 15 minutes (time between the teacher introduction and this lesson activity) what the teacher who
was teaching told them about discontinuing the lesson series even though they wrote it down (personal notes). The Tutor was the person who reminded the teachers and made links for the teachers across different times in the session. This example also highlighted the need for the Tutor to be memorable in the interactions, linking to the session idea and bringing episodic observations to conclusions that the teachers could recall for one another.

Tutor: What do you think of her idea of what he needs to do to be discontinued?
Belinda: I’ve forgotten.
Tutor: Come on, we’ve got to know.
Belinda: Be fast?
Tutor: She said he has to read for meaning.

This example of the following Tutor talk illustrates modelling of how to think by the Tutor as the teachers observed.

Tutor: ...Is he reading for meaning? (Observing) Listen to see if she’s teaching him for that (Observing) Why is this not working? He doesn’t know what to do. It’s ‘try that again and think what would make sense’. (Observing) You see? She’s talking about sense at the end.

The Tutor followed the timing of the interaction and brought each literacy activity to a conclusion. This longer cluster of talk was by way of the teachers deciding that teaching the child to read for meaning was the teacher’s difficulty. Meaning and comprehension was valued but the teachers did not know how to teach for it.

Tutor: Where does he think he has to solve?
Belinda: The word.
Diane: Look at the word then does the meaning.
Tutor: Yes, that’s what he thinks, but what we want is the prediction of meaning and then the checking of visual information. He should always be predicting first.
Belinda: And then use a word that word make sense.
Tutor: So what are you going to do to help her? [the teacher] [observing]
Diane: I think she said it.
[hearing: ‘read that part again so it makes sense’]
Tutor: Put that down. That’s the best thing she has said.
Diane: I think it’s the same for all of us...getting that meaning activity going.
Tutor: You think that? If it’s not meaningful is it reading?
Diane: No
Tutor: If you’re going to make a judgment [about reading] what’s the first basis that you’re going to make it on?
Tracey: Meaning.
Diane: Comprehension
Tutor: So how are we going to tell this teacher that she’s going to need to focus on comprehension and meaning and she’s right....and how she does it?
Lara: By using prompts like does it make sense and then what would make sense with this story and look like that?

**Example of interactions:** The New Book – child reads with teacher support (Lesson 1)

This is an example of the observation of what is occurring behind the screen and what the observers are commenting on it at the same time. The child had just started reading after a discussion about the cover of the book. It unfolded on the first page that the child did not know the animal characters were ‘pet mice’; a teacher in the group did not know either; and the help the child received to problem-solve was to ‘look at the word’, then having solved the child continued reading from the point of difficulty. What the teachers learn from this interaction is to think about ‘book introductions’ and more about ‘meaning’ as a source of information in reading.

[Observing: Pepper’s Adventure (PM) Level 13 ]
C: (stops)
T: Look at the word.

Jemma: He looked at the picture and thought they were guinea pigs
Tutor: What would you say? Try that again and think what would make sense.
Maria: What are they?
Tutor: Pet mice.

[Observing]
T: What does it start with?

Tutor: Now see where his help is. Where is he getting it?
Belinda: The word level.
Mary-Lou: Getting parts of words
Belinda: And the pictures.

[Observing]
C: (solves ‘pet mice’)

Tutor: Now you see here what’s happened? A whole lot of work at the word and he’s expected to continue.
Belinda: Just from the word.

In this cluster of talk the Tutor highlighted the importance of book introductions and the teachers linked looking at the pictures and decoding as not being successful for the child. The Tutor main point for teaching for independence was disclosed to the teachers as the teachers not having a series of different things they say to the children to help them solve.

Tutor: OK. When you have a minimal book introduction...it’s very hard for the child to read a book from a discussion of the front cover. Now look what he does independently.
Maria: He looked at the picture.
Lara: He’s just reading from the word not from the meaning.
Tutor: Decoding...this is what we call decoding. We couldn’t call that reading for meaning or understanding the sentence in the story, would you?
(Observing)
Tutor: Look what happens. Can you see what happens? If you’re going to prompt for independence what is the most open thing you can say?
Diane: Try that again and think what makes sense.
Tutor: OK. If that’s not going to help him you could say try that again, think what would make sense and say the first part. ... I’ve noticed in your teaching that you don’t have a series of things to say. Can you sort of rationalise for yourself where you’re going because you want the child to know how to do it independently.
Lara: It’s like you said before...you will help at the full-stop...so they have to keep trying various things.

In this cluster the Tutor shaped the teachers’ thinking by challenging them and saying that ‘independence’ is easy to say but led the teachers to say what it might mean for the child and summarised that it involved more than one choice of action.
Tutor: If you are the classroom teacher...is his lesson series [going to be] discontinued...

Belinda: Not yet.

Maria: No.

Tutor: OK. What has to change about this kid?

Tracey: More independent.

Tutor: Yes, but that’s easy to say.

Maria: He has to re-read more.

Diane: He has to understand what strategic activity he can use.

Tutor: That’s right, all the different choices.

This cluster of talk is illustrative of how the teachers were grappling for understanding in the middle of the RR course. The Tutor acknowledged the teacher emotion of frustration and linked this to the children knowing how to problem-solve. The teachers suggested teaching at different times in the lesson for this teacher-child interaction; the introduction would give more ‘structures’ to use; and that a lean introduction was perhaps for later on and not when a child started a new reading level. The Tutor’s role in shaping the teachers’ actions was stated as ‘he cannot do things he does not know how to do’ and the teachers concluded that he needed to be shown the ‘how to’s’. The Tutor articulated for the teachers the cause of their frustrations which was in their role in developing ‘independence’. This linked to other examples of talk in this lesson: child choices and flexibility and teachers having choice and flexibility. Teaching for independence conceptually came to ‘teaching children how to become independent’ did not involved withdrawing teacher support.

Tutor: Now the teacher is a little bit frustrated.

Diane: Yeah, she sounds like us because we know we do the same things (laughs)

Tracey: Exactly.

Tutor: Can you see...they cannot do things they don’t know how to do? He thinks look at the picture and do something with my fingers [on the word]

Diane: This is the ideal time to teach it is it? Or should you do it in Familiar Reading...or both?

Tutor: Where is a good place for the child to understand what you are doing?

Belinda: On familiar reading.

Tutor: Would you change the way she is introducing the book?

Diane: More structures as he goes along.

Tutor: I think he’s going to need more of the meaning.

Belinda: Which he mightn’t need later on...but if he’s just gone to this level?
Tutor: De-bugging the book. He needs more of that.

(Yes)

Maria: He needs to be shown.

Tutor: Can you see you’re doing a lot of scaffolding at the beginning of a new book level...then it fades. So you’re never going to say ‘I’m going to do minimal book introductions now’ or ‘I think you should be independent so I won’t do anything’.

Belinda: No, at this level he needs it again.

Tutor: It’s what you understand independence to be...what’s our job? To help him to become independent.

Belinda: So he knows the how tos.

Tutor: We have to teach him how to be independent. Now does that involve not doing anything?

(No)

Maria: It means doing it mostly.

Tutor: It means ...consistently showing him how.

The Tutor in this cluster of talk brought the teacher group to a conclusion about themselves and their learning, which was that they all did similar things when they taught – group cohesion.

Tutor: What do you think is the common area of language teachers focus on?

Diane: The word.

Tutor: Yes, it’s here [in this example of teaching]

Belinda: The word level.

Tutor: Yes, so she’s focusing on the word and getting the word right...[but] ...it’s using continuous print and being able to work it out...but it’s not uncommon would you agree?

Tracey: No.

Tutor: ...when everyone gets in a corner they all focus there...

Belinda: We all do it

Tutor: The idea is to possibly take yourself back to where she knows she should be...which is reading for meaning...meaning and comprehension. OK? Do you see yourself?

(Yes)

5.2.3 Session Seven (video-recording): The Discussion

The main characteristic of the Tutor’s social interaction that unfolded during the discussion after the lesson observations was to link the lesson observations (as examples of learning and teaching) with the course textbook/s (the theory and procedures in Reading Recovery teaching), ‘Literacy Lessons’.
During the discussion the Tutor worked with the ‘main ideas’ that arose during the observations and elicited the support of teachers to help recall what these had been.

*What did we get to as the main ideas for the reading part Jemma? (Tutor)*

The following teaching procedures and emphases were discussed: teaching children to read for ‘meaning’ and use ‘meaning’ when problem-solving, with an emphasis on re-reading when they come to a difficulty; creating conversations with children as a basis for writing topics by inviting them to participate in the conversation around a topic set by the teacher and capturing their oral language development in their written expression; teachers thinking about what they say or how they ‘prompt’ for children to be successful; and how teachers can help children to problem-solve while reading at the sub-word level.

Table 3 shows that the Tutor led the discussions and during both discussions her main role was in re-directing to the next point, idea, and the course texts. In a total of 99 analysed Tutor interactions 46 were around re-directing. Directing involved 14 interactions, extending teacher ideas 9, Summarising 9, explaining 17 and confirming 5 interactions. The discussion of the first lesson took longer than the second in the time available in the session (approximately 20-25 minutes) and subsequently had twice as many Tutor interaction (65) than the second (34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discussion One</th>
<th>Discussion Two</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-directing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directing involved telling the teachers what they needed to do, attend to, take notice of or remember.

Tutor: So, if we were going to think about making it easy for [the child] what is the main thing to talk about?
Can you see the most help you can give him on page 133?
Tutor: Put that down for yourselves. You stick to one idea and work on one idea.
Tutor: Jemma, now what’s a big thing [for this discussion]?

Re-directing involved a change in direction in the discussion, whether that was to guide the discussion towards a different person, idea, different aspect of an idea or focus.

Tutor: So if we are going to have a conversation around reading for meaning we [start by] knowing that Maura has picked it...she knows that he has to ...comprehend. Now when it gets difficult for him...let’s share about that.
Tutor: The other thing Maura said was very important was [for the child to write] complex sentences, so what was our discussion [about that]?
Tutor: When does your conversation start in a RR lesson?

Extending was building on a teacher’s idea.

Tutor: To predict the meaning and then check the visual information
Tutor: Very early. Showing the first part and the last part [of words]
Tutor: This scaffold might help you. [The child is reading] and you say a prompt which doesn’t work, what do you do next?

Summarising was an attempt to bring the discussion to a main point or a conclusion.

Tutor: You want [the child] to solve on the run without slowing the reading down don’t you?
Tutor: There’s personal disclosure. [There’s] ‘tell me about’, ‘tell me more’.
Tutor: The only way to get a complex sentence [to write] Maura is to develop the conversation.

Explaining was giving greater meaning to teacher ideas or information.
Tutor: Let’s think where we’d be doing that. Stop. [The child] says ‘st’ and repeats it. They can’t get passed that part. Then you could say the hearing part ‘op’. he can put his finger over the ‘st’ and see the ‘op’. Then he lifts his finger up and says ‘stop’.

Tutor: You never let him carry on from where he has sorted out the word. Why not?
Tutor: It came out of the story [to the magnetic letter demonstration] and went back to the story [the words were read in the book]. It was integrated. The child [knew] why [she was] doing it.

Confirming was agreement.

Tutor: It probably was lost [when] working it out.
Tutor: Of course you can.
Tutor: Why not?

At the beginning of the discussions the Tutor thanked the teachers who had taught, saying that: ‘We have now had one round behind the screen, so stage fright is behind us’ to which the teachers laughed. The Tutor added: ‘We are all good friends. So we know why we have the lessons and that’s as vehicles to help ourselves and our fellow colleagues, friends I hope, with our teaching. So thanks everyone. We’ve all done it. That’s great!’

The Tutor then asked the teachers whether the lessons they had taught were typical or not, asking for a ‘brief reply’, almost a ‘yes’ or a ‘no’ to avoid long explanations of why the lesson was not typical. Maura said that her lesson was typical: ‘Well mine was as far as T... was concerned because suddenly he switches off and he doesn’t concentrate on what he’s doing and I could see that happening to him as we were going along. He just wasn’t interested in reading and that was it.’

The Tutor’s response was to suggest that perhaps children become like that when the task becomes too difficult for them. The Tutor verbally referred to a common experience called ‘Moving Into Instruction’ where the teachers had guidance on how to keep tasks easy. So that could be a question: how to keep tasks easy? The Tutor then turned to the other teacher to ask: ‘was that pretty typical?’ Mary-Lou said, ‘yeah’.

459
The Tutor asked the group members who were recording summaries of the lesson discussions what the ‘main ideas’ were. The group summary for reading was that they had mainly discussed ‘reading for meaning’ during the lesson observations, which was acknowledged by the Tutor as what Maura had said needed to occur in her introduction of the child. The teachers described what they had observed and their ideas about their observation for the teacher who taught, responding to the Tutor’s question about why the task was difficult for the child:

The Tutor and teachers co-operatively summarised their experience in discussing what they had observed. What was said was the same in different settings and the only difference was that the teacher who taught could hear what was discussed. The Tutor brought the ideas together and redirected talk.

_Tutor:_ If we’re going to think about making it easy for T... what’s the main thing to talk about?
_Tracey:_ Reading for meaning
_Tutor:_ OK. Reading for meaning...and I’ll come back to the main thing for writing.
_Tutor:_ So, if we have a conversation around reading for meaning, we know that Maura picked it. She knows that he has to read and comprehend. Now, when does it become more difficult for him? Let’s share that, from your observation.
_Diane:_ When he’s reading the new book.
_Tutor:_ Think about the meaning...think about the process...think strategic activity...he’s not familiar with the meaning that makes it more difficult for him. Think what he did.
_Tracey:_ When he’s trying to work out a word he’s working at the word level.
_Maria:_ Re-read. He needs to re-read instead of trying to work it out at the word level. You need to go back and re-read the sentence to get the meaning.
_Tutor:_ To predict the meaning and then check the visual information. So why is it difficult for him?
_Maria:_ Because he’s just stopping at the word.
_Diane:_ And he’s not thinking of meaning.
_Tutor:_ So he’s trying to work out this word...this word...this word...
_Maria:_ And it’s not a flow of continuous text.
_Tutor:_ He’s not reading for meaning, so he can’t comprehend until he gets to that. Now what’s going to be really important for him to be able to hear the language? We talked about it.
_Diane:_ It should be introduced to him in the introduction.
_Tutor:_ Yeah, but while he’s doing it...what’s he going to need to do? It’s more than just re-read.
_Mary-Lou:_ Think about the story.
_Maria:_ Listen to himself.
Tutor: Think about the story, listen to himself, always be active, never stop. Stopping is not part of the processing. Can you imagine? Your brain is working like this (hand action) and you’re trying to integrate everything and then you stop. What happened?
Tutor: Yes, you have to keep the action going. So let’s help Maura to think about that. It’s to re-read and think about what makes sense...do we agree with that?

The Tutor redirected to; ‘Now Maura also wants him to use visual information. Where did he do that beautifully?’ The teachers agreed that it was on ‘again’ in the familiar book reading. The Tutor re-directed the teachers to think that the child had to re-read to think of the meaning and ‘what does Clay say in taking words apart in reading?’ The teachers searched through their books. The Tutor guided the teachers through a series of prompting actions on page 133, explaining each action. The teachers agreed that they had tried some of the actions early in the teaching. There was Tutor emphasis on the children not carrying on from solving a word:

Tutor: You never let him carry on from where he’s sorted the word out. Why not? Think of those networks. What’s happened?
Lara: It’s not continuous.
Diane: He loses meaning.
Tutor: He’s come along...he’s come to a problem...and he’s gone on from there. What’s happened to the meaning from before that problem?
Lara: It could get lost.
Tutor: It was probably lost in the working out.

The Tutor picked up on her concern about teachers having a series of things to say to assist children to problem-solve. The explanation was about ‘scaffolding’ the child’s actions, because: ‘if you say a prompt and it doesn’t work, then what do you do?’ The Tutor explained that she would say the broadest thing she could first; then restrict the prompt again and again to re-direct and restrict direct the problem-solving. The point in their learning was not to ‘give it up on your first try’ or ‘tell’.

The Tutor initiated the discussion around writing for the first lesson

Tutor: Now the other thing that Maura wanted that was very important was complex sentences, so what was our discussion? Lara: We talked about creating a conversation.
The Tutor directed the teachers to their books modeling ‘now what did Clay say about, how am I going to get these complex sentences?’ and the page number (p55), saying ‘I know about this because I’ve been talking about it with trained teachers and with Lara…Go down to procedure for eliciting a story.’ The text quoted was: ‘at first the teacher creates a conversation’. The Tutor directed the teachers to unpick the meaning of ‘creates’:

Maria: Something from nothing.
Tutor: You bring forth…is that to create?
Belinda: Yes.
Tutor: What else could it be?
Mary-Lou: Initiate?
Tutor: It’s more than initiate. You create it. You build it. You sustain it.
Maria: You bring it into being…you put it out there.
Tutor: Now how can you create a conversation?
Belinda: You ask a question.
Tutor: I don’t think ask a question is it…if someone comes up and asks you a question…do you think you’ll get much out of me. Questioning is to interrogate.
Diane: Genuine questions.
Tutor: It could be a genuine question. What else could it be?
Maria: A mutual topic.
Tutor: How long have you been with this child?
Tracey: 11 weeks.
Tutor: Do you know about them? Do you do things in common? Do you know what happens in their classroom? You see it’s hard for you. You don’t have a context. You have to create a conversation and you have to have something to create it with.

The Tutor argued that making a statement about something both parties knew about was better than asking a question; just as sharing something about yourself can create a conversation, or the teachers could follow the child’s interests e.g. her child was interested in soccer, even a series of rules about soccer. The teachers by Session Seven were trying to do the right thing in RR and they responded:

Maria: So you can still keep on writing about the same thing the next day?
Tutor: Of course you can.
Maria: So that’s OK?
The Tutor explained to Maura who had taught the lesson that creating conversation required an invitation to the child to participate rather than questioning the child about a topic:

*Maura:* But you’ve seen him and I say ‘football’ ... and he just doesn’t want to...like... go on.

*Tutor:* No, you see there were a lot of questions. You need to come in a different way. It’s not a trick about ‘football’. It’s about saying ‘gosh there are lots of interesting rules in football aren’t there? I saw this happen, and this happen...and...’ he’s invited in to something you have created.

The teachers tussled with their understanding of why they would have a conversation before the child wrote his story sentence with there being two views:

*Mary-Lou:* So they know a focus of what they want to write about.

*Tracey:* For their oral language?

What the teachers would expect from children who had limited oral language capacities was linked to their ‘longest utterances’ in the conversation:

*Diane:* I was thinking too, with one of my little boys... he really... If I ...if make sure...we all make sure the emphasis is oral language... Basically today ... he hasn’t put a sentence together until today... and he has new shoes. He said...I like my new shoes. Before that it was all disjointed. So, in a way we have to be careful we’re not...each child’s different. Like we don’t want to expect a complex sentence off this little boy because he’s just managed to make a sentence...

*Maria:* It was his longest utterance...

*Diane:* Yes.

The Tutor directed the teachers about to think about how to gauge expectation for writing by recording the child’s longest utterance. Belinda concluded: ‘we often cut them off because we don’t think they can write that.’

The second lesson was a discussion around a piece of child behaviour they had observed and what teachers can say in response: e.g. the child said ‘Luca fell over his bike’ and in the analysis of the error over/off it was concluded that the child had used meaning, and structure and visual information. The Tutor modeled for the teachers
verbally that they would think: ‘what is the best thing to say because everyone is grappling with prompts?’

The Tutor directed the teachers to their texts to think about prompting, and modeled trialing the prompts, by not saying what the child has done and scaffolding what the child needs to do

*Lara: It’s so crucial what you say.*

*Tutor: It’s up to you. You have to analyse what the child did in your head before you say anything.*

*Tracey: You have to do it quickly*

*Tutor: So you’ve got a mind like a running record haven’t you? (Laughter)*

*Tutor: If you just leap in and say anything what happens to this processing system?*

Diane concluded: ‘so she just has to check the ends?’ The Tutor replied: ‘what you say has to be something that’s going to get her there very quickly! But it has to be pertinent to what she needs to do.’ Jemma concluded: ‘And you can run the risk of breaking down a link that she’s made that’s a good link. It’s been corrupted by what you say.’

The categories evident in the teacher contributions to the discussion were: asking questions; answering questions; explaining; making links to their own teaching and co-operatively developing meaning for themselves e.g. what ‘creates’ meant. However, they were in the middle of the course: they still did not have skill in prompting the children to successful action or in understanding the meaning of the text.

The Tutor spoke most of the time. The tutor made connections between: the lessons; the discussions; the text and her own teaching. There was a lot of time spent in explaining in ways the teachers could understand. In this session her own experience teaching a child in writing and getting teachers to unpick their own understandings of language meaning were most evident.

5.2.4 Session Seven: Written Reflections

The guiding questions for their reflections were:
a) What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?

b) How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about teaching one particular child?

The teachers wrote without conferring with each other for five minutes. The main ideas evident arising from the lesson observations were: to develop conversations for writing; to teach for independence to teach children to read for meaning; to teach by prompting for ‘strategic activity’; and teaching for words including use of the magnetic letters.

The reflections by the nine teachers present at Session Seven indicated ‘theme’ for the session, ‘independence’, would be taken away as a key learning.

Belinda: I need to be looking at what I am doing/saying that is helping my children to become independent. I need to examine what I am doing that shows them how to do what they need to do to become independent. What I am not doing that I need to do is to support the children to become independent.

Maura: The key understanding of RR is the importance of independence.

Jade: Still need to build children’s independence. Need more on my wait-time. Need to explain to the child why they must do the things I am telling them to do.

Reflecting on ‘conversations’ for writing was a main topic in the lesson observation and was discussed in detail during the discussion time for the first lesson received most attention across both discussions. As a topic for teacher learning it was not planned for beforehand by the Tutor.

Jemma: The need to develop oral language through conversation in order to prompt for more complex sentences.

Lara: During [a] visit by C... and since I have really tried to develop my skills at ‘creating’ a conversation and working this naturally into the lesson the moment we walk away from the magnetic board (even as he enters the room)

Maura: For story writing create a conversation before starting to write. We could work on one idea for a few days.
Diane: I learnt again today the importance of conversation. It has particular importance for me when I think of W. His oral language is poor. So I have some ideas on how to work with him. He has improved though of all the children I need him to converse to me.

Jade: Work on building oral language through writing. Start recording the longest utterance.

Teaching children to read for meaning similarly became a focus when the teacher for the first lesson focused on decoding.

Maura: To read for meaning they must re-read to predict and check visual information.
Tracey: Reading for meaning – I am going to work really hard in ensuring that my children are able to use all skills in order to problem-solve, and read for meaning. They are re-reading, some only through prompts – but I am slowly fading this out. I need to especially work on helping the child understand that they need to listen to themselves.

Teaching for ‘strategic activities’, was introduced by the Tutor in the introductory discussion, and referred to during the first Lesson Observation and in Discussion One.

Jemma: Prompts stimulate strategic activity.
Lara: From today I am going to go away to ‘think’ and work on my prompts, and what I’m doing with magnetic letters.
Mary-Lou: Look at prompts and analyse the error to choose a prompt that supports the strategic activity required to solve the word.
Tracey: “You have to analyse what the child has done in order to use correct prompts”.

The least attention by the teachers was given to the topic that arose in the second lesson around using magnetic letters and was of most interest to Maria only.

Maria: Mary-Lou’s use of three words ‘with’ etc [on the magnetic whiteboard] brought home to me the problem I am having with E...doing the same thing with have, help, has etc. I have tried to explain about searching to her and will make it more explicit with the use of words in magnetic letters on the whiteboard. Maura’s problem with word level leads me to levels of scaffolding to make more sense [discussion around starting with open prompts]

5.2.5 Session Seven: Conclusion

1 a)
What are the major characteristics of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in the group that unfold during a RR session?

The Introductory Discussion

The Tutor initiated the session by telling the teachers that the main learning in the session was about a ‘key understanding’ in RR: ‘independence’. The authority for this emphasis came in quotes in the draft RR ‘Guidesheet’ and from ‘Literacy Lessons’ on ‘independence’, which were given as handouts to the teachers.

The Tutor role was to ‘set the scene’ for the session. She did this by linking the thinking the teachers would need to bring to their observations: the teachers’ prior knowledge; the content knowledge of RR; the teachers’ current experiences in using the procedures in RR.

The Tutor extended the teachers’ RR knowledge to include teaching for ‘strategic activities’ in ‘independence’ with reference to the RR text ‘Literacy Lessons’ and used ‘self-monitoring’ as one example to conceptually to understanding that the learner first had to have a realisation that ‘I am not right’ before they would initiate their own actions to become independent problem-solvers.

The Tutor linked to the teachers’ current experiences in using the RR procedures by asking a teacher who she had worked with to explain the meaning of the text, and clarified the explanation for the group.

The Tutor shaped the teachers’ understanding of ‘have a go’ (colloquial language) in RR as meaning having choices at one’s disposal to try and selecting the most appropriate to solve, rather than just initiating an action or trying the same action every time. The Tutor did this by shaping her response in writing around the different choices a child has to select from.

The Lesson Observations
The Tutor shaped teacher RR knowledge during the observations through questioning that knowledge; telling; expanding on it or explaining further and linking to the course texts and the theme of the session. At this time in the course examples of shaping the teachers’ knowledge was around books selections; reading for meaning; children monitoring their reading; creating conversations for writing and the theme of independence.

The Tutor highlighted salient points for the teachers to attend to in their teaching. This was the main area of the Tutor’s role in this session. Highlighting importance related to what was not happening in the lesson observations (e.g. familiar reading was to be phrased and fluent; processing involving integrating information; teaching children how to be independent; new book introductions facilitate successful reading; independence in writing involves the child in monitoring the meaning of his/her message). Highlighting what the teachers needed to remember was for their own teaching but related to the lesson observation (e.g. phrasing was important; familiar reading is not interrupted by the teacher; children need to be active participants in their learning and children should not be reliant on one source of information). Highlighting what the teachers needed to change in the teaching (e.g. attending to one source of information when assisting children to read; trusting children to act on what they have been taught without interrupting and not reading to children in the lesson). Highlighting what was problematic about the current teaching (e.g. the child’s reliance on decoding; not teaching children to search for meaning by re-reading at difficulty; inappropriate stress on words and managing time for the child to read the whole of the ‘new book’ in the time available for the lesson).

The Tutor did this through: directing and re-directing the teachers’ attention during the observations; telling; explaining and confirming the teachers’ contributions to the discussion.

The Discussion

The Tutor shaped the teachers’ development as RR teachers. For example, the Tutor responded to the teacher who taught the first lesson when she complained that the child wasn’t interested in reading ‘as we were going along’ because the ‘new book’
had a minimal book introduction, and was focused on decoding, by saying that it was a matter of ‘keeping the task easy’ (a guidance for all new material in the RR texts discussed before the teachers’ started teaching the children). This was to change the teacher’s perception of the situation by providing an alternative explanation.

The Tutor developed independence in the group by having a teacher summarise the main ideas from the lesson observations for this group discussion. The teachers offered many ideas from their immediate experiences but it was not yet an interactive discussion with the teacher who taught. It was the group members refreshing their knowledge. The Tutor therefore had to maintain interactive ease with the person who taught: she knew this was the problem, she did want to also teach for the use of visual information, there was a good example of him solving quickly on the run.

The Tutor shaped the teachers understanding flexibility in scaffolding child actions including use of visual information on the run. She directed the teachers to the RR text where she explained their options in facilitating this action of visual processing by the child, within active processing. The key feature of the ‘active processing’ was expressed throughout as having the child re-read before and after visual solving to confirm meaning. The Tutor disclosed her concern for the group members was that they did not have options to scaffold child learning and only seemed to have one scaffolding choice before ‘telling’.

The Tutor shaped the teachers’ awareness of how they could interpret the RR texts in the area of writing. This involved a discussion of invitational talk and assisting children to compose sentences to write around their interests, which could continue over days. The teachers were under the impression that every day the child wrote about a new topic.

The Tutor shaped the teachers’ expectations for writing length as being as well as the children could speak. This related to the complexity of the sentences the teachers were concerned about. One teacher had a child with limited control of language while another teacher said that they often cut the children off in writing because they do not believe that the children can be expected to write as well as they speak, with their assistance.
The Tutor shaped the teachers understanding of prompting children and the best thing to say was to be ‘thinking like a running record’ and prompting towards what the child needs to do to be successful. She did this through modelling ‘what I use this prompt in this example?’ or ‘this prompt?’ To which one teacher concluded that in the example the child only needed to check the ends of words as part of continuous processing. The understanding of the best thing to say was as one teacher explained that which keeps the processing going and does not lead to confusion.

The Tutor explained throughout the discussion. The RR texts therefore did not stand alone. The interpretations of it came through guidance by the more experienced person of the lesser experienced teachers using her own teaching as an example in her talk and their teaching as an example which they could interpret and view for what needed to change when the Tutor directed their attention and discussion.

1 b)

What are the major characteristics of the teachers’ social interaction that unfold during a RR session and how are they orchestrated by the Tutor?

The Introductory Discussion

The teachers’ participation in the introductory discussion was orchestrated by the Tutor. The Tutor: asked for their responses; gave them readings to consider; asked a teacher she knew had the experience to share with the group.

The teacher’s explanation of a RR content procedure was not fully formed even though she appreciated the importance of its use because the children become aware of their own error: ‘they’re taken aback’; so Tutor clarification was necessary for a close understanding of ‘what to do’.

The teachers linked of the new knowledge on ‘independence’ to their current RR knowledge. They articulated the meaning as being that children could problem solve and ‘monitor’ their reading. One teacher having read that ‘self-monitoring’ and ‘self-correcting’ were significant behaviours in RR’s theoretical position (where children
would make mistakes, and call up their resources to correct them) surmised that teacher ‘wait-time’ (time for children to act on their own mistakes) would be important for ‘independence’.

The teachers’ learning in RR was ‘in formation’. The teachers shared that their children were not independent and that they ‘jumped in and told them’ because they did not know what else to do. There was a disconnection between what the teachers knew and how to achieve that through their interactions with the children. This is why they told the children the words when they were in difficulty rather than assisted the children to solve for themselves.

The Tutor’s explanation of the colloquial expression ‘have a go’ in RR having a specific meaning as involving choices and initiating appropriate selections to problem-solve was commented on by a teacher thus: ‘I am just getting used to the language and your expectations’.

**The Lesson Observations (Example: Lesson 1 Reading Activities)**

The Tutor orchestrated the teacher talk and the direction of their observations. The teachers interpreted the Tutor’s questions as they observed the lessons. The teachers could link the Tutor’s question to the observation to interpret patterns of the child’s behaviour; and could interpret that pattern of behaviour e.g. ‘reliance of one strategy’. The teachers could compare within the observation e.g. that the child was better in another reading activity. They could describe behaviour for their peers. However they could not yet easily bring the outside in to the observation (e.g. what the teacher who taught had said needed to change in the child’s behaviour) because the intervening time of intense observation of about fifteen minutes meant the teachers had forgotten what was said before. The Tutor was therefore the reminder for the group and the person who made external links to themes. The teachers could compare the teaching they were observing with their own teaching (‘I think it’s the same for all of us getting that meaning activity going’) and could identify what was important for the literacy activity if not support it in the child’s actions. The teachers identified with the emotional state of frustration with each other, however while they knew what to teach they did not know when or how to teach it in the lesson e.g. ‘how
do you get the meaning going?’ This is just as they valued independence as classroom teachers but did not know how to teach for it. The Tutor therefore has the role of explaining and telling in order to shape their learning. The disconnections for the teachers being understanding independence and how to teach for independence throughout the RR lesson; and how to adjust their scaffolding of the child for the child’s successful action in the activity; which was their role in the interaction.

**The Discussion**

During the discussion the teachers were not yet settled into the social interaction by Session Seven. They could get to main ideas from their discussion of the lesson observations because the Tutor had ‘set up’ teachers to record main ideas and had explicitly pointed out what they were during the observations. However, one the topic was decided e.g. ‘meaning’, they could not discuss ‘with’ the teacher who taught. They offered to the group ideas they could recall around the topic.

The teachers were at a stage in their RR learning where they didn’t know what to do despite six previous sessions and eleven weeks teaching children, using the RR texts. The changes the teachers needed to make which they had not yet made were: having flexibility in their options for scaffolding child learning (a series of things to say); using of the language of RR. The teacher who taught acted on previous knowledge (minimal book introductions from the front cover and directing attention to decoding) and acted helpless herself in the discussion time: ‘I could see what was happening as we were going along. He wasn’t interested in reading and that was it’.

The tutor’s role in shaping the teacher’s learning was through praise: the teacher knew what she wanted; and persuasion: these are ways to do this, enlisting the help of the group who were also learning from their experiences.

The Tutor provided the language for the teachers’ learning and linked to her experiences that they could relate to or their own. Most of the teachers’ language was repeating the Tutor, in different contexts (the observations, recalling topics, and reviewing the RR texts).
The ways the Tutor orchestrated the teachers’ interactions was through directing (telling teachers what they needed to do, to attend to, to take notice of or remember); re-directing the discussion between lessons, main ideas for topics and the RR texts. Extending a teachers idea by adding on; summarising to bring the discussion ‘segment’ to a main point or conclusion; explaining to give greater meaning to teachers’ ideas or information and confirming the teachers in their thinking.

The teachers’ written reflections were directly linked to the main areas identified by the Tutor, through teachers who were recording these; and brought to the discussion. They were about the main theme ‘independence’; creating conversations for writing; teaching for meaning and strategic activities. There was only one teacher in the group ‘off the mark’ who focused on what she would do with magnetic letters with the child she was teaching.

I need to be looking at what I am doing/saying that is helping my children to be independent. I need to examine what I am doing that shows them how to do what they need to do to become independent. What I am not doing that I need to do is to support the children to become independent.
APPENDIX L3: DATA REDUCTION

5.3 Session Eight

Session Eight is an analysis of the introductory discussion time; the writing activities in the lesson observations; the discussions of the writing activities and the teachers’ written reflections of the writing activities.

There are nine literacy activities in the RR lesson framework: familiar reading; independent reading of yesterday’s new book while the teacher takes a ‘running record’ and then teaches for improved literacy processing on the basis of this behavioural record; work with magnetic letters on a magnetic whiteboard in speeded letter discriminations by activity sorting arrays of letters; word-work demonstrations using magnetic letters; writing: the conversation between the teacher and child and the child’s composing of one or a few sentences to write and teacher support of the child as he/she writes; phonemic awareness demonstrations by daily inclusion of the RR technique referred to as ‘Elkonin boxes’ as the child writes; child independent re-construction of the story that is written and then cut-up into words or occasionally word parts to be re-assembled by the teacher; the teacher introduction to the new book and support of the child reading that book. (‘Literacy Lessons, Part One’, p37)

Therefore writing activities included: an initial conversation; helping the child to record a story; and reconstruction of the cut-up story which is written on a cardboard strip and cut by the teacher for the child’s independent reassembly. These activities last for approximately 10 minutes of each 30 minute lesson. What transpired was that the cut-up story was not done by the second teacher.¹⁷

5.3.1 Session Eight (video-recording): Introductory Discussion

The Tutor introduced this session as being about ‘teacher change’. She explained to the teachers that RR requires change in the ways the teachers teach and asked the teachers to share how they had been working towards changing their RR teaching.

¹⁷ Clay writes in ‘Change Over Time’, 2001, that this is not an ‘optional extra’ activity, but teachers make their decision on the run based on their time management of the whole lesson.
At this time in the course the teachers offered that they were thinking about: their prompting of the children; independence; the pace and tone of their lessons; being explicit and in Jade’s case ‘toughness’.

Tracey: I’ve been working on my prompts and making sure what I say is what I want the child to be doing.
Belinda: I’ve been analysing what I’ve been doing to make sure it’s the ‘how to…and making the child less reliant on me. I thought I was doing it but I’m making them dependent.
Jade: I’ve been working on being firm and not being nice.
Tutor: I don’t think that’s what it is. It’s about being consistent and insistent.
Jade: But I was too soft.
Tutor: So you weren’t getting any change. But that’s more a matter of expectation though Jade isn’t it?
Jade: No. I think it’s the way I was teaching. I was not firm enough.
Tutor: OK. What other people have been working on themselves?
Lara: I’ve been working on pace. Like not just with the timer, but just the whole pace and tone of the lesson. Setting that as soon as they walk in the door: come on, let’s get started. Let’s not waste time talking.
Jemma: I’ve been very explicit in what I expect of the lesson…I was assuming that they knew what was inside my head and where I wanted them to go. Now I’m up front. This is what we’re doing today.

The Tutor initiated the talk by explaining that all the teachers in the group came to RR teaching with their own personal theories which were varied and despite that variation all of them were having challenges or difficulties with their RR teaching.

Tutor: All of us need to think about making shifts because Reading Recovery involves everything. Some of us have focused on error fixing and visual information and now we have a devil of a job because we can’t get our children to read for meaning and to read quickly. Would you agree with that? Some of us have focused too much on meaning and we are having a devil of a job trying to get our children to look at print and to solve using visual information. Would you agree with that? So we’re all coming from different ways. Some of us thought that the children would learn ‘naturally’ through the literacy activities we presented. Is that true? Some people have thought that: that there is something magical about the activities. Some of us have overlaid classroom teaching into Reading Recovery teaching quite heavily. Would you agree with that? That’s what I’m going to try to shift and what I want to talk about is us.
This was a Tutor initiated session theme based on her observations of their teaching in their schools and how to assist the teachers to move forward in their Reading Recovery teaching.

_Tutor:_ ... _how teachers monitor themselves and what they’re doing. There’s a piece of research called the ‘Third Chance Project’ where they took children who had been referred off Reading Recovery and 75% of them could be recovered with another program and a different teacher. And what they learnt... the main thing that they learnt, what we need to think about is about ourselves... and what we do, and what we say, and how we do it and how we say it._

The Tutor handed out papers to the teachers of ‘principles’ for learning, saying: ‘Nobody’s perfect you know. Nothing works perfectly. But these are the sorts of things they’ve thought about.’

Tutor explained these ‘principles’ for effective teaching as the teachers read and took their own notes. The ‘principles’ were directive and the teachers were quiet as the Tutor stepped through explaining each one about what teachers must do to be effective: clearly understand and have a consistent focus in the task to be learned; act consistently across all interactions; assume that the child is always making sense in terms of what he or she can understand; check that her prompts act as intended (where the aim is for children to find their own errors before they are taught to fix them, and that there is sufficient ‘wait-time’ for children to have the opportunity to search and correct themselves, usually at the end of a sentence or a page, so teachers would carefully select places to intervene.)

The Tutor emphasised that there was to be no blame on the child, and ‘if they are doing something strange, what it means is that it involves the teacher in a consistent search for the child’s point of view.’ The teachers were to ask: ‘Why would the child do that?’ This was because: ‘... the child is doing what they know how to do. They are only six.’ The Tutor also explained that if the child read and stopped for assistance repeatedly it was probably because their interactions had taught them to act that way’
The group was quiet in response to this information, looking at the handout, taking notes and following the Tutor. The Tutor continued and worked on ‘interactive ease’. She said: ‘Don’t worry. I used to be exactly like that.’ Then the Tutor used the example of how the teachers’ teaching had already improved in ‘familiar reading’ to match the purpose of the task. She asked: ‘what do you think? You’ve gone all quiet when I’ve said: the teacher must do this and the teacher must do that.’

Lara asked: ‘I’ve got a question. I don’t know if it’s to do with that’:

Lara: You know how you said there has been a change with ‘Familiar Reading’…could that be a development in our teaching, or is it an expectation of the book level?

To which the Tutor responded:

Tutor: I think that there is a development in your teaching and there is a development in your understanding of why we do ‘Familiar Reading’. At no point should a book get to ‘Familiar Reading’ that isn’t read at 97-98% accuracy. So there should never be a need to pull a child up at every word. Does that make sense? That’s a development of understanding. [that this activity is for working on ‘orchestration’ of the processing system].

Another teacher reflected that the first ten introductory lessons in RR called ‘Roaming Around the Known’ had not been appreciated for what they were intended for, i.e. building fluency in what is ‘known’ as a foundation for new learning, or what that would mean later in their teaching.

Jemma: It means that ‘Roaming Around the Known’...it’s much more vital, as well.
Tutor: The building of fluency and the flexible ways of responding in ‘Roaming Around the Known’ is critical.
Jemma: I don’t think we appreciated that.

The Tutor extended the teacher’s understanding that all learning required some ‘realisation’ or disequilibrium as an impetus for change. The ‘realisation’ was coming half-way through the RR course. This meant that there was a need for there to be a year long course for teachers to learn from their own ‘awareness’ and that the

---

18 The first ten lessons in a RR lesson series are for extended observation and developing fluency in what is ‘known’ as a foundation for subsequent teaching.
course itself went ‘backwards and forwards’ revisiting themes and teacher knowledge.

_Tutor:_ Do you see, as part of our learning, for any learning, adult learning, child learning, you have to come to a point of realisation or disequilibrium. You’ve got to think this is not fitting... If you don’t realise something you’re not going to work to change are you? I think realisation is essential. Isn’t it wonderful that we’ve got a year to do it? Because we’re going to go back over it, backwards, forwards.

It was the Tutor’s judgment to introduce a topic like ‘teacher change’ in Session Eight. The input for the teachers took longer than intended, so the teachers who were teaching had a shorter time to introduce the children to be taught that day.

Tracey said:
My little girl is named B… She’s six years old. She’s been on Reading Recovery for 13 weeks. It’s her 59th lesson. She started at dictated text and is currently on Level 11 but moving to 12 today. And what I’m wanting to teach her in reading is making sure her reading sounds good, with appropriate intonation and whatnot; and in writing I’m trying to work on her becoming more independent in solving unknown words.

The Tutor asked the group to summarise this information: ‘so we’ve got two things there what were they?’

_Belinda:_ Independence  
_Jemma:_ Phrasing  
_Tutor:_ The reading has to sound good.

Lara said:
My little boy’s name is H… He’s seven. This is his 45th lesson in Week 13. He started on Level 1 and now he’s Level 12, and he just moved to this level last week. I’m looking for teaching for independence, especially in his writing in particular. So I want him to initiate things. I don’t want him to wait. I want him to keep going and do all he can and not to stop and to check what he’s doing. And the same with his reading. I want him to be checking, re-reading, self-correcting and initiating those behaviours.

5.3.2 Session Eight (audio-recording): Lesson Observations
As the lesson observation began at the screen the group was still quiet. The Tutor reiterated the focus of the observations:

*Tutor: What we’re going to try to say it: is this a good teaching decision? Is this not a good teaching decision? Was this effective? Was this not effective? And we can only do that on the basis of the effect of what the teacher says and does on the behaviour of the child.*

5.3.2.1 Lesson One: Writing

After the teachers observed a conversation, between the teacher and the child based on the book she had read the child composed: *Three little bears went in their spooky old tree,* for her writing. The teacher asked her to repeat this composition. The teacher said: *Great story! Tell me it again!* The child then had a problem reconstructing her oral composition, pausing and repeating the first clause, and being assisted by the teacher to include the additional structure, e.g.

*C: Three little bears went/Three little bears/
T: went
C: went
T: in
C: in/their spooky old tree.* ¹⁹

The Tutor explained to the teachers observing that the teacher was lucky the child had reconstructed the original story. This comment was directly linked to the course text where Clay asks teachers to be careful about requesting that children repeat their sentences. (‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’, p56) and is directing (telling) by the Tutor.

*Tutor: Now when you say ‘say that again’ they mightn’t... they may make up something else because they think you didn’t like it...she was lucky she [the child] didn’t change it.*

The interaction at the screen about the writing interaction was very close to the action behind the screen (letter by letter, word by word) as the teachers commented on their observations. The following gives an example of how the teachers’ main

¹⁹*The child (C) and the teacher (T) interaction in the lesson behind the glass screen (what the teachers are observing)
learning comes from what they observe; and how it is commented upon; including the Tutor shaping by directing attention, and modeling a commentary.

Interaction: the child almost writes little (litte):

**Behind the screen**

C: Three little...little...
T: Where should we be?
T: You saw little before. So close! Little (emphasises l at the end of the word)\(^{20}\) What’s missing?
C: L
T: Yes so it’s L- l. You leave the two T’s there like you have. What comes next?
C: I
T: L and then your E. OK. Good?\(^{21}\)

**At the screen:**

Diane: (commenting on writing ‘little’ with a capital) Confusion with L, a capital L (written in the word)
Tutor: (after T: ‘so close’) It was. If she knew it that well why didn’t she learn it? She had one letter to learn. Why didn’t she learn it?
Tutor: (at the end) Missed teaching opportunity. Do you think she’ll know ‘little’ tomorrow? Will she be able to spell ‘little’ any better tomorrow than she could spell it today?
Maria: She’ll know about the ‘e’ being silent and the ‘L’s’ on the end.
Tutor: Will she be able to spell ‘little’ tomorrow?
Maria: Probably not.
Shelley: If she was able to write it three or four times quickly.

This exchange between the Tutor and the teachers links ‘knowing tomorrow’ (an objective of the teaching) with opportunities to learn. The Tutor then redirected the teachers to evaluate the observation of the interaction when writing the word ‘spooky’ in Elkonin ‘sound boxes’ (a box is drawn by the teacher to represent every phoneme in the word).

T: We’ll do some boxes shall we? Right...finger please!
C: (articulating) spoo...spoo...Writes ‘s’
T: What comes now? p-p (sound)
C: P?

\(^{20}\) Capital letters indicate the teacher saying the letter name and lower case the letter sound.
Tutor: What was something that was good?

Belinda: Not breaking up the whole word [as the word was slowly articulated]

Tutor: OK. What else is good?

Lara: Write the part you know [what the teacher said]

Tutor: That’s good.

Lara: Like she’s saying how you do it [interpretation]

The Tutor drew the group’s attention to the teacher articulating the ‘p’ sound and what unfolded was a discussion that revealed teacher confusion about what phonemes were in words, while other teachers agreed that the teacher was articulating for the child. In the observations teachers make different links. The Tutor followed what was most important in the ‘group learning’ and ignored one teacher’s confusion for the group learning.

Tutor: What do you think about that teaching decision?... She (the teacher) said ‘p-p’ (the sound)

Maria: ‘sp’ (sound) isn’t it? Shouldn’t it be? What is it? Shouldn’t it be ‘sp’ ‘spooky’?

Jade: She said it.

Maura: The child isn’t saying it.

Tutor: What can’t the child do with these boxes?

The Tutor prioritised ‘the child’s articulation of the word’ as more important than a teacher not knowing that ‘sp’ is two phonemes. The next example in writing ‘spooky’ shows a number of teacher confusions. These are that ‘oo’ letter representation in words in English can represent more than one phoneme, so the links need to be consistent; and the ‘long e’ phoneme in ‘spooky’ is written as a ‘y’ in English, while the ‘y’ in ‘play’ is part of a digraph ‘ay’ to represent the long ‘a’ phoneme in English. The teaching is erroneous.

C: oo...oo (articulating)

T: What says ‘oo’? ‘oo’?

C: O ? spoo..k (articulating the word)

T: Think about it! What goes on the end that says ‘ee’

C: E?

T: No. Oh that was very close! Very, very close. This is how we’re going to do it.

T: We’re going to do the oo sound today...(makes sound as in spooky)...oo...(repeated) like in look .
(Teacher says oo...oo like in look.) What two letters say oo?(sounded as in look)
C: O-O
T: Good girl! O-O...K... and I need another sound on the end that says E. What is it? No. Nearly. Try again... 'E' like in pla-EE...EE...plaEE. What's on the end of plaEE?... It's a Y B...(child's name)
C: EE...EE

How the Tutor deals with this ‘on the run’ is to prioritise (as above) for the ‘group learning’. The time factor of ‘following the interaction’ throughout the whole lesson precludes treatment of all ‘teacher errors’.

The Tutor determined that the group could evaluate the teaching on the basis of what the child understood and then modeled an alternative and correct letter-sound link, while not discounting that teaching sound links in English by analogy was a good option. What is important in this interaction was that the Tutor did not ignore incorrect teaching.

The Tutor: Was that a good teaching decision? Did the child know what to do?
Teachers: No.
Tutor: How could she have done it? Like ‘mummy’... Like ‘this’, like ‘that’...analogy...if the child makes an error and you led them to that error it’s a memory trace...it’s just another reinforcement of something that’s not right.

The next example was how the teacher tried to teach ‘old’ in Elkonin boxes (sound boxes)

T: We want ‘old’ please! I didn’t see the finger! I think that’s why we ....didn’t do it properly! You need to say it slowly. (Slowly articulating) ... o-l-d...
T/C: o-l-d... o-l-d- (slow articulation)
T: No...we want this one first (the first sound-letter link in the first box)
C: o-l-d
T: Is that right? Does it look right?
C: Yes!
T: Good! Write ‘old’ again! (in a different place to ‘pull it together’)
[This started a second sequence around ‘old’]
T: What is it?
C: o-l-d (saying it slowly)
T: Write it here. Are you right? Are you sure?
C: Yeah. O-l-d (saying it slowly)
T: What is it here? Do you know it?
C: o-l-d (saying it slowly)
T: Keep reading. Three little bears went into their spooky old...

The Tutor initiated the discussion around ‘old’ by saying: What do you think of the teaching? The teachers gave rationales for why it might by ‘good teaching’.

Shelley: she’s showing her what to do.
Belinda: She said ‘does it look right?’

The Tutor confirmed their learning at the end of the observation: ‘Good. If she said that, that’s good! It has to sound right and look right.’ These interactions show how the Tutor determined the direction of attention by the teachers. The role involved keeping the group ‘attention’ on the same part of the observation. For example, when writing ‘old’ Mary-Lou commented: ‘That’s a strange way of doing a ‘d’’. The Tutor replied as an aside to her: ‘That’s not our task’. And Mary-Lou responded: ‘it’s just strange’ and laughed. The discussion was redirected by the Tutor to teacher confidence in children learning how to spell words involving not only ‘quick writing’ but also ‘transference’ of learning.

Tutor: OK. You tell me this...do you think that child can spell ‘old’?
Mary-Lou and others: Yes
Tutor: Do you think she will be that good tomorrow? How are you going to know it will be that good tomorrow? Did she write it somewhere else?
Maura: She wrote it on the work-page
Diane: She didn’t write it on the whiteboard.
Tutor: So she didn’t write it somewhere else...with another pen...did she? So how sure are you that she can spell that?
Belinda: Reasonably confident ...but not sure.
Diane: I’m not confident.

The reconstruction of the cut-up story is an independent child activity. This started with the child picking up ‘tree’ instead of ‘three’ and the teacher saying:

---

22 The child’s story is written on a cardboard strip by the teacher and cut up into words or word parts which are left in an array on the table. The child then independently selects words (monitoring, searching and correcting the visual information) and reconstructs the story (monitoring and correcting the meaning).
T: Hey, what is it? What's your story?
C: Ahhh
T: Look at the first part and the second part!
C: Three
T: Thank you!
C: [Continues saying aloud] ... 'Three little...'
T: OK. Off you go please. Quick! Looking at the first part, looking at the second part. Making sure
you've got all the words there. [there is some overlay of voices here]
T: Were you right?
C: Yeah!
T: What have you checked? I think you need to read it again checking the first and last part!
C: Three little bears/Three little bears went in the/ spooky old tree.
T: Were you right?
C: Yeah!
Y: Good girl!

Following this observation the group’s attention moved on to the next literacy activity: introducing the ‘New Book’ in this lesson.

5.2.3.2 Lesson Two: Writing

During the conversation this example shows how the teacher tried to get additional ideas for the child’s written composition in the conversation by questioning the child. The child ended up giving a different idea to the original idea. That is: ‘what bait he used’; rather than the more exciting idea for the child ‘I got two fish’, even though he had to put them back in the water because they were ‘too little’.

It is an example of the purpose of the task not being understood by the teacher and the learner: a) the child composes language to be written with some assistance by the teacher, and b) the teacher supports the child in writing his/her own message. The conversation became a question and answer about the child’s ‘fishing trip’, involving more and more questioning by the teacher when the child did not respond.

C: I got two fish but I had to put the fish back in the water.
T: OK... you had to put the fish back in the water.
C: Too little.
T: They were too little. Tell me something else about your fishing trip.
C: No response.
T: Where did you go fishing?
C: No response.
T: Was it at the beach...at the bridge...?
C: No response.
T: Where did you go fishing?
C: In the creek.
T: In the creek. What did you do?
C: Used fishing hooks.
T: You used fishing hooks. Tell me something else.
C: No response.
T: Quick tell me something else...you used fishing hooks...you went fishing in the creek...
C: No response.
T: What did you use for bait to try and catch them? Tell me a story about that.
T: Good. (repeating the child) I go fishing and we used bread for bait.

This is another example the teacher learning being on Tutor choice and attention which can sometimes be misguided when the Tutor entered the observation after the child had given an acceptable sentence. The discussion therefore attended to the child not responding and whether that would be acceptable behaviour for the classroom. The alternative probably should have been have been the teacher’s orchestration of a conversation with a child and building on the child’s ideas.

This example shows that in the ‘hurly-burly’ of the fast lesson observation the Tutor can take the group in different directions. It is also pertinent to think about what the Tutor attends to during these interactions: the theory and practices of RR; the current observation (one direction – looking and listening through the glass screen); initiating teacher observers responding and shaping that learning (another direction–looking at and listening to the group) which are two on-going pieces of dialogue and actions behind the screen); the session theme; knowledge of the teachers (from school visiting) and so on.

Tutor: What will he be like in the classroom?
Mary-Lou: He’s not going to start. He’s just going to sit there and wait.
Tutor: So perhaps he needs to be told...this is your job when Mrs So-in-So says this...
As the teachers observed the child write slowly she asked an open question: ‘Tell me what you’re thinking’. The teachers agreed that the behaviour was not acceptable for classroom participation. Jemma suggested an alternative story topic, but the Tutor pulled her back to considering the child’s behaviour in relation to other children in the classroom. After the Tutor gave an example of how a word had been written (which they all observed) the evaluation was that it needed to be learned and how to do this.

Mary-Lou: He’s taking a long time to do anything.
Tutor: OK. He’s not as good a writer as her is a reader.
Jemma: And maybe talking from life experience…probably the wrong way to go. Maybe use the book he’s just read perhaps?
Tutor: Who’s teaching in the classroom? What do you think?
Jemma: He’d be in my bottom guided writing group to start off with.
Tutor: How would you change him?
Jemma: Make him initiate the conversation…make him write faster…particularly words he knows well…
Tutor: Would you leave ‘went’ like that?
Maria: He has to write it all over the page.
Shelley: Yeah, faster
Maria: ‘went’ is a word he should know
Tutor: He’s been on the program for 13 weeks…[and]…you wouldn’t accept this
Tutor: Now we have to look at what she’s doing.
Maura: She’s helping him to write ‘fish’

This shows that RR is preparation for the classroom by teachers, who can easily understand the learning criteria, because this is their primary experience. What unfolded was a conversation about ‘teacher expectation’, with Maria articulating an opinion that teachers have lower expectations for writing than they do for reading, i.e. that in reading the child would look at ‘chunks’ in words visually but not in writing aurally.

Maura: She’s helping him to write fish.
Tutor: If he was good he could have done fish and ing couldn’t he?
Diane: It may be a bit advanced for him?
Tutor: But you see… its expectation.
Maria: The expectation of writing is lower than for reading.
Tutor: Yes Clay agrees with that...write it down...our expectations are lower...she’s written it in the text...

The Tutor addressed the issue in the learning ‘speed’ of writing. In this interaction the Tutor becomes a group member, as all the participants tussle with what they are observing.

Tutor: She’s worked on speed hasn’t she in reading?
Maura: Yes.
Tutor: Could she give equal attention to speed in writing?
Diane: Yes
Tutor: You see, you can look at something that’s written and you can think ‘oh, that’s really cool’ but it’s not cool unless you saw how it was done.
Mary-Lou: Process.
Maria: It could take too long.
Tutor: What would you do to speed him up?
Jemma: I would choose something that’s really relevant to his writing, and I’d probably use it over and over again. Work on it and get him fast.
Maura: Used? She gave it to him?
Tutor: I’d put up three boxes, U-S-D
Maria: She’s doing all the work
Tutor: I think Lara’s talking too much.
Maria: She’s doing the work for him.

In this interaction around the word ‘bread’ in the sentence the teachers conferred with each other about their observations and the Tutor challenged them again about their expectations.

Maria: Can you see what he’s doing there?
Shelley: ‘Bait’
Maura: No ‘bread’
Diane: Oh, ‘bread’
Maura: ‘Bread’. He wanted ‘bread for bait’.
Belinda: But he did that himself.
Maria: The B-R
Diane: Yeah, that’s good.
Tutor: After 14 weeks?
(Laughter)
Diane: C... that’s the problem, its good!
Mary-Lou: There’s a big gap between theory and practice (colloquial expression – how you think something should be and how it actually is)
Tutor: Not in the classroom. Would that be good in the classroom?
Diane: No, no.

The Tutor directed the teachers to notice that child independent control of the Elkonin technique was missing and reached an agreement that the children had not been taught this control.

Tutor: Do the children control the technique?
Teachers: No.
Tutor: Why not?
Mary-Lou: Because we didn’t...
Tutor: …teach them to.

Diane commented on the engagement of the child: ‘…he’s kind of tuned out you know…’ which was turned by the Tutor back to the ‘teaching’: ‘what do you think it is about the teaching that tuned him out?’ The teachers kept returning to describing what the child could not do and the Tutor kept drawing them back to what he needed to be taught how to do, which is a different type of ‘tussling’ around ideas.

Maria: She’s not putting the pressure on him to actually do it.
Jade: He wrote the first letter confidently but then it’s a problem every time.
Maria: Yes, he appeals, look at those sad eyes.
Maura: She just melts.
(laughter)
Tutor: Let’s get serious now...
Mary-Lou: There’s too much pause time.
Diane: Maybe she needs to quickly copy? Well that’s not going to be good.
Tutor: No, he has to control the technique.
Mary-Lou: Yeah.
Tutor: He has to initiate it.
Tracey: He’s just blanking staring.
Mary-Lou: He has not got fluency.
Tutor: Does he know what he has to do?
Maria: Well...
Mary-Lou: He doesn’t know how to do it. It’s too hard.

Maria: I think he does…that’s the part that’s very frustrating for people…you see the blankness you know.

Tutor: ...he looks like that because he doesn’t know how.

Teachers: mmmmm

Tutor: So where do you think it’s slowing him down?

Tracey: She’s doing it.

Maura: He’s not saying the words either.

Maria: He’s not saying anything!

The Tutor summarised the two-sides of the problem for the teaching as dependence and expectation: ‘That’s right. So we have child dependence. And we’ve got expectation…teacher expectation.’

The Tutor explained to the teachers that their role was to teach the children how to do things with the expectation that they would. The teachers took that information back to their observation and the Tutor took the discussion to ‘teacher expectation’ and ‘transition’ into the classroom. The Tutor acknowledged that it was challenging role. Diane’s response: ‘Don’t tip us over the edge C…!’ shows the tension between a teacher knowing what she wants to teach and not knowing how to teach for it, i.e. the contingent teaching skill. (Woods, 2003) What allows for this type of conflict that is part of the teacher learning by Session Eight is the relationship between the group members. The issue for the training teachers is having taught children their role in the interactions and their consistency in their own role. Hence the theme of the session being ‘teacher change’.

Tutor: So we have child dependence, and we’ve got expectation…teacher expectation

Diane: I find myself doing the same. If I’m not careful the kids don’t say a word do they?

Maura: No! That’s why he’s not getting it too.

Tutor: You see, if you say, say the word, I mean you say it. That’s the level of expectation in RR. If I say ‘say it slowly’, you say it. If I say ‘while you’re saying it slowly you’re putting the letters in the box’, that’s good. You do that.

Diane: Don’t tip us over the edge C…!

Tutor: Come on! That’s the challenge you see, because it isn’t good enough to go in the classroom. That’s what happens to our kids you see, they can’t just respond to what the teacher said.

Teachers: Mmmm

Tutor: What would you do to make him better at writing tomorrow?
The teachers responded to how they would bring about change were ‘on track’ in teaching the child how to be ‘fast’ in learning words and how to re-learn how to use Elkonin sound boxes. The teachers could make the direct comparison between classroom teaching expectations and the current child’s behaviour; and how that needed to change, which involved having ‘active’ children.

Maria: Well, I’d have him write it all over the page…write it on the board…write in the book three times…I’d rub it out…tell me you know it …come back and use it in your story.
Tutor: Good on you! What else would you do?
Jemma: I’d actually go back to giving him counters [for the hearing sounds in words technique]
Tutor: What else could you do?
Jade: Just have him do it and not stop.
Tutor: Excellent. Put that down. Because in reading he’s not to stop and in writing he’s not to stop.
(to note-taker)

One teacher brought up the notion of fluency and how that might be achieved which the Tutor considered and linked to previous discussions she had had with the teachers (See: Session Seven), and extended the idea that having children write similar topics with the same vocabulary supports fluency in writing words. This interaction was ‘on the run’ and the Tutor was responsive to the teacher.

Maria: If you’re going to try and pick up fluency can you use the same sentence? Like today we’re going to use the same sentence but a lot faster than we did yesterday.
Tutor: Ohhh!...You can elaborate on it.
Maria: (a misunderstanding) Yeah, because he’s got the sentence in his head.
Tutor: No, not write it faster...I’m saying that you can elaborate on it. You see, I have a series starting...what was it? The soccer ones...did I tell you that one?
Maria: Yes.
Tutor: And the birthday series goes over about four lessons ...and by the end of it he could write ‘birthday’, but it was going faster each time.

This marked the end of the writing activity. The Tutor drew the teachers’ attention to the time. It was concluded that the teacher behind the glass screen had two minutes to go on her timer for the ‘New Book’ activity, that required at least ten minutes, and that the pace of the writing had slowed her lesson down. The conclusion being that if
RR children were too slow they could not integrate into the classroom activities and the onus was on the teacher to change that situation.

5.3.3 Session Eight (video-taping): The Discussion

The discussion in this session was a bit muddled because the bell (timer for the second lesson) went before the reading had progressed passed the first page of the ‘New Book’; and the group moved quickly into the discussions without following the social etiquette of acknowledgement and asking the teachers first about the typicality of their lessons.

This situation coupled with the teachers not yet being able to couch their feedback in examples from the lesson left Tracey bewildered as this example shows:

*Tutor: So what is to help Tracey think about her teaching tomorrow?*
*Maria: If you want her to read smooth, she has to read smooth.*
*Tracey: Yeah?*
*Maria: When you said read it smooth, you then...actually made sure there were no errors.*
*Tracey: OK.*
*Maria: It’s not that you don’t know what smooth is...maybe you need to use another word?*
*Tracey: OK.*

The Tutor changed the direction of the discussion: ‘Let’s go back. If you were going to sum it up what would you say it was?’ Mary-Lou tried to summarise for the group: ‘If we’re going to give an expectation we need to make sure that the expectation occurs.’ Tracey was still bewildered without the context. The Tutor worked with the social interaction by speaking as an aside to Tracey: ‘You see? It’s not even what you think it was, is it?’ Tracey replied ‘No. That’s right.’ Tutor turned to the group and said: ‘So, I think it is the same for everybody: demonstrate, prompt, expect, so that if we say this needs to happen that’s what really needs to happen.’

Then the Tutor turned the attention to Lara’s lesson and said: ‘what do you think was the big thing for that little boy?’ Lara replied: ‘I think it’s that in a nutshell, as well. If I ask him something he needs to answer.’ The following exchange was how the summary of the lesson observations was negotiated with the teachers.
Tutor: ‘What can you say you’ve worked the hardest on Lara, the reading or the writing?’
Lara: ‘The writing…it’s been a big thing for me, with him’.
Tutor: ‘You’ve shifted him in the reading haven’t you?’
Lara: ‘Yeah, I can see a difference there but not with the writing.’
Tutor: ‘OK, so that’s Lara’s challenge. She can shift him in reading but not in writing. So those are the things we need to think about in terms of our teaching. Anybody else?
Diane: I’m thinking too…for everybody…we discussed…is the child going to be better tomorrow. I think that’s pertinent to all of us…to keep in the back of our brains.
Tutor: So, I’m teaching you to be better tomorrow?
Jade: And I’m thinking about how it’s to improve.
Tutor: So that’s really good. So let’s come, just thinking about the first lesson now, and I would like to talk for 10 minutes around the first lesson. So who’s got the notes on the first lesson? OK Maria, can you just give a summary of what the group was talking about…’
Maria: Well as we said before, the expectations, and that you ask what you get for …demonstrate and praise and pull together at the end to reinforce what you wanted, rather than saying one thing and meaning another. But I think that’s all in the semantics of the word…what you understand by it, I guess.
Tutor: It means that the child has to understand it.
Maria: It has to be clear.
Tutor: OK. We’re talking about explicitness for whatever it is that you ask for.

Discussion on writing: Lesson 2

The discussion on Lesson 1 did not include writing as a topic. This is the analysis of the writing discussion for the second lesson. The Tutor looked at the wall clock twice towards the end of the discussion on Tracey’s lesson. The changeover between lessons was thus:

Tutor: In terms of reading (turning to Tracey) you’d be able to move ahead with that?
Tracey: Definitely.
Tutor: Tracey, I sometimes think that where you think you need to move and where your peers think you move can be different things altogether. So what do you think of that?
Tracey: It’s good. Like…I know that I have to step back sometimes and have a good look at myself, and it’s good to hear what other people are thinking. Definitely!
Tutor: It’s interesting isn’t it, because that’s how we help each other/
(Turning to Lara)
Now we come to this little boy and your big issue is writing I believe?
Lara: Yeah.
Tutor: So we have to go there (to writing)...Look at page 59 ...(searching page reference)... on this page you’ve got one, two, three, four, five dots on how your role changes across a lesson series...that’s you. You could possible transfer it to reading...just have a read of that to do with your role.

The following discussion shows how the Tutor navigated the social interaction between the teacher who taught, when the lesson did not go well, and the group. The group is enlisted to give support, which the teachers identify with because they teach similar children and have the same experiences.

Tutor: In terms of those points Lara, where do you think you got stuck with this H...?
Lara: In the points?
Tutor: Yes Lara, which point did you get stuck with? There is change in the interaction, but sometimes the interaction can get a little but stuck.
Lara: You’re very kind in saying ’a little bit’ (laughs) very stuck...Thank you.
Tutor: It’s as much to do with him, so don’t worry...Look at number two Lara...that’s what should have happened...circle ’should’...he ’should’ have done that...what does ’should’ imply?
Shelley: He will know how to do it.
Tutor: What else will ’should’ imply?
Tracey: Expect it.
Tutor: You remember how slow he was to read?
Lara: Yes.
Tutor: And we used the card to give him ...a boost.
Maria: A rocket!
(Laughter)
Tutor: Yeah, well we’re going to have to have a boost in his writing.
Lara: (laughing)
Tutor: So if you unpick it, what do you think group, what would you be a boost for H...in his writing?
Shelley: I think I’d tell him that he has to have something in his mind when he comes to it.
Maria: Make him use the boxes himself.
Tutor: Just listen Lara. You don’t have to write it down. It’s getting to an idea of the discussion [to Lara] Tutor: [to the group] ...but what does it do for change, for Lara?
Maria: She’s going to make up her mind that she’s going to do her part and he’s going to do his part.
Jemma: And when I ask a question he’ll say something.
Tutor: You’re a very kind teacher Lara. That means you do it for him.
Maria: Unconsciously probably.
Lara: Yeah [looking at Maria]

The Tutor tried to offer advice to Lara but she said she had tried this advice.
Tutor: So what needs to happen is he needs to do it for himself. So the first one is he has an idea or he writes about what you say.
Lara: Yeah...we’ve done that.
Tutor: Can he make up a sentence really fast...he has to...so you’ll have to practice that.
Lara: It probably wasn’t obvious but we did in the lesson today...we did a bit of a...it just didn’t work...
Tutor: Well he has to understand what the expectations are in RR that he would do that. How would any of you make a change for him?

The teachers have advice based on their own RR teaching experience:

Jade: I think he’s similar to the girl I’ve got...or I taught similar...in the same way...or did too much...and she was dependent on me...so I just said...no, you do your job and I’m doing mine over here...I even dropped the eye-contact a little...because I found that she was just looking at me with those eyes...and I’ll just tell you...and that made a huge difference.
Maria (added on); I found that if I was looking they’d look back at me.
Jade: Yes, yeah...if you don’t look.

However, teachers can offer each other useful and confusing advice. The situation in the group is that the confusions can be challenged sorted in the session. The issue for Lara was that she believed that she had done everything she could. In this interaction the Tutor continually tried to bring the teachers back to the issue that the child needed to compose in order to write.

Maria: Don’t look...and you just say you do it to the full-stop of wherever...and then I’ll help you.
Tutor: But I think Lara’s first issue is that he has to make up a sentence which is what Shelley was saying.
Diane: So is what Maria’s saying...is that how it is? You make him write to the full-stop? Before you help him?
Maria: Well not the full-stop...but as much as he needs...
Tutor: Well I say the end of the word...it’s the full-stop for reading...but the word in writing
Shelley: Because you don’t want him to write a mistake do you?
Diane: No, well that’s what I mean.
Tutor: Let’s come back to making the change. He has to be shown the book and he has to make up a story straight away. How are we going to get change?
Maria: What do you mean ‘shown the book’?
Tutor: Whatever he’s going to write about...
Mary-Lou: With one of my boys that I’m working with the conversation is actually very very difficult and I’ve actually found that going on personal experience is too hard for him to come up with sentences and stories...so I’ve worked the book that he’s had in familiar reading...what’s happening in the book...tell me about that...
Lara: We did do that...but I’m worried about overusing it as well.
Tutor: You can bring other things in...interesting things...you can bring a picture or whatever it is...but the point is what is it that he has to do?
Belinda: He has to think of something to write.
Tutor: If the teacher in the classroom says ‘what are you going to write?’ What is she going to think?
Belinda: He can’t do it.

Shelley offered: ‘Have it in your brain when you come,’ so that the child learns to start straight away as he would be expected to in the classroom.
The Tutor directed the teachers to consider the Elkonin boxes and to review their texts to discover when they were omitted from a RR lesson, and concluded: ‘you’re all trying to do that too soon I think.’

Then the Tutor directed the teachers to consider ‘teacher talk’ during the writing: ‘Now the only other part before we move on I thought we’d suggest Lara is not to talk to him so much, because you’ve told him what to do...do you think?...So now he needs to do it.’ The Tutor suggested the use of signals instead of the voice:

Tutor: How many of you have moved to signals?
Jemma: I point for what I want.
Tutor: That’s a signal. You don’t say much you see because he should know how to do it. Try to say very little.

Lara was still unsure about her teaching and the child’s learning so she asked about that:

Lara: Do you think I’m assuming that he knows things that perhaps he doesn’t?
Tutor: Well perhaps you need to revise what you’ve taught him?
Lara: Because sometimes I ask him something and I’ll know that he’s written it the day before and he’ll just give me a blank look and I wonder how long you have to wait for him to answer?
Tutor: This is the notion of getting learning from one day to the next...tell him: we did that yesterday, look here it is. Now do it today.
The problem for teacher expectation seemed to be that teachers thought they were not being ‘kind’ or ‘nice’ to the children to ‘expect’ what they would do. This exchange shows that teacher expectations are different for the children in different places, whereas in their RR teaching the teachers should have the same expectations in the classroom.

_Diane_: We’re going to have to get tougher don’t we? I mean in a nice way...we’re going to have to be tougher.
_Tutor_: Have an expectation, and if you have an expectation, follow through.
_Belinda_: I think it’s the big thing, the expectation.
_Maria_: Yeah, because when you look at them when they go back into the classroom the teacher doesn’t really expect them to know it...do you know what I mean? That expectation is lowered then.
_Jade_: Yeah, they’re not expecting that much.
_Mary-Lou_: As a classroom teacher you are expecting the children...OK, this is what we’re writing about today...start writing...so you have to have the expectation that they’re going to be able to make up their own story and keep it in their head while they’re writing.
_Diane_: I think we have to be reminded of it as we watched the lessons today. We think, oh isn’t that good? But it’s not good enough if you put it in the context of the classroom.

Finally the Tutor directed the teachers to the last paragraph in page 68 in their text to consider Clay’s written advice on teacher expectations in writing.

5.3.4 Session Eight: Written Reflections

The guiding questions for their reflections were:

a) _What will you take away from these teaching lessons and discussions that will inform your teaching?_

b) _How did these teaching lessons and discussions inform how you are thinking about teaching one particular child?_
The main emphasis by the Tutor of teacher expectations during the observations, and raised as the main point by the teachers for the discussion were evident in the teacher’s reflections. Eight of the nine teachers present wrote about this:

Jade: Raise expectations. Make sure they are better than yesterday and will be better tomorrow.
Tracey: Today’s big learning point – expectation and making sure that I follow through with this expectation right through the lesson.
Jemma: Make and follow through expectations consistently.
Belinda: I need to make sure that I expect more of my children in both reading and writing. I need to be clear in my mind what my focus in the lesson is, what am I expecting to see in improvement in reading and writing. I need to make it clear to the children what is expected of them.
Lara: Raise expectations.
Diane: Once again the focus was on me. Everyone must have high expectations of each child.
Shelley: Keep the expectations high and follow through. Pull everything together, make sure give praise for doing well and what is expected.
Mary-Lou: Does each child know the expectations I have of them?

Linking writing performance in RR to performance in the classroom received mention by four teachers.

Belinda: I need to talk with the child about what their classroom teacher is expecting them to do and that he/she is working in the Reading Recovery room to make this happen back in the classroom.
Lara: Get into the classroom and see what H… is doing there. Look at his writing in the classroom.
Diane: I have to keep thinking ‘how will the children fit in to the classroom?’
Shelley: Keep in mind what will be good writing in the classroom.

Three teachers wrote about the speed of the writing

Jemma: Writing needs to be just as quick [as reading].
Lara: After my behind the screen today I MUST work on writing. Writing quickly…..
Diane: What have I taught the children and are they fast?

Three teachers wrote about composing a story for writing.

Maria: Varying conversation with ‘Tell me about…’ does help sometimes only.
Lara: Harry should come with a story idea
Maura: A child should be able to write a story quickly and compose them independently.
Two teachers wrote about demonstrating to the children what they need to be able to do.

*Tracey:* Make sure that I demonstrate and the child understands what they are being asked to do.
*Belinda:* Demonstrate, model and praise. Praise again when this has been demonstrated.

Two teachers wrote about child independence:

*Maura:* Reading Recovery is dependent on the teacher’s skill...
*Lara:* Harry should do all he can in these. Harry should come up with a story idea. If he has no ideas I’ll say one. If a question is asked Harry must answer it. Independence?

Two teachers wrote about talking less themselves in the writing activity.

*Jade:* Stop talking start using signals.
*Lara:* I MUST work on writing. Writing quickly. Helping less, Talking less... Work on some signals (less talk).

Maria’s reflection was on the difficulty she was having teaching a child in this respect.

*Maria:* How do you get someone to increase the complexity of their sentence?? The child I am thinking of is very quiet and industrious, will hardly ever say anything else other than answer your question or shrug her shoulders. When coming to write her sentence – writes something else other than what has been written (even though she has been asked to remember and repeat the sentence she is going to write). Varying conversation with: ‘Tell me about...’ does help sometimes only.

Not wasting teaching opportunities was mentioned by Jade ‘Don’t waste an opportunity to teach or reinforce learning’; and ‘use Elkonin boxes more’ was recorded by Lara in her list of what she needed to work on in writing, that included: speed; helping less (meaning getting greater child independence); talking less; having the child come with a story idea; answer questions he was asked; and her raising her expectations of him.
All of the reflections of their learning came directly from the discussion in the session around the lessons observed. The topics arose from where the Tutor directed the teachers to attend within the lesson observations. However, the more powerful follow through came from observation and discussion afterwards; rather than just observation of Tracey’s lesson.

5.3.5 Session Eight: Conclusion (Writing)

1 a)
What are the major characteristics of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in the group that unfold during a RR session?

The Introductory Discussion

The Tutor introduced the theme for the session as ‘teacher change’ and explained the reason for the theme. She began be establishing that the teachers had been working towards change in their own teaching in the fortnight since the previous session by asking the teachers to share how they had been working on changing their teaching. Four of the teachers responded to this self-reflective question. These teachers offered that they had been working on independence (the theme of the last session); their prompts (the language interactions in RR); the pace and tone of the lesson (related to management of the activities in the time available) and being explicit with the children (sharing what they meant and the learning intentions within the lesson). Another teacher shared that she had to think about her manner as a teacher and be ‘tough’ not ‘nice’, as her perception of her role in RR teaching. The Tutor added for her that is was about being ‘consistent and insistent’ but the teacher thought she was too ‘soft’.

The Tutor explained the need to address ‘teacher change’ was that despite the individual theories about learning group members may hold they were all having difficulties with their teaching in terms of success of their children.

The Tutor gave a handout and explained an approach the teachers could take to their teaching using ‘teaching principles’ from successful teaching in a research project.
This involved perspectives they may not have considered in their teaching, such as clear understanding of the purpose of the tasks the children were engaging in; consistency in how they interacted with the children across all activities; assuming that the child (who is only six years of age) is always making sense in terms of what he/she understood of the task, therefore it was the role of the teacher to seek to understand the child; checking that language prompts functioned as intended and teaching children how to find their errors in reading (a search to find) before helping them to fix them, which involved ‘wait-time’ and carefully selecting places to intervene as children were engaged in the tasks of reading and writing. The message was that there was no blame on the child, but rather a search by teachers to find out how to be successful teaching the children despite their diversity in what they knew and how they acted.

The Tutor praised the teachers for the changes they had made with the literacy activity ‘familiar reading’; and answered two teacher contributions. One was the question about whether the children’s familiar reading had improved because the children were reading at higher book levels or whether it was because of the teachers’ development. The other was that the situation the teachers found themselves in at Session Eight, after 13 weeks teaching was because they had not appreciated the importance of the first ten lessons in RR called ‘Roaming Around the Known’ where a fluent and flexible foundation for learning was established in what was already known before introducing new learning.

The Tutor extended the ‘theme’ by acknowledging that ‘teacher change’ did not come about in any learning unless the learners were ‘aware’ of the need to change, which she called a ‘realisation’.

She further explained to the teachers the necessity for the RR course being as long as it was to involve teacher change and having time to be able to revisit teaching repeatedly over the course of the year.

**The Lesson Observations (Writing)**
The Tutor mainly challenged the teachers: to reflect on whether the teaching they had observed would mean the child had learned; how acceptable the child’s competencies would be in the classroom; what changes they would work towards making for the child to transition into the classroom; the teachers’ expectations for ‘good writing’ and ‘good attempts’; the low level of teacher expectation for RR children; having different expectations for fluency in reading than they did in writing or giving unequal attention to this aspect of writing; whether the teacher was talking too much in the teaching interaction; the adequacy of the progress the children had made in thirteen weeks of individual tuition; that lack of independent control the children had over learning techniques in RR; whether children knew their role in the writing interaction; the teacher’s attributing lack of progress in writing to the child when the child had not been taught how to participate and learn in the activity; teachers’ acceptance of child dependency and insistence on their participation when they know their role.

The Tutor directed the teacher attention to the observation (letter by letter and word by word) by modelling a commentary: it was not always a good idea to have children repeat their oral compositions for writing because they may change their story if they think the teacher doesn’t like it; why didn’t the child learn a word she almost knew; would the child be able to spell a word the next day she had not practised;

The Tutor prioritised aspects of the observation she prioritised over others and ignored some aspects of the teaching that were incorrect. However, she could also choose directions that were less profitable for learning such as focusing on the child’s lack of responsiveness and classroom expectations; rather than how teachers create conversations to write.

The Tutor linked the observation to the teachers’ experience of classroom teaching asking an open question: ‘tell me what you you’re thinking’; and the Tutor linked to a shared experience (from the previous session) and her teaching in how to develop fluency by revisiting writing themes, and reviewing writing vocabulary in that way.

The Tutor confirmed the teachers’ evaluations of the teaching decisions and praised their ideas for improving the teacher-child interaction in writing.
The Tutor asked the teachers to evaluate teaching decisions they were observing and specifically identify what was ‘good’.

**The Discussion (Writing)**

The Tutor negotiated the main ideas that would be discussed by the group. This did not start from a base of teachers acknowledging the teaching or the teachers speaking to their lessons first, or indeed the teachers offering a context for their advice, which was what individuals could recall. It left the first teacher bewildered. So the Tutor stopped the interaction and asked for one teacher to ‘sum up’. The topic given was ‘teacher expectation’. The Tutor explained this to include all the group members as: ‘demonstrate, prompt, expect’. The Tutor negotiated what was important to the teacher who taught second based on her knowledge of the person and having worked with her in the school. The teacher agreed that it was the writing activity. The Tutor finally asked for any other responses and a teacher offered ‘improvement for the next day’ as being important for everyone to think about.

**The following is the Tutor’s social interaction in the discussion of the writing for Lesson 2:**

The Tutor orchestrated the discussion around writing for the second teacher who taught by: confirming with the teacher who taught that this was her area of interest; directing the group to a page reference in the text ‘Literacy Lessons’ which they read; trying to involve the teacher in evaluating the part where the teacher needed assistance; directing the teacher and the group to a section on the page reference given and a word in a section on the page to unpack its meaning, i.e. ‘should’ which the teachers determined meant the child would ‘know how to do it’ and that it would ‘expected’; then the Tutor brought the discussion back to the teacher who taught by acknowledging her teaching of the same child to improve his fluency in reading; and told her that the group would now help her give the same child a ‘boost’ in his writing. The teacher who taught started writing down the teachers’ suggestions; but the Tutor asked her (to one side) to just listen; and the Tutor and group together tried to explain that the child needed to fulfil his role in the activity, which meant that in
her ‘kindness’ the teacher could not do the tasks for him, which a teacher offered was what she probably did ‘unconsciously’.

The Tutors role was mainly to give and manage teacher advice after enlisting their support in this discussion with the teacher who taught. At one point in the discussion the Tutor acted as a ‘correcting agent’ when a teacher suggested that the teacher who taught withdraw assistance until the child write to the full-stop. The group queried this advice, but the Tutor was the arbitrator ‘advice giving’ in the group. The Tutor’s most powerful statement in the discussion was to link the issue that if the child could not compose in RR lessons, what would the classroom teacher think if he acted similarly in the classroom, because the function of RR is to prepare children for the classroom learning without additional assistance.

The Tutor directed the teachers to consider the Elkonin boxes and to review their texts to discover when they were omitted from a RR lesson (using the authority of RR). Then the Tutor linked avoidance ‘teacher talk’ in writing to a consideration of using ‘signals’ as a technique, e.g. gesture. The Tutor answered the teacher’s question about assumptions by suggesting revision of what had been taught and that she consider learning as building from day to day on the basis if teacher expectation and reminders of what had been learned on each day. And the Tutor’s final advice to the teachers was to have an expectation and importantly to ‘follow through’ on that expectation.

1 b) What are the major characteristics of the teachers’ social interaction that unfold during a RR session and how are they orchestrated by the Tutor?

**The Introductory Discussion**

The teachers listened, read and took their own notes as the Tutor explained the theme ‘teacher change’. A few teachers (four) reflected and shared how they had been working towards change in their teaching in the intervening fortnight between sessions.
One teacher questioned whether it was the teachers’ development as RR teachers that had made a difference for the activity ‘familiar reading’ or whether the children were better because they had greater competencies (reading at higher book levels). The teachers did not have the experience to appreciate that ‘orchestration’ of effective literacy processing was taught for in RR and not an outcome of being able to read ‘more words’. ‘Orchestration’ in reading involves: pace, phrasing, fluency; appropriate pausing; appropriate stress on words, pitch and intonation.

The one teacher reflected and commented that the importance of ‘Roaming Around the Known’, the ten lessons set aside in RR at the beginning for the development of fluency and flexibility in what is known as foundational for learning new things had not been appreciated when they had that time at the beginning of the course.

**The Lesson Observations (Writing)**

The teachers observed the lesson closely (letter by letter and word by word). They interpreted what they observed and shared that with others ‘talking aloud’, one example being a teacher’s erroneous thought which was not commented upon. Thinking aloud commentary included articulating what they saw and keeping each other on track. This was behaviour that was not initiated by the Tutor as was an example of keeping themselves up with the observation.

The teachers responded to the Tutor’s questioning about: what would be known after a writing learning interaction (modifying their opinions) and indirectly the effectiveness of the teacher interaction; what they thought was good in the teacher’ interaction with the child; what would be ways to learn words, recalling their RR knowledge.

The teachers interpreted what they observed e.g. the time it took the child to respond; what would need to improve for the child to participate in the classroom; that the expectation of writing was lower than for reading (a teacher comment); that the teacher was doing the work for the child; that the teacher didn’t respond well to the child’s appealing (she did not turn the task back onto the child); that the child was
inactive (passive); that the child was slow because the teacher did the task for him; that the child was not learning because of his passivity.

The teachers agreed that actions had to occur to promote learning; that the product in writing told the teacher nothing about how it was constructed; that there was a problem when teachers thought minimal attempts in writing in RR were good and that children lacked independence after the time they had been receiving individual tuition; that children needed to be taught control of techniques in writing (e.g. linking sounds to letters using Elkonin sound boxes)

The teachers found Tutor’s explanation of teacher expectation and follow through on expectation (insistence) challenging, but they could make suggestions of what would improve the child’s writing for ‘tomorrow’.

One teacher offered a suggestion for improving fluency as re-writing the same story the next day ‘faster’, and listened to the Tutor’s counter suggestion to develop topics that have the same vocabulary and that children learn through revisiting vocabulary on a daily basis.

**The Discussion**

The Tutor neglected to orchestrate the teachers’ interaction at the beginning of the discussion around: acknowledgement of the teaching; allowing time for the teachers to talk briefly to their lessons, and insisting that the feedback given to teachers be couched in examples from the lessons. This meant that the first teacher was bewildered by the feedback they received when teachers were at a stage in their learning. The feedback the teachers gave without this orchestration did not engage the person who had taught and consisted of ‘snatches’ of what individuals could remember from the lesson observations. The Tutor orchestrated a return to a point of ‘summary’ about the first lesson, and although it was a better social position for an interaction it neglected to engage the teacher who taught initially because she had no contextual reference.
The Tutor engaged the teacher who had taught an unsuccessful lesson by appealing to their background understanding of the child and that the teacher had shifted the child in one area (reading) so the group was being enlisted to assist in shifting the writing. The teachers supported the Tutor in offering advice to the teacher who taught. The summarised the discussion of the observation; answered from their own position and what they would consider; and when the teacher kept saying that she had tried the advice they were giving they persisted and described their own children who were similar and what they had tried. The teachers tussled with the advice they were hearing from each other and questioned it. This meant that in the group situation Tutor was the arbitrator in advice giving.

The teachers were supportive of the concept that the children were being prepared for the classroom so that was the level of expectation they would try to achieve with RR children. The teacher who taught was unsure about her teaching in terms of her assumptions about what the child could do and said so. The Tutor advised at this point that revisions were necessary and monitoring learning through expectations being carried through for improvements from day to day.

The teachers reflected on themselves in the group with one teacher linking ‘toughness’ with ‘expectation’ and the expectations for RR children not only in RR but also in the classroom.

*I think we have to be reminded of it as we watched the lessons today.*

*We think, oh isn’t that good?*

*But it’s not good enough if you put it in the context of the classroom.*
APPENDIX L4: DATA REDUCTION

5.4 Session Nine

5.4.1 Session Nine (audio-taping): Introductory Discussion

Session Nine opened the same way as Session Eight. The Tutor opened the session with a) a link to what was discussed at the previous session as a statement; this was followed by b) a request for the teachers to share what they had been working on in the intervening fortnight. The teachers had their course books and their handout about ‘principles for teacher change’ on their knees when the session started.

_Tutor:_ [At] our last session we were talking about our interactions with children and how as teachers we influence the shaping of the child’s literacy processing by the things we say and the things that we do. Right, now what have you been thinking about and how do you change what you do and why?

The teachers’ responses were varied as they had been in the previous session. They spoke mainly about changing their language interactions so that they were more explicit; trying to be more consistent in their expectations of the child’s responding to their teaching; working on daily improvement and focusing on a part of the lesson for improvement. The ideas that the teachers have for their own improvement have had the ‘seed’ planted in the previous session.

_Belinda:_ I am trying to talk less but be very clear in my own mind what I am asking the child and gauging more from the child whether... what I think I’m saying, whether the child gets it. As well, I’m trying to be more consistent, concise and clear.

_Tracey:_ I am trying to be much more consistent with my expectations making sure that the child is actually doing what I’ve asked them to do.

_Diane:_ Because I have a few difficulties with one little boy I have been re-reading the guidebook and just seeing, with a focus on me again, like you two, what can I do to help the situation, from the point of view of my actions? What am I doing? What am I saying?

_Lara:_ I think that at the back of my mind, every lesson now, I’ve got the little words, it came through – I’ve got to make it better for tomorrow. How am I going to make this better tomorrow? What am I going to lift with this child?

_Maura:_ I’ve got a child who isn’t very clear when you give the instructions, so the instructions should be clear and precise instead of rambling on because sometimes they just don’t get it if you keep on.
Jemma: I’ve targeted the oral composition, rather than let it continue on… to run with the best at that point than to try to make it better…to the point where ‘that’s enough’. Talking’s OK but writing is important too.

The Tutor explained that RR teaching involved continuous change in response to the child’s behaviour and the Tutor explained that the change required was ‘continual’ – ‘a continual adaptation to the responses and behaviour of the child’ and asked the teachers if that is what it requires ‘what do we have to be like?’

Belinda: You have to be very open and be able to be critical in a positive way about ourselves and our own teaching. We have to be honest to ourselves about our teaching.

Lara: Be flexible. If what you’ve planned doesn’t work or isn’t what the child needs you need to be flexible to be able to do it on the run…pick it up and run with it.

Belinda: Probably the word I mean is more reflective… you need to become reflective about what you’re doing.

Tutor: Another word Clay would like is to be ‘tentative’, so that we don’t have rigid ideas. What can that lead us into?

Jade: Your ideas don’t suit every child do they? So it stops you being flexible really.

Diane: I think it can blind you to what is actually happening too. With that little boy, I can be thinking, the accuracy rate is down ahhhh! Then I reflected on it as Belinda said and with our gathering knowledge about what strategic activity is about I thought this little boy is not using visual information properly. I need to get over this kind of reaction: Oh what’s wrong? Oh what’s wrong? And just reflect on it. Think about it.

The Tutor explained what ‘tentativeness’ meant in RR teaching as a scientific persona, based on accumulated evidence about children learning:

Tutor: Our notion of ‘tentativeness’ means that you gather information, or evidence, for what you’re trying to problem-solve, doesn’t it? You’re not going to form your opinion on the basis of one example. If you’re thinking about something being a problem, you’re going to analyse it in different settings. And think of different ways, or the different things that might be the issue or the problem. That notion of tentativeness I think is something that Clay would like us to take through in RR. 24

The Tutor also related ‘tentativeness’ to the social interaction between teachers on the course and how they related and spoke with one another:

---

24 Reference: ‘Literacy Lessons Part One’: ‘a simple view of a complex theory’. The Tutor gives information from the text in her role in the discussion.
Tutor: And I think, for all of us, we do tend to be tentative in our language don’t we now, when we talk with one another?

Belinda: Yes.

Tutor: We’re not saying... ’I think so-in-so should’...or ’this child needs to’...we’re saying: ’in light of this evidence I am thinking that perhaps...’ Can you understand that? Because perhaps we can be blinded if we hold very strong views about what we think the issue might be? I hope that that sits with you...that notion of tentativeness.

The Tutor re-directed the discussion to the theme of ‘teaching change’ that had been introduced in Session Eight. She added to the persuasive nature of her talk in representing the teaching principles. The first principle she shared was that: ‘children are always making sense in terms of their current understanding’ as being ‘powerful’ for her thinking.

Tutor: We assume that. We are not looking at a deficit. That’s when we have to seek out the child’s point of view...to empathise with the child. To think: why are you thinking like that? What do you understand? And then, how can I help you? Have some of you been thinking like that? (murmur) How does it change the way you interact? (pause)

A teacher adapted what the Tutor had said and related it to her own experience of a) understanding the child, b) using evidence of the child’s processing and c) trialing teaching on the basis of a new insight.

Shelley: I had a visit from C... yesterday, and that was the exact thing. I was puzzled about a little boy and she sat down during the lesson and recorded evidence, just as it was happening. And then she was able to present that to me. And from what she found she said that she thought that he didn’t have meaning. That he wasn’t reading for meaning. And so today, I did what C... advised, just to take a little, a paragraph at a time, and say ’This is the part where Ben is talking to Mum’ (or whatever) and it was fantastic. It worked so well. So he wasn’t baulking at the words because he had the meaning, so...therefore the words just flowed. It was really good.

The Tutor followed the teacher’s logical connections and linked the group’s teaching and her conversations with group members to scaffolding and shaping meaning as the child was reading thereby bringing everyone into the conversation:

Tutor: That’s an on-going discussion I am having with a lot of you which is how to scaffold or shape meaning while the child is reading. That’s an interesting thing. ’Why are you doing this?’ ’What do
you understand of this task? ’ And then, ‘how can I help?’ to change [child behaviour]...so that you understand more, where you have a different idea about what to do.

The Tutor redirected again to the teaching principles that had been in the handout: ‘Think about the one that is: why should the teacher select carefully the places she intervenes. Jemma’s interpretation revealed teacher understanding at this time in the RR course and linked interference to the child’s brain function in integrating ‘pulling together’ all sources of information available as a strategic activity of the brain:

Jemma: Because you can ruin their network, their strategic activity can be impaired if you jump in too quickly or too late, so they either don’t get an opportunity to make meaning, or it’s too late, they’ve already made a connection that’s incorrect.

The Tutor was responsive to and developed the teacher’s idea to mean not only selecting places to intervene but not intervening too often, which is information in the course text ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’.

Tutor: The other one that Clay said was ‘too often’. If you intervene or you are making comment too often – in a sense your interaction breaks down the meaning for the child because all they’re getting are little snatches because that’s all they’re able to hear because they have somebody who keeps intervening. Can you see it? So if you were even going to make a decision for yourself ‘is it really that important that I need to intervene?’ rather than being able to treat it another time. That might be an important thing for breaking down meaning, do you think?

When ideas were new for the teachers, they appeared to listen, there were pauses, they did say: ‘mmmmm’ which kept the Tutor on track, but there was no discussion around very new ideas. The Tutor continued:

Tutor: What about this one? How does a teacher check what they say and do acts as they intended it to? (pause)
Tutor: It comes back to that idea we say we do things, but whether we actually do them is ...a different scenario...we’re not necessarily doing what we think we’re doing... have you come to that realisation?
Teachers: Yes
Tutor: OK. So how are we going to be able to monitor[what we are doing]?
The ideas that came up in the previous session came to this session when the teachers responded. The Tutor presented the following ideas to the teachers: being responsive to the child; acting in the moment of the interaction; being tentative in terms of any preconceived lesson focus; and being flexible in response to child actions, which meant being able to change direction ‘on the run’. The teacher talk was tentative as they explored the new ideas:

\textit{Lara: Part of it might be if the child’s able to respond appropriately. So you’ve given him the correct prompt.}

\textit{Tutor: So you’re going to look for evidence in the child’s behaviour?}

\textit{Lara: Mmm}

The Tutor linked evidence of teacher effectiveness with successful child responding.

\textit{Tutor: And you’ll constantly be doing that? What say you don’t get the sort of behaviour you’re expecting, what would you be doing then?}

\textit{Jade: You’d need to look at what you’re saying and think if you could change that somehow, because it’s obviously not working for that child.}

The Tutor lifted the challenge to what if the teacher does not get the response she expected and the idea of teacher flexibility:

\textit{Tutor: When do you need to change it? (pause) I think that goes back to what Lara said about being flexible. Can you be flexible and can you change direction on the run? (pause) Can you see? I’ve said this...no I’m not getting the response, therefore I must come from another angle? (pause) That comes to your notion of being tentative and flexible. (pause)}

The Tutor challenged the teachers with the idea of having a lesson focus and that tension with teacher flexibility:

\textit{Tutor: Just to round that up, can you see that if you have a lesson focus, how would that marry with how we’ve been talking...if you had a lesson focus and followed that focus?}

\textit{Maria: It mightn’t be important at the time.}

\textit{Tracey: It narrows your vision of what the child can do and what is actually happening.}
The Tutor explained why teachers do not have a focus in RR teaching and asked for a reaction to this information:

*Tutor: That’s why we don’t have a focus in Reading Recovery. You might have an emphasis of what you’re thinking about in the back of your mind but you have to be prepared to change it...in light of the interaction...*(pause)...Can you imagine that sometimes, perhaps, a person might be teaching their lesson but they’re not actually teaching the person beside them?* 

(Audible agreement)

*Tutor: And that’s where you lose in terms of the interaction. *(Pause)*

*Tutor: Just a quick response to that...what do you think?*

Lara responded to the new idea by linking it with her own professional learning, which was insightful about why young teachers do what they do without a basis of sound rationales.

*Lara: I just think of... perhaps I’m thinking back to my own training...professional development...[a distinction between pre-service training and subsequent professional development]... like we were encouraged, during guided reading, to pick a focus...I always had this feeling...I never questioned it...I just went along because I was listening to advice and I don’t know...and I’m learning...and it’s new to me...but I never felt comfortable with that. It makes sense. Because you’d be...this would be your focus...and the child would be stumbling over things that you needed to work on somewhere else...but that was your focus and you had to...but it didn’t...marry.*

This professional learning was in competition with a view of teaching ‘moment by moment’ in flexible teacher responses to child learning, and making judgments about teacher effectiveness ‘on the run’ based on the child’s successes.

The Tutor summarised following Lara’s contribution to the discussion.

*Tutor: OK. So all this leads to being thoughtful people...getting the best in terms of learning from the teaching interactions that we have...*

The Tutor then re-directed to the lesson observations for that day in terms of the session social structure: Tutor led introductory discussion, leading to teacher descriptions of the children they were teaching that day, and movement to observe the lessons. The emphasis of the observation ‘looking at the teacher’ and the rational
‘to think about the teacher’s decisions and the effect they have on the child’ was stated before the lesson observations. The Tutor stated that she wanted change from teachers who asked ‘am I doing the right thing?’ because it was not for the Tutor to make a judgment: ‘I wouldn’t know unless I can see what you are doing in the interaction.’

This was a call for a teacher-change half-way through the RR course.

*Tutor: OK. They are the sorts of things I want us to be thinking about as we move into the lesson observations today. We are going to be looking at the teacher again, because we are thinking of the teacher’s decision and the effect of what the teacher does, has, on the child. So when I come and see you now [on a school visit] I don’t want you to feel as though you have to ask me ‘am I doing the right thing?’ Because you know from when I come that I’ll say: ‘well I don’t know if you’re doing the right thing’... because I wouldn’t know unless I can see what you are doing in the interaction. Is that OK? So that we can feel that?*

The Tutor finally re-directed to the observation and how the teachers were to have a ‘developing hypothesis’ about the child’s learning as they observed:

*Tutor: What do you think of as an hypothesis?*  
*Lara: An idea.*  
*Tutor: It’s an idea...I think it’s this way...I think that’s what it is...then you have to go out and do what?*  
*Diane: Find evidence.*  
*Tutor: Find the evidence and how much evidence supports your idea. And then on the way you may modify your idea. And then by the end...at the very end...you may think ‘perhaps this is it’...in this one lesson we’ve observed. That gives us an idea of being tentative.*

**Teacher introductions of the children to be taught**

In these teacher introductions of the children being taught the teachers summarise what they think is important in the teaching for their group members before both lessons. Jemma is thinking about the child re-reading to predict meaning consistently in reading and how to develop a complex sentence in writing. Belinda was also thinking about consistency in the child’s processing from ‘day to day’ and ‘book to book’ in reading and composition of the more complex sentence for writing.
Jemma: OK. S...is 6 years 11 months old. This is his 15th week in Reading Recovery. He has had 67 lessons. He entered on Book Level 3 and is currently reading Book Level 13. My purpose of the lesson today is that he re-reads and predicts and he doesn’t stop without prompting from me.

Tutor: What else do you want him to do?

Jemma: I want him to do that consistently.

Tutor: What were you looking for in the writing?

Jemma: To extend the complexity of his sentences...through his oral composing of a complex sentence...and taking that complexity to his writing.

Belinda: My little girl B...is 7 years of age. She has been on Reading Recovery for 15 weeks and this is her 60th lesson. With B...she’s actually bringing a lot of things together in her reading. With her monitoring, processing and listening...but she doesn’t do it consistently. She doesn’t do it consistently from book to book or from day to day. So I will think that she’s got it all in place and then the next day I will be pulling my hair out because she’s not listening for meaning, or she’s stopped looking from the first part of the word to the second part of the word. So, it’s just telling her that she can do it...and that she’s to do it in every book...because she is actually able to do it...and the teacher is pleased with her reading and also her writing. She’s been taking a lot of what she’s been doing in Reading Recovery...and she’s writing independently in the classroom...she’s fitting in with that middle group of children. When she does an independent writing task she holds her own with that...but it’s again the complexity...she’s happy with something simple...whereas she really can do something more complex than that...she’s happy she’s got something and she’ll just write that.

5.4.2 Session Nine (audio-recording): Lesson Observations of Reading.

This is an analysis of the ‘reading’ activities in the lessons observed: familiar reading (when children re-read books for fluency and orchestration of the reading processes); the child’s independent reading of ‘yesterday’s new book’ while the teacher took a running record in one lesson; and the ‘new book’, (which is a teacher selected book that is introduced to the child by the teacher and during which the teacher supported the child’s reading) to examine the main characteristics of the Tutor’s social interactions and the teachers’ social interactions with each other.

5.4.2.1 Lesson One

**Familiar Reading Activity**
This activity takes about five to six minutes in a 30 minute RR lesson. The Tutor directed the focus of the observation and highlighted the salient point to be remembered ‘when the teacher asked the child to read faster he did not do so’ with an idea as to why that might be.

_Tutor:_ So when you’re starting off it’s very important to look at what the teacher does and the effect of what the teacher does. OK? So if the teacher asks the child to read quickly…does the child read quickly?

[Observing]
_Tutor:_ Was he faster?
_Teachers:_ No
_Tutor:_ So you write that down. You’ve asked for something and he’s not fast. So how do you adapt?

[Observing]
_Tutor:_ On the other hand do you have a developing hypothesis about why he is not faster??

_Jade:_ Meaning. Meaning wasn’t there.

The Tutor assisted the teachers in developing an hypothesis: was the speed of the reading hindered by the complexity of the language or the type of language in the text?

_Tutor:_ What type of language was he reading on the second page? That might have made it more difficult for him.

The teachers offered an analysis of the language being read as ‘imperative language’ in direct speech, and the Tutor then re-directed to the next idea and whether they had a developing hypothesis.

_Tutor:_ Let’s see on a different page what sort of [language] structures he’s getting to read.

[Observing]
_Tutor:_ Does anyone have a different hypothesis? Why is he not going faster?

The teachers offered other ideas: it was not the right book level; he was not scanning fast enough; he was not familiar enough with the book.

The Tutor prioritised ‘familiarity’ and ‘visual information’. She said: ‘He’s still having to work it out. It’s not easy enough. Do you agree with that?’ Lara agreed:
‘it’s ‘not quite decoding but he is having to look at every word rather than predict a little bit more.’

So the teachers were included in a search for why the reading was not ‘fast enough’ against evidence of what they saw and how they described it.

In this way the Tutor influenced the teachers’ learning: directing attention; offering an idea; asking for teachers ideas and shaping these into a tacit and sometimes verbal agreement. The teachers’ interaction was to continuously observe; answer questions and link to their developing knowledge and hypotheses about their observations. The teachers were redirected by the Tutor to the purpose of the activity in contrast to the observation.

\textit{Tutor: So what are you working on in familiar reading?}

\textit{Diane: Fluency.}

\textit{Tracey: And phrasing}

\textit{Tutor: And speed...pace.}

In this way the teachers’ attention was constantly switching from the observation to their own ideas, and from the observation to the ideas the Tutor was presenting; and linking these themselves to RR practices and rationales. The decision made by the teachers was to integrate the information.

\textit{Tutor: Did she tell him what he needs to do?}

\textit{Shelley: She told him to read faster like talking}

\textit{Diane: Maybe she needs to use a card or something? [procedure to force pace and fluency]. You know, read a certain amount in a certain time.}

This interaction shows that the Tutor reinforced or rehearsed the teachers in the knowledge of the activity they were engaged in.

\textit{Tutor: We’re getting the idea that we are shaping behaviour on the run. The child is being pulled up when he makes mistakes with words. When what led him into the mistake was maybe to do with...}

\textit{Tracey: Structure?}

\textit{Tutor: Which is to do with listening to your}

\textit{Diane and Tracey: self read.}
Tutor: And you can never hear [this] unless you are going...

Maria: fast enough

Tutor: Therefore, to get him to go faster, what experiences do you think he needs with familiar reading?

Lara: Less interruptions.

Tutor: What else does he need?

Diane: An easier book

In developing an hypothesis (above) the teachers were led by the Tutor to think about themselves. The teacher had said that she wanted the child to re-read in her introduction (search in the word sequences for meaningful possibilities to cross-check with visual information) but the interpretation by the teachers was that requiring the child to ‘fix errors’ meant that she wanted accuracy.

Tutor: What does the teacher think he should do?

Lara: Re-read

Tutor: What does she really think?

Belinda: Read it accurately.

Tutor: What should she be helping him to do?

Lara: It’s word by word.

Tutor: Why is he doing that?

Jade: Because there’s so much attention to the visual.

Tutor: Yes, he is giving primary attention to visual information.

The Tutor reiterated that the activity was about ‘making sense’; that ‘making sense’ was continuous in reading and linked to fluency25 and pace of the reading; thereby challenging linking a teacher’s idea that comprehension was measured by questioning at the end of a reading.

Tutor: Always make sense. Are you thinking about this now?

Lara: Maybe at the end a little thing about comprehension like asking him a question that would relate to the story.

Tutor: What is Clay talking about? She’s talking about comprehension, fluency and speed.

---

25 Fluency is interpreted as being to do with the connectedness of the reading – i.e. smoothness or not reading word by word.
A follow up for the teachers’ consideration was the idea that reading could be reasonably accurate even if it sounded like ‘decoding’. The shift was to make it better and how to do that.

_Tutor:_ Listen to him again.
[Observing]
_Tutor:_ Do you think he has a reasonably accuracy?
_Teachers:_ (No)
_Tutor:_ Yes, I do.
_Shelley:_ Oh, do you? It’s not sounding... it’s decoding.
_Tutor:_ ... an instruction accuracy [but] is it good reading?
_Tutor:_ You have a hypothesis about what to do. How to make it better?

**Reading a second familiar book**

The teacher started by having the child re-read the first page. The teachers clarified whether being explicit involved asking questions of the child; and when the child was questioned in RR lessons.

_Tutor:_ Why is he reading this page again? Does he know why?
_Shelley:_ Jemma wants him to read expecting to see something about a relay race so she thinks he’s going to get the meaning. Maybe it needs to be a bit more explicit [so the child knows what to do]?
_Tutor:_ Listen to her, why is she not being explicit?
(Observing)
_Jade:_ She’s asking questions all the time.
_Tutor:_ When in Reading Recovery will we ask questions?
_Shelley:_ Comprehension at the end.
(pause)
_Tutor:_ When you don’t know what the children are doing...that’s the only time you’ll be asking questions.

The Tutor asked the teachers how they would bring about change and have the child read for meaning and monitoring meaning continuously. The teacher idea was to introduce the book with more ‘meaning’ rather than assist the child to construct meaning as he read.

---

26 The lesson framework required two books read in familiar reading but this did not occur in the second lesson.
Tutor: How are you going to bring about change?
Tracey: Introducing the new book with a bit more meaning.
Tutor: You tell what you want him to think about as he reads. What are you doing if you ask him to 'think'? (pause) Search. Search for meaning and be listening for meaning.

The ‘New Book’

The ‘New Book’ is chosen by the teacher from her school book collection. The teacher chooses this book taking into account the child’s current competency and the challenges of the book in terms of language used, topic and vocabulary. Then the teacher crafts an introduction that will mediate both so that the child will know what the story and the plot are about before attempting to read the book with teacher support.

In this interaction the Tutor drew the teachers’ attention to when the child’s reading started to become ‘decoding’ and how this was influenced by the teacher’s behaviour. The teachers observed repeated examples of the teacher directing the child’s attention to the visual information, which was not consistent with what she explained to the group at the beginning of the lesson: ‘My purpose for the lesson today is that he re-reads and predicts and he doesn’t stop…without prompting from me.’

Tutor: ...where did his eyes go?
Teacher : To the visual information.
[Observing]
Tutor: There he goes again... What’s he trying to do?
Diane: Trying to sound it out.
Tutor: She’s trying to change his behaviour so he will think of meaning first.
[Observing]
Tutor: Is that better?
Teachers (No)
Maria: He’s taken four goes to get that.
Tutor: Has she changed him?
Teachers: (No)When has it stopped [good reading] and started to go down?
Tracey: At the start of a page.
Tutor: When she has withdrawn her support to do with meaning. Can you see that?
The Tutor directed the teachers; attention to the teacher’s behaviour, which was to attend to visual information (decoding) when the child came to an error. The Tutor confirmed the teacher’s interpretation of what the teacher did and involved the teacher in thinking of a solution, which the teacher articulated as ‘do what is successful.’ The Tutor directed the teachers in what to share with this teacher in the discussion, which was to scaffold for meaning as this brought about successful child reading.

Tutor: Now what does she do?  
[Observing]  
Tutor: She knows what she wants then what does she revert to?  
Jade: She goes to the visual information.  
Tutor: That’s it! Then she falls back on the visual information.  
Jade: It’s going back again.  
Tutor: So, in terms of changing behaviour what do we have to do?  
Jade: Maybe if she stuck to what she was doing in the first couple of pages.  
Tutor: It’s what we were talking about at the beginning [in the session introduction] your consistency. To stick with it for the whole book.  
Shelley: Because it was working.  
Jade: Yeah it was.  
Tutor: She needs to hear that. You scaffold to the meaning...that works...as soon as you stop...he goes back to his old habit. Can you see that he has a habit that is hard to break?... His strong habit is to go straight to visual information.

5.4.2.2 Lesson Two (Reading)

Familiar Reading Activity

This analysis in Session Nine is of the same literacy activity in the second lesson. The Tutor explained to the teachers that the second lesson observation was a comparison with the first observation and not a repeat of the first observation ideas.

Tutor: Now how are you going to get shift for ourselves between our observation of the first lesson and the observation of the second lesson?

The teachers started interpreting the child’s reading, which the Tutor moderated ‘it’s fast enough though’ and redirected the teachers to an aspect of the reading.
Maria: It’s not fast.
Diane: It needs to be faster.
Tutor: It’s passable though…it’s enough...
(Observing)
Tutor: There’s something to do with stopping at the end of the line that you’ve got to watch.

The Tutor questioned the teachers about the child’s monitoring where the child responded to the teacher monitoring the meaningfulness of the reading.

Tutor: So she went wrong, but what brought her back?
Tracey: The message.
Tutor: Who told her?
Diane: The teacher.
Tutor: Tell me about that.
Lara: She’s responding to the prompts.

The Tutor initiated the teacher’s comments on the self-initiated self correction when the child self-corrected at the word starting wee/days (weeks/days)

Tutor: Weeks and days…the same meaning…time?
Diane: She got it.
Lara: Then she attended to visual.

The teachers self initiated comments as the reading continued.

Maria: It’s smooth and got a bit faster.
Shelley: She’s keeping it together.

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to what may have led the child into error in this exchange and explained that distractions when the eye left the page could lead to error. The teachers observed that the teacher teaching was trying to control that behaviour.

Tutor: Now isn’t that interesting for you to see…she went wrong…why did she do that? (pause). It’s the movement of her body… to be able to keep the eye on the page and where she’s up to… [when] …there’s a lot of movement going on… that means a lot when the eye comes off the page.
Maria: She actually said that.
Diane: Yes.

Maria: [She said] You moved it. Hold it still because you made a mistake

The Tutor explained a different type of questioning in RR teaching, this was in contrast to the discussion between the teacher and the child which involved the teacher telling the child what she needed to do; what did, what she noticed and what she corrected, finishing with a rehearsal by the teacher that it had to make sense.

Tutor: If you ask questions ...they’re not questions the child is expected to answer...they’re what you call rhetorical questions...they’re shaping the way she thinks.

The Tutor asked why the teacher might be checking the child’s reading accuracy when the child had used meaning and structure and visual information in her error.

Maria: Because that’s teacher fear of not being able to see the word.

**Yesterday’s ‘New Book’**

This is an example of an interaction when the teacher’s closely observed the child reading.

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to what the teacher had said at the beginning of the reading; asked the teachers to contribute; commented and interpreted the child’s errors; directed the teachers to think about what to teach at the end of taking the ‘running record’; thought aloud for the teachers about the language structures the child was reading; and invited teacher participation in considering her reasoning.

The teachers commented on their observation by reiterating what the first teacher had said in agreement with her; articulated what they thought they saw and were redirected to the actual behaviour by the Tutor; offered a hypothesis when asked and justified the hypothesis.

Tutor: Now she said that it always has to make sense and get better!
(Observing child reading first page of ‘The Flood’ (level 14) independently for the running record – re-reading and correcting on the run)

Shelley: She kept going.
Maria: She didn’t stop.
Shelley: Didn’t break down.
Tutor: Say something.
Shelley: She corrected quickly under her breath? Did she?
(Observed: Is coming to come into the house)
Tutor: It didn’t make sense.
Shelley: OK.
Tutor: Now if you say it has to make sense what are you coming back to at the end?
Shelley: Meaning.
Tutor: To that example.
(Observing: Then the mud/Then the mud/brown water came in)
Tutor: Muddy...she went mud/mud and carried on...I can’t think of it for now...carry on. Did she maintain meaning?(pause) Sort of?
(Observing)
Tutor: Why is this hard Maura?
Maura: Is it to do with the sentences?
Tutor: ‘It isn’t clean’...’isn’t’?...Unusual structure?
Diane: It’s usually not.
Shelley: It’s not.
Maura: But a lot of them do it ...for aren’t they say are not.
Tutor: Think about why.
(Observing)
Tutor: Can you see what’s happening? OK think about the structure and the language.
Maria: It’s hard.
Tutor: It is complicated isn’t it? So she’s making a fair fist of it.
Mmmm
(Observing)
Tutor: So if you are choosing a really good example to strengthen the processing system that’s when you choose it as you’re going along.

The New Book

Lesson Two began with a story introduction of ‘The Three Little Pigs’ (RR Book Level 15). The teachers observed the teacher behind the screen in the following
interaction with the child after the building materials for the pig’s houses had been recalled from prior knowledge.

C: Straw, sticks, bricks
T: Look at my face. Say sticks.
C: Sti-cks
T: No, say it smoothly. Sticks.
C: Sticks
T: What would you expect to see on the end of sticks?
C: s (sound)

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to the help the teacher was giving the child and challenged the teachers to have children make predictions about what words could be before looking at parts in the words. The teachers attended and asked ‘so that’s what you should be doing.’

Tutor: Look at the interaction.
Lara: She’s directing her to the end parts.
Tutor: Was the child looking at the print? When you’re asking about visual information you’re asking ‘what do you expect’... What are you asking her to do?
Maria: Think about it.
Diane: In the writing of the text.
Tutor: She will know about that when she comes to read it.
Diane: So that’s not what you should be doing?
Tutor: She’s engaged in making predictions and when she wants to think about finding the word... what would you see? what could it be?... The operative word is ‘think’. You think then you look.

The teachers observed the teacher behind the screen repeatedly telling the child what she should be doing throughout this lesson.

T: So B... when you’re reading you have to keep thinking about the story. What’s the story about? And is what you’re reading making...
C: Sense.
T: Make sense. But you have to look at the word as well and check the beginning and the end. We have to do that as well. Yes we do. So you read the ‘Three Little Pigs’

When the child got into difficulty on the few sentences on the first page the following interaction unfolded:
T: Look!
T: That makes sense. Why don’t you go back there?
T: Keep reading. There. You’ve read ‘there’.
T: So B... did that make sense? Yes. So that’s what you have to do. If you read something and you think it doesn’t make sense what do you have to do?
C: Re-read.
T: Yes, you have to re-read it but you also have to look at the word. You have to make that beginning sound.
C: [reading the sentence]
T: So B... did that make sense?

The Tutor explained RR teaching ‘on the run’ as: ‘you’ve got to be able to be quick, in and out and move’ in relation to teacher-child interaction during reading. Shelley commented: ‘So you keep scaffolding as you go?’

The Tutor directed the teachers to record the child’s errors as the reading proceeded as a way of gathering evidence during an observation: ‘Home over house and was over were. All of that should be written down there [on the lesson record] so that you know the sorts of things she does.’

The Tutor re-directed the teachers from their conversation to observing the lesson so that the observation did not get waylaid. One teacher commented: ‘Oh dear, she always says straws. Maybe they don’t know what straw is? They’re thinking of straws for drinking.’ To which Shelley concurred: ‘yeah, straws for drinking.’ The Tutor said: ‘it doesn’t matter because it’s something you can come back to.’

This is an example of the teacher teaching the child to read ‘bricks’ in the story:

C: (Stopping at bricks and saying ‘br’)
T: What beginning with ‘br’ would make sense?
C: bri (long vowel sound)
T: Look at the word.
C: br
T: What would make sense?
The Tutor modeled for the teachers how to quickly get the child to say this word in a well known story and one teacher quickly supplied the word in the Tutor’s example. The teachers were tussling with how to support the child, by scaffolding meaning or attending to visual information; while the Tutor was directing the teachers to consider that the child behaviour was in response to the teacher’s behaviour.

Tutor: How can you get the child to ‘bricks’?
Diane: You’d say it’s not bri (long vowel)
Tutor: [ignored]
Tutor: You say the first one was straw and the second one was sticks and the third one was...
Maria: Bricks.
Tutor: You know that. Off you go!
Shelley: So you go for the meaning rather than the word level?
Tutor: What’s happening here?
Diane: She’s getting bogged down.
Tutor: Why is she getting bogged down?
Jade: Too much attention to visual
Tutor: By...?
Jade: The teacher.
Maria: She’s lost meaning now.
Tutor: Why?
Lara: Because there was a big pause
Tutor: Yes, there’s pausing but there’s also how she directs her attention.

The book was not read passed the first few pages in this lesson.

The Tutor directed the teachers to summarise the lesson, at the end, and before the teacher who taught returned to the room. The quick summary was a rehearsal for the discussion. This was: the teacher took the child in the direction of visual information; the writing needed to be faster; there was need for consistency in teaching; and the Tutor concluded that the teachers needed to attend to ‘meaning’ because other errors could be treated later.

Jade: The teacher started to take her in the wrong direction.
Tutor: Perhaps, and an over-attention to visual information made it break down. And what about the writing that’s going to help today? If we had one word?
Jemma: Quick.
Maria: Getting faster.
Tutor: Now do you think that will bring about change?
Shelley: It must.
Tutor: So what’s the hardest thing for us? It’s always hard. It’s the hardest thing to bring that change.
Jade: And be consistent.
Tutor: To let things go. Do you think? Hold on to what’s important. And even if it niggles you – let go!
Jade: That’s the thing, that you think if I don’t show them that they’ll remember it the wrong way or they’ll make that mistake. So it’s a change of mindset for us just to go with one thing.
Tutor: But what will you accept? The first thing you want to accept is what? The reading...what’s the first thing you make your judgment on? The meaning, and then you can always come back. Isn’t that the hardest thing in an interaction to think about? OK. Well you’re only halfway through the course!

Jade reflected that the teachers learned from each other because when they teachers observed each other they came to understand why they got the same results.

You can see what you’re doing in their lessons, and you can compare it to your own teaching and think ‘well I do that and maybe that’s why I’m getting the same result?’ Whereas sometimes you can’t stand back from yourself. It’s hard to stand back and look at yourself or your own teaching, I guess, or your lesson, because you’re giving it.

The Tutor reinforced this view. She said that it is hard for teachers to monitor themselves (observe themselves in action) so the teaching group helped them think about their teaching.

I like that. It’s very hard for you to monitor yourself. That’s the hardest thing to do. Isn’t that good? And we’re lucky that we’ve got peers to help us.

5.4.3 Session Nine (video-taping): Discussions

The Tutor thanked the teachers for attempting to bring about change in the children’s behaviours at the session, and explained that the teachers in the group knew what needed to change but what they needed to do now was work out how to bring about change. The Tutor pre-empted a discussion about a difficult lesson by acknowledging the teacher’s challenge.

Tutor: I’ll do the acknowledgements. Other people can...but if you’re not quick enough I’ll get there first. What I liked about the lessons and I commend you for is to really make an attempt at bringing
about change in a setting like that. OK? That is what I hope we will all be able to do now that we
know we can work with one another and we can see that things work, and sometimes they don’t
work…the best thing is, I think, that we all know what needs to change…then what we need to do is
work out how we do it.
(Affirmation)
I do think that Jemma’s little boy was a bit harder because Jemma’s having to bring about more
change, than with the little girl, because he has a habit of behaving a certain way. OK? And when you
have a habit, that’s like strong skill, that the teacher has to break, so we will start thinking in different
ways.
Jemma: Sometimes those habits have been broken.
Tutor: That’s great. So from both teachers can you just make a brief comment about your lesson?
Jemma, what did you think?

Jemma commented on her disappointment with the lesson and herself in how she
introduced the ‘new book’ to the child, but shared that the ‘familiar reading was the
best the child had done.

‘I was disappointed with it... He’s usually much more articulate than that and he usually takes that to
his writing ... much more fluently. I was also cranky with myself in the text introduction for the new
book. I had read that book last night. I did know what it was about. I just got there and it all went out
of my head, and even though it was written down it just didn’t come out. So I was pleased with his
familiar reading, that was probably the best that he has done to date, and while some parts weren’t
always perfect, that’s the best he’s done to date. So, at least we’re working on that area as well.’

The Tutor invited the teacher to explain more about the ‘familiar reading’ and the
teachers listened to her explanations of how she found the teaching of this child
difficult. The Tutor thanked the teacher and said that the whole group needed to hear
this explanation because if they had strong skills that needed changing it would take
time to work out what they were and to bring about change.

In his familiar reading he tended to get to the first part of the word and just hammer the first part of
the word...he’d get to a ‘g’ or a page where he had it go ‘p-p-p’ until you just wanted to drag the
word out of his mouth. He would not go back and re-read. He was just on the first part. No, it was no
use. It was just saying ‘one chance’ and that’s his chance...he does get it when he goes back and re-
reads it...and it’s taken me a week ...a good week...to get him to do that...to break that habit...so I
was really pleased. I know he did it but he didn’t do it as frequently as he was...so at least he’s re-
reading...but he’d get to this first part and just hammer it and not let it go...even when I said stop...so
now I’m just saying ‘one chance only’ and C... taught me that...‘one chance only’...He fidgets a lot
and his body movement does distract him and that’s why I stopped his feet. They drive me crazy, but he’s distracting himself by moving his feet. He now doesn’t fidget ...usually...when he delivers his oral composition...he works quite...good at that...and he keeps his hands still ...and these are all behaviours that I should have noticed in ‘Roaming Around the Known’ but I didn’t notice them until I noticed them...you know what I mean?

The Tutor asked the next teacher to tell the group about her lesson:

That was really reasonably difficult because that’s what I was saying before that she’s not consistent with things, so that things that yesterday (well she wasn’t at school yesterday)...the last lesson, that she would have done, she didn’t do today. That’s how it’s been going with her, so tomorrow she might be doing the same things she did today, so that’s why I kept stopping her and saying: what does it have to be? It has to make sense? ...because often she’s just reading words.’ Last week, the last lesson I had she wouldn’t have done that...she wouldn’t have kept reading...but she has to be consistent...it’s not good for her to be doing it one day and not another day...that’s why I kept stopping and saying ...’It has to make sense and you have to look at the first part and the last part of the word’... which again at different times she did not do...but that is what she’s often like...and the next day it will go really ...very smoothly and she’ll do all of those things...so that was very typical of a pattern rather than a particular lesson...it’s a pattern...so she knows but she’s not consistent with it...so I’m trying. but what can I do other than pull her up and say ‘you know that it has to make sense.’

The Tutor directed how the discussion would start and for how long it would continue: ‘Now, with the group, we worked on the effect of what the teacher was saying on the child’s behaviour, for both of them, and then we also worked on a developing hypothesis where we ended up with a conclusion about what the group could tentatively say about the child’s responding. So we have, possibly about, 10 minutes for each lesson. So, if we could start off with the first...just with the conclusion... and then I would like the group to join in the discussion.’

Diane was asked to share with Jemma the main discussion of her lesson (a summary) from her notes. She said that the teacher needed to focus on meaning and that the reading fell down when that scaffold was removed. Maria assisted by elaborating on scaffolding meaning. Maria also identified with the teacher who taught by saying what made it hard for the teachers was not knowing how to interact with the child when the child’s reading became problematic.
Diane: Jemma, we had that you need to continue the focus on meaning...and the scaffolding and that where you took that away it fell down...and then...perhaps the rest of the group can help me with that?

Tutor: So anyone who would like to elaborate on that comment?

Maria: I went really well as you went paragraph by paragraph [emphasising the meaning]...but then after a couple of pages when you thought it was going fine and you took the scaffolding away he then went straight back to his other habit which meant that then you should have come back in and gone back paragraph by paragraph again. You probably knew that, like I know how you feel, because you think everything’s going fine and then it falls down and then you think ‘God what do I do?’ ‘Do I go back or push more?’

The Tutor redirected by telling the teachers that the scaffolding for meaning occurred before the children made errors, so that they could make predictions about what they were reading.

Tutor: OK. There was one page that we particularly felt that his reading went back to his old habit of word by word...and why did we think that happened?

Belinda: There was directed speech on that page?

Tutor: It has to do with what Maria was talking about.

Maria: Because you didn’t do any scaffolding.

Tutor: At the beginning.

Maria: Yes at the beginning. The first line.

Tutor: So if we want the child to predict the meaning, we’re going to have to say it before they read, not after they’ve made a mistake.

Maria: So as they’re turning the page you’re saying? 27

The Tutor directed the teachers to be precise in their language interactions in RR teaching, and referred them to their course text. A teacher located the reference and a prompt that they could use.

Tutor: OK. Can we get out our books because what I am hoping for the group is that we’re going to get closer to the use of the language of RR? We are getting good at rationales, our own rationales, we’re getting very good at that, and we’re very good at saying things in a round about way...

Teachers: (laughing)

Tutor: But we need to get to things that are precise in our language.

Tutor: So if we wanted a child to search for meaning, consistently search for meaning, what would we be saying? And what page would we be on?

27 This teacher action is directly from the texts ‘Literacy Lessons, Part Two’, p94
Tracey: 111.
Tutor: Thank you, 111.
Tracey: Try that again and think what would make sense.

Organisational talk revolved around referencing the text. Tutor: ‘Have you all got pencils? Can you see where it says: Try that again and… You can truncate that and say ‘Think what would make sense.’ You can elaborate sense. But you really want to come back to: ‘Think what would make sense.’ Does that help you? OK. Just leave your books open now.’

The Tutor directed summarised information from Diane: ‘Do you have anything else in your notes Diane that we could think about how he was reading in familiar reading?’

Diane: We thought that in familiar reading that he lacked fluency and pace and you Jemma just said to read faster but you didn’t kind of follow up on how to do that. So we all got out of that that all of us have to shape behaviour on the run. Take steps to do so.

The Tutor then directed the teachers to read page 155 in ‘Literacy Lessons’.

Tutor: OK. Can we look at page 155? And this is for all of us Jemma. We’re looking at the heading ‘Say read it fast will not do’, so can you see ‘It takes time to develop fast control of many subparts of a complex whole’? Can you see that? ‘So it operates smoothly and fluently… what needs to speed up is different for different children.’ So if we stop there. What needs to speed up for that boy? So he can read faster?

There was no response from the teachers, so they were redirected to the text: ‘Well look at the dots, one two on this page and two on the other page. What do you think needs to come together faster?’ After a pause Maria gave a generic response: ‘His skill in reading the text.’ This is an example shows that teachers use experiential learning before they search their texts for solutions.

And the Tutor redirected the teachers to study the text: ‘Yes, but can you get down to it?’

The Tutor acted as a co-worker with a teacher, accepting and rejecting a suggestion:
Diane: Point four is it?’
Tutor: ‘OK. Oral reading comes together well when it occurs on material that is just challenging enough.’ ‘Perhaps not…because he has a habit that has to be broken.’

The Tutor continued acting as a co-worker with the teachers in exploring the text:

Tutor: What about the one above? ‘Seeing and recognizing objects is fast and fluent in ordinary life but only after we have become familiar with objects in general and some objects in particular…recognition becomes faster as visual familiarity increases.’ I would suggest to you that perhaps he is not visually familiar with the words he is reading, would you?’
Jemma: ‘He’s read those books a number of times. That’s what’s frustrating me now.
Tutor: Because if it’s not that what’s it got to do with?

The teachers continued reading and a teacher made a suggestion with a rationale:

Shelley: I think it could be number two, because he’s got the meaning totally in his head therefore he can’t make that thinking, the link fast with words.

The Tutor concluded for the group:

Tutor: OK. So the group actually thinks its point two on page 155, which means that he definitely has to have the meaning in his head to be able to make a link with the words he’s looking at. Is that right Shelley?’
Shelley (nods)

The Tutor directed the teachers to think about what they would need to do, rejecting one idea and completing another.

Tutor: So what does that ‘definitely’ mean if you’re going to have him read faster? What is the teacher going to have to do?’
Lara: Make sure that he’s got books he’s familiar with.
Tutor: She’s doing that. What is she going to have to do all the time?’
Jemma: Scaffold…
Tutor: …the meaning…and never forget.
The Tutor also directed the Jemma to think that she could ‘let some things go’ if they made sense and elicited group agreement that the child could read faster when he knew what he was reading about.

*Tutor: You’re going to have to let some things go Jemma.*

*Jemma: I have to let some things go?*

*Tutor: Yes, you can deal with that at the end, as long as you’re on the path to get it going faster. Does everybody agree with that, that he could read a sentence faster when he knew what it was about?*

*Teachers: Mmmmm*

The Tutor redirected the teachers to stay on one topic when different ideas were suggested and side talk started, summarised the learning around reading from Lesson One, and managed the time saying that there were five minutes to discuss the writing, before discussing Lesson Two.

*Jemma: He was looking back at the illustrations in the new book*

*Maria: Wasn’t it the contractions he was reading wagon? Aren’t or are not or something?*  
*(Teach talk)*

*Jemma (explaining to someone): That’s his pronunciation.*

*Tutor (to Jemma): No, just leave that...*

*Tutor (to the group): Can we all stay together on that? So what have we learnt? If he’s going to be faster what’s he going to have to do?*

*Tracey: Carry the meaning always.*

*Tutor: Mmmmm...he’s going to have to be led strongly by meaning. OK? And we need consistency in that.*

The discussion in this session showed that the structure of the social interaction was: summarise what has been observed to a ‘main idea’; share what that could mean as a group with reference to the text; try to understand the text; have a temporary solution for the teacher who taught; and move on. The teacher, theoretically, should have a discussion around two main points that she could take back for her teaching and the group could take those two points away for their teaching.

The Tutor concluded the writing discussion and then directed the teachers to discuss the second lesson: ‘Now what about the little girl? Just the summary.’
The teacher gave advice to the teacher who taught without a context. The Tutor redirected the group to consider the reading activities that went well and to a context for discussion.

*Shelley*: Perhaps there’s an over attention to visual?
*Belinda* nodded.
*Shelley*: I mean that you worked very hard on the meaning but there still might be an over attention to visual.
*Tutor intervened*: Only on the new book.
*Shelley*: ‘Oh, sorry’.
*Tutor*: Can we only talk about the new book? How did everything go on familiar reading?
(Affirmation)
It worked really well. How did everything go on yesterday’s book [the next activity] as a result of that? It mainly went...
(Affirmation)
*Tutor*: It mainly went well didn’t it? So what we were thinking of in the ‘new book’ was about ‘bricks’ and...

Belinda’s explanation to the group revealed that teachers were as confused as the children:

Well, I was getting her to attend to the second part but I should have attended to the first part as well because she was going ‘dr’. She has a b/d confusion and I should have brought her attention to that and not just the ‘k’ part because then she was reading ‘straws’ because she’s read ‘sticks’, so she was getting herself quite confused on the visual...

The Tutor clarified Belinda’s explanation

Now you’ve listened to Belinda’s hypothesis. Belinda’s hypothesis is that she’s getting confused with visual information. Was that our hypothesis? On straw and bricks? We’ll leave the b/d confusion. Belinda needs to hear that. You explain.’

A teacher summarised their discussion for the teacher who taught.

*Jade*: Just thinking of when she got to ‘bricks’, and you’d discussed with her the meaning [in the introduction], I think what came out [of the discussion] was that it would have been better to go to the meaning than ‘bri’ or the visual...

*Belinda*: Oh, OK. [Accepting this explanation]
Jade: So for you to scaffold the meaning a little bit more because you started with the meaning [in the introduction] and then went to the visual [in the support of the reading]

The Tutor explained that teaching for meaning would require getting the child to think about that when she was reading.

Tutor: (interpreting) The meaning is first. She knew all about the first pig, and the second pig, and the third pig didn’t she? She knew there was going to be straw and sticks and bricks. So think how do you get her mindset to think about that? That will be your skill.

The Tutor re-directed the teachers to the text for prompting children to search for meaning and modeled what thinking what would make sense in the story context may be, when the child knew the story structure.

Tutor: [directing] So can you turn to page 111 again...Because we want children who are going to search for meaning.

Tutor: [modeling what could be said to the child] Think about the third little pig, think what would make sense. Then you don’t have to say ten different things.

Tutor: [redirects to the group] Does the little girl know the structure of the story? To which there is general agreement.

Tutor: (emphasising the point): Yes, she told you [in the introduction] she just stopped thinking about it [in the reading, which was probably because of the excessive amount of interrupting on the first page and in the first sentences].

The Tutor clarified different rationales for why children may say what they do e.g. straws for straw in terms of use of language rather than the child not attending to the visual information and told the teacher that she could go back later and teach for that.

Tutor: So why did she say straws? We had an hypothesis about that?

Diane: That she didn’t know about straw...punnet straw.

Shelley: That she was thinking about drinking straws.

Tutor: Well she was going to the plural wasn’t she? And that was fair enough.’

Belinda: Because there were sticks and bricks so why shouldn’t there be straws?

Tutor: ‘That’s right. So visual information didn’t lead her to say that. You can come back and teach it afterwards.

The Tutor concluded the discussion by saying: ‘So the challenge ladies, is to move away from general language and to start to use this language for searching,’ and
directed the teachers to the text on page 113 that was a teacher example of reinforcement of searching: ‘Can you see where it says ‘teacher reinforcing the searching’? Can you see that bit down there? You don’t need to think of anything else just that bit.’ The Tutor read from the text: ‘Yes that was good, you found two ways to check on that tricky new word,’ and asked the teachers: ‘can you all put that in your language?

5.4.4 Session Nine: Written Reflections

In the teachers’ written reflections on their learning the themes of: teacher consistency and scaffolding for ‘meaning’ on new books; having the children read faster; and changing the habit of slow reading with a child and teacher focus on decoding, were the main features.

Meaning:
Shelley: Scaffold for meaning as often as necessary in the new book.
Diane: I will take away the need for breaking habits and imprinting good new habits that focus on meaning...I should not have a focus (perhaps other than meaning).
Jemma: Prompt on meaning strongly before prompting for visual – first/last parts. Seems next lesson needs to focus on meaning.
Belinda: Always focus on meaning. Scaffold for the meaning of the new book. When attending to errors, focus on meaning, don’t immediately go to the word level.
Maria: The idea of scaffolding and shaping meaning and reading for meaning has become clearer I think? Using prompts correctly is another facet of teaching on the run which will enhance time and quality of reading for meaning.
Tracey: The need to reinforce meaning – especially always when introducing new book...prompting the child to use meaning always.”MEANING”: I need to reinforce this.
Jade: Following C...’s visit to my school I have shifted much of my focus this week to: ‘Meaning’.

Consistency:
Michelle: Be consistent and follow through. Bring things together.
Maura: Today’s lesson dealt with the use of language in Reading Recovery. Language should be precise and consistent.
Jade: I need to scaffold throughout the lesson and need to be consistent with my prompts and especially my expectations.

Speed:
Shelley: To read faster, must have meaning, or flow will be interrupted.
Diane: I also have to do something about what I say, e.g. fast reading in Familiar Reading, if the children do not do what I have said.

**Tentative and flexible teaching:**

Diane: I should not have a focus (perhaps other than meaning) but be tentative and flexible and respond to the needs of the child.
Maura: RR teachers must be flexible to change. There should be no lesson focus. This narrows the vision. We must think of ways to get the best learning from the interactions we get.

**Use of language in RR (prompting):**

Maura: Today’s lesson dealt with the use of language in RR. Language should be precise and consistent.
Diane: I have to do something about what I say…
Jemma: Prompt on meaning strongly…
Belinda: Be conscious of what the child is doing and question my prompts. Are they too wordy?
Maria: Using the prompts correctly is another facet of teaching.
Tracey: … prompting the child to use meaning always.

**Developing an hypothesis supported by evidence:**

Maura: A RR teacher should have a developing hypothesis and find evidence in the teaching to support the idea. Then we can modify the idea and go on to a conclusion.
Lara: By gathering ‘evidence’ and ‘observation’ can make some assumptions and hypothesise on the difficulties that they may be having with problem-solving.

Lara also mentioned one of the ‘principles’ of teaching introduced in Session Eight and followed up in Session Nine in relation to H…: ‘Arising from discussion I need to keep in mind that the child is always making sense of the task in terms of what they know’. Jade’s main learning was written thus: ‘KEY POINT – what is the child doing? Why are they doing this?’

**5.4.5 Session Nine: Conclusion**

1 a)
What are the major characteristics of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in the group that unfold during a RR session?
The Introductory Discussion

The Tutor opened the session by linking to the previous session about ‘teacher change’ and asking the teachers what they had worked on changing in the intervening fortnight. The Tutor explained that RR teaching involved continual changes in how they responded to the children and asked them to reflect on their own dispositions if they were to be teachers who could continually adapt to the behaviours of children. The Tutor explained that the teachers would have to have a ‘tentative disposition’ and clarified that as meaning that the teachers would base their assumptions about child learning on accumulated evidence. The Tutor explained that ‘tentativeness’ was the manner of their social interactions with each other when discussing teaching and learning.

The Tutor re-presented the teaching principles from the previous session. The Tutor emphasised the principle that the children were always making sense in terms of their current understandings and explained that for teaching the teachers would need to consider why children make errors.

The Tutor linked to a teacher’s contribution to the discussion and extended it to include the whole group in her explanation that ‘shaping meaning’ with children was a conversation she was having with all the group members.

The Tutor redirected the discussion to another ‘teaching principle’ about teachers carefully selecting places where they intervened when children were reading and writing. The Tutor was responsive to a teacher’s idea about what this meant for the child developing a literacy processing system.

The Tutor continued with the ‘theme’ when there were pauses and provided her explanations of what the ‘principles’ meant. The Tutor explained that teachers sought evidence of the success of their teaching in the successful behaviour of the children and the Tutor introduced the idea of ‘teacher flexibility’ when they did not get the responses they expected.
The Tutor challenged teachers to think about the idea of having a ‘lesson focus’ and what that would mean for ‘teacher flexibility’ and the Tutor responded to and summarised a teacher’s contribution to this idea.

The Tutor redirected the teachers back to the ‘theme’ for the session before they were to observe the lessons. The Tutor was explicit that the emphasis in the observations would be in observing the teacher and the effectiveness of the teaching decisions; and explained that this skill was needed so that they did not ask the Tutor if they were doing the ‘right thing’, because the ‘right thing’ could not be determined unless the interaction was observed.

The Tutor finally directed the teachers to have a developing hypothesis as they observed which involved gathering evidence that supported their ideas and modifying their ideas on the basis of evidence. This was to give the teachers an idea of what it would mean to be ‘tentative’.

**The Lesson Observations (Reading)**

**Familiar Reading:**

The Tutor directed the focus of the observation and highlighted the salient point to be remembered was that of the teacher asked the child to read faster and he did not do so the teacher needed to think why this might be and adapt. The Tutor assisted the teachers in developing an hypothesis as to why this might be directing their attention to the language structures in the book, then the Tutor asked the teachers to offer other hypotheses as to why the child was not reading faster. The Tutor prioritised some teacher ideas over others, e.g. familiarity and use of visual information over ‘book level’. The Tutor asked for agreement in the interpretation of the child’s reading. The Tutor therefore influenced the teachers’ learning by: directing attention; offering an idea; asking for teacher ideas and sharing those ideas into a tacit and sometimes verbal agreement.

The Tutor rehearsed teacher knowledge in a series of Tutor-teacher interactions involving the teachers in completing the Tutor’s sentences, e.g. what led him into the
mistake may be to do with ...which has to do with listening to your...and you can never hear unless you are going... Therefore to get him to go faster requires what experiences in ‘familiar reading’?

The Tutor reiterated the purpose of the activity ‘reading’ was to ‘continuously make sense’ and that was linked to fluency and pace of reading, thereby challenging a teacher idea that comprehension is determined by asking questions at the end of the reading. The Tutor also challenged a teacher’s idea that accuracy was necessarily linked to reading that ‘sounded good’, when decoding that sounded poor could be reasonably accurate but not ‘continuously reading for meaning’. The Tutor told the teachers that asking questions of the child in RR teaching was reserved for when the teacher did not understand what the children were doing and needed that clarification.

The Tutor told the teachers how they could assist the child to change the orchestration of his reading by having him think about meaning and continuously listen for meaning as he read; which shaped the teacher idea which was to have a ‘more meaningful’ story introduction.

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to child’s self- monitoring of meaning in the text to an example where ‘the teacher told her’ and a spontaneous self correction where the child used meaning and cross-checked this with visual information, but these were not compared.

**Yesterday’s New Book**

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to what the teacher had said during the child introduction; asked the teachers to contribute; commented and interpreted the child’s errors; directed the teachers to think about what to teach at the end of taking a ‘running record’ and thought aloud for the teachers about the language structures the child was reading; and invited teacher participation in considering her reasoning.

**The New Book**
In the first lesson the Tutor drew the teachers’ attention to what was problematic with the child’s reading and how this was inconsistent with the teacher’s intentions for the lesson which were that the child could re-read and predict without prompting; and explained that the child’s reading reverted to ‘sounding out’ when the teacher withdrew her support of the ‘meaning’.

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to the teacher’s behaviour which was to attend to visual information (decoding) when the child came to an error. The Tutor confirmed a teacher interpretation and involved the teacher in thinking about a solution. The Tutor concluded the observation by telling the teachers that the teacher who taught needed to hear the group’s summary. The Tutor summarised this as scaffolding for meaning because when she stopped this the child reverted to an old habit of decoding.

In the second lesson the Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to how the teacher was assisting the child (focusing the child on the final parts of the word) and challenged the teachers to have the children make predictions about words before they were directed to look at word parts. The Tutor explained that the operative word was ‘think’. The child was to ‘think’ of a possible word and then check the visual information. The Tutor explained that RR teaching was quick moves interacting as the child continued to be engaged in the task.

The Tutor directed the teachers to record child errors on the run in their lessons as a way of gathering evidence to consider the children’s responding as the lesson continued.

The Tutor re-directed the teachers so that all of the teachers were attending to and commenting on the same observation and discounted some observations they focused on.

The Tutor modelled for the teachers how to quickly get the child to solve a word using meaning in contrast to the teacher’s teaching which was ‘bogged down’ in trying to have the child solve with an over-attention to visual information. The Tutor
directed the teachers to consider that the child’s behaviour was in direct response to the teacher’s attention.

The Tutor directed the teachers to summarise the second lesson as a rehearsal for the discussion. The summary was that the teacher took the child in the direction of visual information; the writing needed to be faster; there was a need for consistency in the teaching; and the Tutor concluded that the teacher needed to attend to ‘meaning’ and leave other errors to be treated later.

**The Discussion (Reading)**

The Tutor thanked and acknowledged the teaching when a teacher had a difficult lesson. She commended both teachers for attempting to bring about change in the children’s behaviour during the lesson observations and then invited both teachers to talk about their lessons. The Tutor invited the teacher who taught to explain more about why she found the teaching difficult and allowed the explanation to be full. She gave time to both teachers to express their frustrations with their teaching, but did not have that become a general group discussion. Instead the Tutor turned the discussion to the group to discuss the developing hypothesis they had during the lesson observations and their tentative conclusions.

The Tutor invited a teacher who had been keeping notes for the group to share the main idea of the discussion which was that the child’s reading fell down when the teacher removed her scaffolding of the meaning. The Tutor told the teachers that scaffolding for meaning occurred before the children made errors so that they could make predictions as they were reading. The Tutor directed the teachers to be precise in their language interactions while teaching for ‘meaning and referred them to their course text and a teacher located a reference for the group.

The Tutor asked the same note-taker to elaborate on what else the group had talked about during familiar reading, which was that the reading lacked pace and fluency. The Tutor referred the teachers to a page reference in their text and after they had read: ‘say read it fast will not do. It takes time to develop fast control of many subparts of a complex whole so it operates smoothly and fluently, what needs to
speed up is different for different children’ (source: data) the Tutor asked the teachers to think about what needed to come together faster for the particular child, and asked the teachers to ‘get down to it’ from the general ‘his skill in reading the text’.

The Tutor modelled what the teachers were not yet able to do. The Tutor read the text parts aloud and rejected parts with rationales and with the teacher who taught input. The Tutor waited until one teacher made a suggestion with her rationale which the Tutor concluded was the group suggestion. The Tutor then redirected the teachers to consider what they would need to do, rejected ideas until the teacher who taught came up with the idea about ‘scaffolding’, which the Tutor added to as ‘for meaning’ and ‘all the time’. The Tutor also directed the teacher who taught to think that she could ‘let some things go’ if they made sense and elicited from the group agreement that the child could read faster when he knew what the reading material was about.

The Tutor redirected the group to stay with one topic for the discussion when the group momentarily disintegrated into side-talk and remembering items from what they had observed.

After the discussion about a writing main idea for Lesson One the Tutor directed the group to the discussion of the reading in Lesson Two. The Tutor redirected the discussion from the teacher being given isolated pieces of advice without a context e.g. ‘perhaps there’s an over-attention to visual’. The Tutor praised the aspects of the reading that were going well and sought group agreement that they were. Then she asked the group to only discuss the ‘New Book’ and gave the specific example that all the teachers, including the teacher who taught, could use as a ‘context’.

The Tutor followed the teacher’s hypothesis about what happened in her lesson by summarising it and asked for the group hypothesis about the same interaction in the lesson. This also brought the teachers to share with the teacher who taught that it might be better to scaffold for meaning as well. The Tutor expanded this idea and shared with the group that this would mean requiring the child to be thinking about the meaning as she read.
The Tutor directed the teachers to think further about prompting children to search for meaning with reference to a page in their text, then she and modelled (aloud) what the piece of teaching might sound like.

The Tutor’s role was to avoid the upsetting the teacher by sharing that the child could not make meaning from the first page because of the excessive amount of interrupting and to lead the teacher to understand when and how the child could be successful.

The Tutor clarified a language-based rationale for why a child might say ‘straws’ for ‘straw’ in the story of ‘The Three Little Pigs’ to do with structure, which the teacher who taught understood, rather than the teachers more esoteric views about ‘punnet straw’ being an unknown concept or that ‘drinking straws’ were probably the only straws the child knew about, when the story had ‘bricks and sticks so why not straws’ which is a generalisation common to many children.

The Tutor brought the discussion to a conclusion by having the teachers refer to another page in their text about reinforcing children’s searching for solutions so that they knew that there were ‘two ways’ to confirm new words (use of meaning/structure and visual information), whereas the children saw this as a separation of process, i.e. as soon as they met an unknown word they would only use ‘visual information’. This was the same separation the teachers’ had in their thinking, that is that meaning was a given before a reading occurred and not scaffolded throughout the action and that the child was to think about the meaning without being scaffolded as to how, e.g. the teacher rehearsals before and after reading about what the child had to do while she was reading; and the teacher ‘pulling her up’ when something was not meaningful and visually accurate. The part in the text the teachers were referred to was an interaction between a teacher and a child that could be a script of what they could say as a way of scaffolding.

1 b)

What are the major characteristics of the teachers’ social interaction that unfold during a RR session and how are they orchestrated by the Tutor?
The Introductory Discussion

The teachers’ social interaction was orchestrated by the Tutor. The Tutor invited the teachers to share what they had been working towards changing in their teaching since the last session. The teachers offered that this was: changing their language interactions so that they were more explicit; being more consistent in their expectations of the child’s responding to their teaching; working on daily improvements and focusing on improving parts of the lesson.

The teachers responded to the Tutor’s question of what being continual adaptive in their teaching would be like. They said it would involve being open to criticism; being honest with themselves about their teaching; being flexible and able to teach ‘on the run’; being reflective about what they were doing in their teaching.

The teachers’ said to a concept of ‘tentativeness’ meaning not having ‘rigid ideas’ fitted with being flexible because ‘your ideas don’t suits every child’ and that rigid ideas could blind you to what was actually happening. A teacher also reflected that she had to get over an emotional reaction when the child’s behaviour was not what she expected and be more analytical about the behaviour and reflective about herself.

A teacher reflected on her experience of change in the child’s behaviour that came about through a school visit with the Tutor and involved having an outside person gather information (evidence) and share their interpretation of what was hindering the success of the child, with teaching suggestions that could be trialed. The teacher was pleased that the child’s reading had improved: ‘he wasn’t baulking at words because he had the meaning, so therefore the words just flowed. It was really good.’

A teacher explained to the group her interpretation of why teachers needed to ‘carefully select places to intervene’. Her interpretation revealed her understanding of ‘brain functioning’ as children were pulling information together, and what unwarranted interventions might do to that system: ‘you can ruin their network or their strategic activity can be impaired if you jump in too quickly or too late…they
either don’t get an opportunity to make meaning, or it’s too late, they’ve already made a connect that is incorrect.’

The teachers were quiet when the ideas were new to them, but indicated that they were flowing what the Tutor said by saying ‘mmmm’, and responded tentatively, whereas when they spoke from their own experience they spoke more easily about their thinking. The teachers said that having a lesson focus either a) may not be important at the time, or b) could narrow your vision to what was happening. One teacher spoke about her teaching experience where she followed a ‘lesson focus’ because she was listening to advice and the learning was new to her, however it did not make sense to her because ‘the child could be stumbling over things that you needed to work on somewhere else, but that was your focus and you had to, but it didn’t marry.’

The teachers had an idea of what an hypothesis was, an idea, and that they supported these ‘ideas’ by gathering evidence.

**The Lesson Observations**

**Familiar Reading**

The teachers observed the lesson and responded to the Tutor’s questions, initially confirming that the reading was not fast and inferring that this was because the ‘meaning wasn’t there. The teachers were included by the Tutor in a search for why the reading was not fast and it was concluded that the reading was not quite decoding but that the child was looking at every word rather than predicting. The teachers were redirected by the Tutor to the purpose of the task which they said was for fluency and phrasing.

The teachers’ attention was constantly switching from the observation to their own ideas; and from the observation to the ideas the Tutor was presenting; and linking these themselves to RR practices and rationales. The decision made by the teachers was to integrate these. The teachers could describe their observations and did make suggestions from the RR practices as to what the teacher might do, e.g. use a card.
The teachers participated in rehearsal scenarios of their knowledge with the Tutor providing the answers while following the logic: What led the child to make the mistake may have been to do with (structure); which is to do with listening to you (self read) and you can never hear unless you are going (fast enough), therefore to get him to go faster what experiences do you think he needs with familiar reading (less interruptions) and what else (an easier book).

The teachers could make the connection between what the teacher did and how the child responded.

The Tutor reminded the teachers about what the teacher said she wanted from the reading experience with the child and the teachers interpreted the observation of the teaching as being focused on fixing errors, therefore the teacher’s real attention was on accuracy.

The teachers offered their thoughts about checking meaning by having a comprehension question at the end of the reading and that the reading sounded poor (decoding); and the Tutor challenged them to think that comprehension involved fluency and speed as the reading ‘always made sense’ and that decoding can be accurate by not ‘reading for meaning’.

In the second book (Lesson One) the teachers provided teacher rationales for why a teacher might have a child re-read the first page of a book and it was suggested that this could be preparation for the meaning of the book about ‘relays’ but perhaps the intention could be made explicit to the child. The teachers noticed that the teacher was asking questions all the time, and they revisited the idea of when you asked questions in RR. A teacher thought it was for comprehension at the end of books, and the Tutor told the teachers that it was for when the teacher did not know what the child was doing.

The teachers thought that bringing about change in the child’s reading for meaning could be brought about by a stronger book introduction. This was a different with
what the Tutor was saying which was that ‘meaning’ was reinforced continuously in the act of reading, the child needed to know what to be thinking about as he read.

In Lesson Two the teachers spontaneously commented on the reading which again was ‘not fast’. In terms of the child’s monitoring of meaning the teachers determined that it was the teacher’s prompting that alerted the child to the loss of meaning, so the child was responding to prompts.

The teachers commented on spontaneous examples of self-correcting some as ‘she got it’ and others by what information the child was attending to.

**Yesterday’s New Book (Lesson Two)**

The teachers commented on their observation by reiterating what the first teacher had said in agreement with her, e.g. ‘she kept going’ ‘she didn’t stop’; articulated what they thought they saw (but were re-directed to the actual behaviour by the Tutor) and offered hypotheses which were justified when asked.

**The New Book**

The teachers directed their attention to where the Tutor wanted it to go, and described what they were observing; e.g. ‘trying to sound it out’; ‘he’s taken four goes to get that’. The teachers interpreted what may be more successful in the teaching: ‘maybe if she stuck to what she was doing of the first couple of pages’ which they agreed was working.

The teachers (in the second lesson) gain commented on what they were observing, and the Tutor lifted their thinking about that to asking ‘what do you expect?’ which a teacher answered to ‘what are you asking her to do?’ as ‘think about it’.

One teacher asked: ‘So that’s not what you should be doing?’ and the Tutor explained about making predictions and when the child thinks about find the word the child is engaged in self questioning: what would you see? What could it be? ‘The operative word is ‘think’. You think then you look.’
Another teacher asked: ‘so you’re scaffolding as you go?’ in response to the Tutor’s explanation of teacher moves in RR: ‘you’ve got to be able to be quick, in and out and move’.

The teachers commented on what each other said, e.g. comments on the child saying ‘straws’ instead of ‘straw’ in the ‘Three Little Pigs’ reading. The Tutor moved the discussion along with ‘It doesn’t matter. It’s something you can come back to.’ Teachers prioritising what needed to be and what did not need to be attended to was ‘in formation’.

The teachers described interactions as ‘not being successful’, and knew why they were not successful ‘an over-attention to visual information’, but it was the Tutor who modeled how this could quickly be resolved using the meaning of the story.

The teachers summarised the last lesson observed as: the teacher taking her in the wrong direction; and ‘quick’ and ‘going faster’, as short phrases that would describe for them what it was about.

A teacher inferred that the hardest thing for the teachers in bringing about change was the ‘consistency’ in their teaching, and that it was a mind-set for teachers to think if they don’t treat every error the children will not be able to read it on another occasion. They required a change in their mind-set to follow one thing.

The same teacher shared that the value of the lessons was that she could compare it with her own teaching and she could understand why she had the same results.

**The Discussion (Reading)**

The Tutor orchestrated the teachers’ interactions in the discussion. The Tutor thanked the teachers who taught and invited them to share their observations of their own lessons with the group. The teachers spoke at considerable length to the group of their disappointments about how their lessons went behind the screen and in an emotive way indicating that they did not know what to do to improve their teaching
in a way that would improve the children’s processing e.g. ‘that was very typical of a pattern rather than a particular lesson...so she knows but she’s not consistent with it...so I’m trying, but what can I do other than pull her up and say ‘you know that it has to make sense?’ ‘I was cranky with myself in the text introduction for the new book...I know what it is or ‘it took about ...and it all went out of my head’...‘He would not go back and re-read. He was just on the first part. No, it was no use...he does get it when goes back and he rereads it...and it’s taken me a good week ...to get him to do that...to break that habit.’ The issue being that while the teachers are gaining RR knowledge they cannot scaffold the successful reading of the children ‘on the run’ and this is their frustration. One teacher mentioned her own efforts in the interaction as being disappointing in terms of ‘delivering teaching’ while the other expressed her concern with the child’s ‘inconsistencies’ throughout her evaluation of her own lesson.

The Tutor did not discuss the teachers’ observations of their own lesson but rather asked the group for their developing hypotheses on the first lesson based on their joint observation through the nominated note-taker. It was shared with the first teacher who taught that her child read well when scaffolded for meaning and fell down when it did not. Another teacher shared that it was hard for the teachers not knowing how to interact when the child’s reading became problematic: ‘...you think everything’s going fine and then it falls down and then you think ‘God what do I do?’ This differentiates between teachers (learners) having or developing ‘knowledge’ and being able to match that knowledge with the performance of the child (another) in a moment by moment interaction, or the act of ‘tutoring’. (Woods, 2003)

The Tutor re-directed the teachers to a direct example from the observation rather than exploring the emotional response and the Tutor told the teachers what they would need to do in that example: ‘ If we want the child to predict the meaning, we’re going to have to say it before they read, and not after they’ve made a mistake.’ One teacher interpreted this as ‘so as they’re turning the page you’re saying?’

The Tutor directed the teachers to refer to their text to use the language of RR in their interactions explaining that they were getting ‘good at rationales’ but needed to
learn how to be precise in their language scaffolding the learning of the children. A teacher found the text reference and decided that ‘Try that again and think what would make sense’ may be an appropriate prompt, so the teachers were becoming familiar with the text that was used as a ‘guide’ for their interactions.’

The Tutor asked for a summary from the note-taker about one aspect of the reading that the teacher had said she was pleased with. The teacher summarised that the group thought that in ‘familiar reading’ ‘he lacked fluency and pace and you Jemma just said to read faster, but you didn’t follow up on how to do that. So we all got out of that that all of us have to shape behaviour on the run. Take steps to do so.’ This exchange allowed the teacher to hear the opinion of the teachers.

The Tutor then referred the teachers to a page reference in the text for ‘all of us Jemma. We’re looking at the heading ‘say read it fast will not do’ can you see it?’ The teachers could not respond to the question: ‘what needs to speed up for that boy. So he can read faster?’ because they did not know. The teachers then followed the Tutor who modeled for them how to use the text referring to specific places. One teacher gave a generic response without reading the text saying that what needed to get faster as ‘his skill in reading’ which was not helpful for the teachers, and the Tutor said in response: ‘yes, but can you get down to it?’ This meant, find out what aspect of that ability ‘needs to speed up for that boy’.

One teacher suggested a point in the book as a question. The Tutor read that aloud and rejected it because the child had a habit that of reverting to sounding out that first part of unknown words that needed to change. Instead the Tutor asked the group ‘what about the one above?’ and read that out loud. The Tutor surmised aloud ‘I would suggest to you that perhaps he is not visually familiar with the words he is reading, would you?’ thereby asking the group to consider that reason. The Tutor who taught the child rejected that saying that he had ‘read those books a number of times’. She acknowledged that that was what was ‘frustrating her’, i.e. a child who was familiar with the books who could not read more quickly and fluently. The Tutor redirected the teachers to consider something else. One teacher decided on the possibility of a specific point: ‘I think it could be number two, because he’s got the meaning totally in his head therefore he can’t make that meaning, the link fast with
the words.’ The teacher’s supposition was tentative as the exploration had been directly modeled to her by the Tutor.

The Tutor accepted this explanation as the group’s collective opinion with no other to the contrary and clarified what the teacher had said as ‘he definitely has to have the meaning in his head to be able to link with the words he’s looking at. Is that right Shelley?’ To which Shelley nodded in the affirmative. The Tutor posed the question” ‘what is the teacher going to have to do?’ One suggestion was only use books the child is familiar with, which the Tutor rejected because the teacher was doing that. The teacher herself suggested ‘scaffold’ and the Tutor developed that as ‘the meaning’. Further to this modeling the Tutor directed the teacher to ‘let some things go’. The teacher reading that as if it was a new idea” ‘I have to let some things go?’ The Tutor explained that a rationale could be that if the teacher wishes she could refer to these things after the reading rather than interrupt the pace of the reading.

The teachers were still working with the interaction of giving feedback in context to their group members. At one point the discussion fell into different remarks about what they had remembered observing and the teacher replying in some way about the child’s pronunciation. The Tutor orchestrated that the group stay together and speak to one topic” ‘Can we all stay together on that? What have we learnt?’ The consensus was that the child would need to ‘carry the meaning always’ expressed by one teacher, which the Tutor clarified: ‘he’s going to have to be led strongly by meaning…And we need consistency in that.’

The Tutor directed the discussion to the second lesson. The teacher feedback was to immediately give an uncontextualised summary: ‘perhaps there’s an over-attention to visual?’ The teacher receiving the advice nodded. This led the teacher to re-state: ‘I mean that you worked very hard on the meaning but there still might be an over-attention to visual.’ The ability to give feedback was still in ‘formation’. The Tutor intervened and said ‘only on the ‘New Book’.’ To which the teacher giving feedback apologised: ‘Oh, sorry.’ The Tutor redirected the group to have a discussion around the ‘New Book’ and to the one part that all the teachers could identify with: ‘the bricks’.
The teacher who taught gave an explanation of what she was trying to do: ‘get her to look at the second part as well’ and that what she was doing was confused by the child having a b/d confusion. The teacher thought she should have brought her attention to that and not the ‘k’ part. The teachers interpretations was also that the child was reading ‘straws’ because she had read ‘sticks’ so the child was confused with visual information. This explanation is clearly that the teacher is confused about how to interpret behaviour and how to act in the interaction.

The Tutor clarified the teacher’s explanation ‘you’ve listened to Belinda’s hypothesis…Was that our hypothesis?’ and asked the group to share the group’s opinions. The teachers could refer back to a specific example of behaviour. A teacher summarised that the group’s opinion was that it would be more beneficial to scaffold the meaning. The Tutor extended that for the teacher who taught’s understanding, explaining that the child knew the story structure to help her and that directing her to that was the teacher’s skill.

The teachers did share their hypotheses about why the child may say ‘straws’ for ‘straw’ but adopted the Tutor’s explanation that it was following the ‘plural’ in the story structure: ‘sticks, bricks and straws’, so ‘visual information did not lead her to that. You can come back and teach it afterwards.’

The teachers followed the Tutor in the conclusion to a text reference about how to reinforce searching behavior in children whereby the children simultaneously monitor more than one source of information. The language example for the teacher was in direct contrast to what she was saying because it was scaffolding this rather than telling the child what to do.

The teachers’ written reflections show that six of the ten teachers present commented on ‘meaning’ as being what they had learnt about: scaffolding for meaning; changing habits by focusing on meaning; prompting strongly to meaning before visual information; don’t immediately go to the word level; scaffolding and shaping meaning was becoming clearer as well as using the prompts (in the text) on the run to enhance the quality of reading for meaning; reinforcement of meaning and one teacher commented that this was her focus since the Tutor had visited her at school.
It’s hard to stand back and look at yourself or your own teaching, I guess, or your lesson, because you’re giving it.
APPENDIX L5: DATA REDUCTION

5.5 Session Sixteen

5.5.1 Session Sixteen: Introductory Discussion (video-taping)

The Tutor introduced the ‘theme’ of the session as ‘teacher learning and child learning’ with the emphasis being on teachers being ‘observant, tentative and flexible’. The Tutor questioned the teachers’ understanding of what being ‘observant’ meant. This was restricted to ‘what can you observe?’ and ‘if all that you do is based on observations what does observing mean to you?’ The Tutor re-shaped the teachers’ thinking from being around their teaching of a ‘lesson series’ to thinking about this in moment by moment interactions with a child. The Tutor asked the teachers that if they were ‘observing a child’ what would they be thinking? What would be your aim?’ They were to think about this in the moment by moment interaction because it would be ‘critical to how you respond.’

The Tutor informed the teachers that ‘acceleration of the child’s learning’ would depend on observing child behaviour; inferring ‘strategic activity’; and what the teachers knew about RR theory and teaching procedures. The Tutor asked the teachers about their thinking: ‘When you are inferring what are you doing in your mind?’ and told them that this was important because the RR teacher did not react because ‘no-one just reacts’ in a learning interaction.

The Tutor clarified and expanded on the teachers’ ideas in order to develop their understandings further when she asked about what enables a teacher to be flexible, eliciting more than one response with ‘and what else?’

*Tutor: You’re talking in terms of having an hypothesis; and you interact with the child; and that’s a way of testing your hypothesis; and you see if that has improved the child’s behaviour and if it doesn’t you go in a different direction. That’s when you come to this notion of being flexible. If you are a flexible teacher what will enable you to be flexible?’

The Tutor confirmed the teacher’s thinking ‘change direction, yes’, and clarified that the teacher’s explanation ‘So you’re going to be tentative’. The Tutor lifted the
teachers’ ideas again about ‘when do you think being tentative comes in?’ and ‘what does it mean to be tentative?’ repeating the teacher’s final comment as a summary: ‘you’re prepared to change.’

The Tutor asked the teachers to refer to their text (‘Literacy Lessons, Part One’, page 23) to do with ‘acceleration of the rate of learning’. She explained as the teachers found the page and opened their books that acceleration was the purpose of RR and it would mean that children learn at a faster rate than children in the classroom. Then the Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to a part in the text that was the basis for ‘acceleration’. The Tutor asked a teacher to read the part aloud ‘because it is a famous quote’; following up with explaining that it could be easy as a teacher to take away from RR’s intent; and she explained that the intent was to teach for ‘what’s going to help this child in developing their processing system’.

The Tutor followed this up by asking the teachers what their challenges were in their teaching when they were interacting with the children; and then challenged the teachers to ‘unpick’ their answer of ‘choosing the right prompt’: ‘because you’ve been saying this to me since the beginning of the year. So, what do we mean when we say that?’ ‘How will we judge a prompt and its appropriateness?’ A teacher determined that it would be because the child was successful after the prompt.

The Tutor developed a persuasive argument further explaining that: ‘in terms if a prompt you would have many options. If you’ve only got two options you’re not going to have great skill at your fingertips are you? In terms of helping a child? So what else do you think about in terms of a prompt?’ In this way the Tutor kept turning the ‘theme’ and its development back to the teachers to think about. The Tutor clarified ‘level of prompt’ in terms of support and what ‘strategic activities’ were, then asked ‘what is a prompt for?’ The Tutor clarified that prompts were for ‘successful child actions’ and reiterated that a wide array of prompts was the ‘challenge’ for the teacher’s skill in RR teaching; again asking them ‘what other challenges they had right now?’

The Tutor elaborated that ‘unpicking’ the relationship between reading and writing which was a ‘powerful thing to teacher for’ was a challenge and illustrated that with
the evaluation that teachers ‘might not be as strong as they might be in using Elkonin boxes and linking sound to the letter – the co-ordination of the child being able to do that.’ The Tutor explained that children who were referred off RR often had not developed that co-ordination and other learning that ‘brings us back to early learning issues – issues or difficulties that children have may be based in their early learning and still be there (evident)’.

The Tutor summarised the discussion that: teaching in RR ‘next year’ would involve the teachers in the three aspects of their disposition: being observant, tentative and flexible.

The Tutor added to the developing them that the children were to be constructive but in RR teaching Clay wrote about ‘co-construction’. The Tutor had the teachers explore the difference. It was explained that small children can construct erroneous ideas about ‘reading’ ‘like looking the wrong way’ so RR was interested in the co-construction with an ‘observant teacher sitting beside a child’ and she asked the teachers how that worked.

The Tutor used examples from her own teaching to explain how that might work: ‘I was working with J… at Level 16 today. He has a lot of issues to do with …how he looks at print.’ The Tutor used an analogy attributed to Clay of ‘having a telephone conversation when you can only hear every third word’ to link ‘making sense’ with the information available to the learner and how difficult that would be. The Tutor gave a specific example of how her child confused letters ‘y’ and ‘h’ in writing as an automatic response, saying: ‘it keeps coming back’; so her child had to be very careful in controlling directional movement and sequence when he looked at the print.

Tutor: Can you relate that to trying to make sense of a telephone conversation where you’re not getting all the information and you’ve got to get it in the right sequence and the right order. So in terms of the co-construction what is my role?…What’s going to happen to J…if I just left him?

The Tutor used this concrete example to model: ‘what am I going to say now if I’m to prevent this little boy saying ‘was’ every time it is ‘saw’’ because he would be
strengthening incorrect connections. This is where the Tutor explained that RR teaching was ‘creative’ in its responsiveness to individual children. So a main challenge for the teachers was that the children were diverse in their learning and how to interact differently with different children.

The Tutor emphasised that there was nothing wrong with the children ‘the children do not have damaged brains – they are not damaged to that extent that they cannot learn…so if we think what the challenges are perhaps we can match the opportunities (to learn) better to their needs.’

The Tutor responded to a teacher’s question about how she worked with her child and ‘what she would say to prevent confusions of ‘was’ and ‘saw’’. The Tutor explained that what she did had built up over time. She was ‘talking to him about sequences of events and predicting meaning, because when you predict meaning you can confirm your predictions with the visual information.’ The Tutor explained further information the teachers had read in their RR text: ‘you don’t just have input coming through your eye, your brain is actually active and meets the input, and there is interpretation isn’t there? So he has to predict and look from left to right.’

The Tutor referred to her Tutor colleague who worked out of the same RR Centre, whom the teachers knew, and showed them how she made sure her children looked from the left to the right putting a pencil at the first letter of the word and saying ‘pick it up from here’, and that her child had to be aware that he needed to do this.

The teachers followed the persuasive argument of the Tutor during the introduction to the ‘theme’ as they developed their learning.

The following interactions illustrate the teachers’ reasoning about their learning:

**What does observation mean to you?**

*Mary-Lou:* Look at what they’re doing and not doing.

*Jemma:* Listening. **Keeping your mouth closed is the best way to observe effectively.**

**What can you observe?**
Mary-Lou: What they’re doing with their eyes. How they are solving.

All you do is based on observation. What does observation mean to you?

Lara: If you’re noticing something repetitively you’re seeing a pattern. So it starts to emerge and might confirm what you might be predicting about something.
Diane: And you can work your lesson series around some of those things.
Shelley: What you observe will determine where you go in the lesson series.

So if you are observing a child what are you thinking?

Jade: What you need to do for them at that moment of the lesson.

What is your aim?

Jemma: That they will be successful. That at the end of the lesson they will have learned something new.

Think of the moment by moment interaction that’s when it will be critical in how you respond:

Jemma: Because we know the procedures and the prompts to use to encourage strategic activity.
Shelley: Sometimes we know what works best with a particular child. Some children work better with meaning scaffolding than others.

When you’re inferring what are you doing in your mind?

Maria: Predicting what’s going to happen, then you’re confirming your prediction and then you move on and predict again and infer again.

What will enable you to be flexible?

Diane: A good understanding of what the purposes of each activity are.
Jade: When you’re able to change your mind at that moment for how the lesson will go because at the start of the lesson you’ve always got an idea of something and if you see a different behaviour or something different happens you have to be able to change to that
Jemma: Every child is different so one strategy is not going to work with each and every child so you’re going to be flexible – what works best for that child.

When do you think being tentative comes in?

Maria: In your prediction of what you’re going to do.

What does it mean to be tentative?

Maria: Well you’re going to do something tentatively – it’s with the thought that maybe you’re going to change.
Jade: It’s not confirmed.

Read aloud, it’s a famous quote that starts ‘acceleration depends…’
Belinda: ‘Acceleration depends on how well the teacher selects the clearest and easiest and most memorable example to establish a new response, skill, principle or procedure.’

What challenges are you thinking about in terms of how you are interacting with a child?

Belinda: Choosing the right prompt, the most appropriate prompt that is going to cause that to happen.

So what are we meaning when we say that?

Belinda: To elicit from them from what I am saying or asking, to elicit the response of success.

How will we judge if the prompt is appropriate?

Lara: If the child is successful or not.

What else do you think of in terms of a prompt?

Mary-Lou: Independence. You’re trying to get them to do it on their own.

So you’re scaffolding the input you are putting in:
**What is ‘strategic activity’?**

*Tracey: The ‘how to’s’.*
*Jemma: The brainwork.*

**What is a prompt for?**

*Belinda: For reading and writing success that’s what it’s for.*
*Tutor: For action. A prompt is for action. (correcting)*
*Shelley: It starts off in the child’s brain – what they know – they already know to do – it just reminds them about what to do.*

**What are people thinking of in terms of their challenges right now?**

*Jemma: Using the writing component of the lesson more effectively. I’m thinking that there’s such potential and I personally miss opportunities.*

**Why is the child the constructor if his or her own learning?**

*Maria: Because he’s learning on the basis of his own experiences and building on his own experiences*
*Jemma: Yes. They’re in control of their own ‘strategic activity’. We can’t get in there and control it. It’s their experiences that promote it but ultimately it’s theirs.*

**How does it work out in a co-construction?**

*Lara: I guess if you’re looking at the child’s construction of their own learning they can organise learning in their brain anyway they like but if it’s co-construction you’re trying to help them to make the most useful links so is there better ways of looking at it and refining it?*

**In terms of co-construction what is my role?**

*Shelley: To prevent error so you can erase that pattern.*
If he’s a constructor of his own learning what’s going to happen to J… do you think if I just left him?

Shelley: He’d go back to his old ways.

The teachers introduced their children to be taught:

Jemma: OK. L… He’s in Week 9 and has had 40 lessons, and he’s currently reading Level 21. The challenges for us are particularly looking at the clusters of letters in the word he is unsure of. He will predict, but particularly in the last few days he needs reminding. That is a disappointing thing because I thought it was secure but as you said it just pops out again. So I’m focusing on him looking at the parts of words in sequence.

The Tutor asked the teacher to try to change from saying ‘my focus’ to ‘I am thinking about’ and the teacher immediately changed direction in her speech.

Jemma: I’m thinking that he doesn’t always use left to right as you’ve said and I’m assuming at the ‘strategic activity’ is working but not working effectively all the time.

The Tutor explained to the group that reading from Level 21 was a challenge and read from Clay’s book ‘Becoming Literate the Construction of Inner Control’ (1991) Clay’s definition of reading elaborating on the meaning as she did so:

Tutor: ‘I define reading as a message getting activity’, so the brain goes out to get the message, I’m problem-solving on the basis of what comes through the eye, and this is going to ‘increase in power and flexibility’ the more experience I have. ‘My definition states that this happens’ and I’m putting this in my own words, ‘within the directional constraints of the printer’s code’. ‘Language and visual perception responses’, two lots of responses, language, and what you understand about language, and visual perception ‘are purposefully directed, and the reader in an integrated way’, that we don’t understand, we can look at integration in our book and see what Clay says integration is, are directed at the problem of ‘extracting meaning from the cues in text, in sequence, so the reader brings a maximum of understanding to the author’s message’, going out to get someone else’s message.

Tutor: So what are the challenges going to be? You’ve said one. If it’s not in the visual responses what’s the other part that’s going to make it tricky?
Jemma responded: ‘If the child is not making meaning and retaining that meaning then it’s not going to happen either’, and Diane added: ‘they mightn’t have the right kind of vocabulary – their store of vocabulary’.

Jade introduced her child:

*Jade: A…is in the 6th week, Level 21, 23 lessons. I’m finding at this level that the structure is challenging so the challenge is for me is to give strong book introductions for the way the structure is coming up, especially for the way the direct speech is written.\]

The Tutor directed the teachers’ attention to the importance of their interactions and that in RR what teachers say in the area of meaning and structure are not a script in the texts ‘Literacy Lessons’

*Tutor: Can you see – its two things. It’s not just the visual response. We’ve got two areas. We’ve got structure and we’ve got meaning. So you’ve got a role here that is not necessarily played out in these texts as a script. It’s how you interact. Do you agree with that?*

5.5.2 Session Sixteen: Lesson Observations (audio-taping)

**Lesson One**

At the beginning of the lesson observations the Tutor re-established the ‘theme’ of the session for teaching which was to be: ‘observant, tentative and flexible’. The Tutor also asked the teachers to couch their language in ‘I am thinking’ and ‘I am wondering’ as they developed their ‘hypothesis’ about what they were observing.

The Tutor initiated the discussion by asking the teachers to ‘say something’ and to ‘build on that’. After teacher contributions the Tutor quickly summarised what they had said and continually redirected the discussion. At Session sixteen the teachers respond more freely and quickly so the discussion of the lesson observation is a flow of ideas contributing to a whole picture.

*Maria: I’m wondering if he’s getting any meaning out of that. It’s very monotone and I’m wondering if he understands it?*

*Tutor: Build on that.*
Jade: It’s not phrased.
Tutor: What do you think is happening in the head?
Mary-Lou: He’s attacking the word.
Diane: It’s word by word.
Maria: Not predicting.
Jade: Going from the visual rather than thinking what the story is about.
Tutor: Attention to visual information and that might be harder for him. Is that what you’re saying?
Tracey: He might be relying on visual because of the language.
Tracey: It might be language or structure or he’s not familiar with it.
Maria: There’s a lot of print on the page. It’s quite small.
Jade: (repeats the teacher) ‘you know what to do put your fingers on it’.
Diane: Break the word.
Tutor: Think of the input of the visual information. It’s supposed to sound good.

The discussion considers what the teacher teaching is saying e.g. ‘put your fingers on it’, ‘you know what to do’ and ‘try that again it didn’t sound right to me’ and the teachers can initiate the talk.

Shelley: It’s gone to the teacher level rather than him listening to himself.
Tutor: Unpick that. If you say ‘it didn’t sound right to me’, what does that mean?
Tracey: No meaning.
Diane: It has to meet my approval or my standard.

The exchanges were very quick keeping in time with the lesson with all of the teachers on the same track during the observation.

Tutor: What’s going to help him?
Shelley: To have rehearsed the structure.
Tutor: What is he going to need to be thinking?
Lara: Can it sound that way?
Mary-Lou: To be listening to himself to make sure he’s getting some meaning.
Tutor: How would you scaffold that?
Jade: (Say) Make it sound like talking.
Tutor: What else could you be saying to him?
Mary-Lou: Did that make sense?
Tutor: Go beyond the prompts and be flexible. What will allow him to sound good?
Mary-Lou: Work on phrasing.
Diane: Perhaps the meaning of the book.
Tracey: Maybe scaffold on each page to get meaning for him.
Tutor: Think what the teacher has said.
Jade: This is the part where such and such happens.
Mary-Lou: What are you going to say about that?

The Tutor rehearsed the teacher persona as they sit beside a child: ‘Try I am thinking and I am wondering as you sit beside the child every day’ and challenging each other.

Lara: I am thinking, what am I going to do at the end of the book?
Tutor: Challenge Lara. She’s going to do it at the end of the book.
Shelley: If you need it you have to do it then.
Jade: Maybe go back to the start and prompt for the meaning very strongly so that he has the meaning from the start.

The Tutor continued to shape the teachers’ RR teaching and thinking, e.g. around monitoring for the child and the child’s attention to visual information.

Tutor: If you monitor for the child, what will happen then?
Lara: He won’t be independent...won’t be able to do it themselves.
Tutor: He’s good at using visual information (here)
Shelley: Yes, he’s getting through it.
Shelley: If you asked him what it was about he wouldn’t know.
Tutor: Because too much effort is going into the visual information.

The observation continued to reiterate what was problematic about the child’s reading; what is advised in RR that teachers should do; and that the teacher’s attention was the same as the child’s attention. The Tutor asked a teacher to ‘get up and see’ what was happening to look closely at the print.

Diane: ‘Machine’. Just tell him. It’s a running record, so she shouldn’t be interfering.

The child’s efforts to solve during the running record were to decode words:

Mary-Lou: he’s going from left to right.
Diane: He’s trying to sound it out.
The Tutor turned the teachers; attention to what a good reader might do if the child was on his own and did not have teacher support, which needed to be taught to RR children.

*Mary-Lou:* Keep going.
*Diane:* Put in a word.
*Tutor:* Put in something that would make
*Diane:* Sense.
*Tutor:* And leave for now and come back. That’s something to teach our children or else what’s going to happen?
*Shelley:* They’ll stop.
*Jade:* They’ll lose the meaning.
*Tutor:* Did he put a meaningful word there?
*Shelley:* He said...I think. No.
*Tutor:* We’re not getting a marry of language and the visual response.
*Maria:* It’s too hard.
*Tutor:* Not necessarily if we scaffold it. What is not in?
*Maria:* Phrasing and fluency at this level.
*Tutor:* How will we get there?
*Mary-Lou:* Looking at what he relates to.
*Diane:* Thinking about the introduction to storybooks.

In the writing activity the Tutor related the teacher support to expectation in the classroom and that teachers in RR needed to adjust how they taught reinforcing higher level processing such as making analogous links between words.

*Lara:* He should monitor his own writing I think.
*Tutor:* Writing is about what you ‘hear and see’ and reading is about what you ‘see and hear’. You need to get to analogies in writing. If you do it yourself what do you need to say?
*Maria:* What do you know that sounds like that or looks like that?
*Tutor:* Not looks like that because he hasn’t seen it. Do you know a word that sounds like that?
*Shelley:* Working from what they know.
*Tutor:* That’s how you get to an analogy isn’t it?

In the writing activity in lesson there was some confusion over the use of Elkonin boxes and reflective comment about how the teachers could change themselves:

*Lara:* The child needs to own that exercise.
Shelley: When I go to sound boxes they automatically go to letters.

Maria: They don’t know the sounds, a lot of them.

Mary-Lou: Maybe I didn’t do enough of the counter work you know introducing what the boxes were and there was a box for each sound.

Tutor: How good are they in sequences?

Lara: I think we assume things too. You know, we’ve done it once or twice. These are children you can’t make these judgments about.

As the teachers’ observed the ‘New Book’ activity the Tutor made some comments about how the teacher was scaffolding the story content to the child’s personal experiences and when the child started reading she commented on the child’s ‘wandering eye’ when he came to a difficult word asking: ‘why does he do it?’ A teacher had a ready interpretation ‘he couldn’t predict’ and a discussion ensued about how to assist the child to make predictions in his reading. In this example Lara has taken over the Tutor role in shaping Maria’s thinking.

Maria: Say is it ‘build’ or ‘something’ and they make a choice.

Shelley: I have been trying that and it gives them the most success.

Maria: Yes, you’re giving them the vocabulary.

Diane: Then they have to check it too, don’t they?

Maria: Yes, they check it and come up with the right answer.

Shelley: Most times.

Tutor: I think Clay is saying that they can look at it but they can’t think what possibility it would be.

Maria: No, but you give them the choice and he can make the choice.

Tutor: And he can bring together the language and the visual information.

Maria: The challenge for the teacher is to think of the other choice and that actually starts with that letter you know what I mean?

Lara: No, it doesn’t have to start with that letter. It’s what it could be.

Maria: Oh, alright. OK.

Lesson Two

The Tutor redirected the teachers’ attention to the second lesson: ‘Tell me what you’re thinking about for the next lesson?’ The agreement was that it was the ‘more difficult texts’. In re-orienting the teachers to their own teaching the Tutor asked: ‘The challenge next year is that you’re going to need to be ‘observant, tentative and flexible’. What do you think you need to work on of those three?’ The agreement at
this stage of the teachers’ learning it was agreed that it was ‘flexibility.’ Finally they were reminded to say ‘I think’ when they contributed to the discussion.

The child’s reading in the second lesson was much more successful than in the first and the teachers commented on that, however thinking about what made the text more difficult in parts was prompted by the Tutor:

*Shelley:* She’s sounding good.
*Tutor:* What about the pausing? It’s an additional clause. Children are not expecting that, so she pauses. Was she successful? She has to be able to sort direct speech from the narrative.
*Mary-Lou:* I think she’s reading for meaning because she’s putting good intonation in her voice.
*Tutor:* I would agree with you – it’s got intonation and flow.
*Lara:* And it sounds natural.
*Tutor:* She had to search then. What’s that? She had to go searching for the word.
*Mary-Lou:* She’s not expecting that end part.
*Tutor:* The additional parts in sentences.
*Maria:* The additional parts that come at that level.
*Lara:* I think she’s got the meaning of the story so it might be structure.
*Tutor:* If she has too many structures to work on it’s going to be hard.

The Tutor shifted the teachers’ attention from ‘intonation’ to sentence structures for their consideration in literacy processing:

*Tutor:* Are they negative structures?
*Mary-Lou:* It’s not language they would use either at this age.
*Tutor:* We are building on the child’s ability with the English language, but it is far beyond how she would speak. Is that a challenge at Level 20?
*Shelley:* Yes it is.
*Jemma:* It’s also at Levels 13 and 14, the structures.
*Tutor:* What’s that structure Shelley, a double negative?
*Shelley:* ‘She doesn’t like our school does she?’ and she says ‘doesn’t she’.
*Lara:* So if you were to choose that would you go back and re-read it?
*Tutor:* You’d teach it to her.
*Lara:* So, let’s look at this?
*Tutor:* This is what it sounds like. How do you know if you’ve never heard it?

This example is of further discussion around more difficult sentence structures at the higher book levels and the child’s correction of their intonation while reading. This shows close observation and the teachers’ reasoning about that observation and the
Tutor linked this to the quote shared before the observations about Clay’s definition of reading.

**Tutor:** Let’s watch some more. What did you think of that?

**Maria:** She didn’t read the punctuation there.

**Mary-Lou:** Yeah, but she stopped and she went back and she started ‘just then’, then she went to ‘she thought’ and kept it going, she stopped and she went back to ‘she thought’.

**Maria:** She re-read it?

**Mary-Lou:** She’s actually picked it up.

**Tutor:** So a child will correct their phrasing and their intonation.

**Lara:** Would you say that if she’s correcting the intonation that’s a higher level because there wasn’t an error in any of the words, so she’s thinking about how it would sound herself?

**Tutor:** Think what Clay says. What’s coming together? The visual information and the language. So she’s making a decision about the language.

The Tutor questioned the teaching after ‘Yesterday’s New Book’ (when a running record had been taken) and modeled how she was thinking, but issues in the observation were sometimes unresolved as the observation continued a-pace with the lesson.

**Tutor:** She’s going for that ‘s’ on the end. Why?

**Maria:** She’s going for accuracy.

**Tutor:** I thought she would practice where she paused. I don’t know, what do you think Diane, you’re the English teacher. Is it unusual to say ‘practice’ at the end of a sentence: ‘….’s class arrived at the pool to practice.’

**Diane:** To practice at the pool, you might say.

**Lara:** Or to practice their swimming.

**Tutor:** I’m trying to say that you are in an interaction, are you more interested in pool or pools or that structure?

During the writing activity the observation can still be side-tracked at Session Sixteen, near the end of the course, as shown in this example when a teacher talked about use of pens or pencil to write:

**Mary-Lou:** I think she’s writing a lot.

**Maria:** It’s matching her reading.

**Tutor:** In RR Clay is asking for two to three complex sentences. Are you seeing this?

**Maria:** Yes.
Tutor: You have to know how to teach for a complex sentence.
Maria: She’s writing in pencil is that OK?
Tutor: We prefer colourful writing, it’s more interesting.
Mary-Lou: You could infer that she’s getting her ready for the classroom.
Tutor: You could.

The Tutor redirected the discussion to the close observation and the learning she was shaping such as: the child self-correcting her writing (spelling); children needing to monitor their own writing; children at higher levels of writing being taught how to use punctuation (e.g. of direct speech in sentences).

Maria redirected the attention of the group again with her idea about why the teacher may not have taught the ‘comma’: this person mightn’t know that. You only teach what you know. If you don’t know it, you don’t know to put it in. I think that’s got a lot to do with how we’re teaching,’ and the Tutor brought the group back to the main observation of the lesson:

Shelley: I would assume everyone would know that, correct punctuation.
Maria: But we don’t.
Tutor: We direct our attention to different places. She’s directing to the ‘s’ on words; I’m directing attention to structures.
Maria: It’s because you’re more experienced.
Tutor: Which is why I’m helping you.
Tutor: She is directing the child’s attention to speech marks because she thinks that’s really important. Each time you lift the child.
Maria: But she didn’t know about commas did she?

In Session Sixteen (writing) the teachers were disagreeing with each other and putting forward their own opinions. The final decider was found in the observation, i.e. ‘what did the child do to test her hypothesis?’ and ‘this was the close observation replayed’:

Maria: I think the child has an hypothesis of her own and she’s testing them out – this child- with what the teacher is telling her. She knows quite a bit.
Tutor: OK. That’s when you try to read the teacher and second-guess the teacher. This is a problem if the child doesn’t do anything. Did the child do something?
Teacher: No.
Tutor: Children will appeal, that’s that ‘looking to check’. If you’re going to tell me she’s got an hypothesis that she’s testing out against the teacher, I’m going to assume that she does something.

Maria: She’s got the ‘gh’ and then the ‘ing’

Mary-Lou: No. It was actually a ‘ph’. She got a ‘ph’ and Jade said ‘Oh, that’s very good but in this word it’s ‘gh’ because she got the ‘ph’ down.

The teachers observed the introduction to the ‘New Book’ in a very inviting way explaining how she went ‘camping with her brothers.’ The Tutor explained that the teachers’ need to lift the children’s learning at high levels and asks them about where they give their attention and then what was the problem for the child in the observation. One teacher determined that it’s the structure of the sentence, but it is the Tutor who gave the example: ‘It’s ‘let’s imagine’” in the sentence, ‘Let’s imagine we’re doing this, then in the middle of that (direct speech) ‘said so-in-so’.’ As the child continued reading it was the Tutor again who commented: ‘She’s doing quite well isn’t she but can you see where the challenge is?’ Another teacher said, ‘Yeah, it’s that structure that’s difficult’. And the Tutor provided the example: ‘Did you hear that? ‘I’m even afraid’, just one word. What do you think is enabling her?’ There was no teacher response so the Tutor said, ‘it’s the quality of the voice’ and a teacher could comment on that:

Tutor: It’s the quality of the voice.

Shelley: She’s kind of stretching the words out so they do join up.

Tutor: She doesn’t leave the spaces do you think? She doesn’t go word by word.

Shelley: She joins them.

The Tutor and the teachers attended where the Tutor directed their attention, i.e. the sentence structures, such as unusual phrases and the continued direct speech broken by who is speaking in the middle, and embedded phrases and clauses in sentences, which was a feature of a higher book level, and they conclude that it is better to comment about this ‘on the run’ rather than in a ‘book introduction’. The Tutor commented more as a fellow colleague, but the decision was not definite in terms of the RR procedure, and where unusual structures could be treated by the teacher.

(Observing Jade saying to the child ‘That made sense but it didn’t look right did it? What could it be?’)

571
Tutor: But it was so good wasn’t it? Why stop there? She said ‘but neither of them...’ and it’s got ‘none of them’. So what makes her a good reader?
Maria: She substitutes the word.
Tutor: She substitutes a meaningful word and she can continue with it. It’s not every word. She’s not inventing the text.
Maria: She’s got meaning because the substitutions right.
(Observing the teacher talking to a sentence structure while the child is reading)
Diane: That was probably a good way to introduce that structure too, rather than all at the beginning.
Tutor: I’m thinking that where she’s trying to say ‘more to come’ (in reference to punctuation) and there is an interruption in the speech...in an introduction you could practice those parts. ‘You be Martin and I’ll be mother’.

The Tutor initiated an idea about where teachers intervene at higher book levels as ‘feeding forward to prevent error’.

Tutor: As you’re getting up to higher levels you’re going to have to choose where you intervene. Where do we say we want to intervene?
Mary-Lou: When it doesn’t make sense.
Lara: At the end of a sentence.
Tutor: OK. If you want to ‘feed forward’ you say it before they read it. OK? If you want to ‘feed forward’ you want to prevent error and if you’re saying it at the end you’re saying it so the child will say something else.

In this part of the discussion the Tutor used an example from the observation to illustrate the point that teachers have different things to say to a child when the issue is semantics or syntax.

Tutor: This child has said, ‘Katie shōne her torch all around.’ The teacher is saying ‘did that make sense?’ Is that what you’re saying?
Maria: That’s a vocabulary thing. Shine. It’s a past tense.
Tutor: You’re getting there...what I’m trying to say is a lot of teachers will say to a child...
Maria: Did that make sense.
Tutor: Did that make sense.
Maria: She (the child) thinks she does.
Tutor: But what we’re asking you to check is the language structure, which is ‘does it sound right?’ which is the grammar – is that right? ‘Can we say it that way?’ I’m just using this as an example...you think what you say to a child because when you’re going to be unpicking language we’re unpicking the semantics and the syntax aren’t we?
At the conclusion of the reading the Tutor and the teachers came to a summary that included: treating vocabulary at higher levels by giving children options for what words could be that they cross-check with visual information, and teaching the children to insert meaningful options if they do not know a word and continuing with their reading to prevent them stopping at words and not continuing.

_Tutor:_ What do you think the major challenge is as you get to higher levels?

_Shelley_: The structure.

_Tutor:_ The vocabulary and the meaning for which you are teaching through cross-checking information and you’re giving options and synonyms and the other is the structure isn’t it?

_Tutor:_ What is the quality that she has that will enable her to have a self-extending system?

_Shelley:_ She doesn’t stop.

_Maria_: She takes risks too.

_Tutor:_ She will substitute something that’s meaningful. You have to think its ‘OK for now’. ‘I know I’m not right but it’s OK for now.’ because if you don’t think like that what’s going to happen to you?

_Shelley:_ They baulk at the words.

_Diane_: They keep stopping.

_Tutor:_ You stop and start and don’t continue...so if you had reading ...so if children were tested like they are for the BST or whatever...they’re going to have to put in something that’s meaningful and carry on. Do you agree with that? Maybe that’s something we need to teach the children to do?

_Tutor:_ Thanks very much. That’s been interesting.

### Session Sixteen: Discussion

The Tutor started acknowledging the teachers who taught modeling this interaction and bring the opinions of the teachers who taught to ideas that can be discussed by the group: where do I go next at higher levels and how can I orchestrate the lessons so that the child can make the links I would like him to make:

_Tutor:_ Thank you both. We had a wonderful conversation about challenges as we move to high levels and thinking about ourselves and how we interact with a child. If I went back and asked both of you, where do you put your mind, what are you thinking about as you interact with a child?

_Jade:_ I have trouble with A...because I feel like sometimes I don’t know where to go next or when to. She reads well, but I kind of feel like I’m wasting too many minutes of just listening.

_Tutor:_ Where do I go next? That’s something for everyone.
Jade: Yeah. And she’s the highest level that I’ve taught and I just feel like I don’t put enough in but I just don’t know what else to put in.

Shelley: She’s good.

Jade: She is, but I feel like I’m just listening to her. I am taking notes but I feel like there’s too many minutes in the lesson and they’re wasted because I’m just listening.

Tutor: Leave it like that. She thinks ‘I’m just listening’. OK. ‘Where do I go next?’ because the child has to be better. That’s where we take it because that’s what you think – what do I do next when a child is at that level? (Turns to Jemma)

Jemma: I’m pretty much the same. I know L… quite well because he’s in my class so I have quite a good social relationship with L… so when I’m listening to him read I’m starting to think that we’ve read a word similar to that in another book, and I wish I had that book beside me. I wish I could just reach in and grab it and show you that there are links that you can make, and I feel that I miss lots of opportunities in lessons because of that.

Tutor: OK. Turn it around. OK? He’s missing the opportunities. He’s not making the links you’d like him to make. So how am I going to set it up so he is making links that I’d like him to make? Is that a good place to start for a discussion?

Before starting the discussion the Tutor spoke to the group about using a specific ‘book series’ at higher levels which in her opinion were more difficult than the book leveling in RR and the books she was familiar with, because of how the author had organised the texts. It was the Tutor’s opinion that the children should be able to go to Year 2 reading Level 20, which she said was about a reading level of 7-7.5 years; however these other books, which were challenging for the children were a ‘good six to twelve months higher’ and the Tutor was thinking about lifting them ‘one to two levels’.

Tutor: Anyway, we’ve got children reading really well at higher levels haven’t we and we’re going to have to think what the challenges are. Share with Jemma what the challenges are for her boy.

Lara summarised for the group: ‘He tends to grab the visual information. He’s very strong with the visual information but lacks a bit in his meaning…he’s not gaining meaning as much as he’s reading.

Tutor: OK. Does that summarise the discussion?

(Agreement)

Tutor: What sort of links do you want him to make Jemma?

Jemma’s explanation was that she wanted the child to make analogous links between words he knew to solve new words and her hypothesis was that a quicker access to visual information would allow the child to gain meaning, whereas the definition of
reading explained in the introductory discussion was that ‘reading was a message getting problem solving activity’. This exchange determines that the teacher does ‘believe’ that meaning comes first, which may or may not be evident in her explanation. The Teacher also draws from her classroom teacher knowledge to argue about children making ‘meaningful links’ in terms of topic.

Jemma: To take the many words that he knows well and use them to solve the words that he’s not terrible good at because he’s so visual and it’s letting him down in his meaning. If he could just make the links quickly he wouldn’t lose the meaning as much.

Tutor: Explain a bit more. What sort of links?

Jemma: If he can get to a difficult word, he perceives to be difficult, and solve it quickly with the words he knows, like ‘camp’ and ‘tramp’. He knows ‘camp’ really well. He should be able to get ‘tramp’ that was there. And because he’s stopping at the visual, that’s why he’s losing the meaning. If he can get those links quickly. I think he’s wasting too much time processing visual and that’s why he’s losing meaning.

Jade: But making links is visual isn’t it?

Jemma: It is. But you can make links with meaning too. You can take a technical book about camping and read a narrative book about camping and you’ve got meaning to draw from that text. That’s just an opinion.

Tutor: We’ve got to come down to RR theory.

Jemma: I know.

Tutor: So what I’d like to ask you is, what comes first?

Jemma: Meaning.

Tutor: Do you believe that?

Jemma: I believe that meaning comes first.

The Tutor asked a teacher to share further what the teachers thought about the child’s reading. It was made clear for the teachers that the task was ‘message getting’ and the teachers agreed that they would scaffold for this but the issue for teachers, which the Tutor kept emphasising was, ‘how are you going to do that?’

Jade: We thought his focus, as we said, was on visual and that mainly he needed to be scaffolded a little bit more with the meaning so that meaning came first to him. So that maybe...is that what we were saying?

Tutor: Scaffolding input in terms of meaning. You see what I’m hearing in terms of us at high levels is, we become concerned that the children need to link to whatever they know about visual information, and then perhaps they’ll get the meaning. They’ll get it. But the point is we want them to
be predicting it first and then checking. That’s the theory isn’t it? The ‘message getting’. I go in search of meaning. I problem solve the meaning.

Lara: And see if it matches.

Tutor: And then bring together ‘within the constraints of the printer’s code’ – I’ve got to make some meaning out of this and then I have to bring it together. So if he had difficulty in terms of his processing we would say that he gives an over-attention to visual information and not enough attention to meaning. Therefore, if you’re observing this, where does your attention go?

Jemma: It should go to the meaning.

Tutor: You would go to the opposite. OK? So how would you do that? It’s not there in the book. Clay’s not going to give you a script.

Lara: Scaffold the meaning.

Tutor: How are you going to do that?

Lara: At the beginning of each page you could give a little link

Jade: What’s coming up.

The teachers could describe their observations and replay them for the teacher who taught and what led them to their hypothesis about the child’s reading:

Lara: It was a trend. When he came to something unusual he would stop. He would pause. Then he would try from the left to the right or he would use his finger.

Diane: There was one he sounded out ‘machine’.

Tutor: You decided before then.

Mary-Lou: In familiar reading he wasn’t phrased and fluent.

The Tutor modeled a way of problem solving in RR with reference to the text when the Tutor does not know the answer. The Tutor presented a summary of the issue, acknowledging that this was the ‘challenge’ for all of the teachers, and how to think about that. I think: ‘what could we do?’

Tutor: I do think that as we are at higher levels we’re worried about the child ‘getting it right’ but the issue is do they understand it? So that’s the challenge. Where could we go? Let’s go to those little boxes with the clouds because I’ve never thought of this before. You keep me on my toes. I think: what could we do?

The teachers searched for the page reference and the Tutor acknowledged that she did not know the layout of the book very well.

Tutor: I don’t know this book. Oh, thank you. Excellent. I’ve got someone to help me.
The following was a discussion of a diagram in the text in which Clay illustrates the cross-referencing of information in the brain of all sources of information in what she describes as a ‘simplistic way’, that is; meaning (semantics); structure (syntax); print (visual information); and sounds (phonological information). The diagram shows that sources of information answering these self-question cross-reference with each other: does it make sense (semantics); does it sound right (syntax); does it look right (visual information); and can I say it that way (phonological information). The Tutor drew the teachers’ attention to the clouds in each quadrant which were darker to lighter in the visual image.

Tutor: Which holds the most rain?
Teachers: Meaning.
Tutor: Then?
Teachers: Structure.
Tutor: Then?
Teachers: Visual.

The teacher then turned to the main issue arising which was ‘vocabulary’ at higher levels and ‘how to’ assist children to reach out to vocabularies beyond their control without resorting to visual information (decoding) when they may not be able to pronounce the words e.g. shōne. A teacher’s example was also problematic in this exchange as she introduced an added complication of grammatical words e.g. ‘best’ and ‘better’. When the child did not know the choice the Tutor concluded that the teachers could tell and say ‘we say it this way’.

Tutor: You’ve found it successful when you don’t know about the vocabulary, can you share it one more time.
Maria: Give them a choice. It’s two meaningful things. Not necessarily starting with the same letter, although I’ve been trying to do that and I’m finding it a bit hard.
Tutor: Synonyms.
Maria: Would it be ‘best’ or would it be ‘better’.
Tutor: That’s quite hard.
Maria: But they’re getting the structure of the word and then they’re making a choice.
Tutor: So you’ve actually lifted that in terms of cross-checking visual information, so it’s not only the meaning and the visual information but the structure and the visual information?
Shelley: And the grammar too.
Tutor: They might not necessarily have the vocabulary so we’re not going to say ‘sound it out’ ‘get the letters’ ...these are the options, meaningful options, there’s your choice.
Tutor: We had a discussion about what you actually say. Can you see what you say for structure/grammar? (looking at the diagram)
Maria: Can we say it that way?
Tutor: And the child might not know that as you’re getting to higher levels, like shone and shōne.
Maria: Or doesn’t or does she?
Tutor: Maybe instead of saying that question it’s ‘we say it this way’?
Lara: We say it this way.

A teacher started this discussion with her observations of reading that led into a teacher exchange as a series of questions between themselves:

Diane: You know when you let them make substitutions and let them go right through it and then you go back to it my young fellow immediately picks it up, just reads it properly. Would they be processing so quickly they just put something in and they’re happy?
Maria: Yes, you can’t really tell can you?
Jade: Well it’s easier for them to start with isn’t it because they’ve seen it before so maybe they just got time to think more about it?
Diane: What we were saying is that maybe you should just let them keep going if they put in ‘shōne’ or something?

The Tutor redirected the discussion because the teachers picked up on the example that was from the second lesson and not the lesson they were discussing, and the Tutor refocused the teachers on the diagram in the page reference they had open on their knees.

Tutor: We’re saying that especially as you get to higher levels that that’s a nice little picture of where you go to give you an emphasis first and foremost. It also gives you an emphasis that when the child reads you would start there, and when the child finishes that you would start there. So our emphasis is on it being a ‘message getting problem solving activity’.
Tutor: So what was Jemma’s question?
Jemma: About making links.
Tutor: How do you help him to make links? The suggestion is that he be able to link to language and then the prediction of meaning and then he can make his links.
A teacher redirected to the topic of the child’s writing saying: ‘I was just going to talk about making the links in writing. What was the word?’ At this point the teachers got confused with their examples from the different lessons and the logic of their argument. The Tutor summarised the ‘main idea’ for the teachers to recall:

*Shelley: Track and ... No what was the word?*
*Jade: Snake and Shaking?*
*Maria: C-K.*
*Shelley: shake and snake, that’s right. C... suggested one time to use the book at the same time.*
*Tutor: How about this? Link to words you know that sound the same. That’s what it means. So instead of saying ‘if you can write this you can write this’ which is a classroom teaching move, but they will not necessarily remember that, what we’re saying is: if you want him to make links it is to think ‘here is a difficult word that I want to know’ and to think ‘do I know a word that sounds like that?’*

As the group turned to discuss the second lesson there was still awkwardness in following and the first teacher chose her own thinking over the group’s overall discussion.

*Maria: We were saying that you have an hypothesis about what the child knows and where they should go and they also...because there’s a reciprocal relationship there...they also have an hypothesis about you... is that what we’re saying?*
*Tutor: I’m trying to get to what Jade was saying ...and Jade is saying here I am out there...in teaching, without all the props...and everything that comes from your RR teaching comes from within you.*
*Maria: You teach what you know, that’s it. Sorry.*

The next exchange is dising with the teacher what she did and why. The summary is that the teacher did what she thought at the time because she did not know what to do.

*Tutor: So we have to teach, we have to lift that reading, to improve that reading. So what did you do?*
*Jade: I think I went to punctuation because when she started she wasn’t looking at any punctuation.*
*Tutor: She was quite good at that, but where you went at the end to ‘square’ and ‘squares’ and ‘pool’ and ‘pools’?*
*Jade: Yeah, I went to visual because I think she’s got the meaning and I think she’s fluent.*
*Tutor: Yeah, but if you’re going to go for ‘square’ and ‘squares’ and ‘pool’ and pools’ that’s at Level 5?*
Jade: Alright. OK. So what am I to do then?
Tutor: That’s what you want to know. Shelley has an answer.

The Tutor enlisted another teacher to assist Jade in what she might do so that she did not focus her attention on the final inflections on words which was a lower level of teaching. The teacher who gave the feedback gave an example that Jade could identify with and add on to and the Tutor gave an example of possible teaching moves:

Shelley: We thought going back to unusual structures that she doesn’t have within her, for example when she said ‘she doesn’t like our school does she?’
Jade: And she said ‘doesn’t she’.
Shelley: That difficult structure that isn’t in her is going to be good to go to.
Jade: Oh, I see.
Tutor: So you say ‘this was a tricky part to say, we say it like this…’ Not ‘can you say it that way?’ she doesn’t know she got it wrong.
Jade: OK.
Tutor: She can have a go at saying it like that.

Further examples from the lesson made it easier for the teacher to relate to the feedback she received. This was orchestrated and summarised by the Tutor:

Tutor: What was the other part? The first book. She had difficulty saying it.
Mary-Lou: That was when she wasn’t expecting the person to be still within the writing, within the talking marks.
Jade: Oh, yeah!
Mary-Lou: She kept stopping and then kept going like ‘I didn’t expect to see that there’.
Tutor: There were additional structures on the ends of sentences.
Lara: And the practice.
Diane: The practice one.
Tutor: ‘Something, something to practice’.
Jade: Oh, OK.
Tutor: So you might be able to read a word in one context but can you read it in a different context? What did you say about it Shelley?
Shelley: When she expects to see it in the middle but not at the end, for example, ‘to practice swimming’ not ‘she went to the pool to practice’.
Tutor: If you want to lift her – what can’t she do? What doesn’t she control? Does that help?
The Tutor re-directed the discussion to what the child did well and what to be listening for:
‘the pauses, the intonation’. Jade agreed that she read ‘expressively’. The Tutor re-stated for Jade: ‘She doesn’t read the spaces, have you noticed that? That helps her. And she reads back one word and keeps the activity going.’ The Tutor brought in another teacher into the discussion: ‘The other thing she’s doing that’s really good is what Maura is saying’ and strongly emphasised the main point for the teachers’ learning when working at high levels which was ‘it’s OK for now’ as a feature of child resilience.

Maura: When she substituted the word and it made sense. The word was ‘neither’ and she said ‘none’; she said ‘none of them’ and it made sense, so that was a good thing.
Tutor: Why did we say it’s what a good reader does?
Diane: It makes sense.
Jade: She put a word in.
Tutor: OK. All write this down: ‘OK for now’, to make your children resilient. A resilient reader keeps going in the face of adversity. They don’t give up. These children have to be resilient, so they have to be able to make a judgment that it’s ‘OK for now’.

The Tutor re-directed the conversation to the writing, which was discussed with example. The Teacher knew what the teachers were referring to and the Tutor summarised the learning as: ‘we teach for what we attend to, so we have no focus, and we follow the child’, which one teacher described as ‘flexibility’.

Mary-Lou: What we noticed was that when you actually said ‘what do you see in the book’ the actually said ‘commas’.
Tutor: Maria had the thought that we teach for what we know and I would like to challenge that, we teach for what we are attending to, Jade does know about commas.
Jade: And I just went for the answer I wanted. I had it in my head this morning that we were going to do ‘talking marks’ because I knew we were going to continue the story.
Tutor: Perfect. No focus. You had a brilliant place to lift the child when it comes from her.
Maria: Flexibility.
Jade: Yeah.
Shelley: We thought when the little girl said commas first she may be confusing them with speech marks.
Jade: Yes, that’s what I thought.
Jemma: She’s a good girl.
In the conclusion of the discussion the Tutor said: ‘those were two questions, maybe we should write them down: where should I go next, that’s Jade’s that will lift this child? And Jemma’s is: ‘How do we get children to make their own links?’ So the writing one is: when I come to a word I don’t know I want you to think ‘do I know a word that sounds like that?’

The Tutor further explained using her own child as an example how to teach the child to write multi-syllabic words by tapping chunks of sound. In this conversation a teacher said, ‘I wouldn’t write it. I wouldn’t know how to spell it.’ The Tutor replied to the group: ‘Never shy away from the opportunities that you get even if they seem hard, and even if it doesn’t work, you will have given the effort.’ Maria added a comment about her change as a teacher on RR from a person who concentrated on the lesson framework and getting from the beginning to the end, and that it was experience that made her more willing to be ‘flexible’.

María: As we are getting more experienced, well I’m more willing to take that challenge more, rather than when we’re at the beginning, you were...more kept on the line and only wanted to get them from a to b in one piece.  
(Laughter)

The final comments were about ‘flexibilities and risk taking:

Tutor: If you’re going to be flexible in your interactions with children you’re going to have to be a risk-taker yourself.  
Mary-Lou: I don’t even think it’s that. I think it’s that you’re missing opportunities because you’re focused on one spot and you’ve actually missed it.  
María: As you get more experienced in the observation you will.

5.5.4 Session Sixteen: Written Reflections

Ten teachers were present at Session Sixteen. Seven teachers wrote about ‘meaning’ in relation to Clay’s definition of reading and the observations and discussions:
Lara: Reading is about getting a message, problem-solving the meaning and bringing it altogether.

Maura: Again emphasis on the importance of meaning.

Maria: Using vocabulary prompts (two choices) are proving a meaningful way of enabling my child to make a choice for the correct word based on meaning and structure. They have in most cases chosen the correct word. This also aids continuity and flow i.e. the reading doesn’t fall down and the child is also receiving scaffolding.

Belinda: The major area the child and I both need to attend to is meaning. Sometimes I will need to focus the child on language, punctuation and tricky structures to assist in gaining meaning.

Jemma: The need to focus more on meaning across all texts. To do this by more consistent scaffolding for meaning throughout the lesson. The making of links by child is related to language which is again supported by meaning. To prompt more effectively for meaning and to get L… focus less on visual information and more on meaning.

Diane: We must focus on meaning-getting.

Tracey: I liked Clay’s quote: ‘Reading is a message-getting problem-solving activity.’

Six teachers wrote about being ‘observant, tentative and flexible teachers’ a theme’ that arose in the introductory discussion that was also evident in the lesson observations:

Maura: Teachers should be observant, flexible and tentative. In the words of C... ‘never shy away from opportunities that you get’.

Jade: Must be flexible and tentative.

Lara: Be flexible and tentative.

Diane: The need to be observant, flexible and tentative.

Tracey: Teachers need to be observant (of behaviour – to make them successful, moment by moment); flexible (change direction according to the needs at the time); and tentative (need to predict and be prepared to change). We need to change from having a focus to ‘I’m thinking about’.

Mary-Lou: Am I missing opportunities in my teaching?

Five teachers wrote of the learning being a ‘co-construction’ between the teacher and the child, a theme that started in the introductory discussion:

Maura: Co-construction is important. The teacher steers the child in the right direction.

Belinda: What direction do I need to take on the run, to respond to what the child is doing or not doing? ... I need to make sure I am really listening to the child and responding flexibly.

Diane: We talked about being co-constructors with the child. This means that we as RR teachers must know all of our options that can be used to meet the child’s needs. We must have a great
knowledge of what reading is about and what strategic activity the child appears to use. We must focus on meaning-getting.

Tracey: Today we talked about teacher learning and child learning and the fact that the RR sequence should be co-constructive. We are there working together.

Mary-Lou: Am I assisting the child to make his own links in the most effective way for the child?

Three teachers wrote about how they learnt from giving, observing and discussing teaching:

Jade: I really appreciated the feedback from my lesson behind the screen. I am taking a lot away with me. This is such a valuable experience. I might consider video-taping my own lessons like I have had to do with violin teaching. This session really helped me with ‘where do I go next?’

Belinda: I need to think ‘where next?’

Mary-Lou: Am I thinking of the most useful step forward?

Shelley: I enjoyed seeing the two lessons today and I really gained from the discussion during and after the examples that came from Jade’s lesson were ones that I will remember for teaching at higher levels i.e. teaching difficult structures that the child does not have, looking at different order of verbs and inferred words.’

Teachers also wrote about resilience for the teacher and the child:

Maura: ‘never shy away from opportunities that you get. Be valiant in your efforts.’ Must remember ‘OK for now’. A resilient reader keeps going.

Independence:

Lara: At higher levels during writing the child needs to know what their options are and which of those options do I choose, trial it and see if it looks right. The child needs to be able to do this independently.

Expectations:

Lara: The teacher needs to adjust her expectations.

Mary-Lou: How am I lifting each child each lesson?

Transition to the classroom:

Lara: During writing child should be able to monitor and pick up some of their own errors and make self-corrections as this would be something that they would need to be able to do in the classroom.

Use of the known for teachers and children:
Jemma: Remember to use analogy by linking child from known to unknown.

Maria: Teaching what you know’. Interesting to note that younger people do not teach much in regard to punctuation.

5.5.5 Session Sixteen: Conclusion

1 a)
What are the major characteristics of the RR Tutor’s social interaction in the group that unfold during a RR session?

The Introductory Discussion

During the ‘introductory discussion’ in Session Sixteen the Tutor’s main role was to introduce the ‘theme’ (teacher and child learning); to inform the teachers (e.g. the important quote from their text about selecting examples to teach from and the elaboration of Clay’s definition of reading); and to shape their understanding around key concepts related to the theme. Those of: ‘observation; tentativeness and flexibility’ in particular; but also independence; prompting for ‘strategic activity’ and the difference between construction and co-construction in learning. The Tutor directed, re-directed and orchestrated the teachers’ learning in this preliminary discussion that ‘set the scene’ for their observations’.

The Lesson Observations

The Tutor re-established the ‘theme’ at the glass screen and directed the teachers as to how she would like them express their observations, i.e. couching their language in ‘I am thinking’ and ‘I am wondering’.

The Tutor mainly orchestrated the direction of the observation and discussion (31 examples) and told the teachers’ new information or ideas or evaluated and concluded for the teachers: (29 examples)

Directing the observation and discussion (the teachers’ attention)

Tutor: Build on that.
Tutor: Think of the input of the visual information. It's supposed to sound good.
Tutor: Unpick that. If you say 'it didn’t sound right to me'. What does that mean?
Tutor: What's going to help him?
Tutor: What is he going to need to be thinking?
Tutor: How would you scaffold that?
Tutor: What else would you be saying to him?
Tutor: Think what the teacher has said.
Tutor: Challenge Lara. She’s going to do it at the end of the book.
Tutor: If you monitor for the child, what will happen then?
Tutor: That’s something to teach our children or what’s going to happen?
Tutor: Did he put in a meaningful word there?
Tutor: What is not in? How will we get it there?
Tutor: If you do it yourself what do you need to say?
Tutor: How good are they in sequences?
Tutor: What about the pausing?
Tutor: She had to search then. What’s that? She had to go searching for the word.
Tutor: Are they negative structures?
Tutor: What’s that structure Shelley, a double negative?
Tutor: Let's watch some more. What do you think of that?
Tutor: She’s going for the ‘s’ on the end. Why?
Tutor: I don’t know. What do you think Diane, you’re the English teacher?
Tutor: In RR Clay is asking for two to three complex sentences. Are you seeing this?
Tutor: Did the child do something?
Tutor: She doesn’t leave the spaces do you think? She doesn’t go word by word.
Tutor: Where do we say we want to intervene?
Tutor: The child has said ‘Katie shone her torch all around’. The teacher is saying ‘did that make sense?’ Is that what you’re saying?
Tutor: What do you think is the major challenge as you get to higher levels?
Tutor: What is the quality that she has that will enable her to have a self-extending system?
Tutor: If you don’t think like that [it’s OK for now] what will happen to you?
Tutor: Do you agree with that? Maybe that’s something we need to teach the children to do?

Telling new information or ideas or evaluating and concluding:

Tutor: Leave it for now and come back.
Tutor: We’re not getting a marry of language and the visual responses
Tutor: Writing is about what you ‘hear and see’ and reading is about what you ‘see and hear’. Tutor: You need to get to analogies in writing.
Tutor: Not looks like that because he hasn’t seen it. Do you know a word that sounds like that?
Tutor: That’s how you get to an analogy.
Tutor: I think Clay is saying that they can look at it but they can’t think what possibility it would be.
Tutor: And then he can bring together the language and the visual information.
Tutor: It's an additional clause. Children are not expecting that, so she pauses...She has to be able to sort direct speech from the narrative.
Tutor: I would agree with you, it's got intonation and flow.
Tutor: The additional parts in sentences.
Tutor: If she has too many structures to work on it's going to be hard.
Tutor: We are building on the child’s ability with the English language, but it is far beyond how she would speak. Is this a problem at Level 20?
Tutor: You'd teach it to her.
Tutor: So a child will correct their phrasing and intonation.
Tutor: Think what Clay says. What’s coming together? The visual information and the language. So she’s making a decision about the language.
Tutor: I’m trying to say that you are in an interaction, are you more interested in pool and pools or that structure?
Tutor: You have to know how to teach for a complex sentence.
Tutor: We direct our attention to different places. She’s directing to the ‘s’ on words. I’m directing attention to structures.
Tutor: She is directing the child’s attention to speech marks because she thinks that’s really important.
Tutor: This is a problem if the child doesn’t do anything.
Tutor: Children will appeal, that that ‘looking to check’. If you’re going to tell me that she’s got an hypothesis that she’s checking out against the teacher I’m going to assume that she does something.
Tutor: It’s the quality of the voice.
Tutor: In an introduction you could practice those parts.
Tutor: As we’re getting to higher levels you’re going to have to choose where you intervene.
Tutor: If you want to ‘feed forward’ you say it before they read it. If you want to ‘feed forward’ you want to prevent error.
Tutor: What I am saying is that a lot of teachers will say ‘did that make sense’...but what we’re asking you to check is language structure, which is ‘does it sound right? Which is grammar – is that right? ‘Can we say it that way? ...you’re going to be unpicking language when you’re unpicking the semantics and the syntax.
Tutor: The vocabulary and the meaning for which you are teaching through cross-checking information and you’re giving options and synonyms and the other is the structure isn’t it?
Tutor: She will substitute something that’s meaningful. You have to think ‘OK for now’ “I know I’m not right but it’s OK for now.’
Tutor: You stop and start and you don’t continue ...so if the children were tested like they are ... they’re going to have to put in something that’s meaningful and carry on.

**Evaluating the teaching and processing:**

Tutor: He’s good at using visual information (here)
Tutor: Because too much effort is going into visual information.
Tutor: I thought she would practice where she paused.
Tutor: But it was so good wasn’t it? Why stop there?
Tutor: She substitutes a meaningful word and she can continue with it. It’s not every word. She’s not inventing the text.

Clarifying:
Tutor: Attention for visual information and that might be harder for him. Is that what you are saying?

The Discussion

The Tutor’s main social characteristic in the discussion was to scaffold the interactions between the teachers, with reference to the lessons taught, the introductory discussion and the teachers’ current understandings about RR teaching. The Tutor did this by: summarising; maintaining interactive ease; reiterating the ‘themes’ of the session (that she orchestrated in the introductory discussion and which arose during the lesson observations); inviting teacher participation; explaining; acknowledging teacher difficulties; Maintaining the direction of the discussion; shaping the teachers’ knowledge; redirecting for further explanations and reminding the teachers what to talk to by leading them to examples in the lesson observations.

The Tutor thanked the teachers who had taught explaining to them that the group had had a ‘wonderful conversation about challenges as we move to high levels, and thinking about ourselves and how we interact with a child. The Tutor invited the teachers who taught to share what they thought was ‘challenging’, and summarised what they said as; where to go next? And how am I going to help the child to make links or connections?

The Tutor reiterated the challenges at higher levels were also that some of the books they used were more difficult ‘in her experience’ than books she was familiar with at the levels they were teaching to.

The Tutor asked the group generally to share a summary of the challenges for the first child; and then invited the teacher to explain what sort of links she would like
him to make and included a further invitation with ‘explain a bit more’. This invitation allowed the teacher to express her personal theory about learning, i.e. that quicker access to visual information through analogous word links would allow the child to maintain the meaning as he read. The problem was therefore in the area of visual information.

The Tutor extended the invitation to the teachers to express their interpretations, and explained for all of the teachers that she was hearing a concern about visual information (acknowledging the teacher who taught) and that if they were more proficient in this area that they would be able to comprehend the texts. Then the Tutor connected to the RR theory as being ‘message getting’ – that children went in search of meaning, to problem solve the meaning of text, and bringing ‘the meaning’ together with the code.

The Tutor explained the teaching dilemma was what to do in response to the child; e.g. ‘he gives an over attention to visual information and not enough attention to meaning. Therefore, if you are observing this where does your attention go?’ While the teachers could say the meaning as this was the emphasis in the persuasive argument around the ‘reading definition’ that guides RR, the Tutor said: ‘You would go to the opposite.’

The Tutor also acknowledged that in RR the author did not give them a script for teaching the meaning or structure, which was an additional teaching challenge.

The Tutor explained that their concern was concern about the children ‘getting it right’ and whether the children ‘understand it.’ To illustrate the complexity of reading in a visual form the Tutor directed the teachers to their text to a diagram that showed how: semantics, syntax, visual information and phonological information were all connected with each other. However the Tutor emphasised that ‘meaning’ was prioritised before, during and after reading; even though the teachers have no script for that.

The Tutor maintained the direction of the discussion when it dissipated into asides and different opinions. She referred back to the diagram in the teachers’ text and re-
focused on the first teacher and her main question: ‘How do I help him make links?’ The Tutor summarised the answer for the reading: ‘The suggestion is that he be able to link language and then the prediction of meaning and then he can his links (to the visual information).’ The Tutor also maintained the direction of the discussion when the teachers could not get themselves to ‘examples’ from the lesson to share with the teacher who had taught: ‘How about this? Link to words you know that sound the same’. The Tutor explained that classroom teachers might say: ‘if you can write this (giving and example) you can write this (the analogous example)’ but that children could not necessarily remember those links. The teaching in RR was for child independence in this way: the child was to think ‘here is a difficult word that I want to know (write)’ and to think further: ‘do I know a word that sounds like that?’

The Tutor had to maintain the direction of the discussion as the teachers turned their attention from one lesson to the next and redirect a teacher who started the discussion with her own idea of the lesson discussion, with: ‘I am trying to get to what Jade was saying…everything that comes from your teaching comes from within you.’ The teacher interpreted this as: ‘You teach what you know, that’s it. Sorry.’

The Tutor shaped the teacher’s knowledge of what to teach at higher levels. The teacher expressed that she taught what she did (from lower levels of learning) because she did not know what to do: ‘what am I to do then?’

The Tutor re-directed to the teachers to explain about the use of structures, with a reminder to get the teachers’ minds to the examples to discuss: ‘what about the other part? The first book. She had difficulty saying it.’ This directed the teachers to share with each other with examples (context).

The Tutor redirected to what went well in the reading. This gave the teachers a measure of ‘what was good’ and therefore to be expected. She further enlisted a teacher to explain another point of the lesson discussion: ‘OK for now’ and had them explain to each other.

The Tutor re-directed the discussion to the writing in the second lesson with an example that the teachers could replay for the teacher who taught, however the Tutor
lifted the discussion to the topic of ‘we teach for what we attend to’ and that in RR
the teacher would not have a pre-determined focus if she was to be ‘flexible’ and
responsive to the child. A teacher commented: ‘I think it’s that you’re missing
opportunities because you’re focused on one spot and you’ve actually missed it.’

1 b)

What are the major characteristics of the teachers’ social interaction that
unfold during a RR session and how are they orchestrated by the Tutor?

The Introductory Discussion

The major characteristics of the teachers in Session Sixteen were to be responsive to
the series of questions that were asked by the Tutor. The Tutor orchestrated these
around the stated theme for the session which was ‘teacher learning and child
learning’ and that the teachers were to be ‘observant, tentative and flexible’. The
Tutor unpicked the teachers’ understandings of observation: what it meant to them;
what they could observe; if all that they did was based on observation what did that
mean to them and what would they be thinking as they were observing. The Tutor
turned the direction to explore what the teachers’ aim was when they taught, which
was that the children would be successful, which would influence their observations.

The Tutor then unpicked the teachers’ understandings of what enabled them to be
‘flexible’ in their teaching, which they said involved a good understanding of the
literacy activities and an ability to change your mind at the moment for how the
lesson would go because: ‘you’ve always got an idea of something and if you see a
different behaviour or something different happens you have to be able to change
that.’ (Jade) The teachers’ acknowledged that because every child was different; and
one way of teaching would not work for every child; therefore they would have to be
‘tentative’.

The Tutor asked the teachers to unpick ‘tentativeness’ which they said was a
preparedness to change.
The Tutor referred the teachers to their text on ‘acceleration’ and said that this was critical in RR. Then she referred the teachers to a famous RR quote which was read aloud by a teacher:

‘Acceleration depends on how well the teacher selects the clearest and easiest and most memorable example to establish a new response, skill, principle or procedure’.

The Tutor asked the teachers to unpick the meaning of this quote. The teachers thought that it meant that from what the teacher did or said the child would be successful. The Tutor turned the ‘say’ into a ‘prompt’ and asked what else they thought of in terms of using ‘prompts’. The teachers thought it would mean that the child could act independently and that they would be linked to ‘strategic activities’ or how to’s (generative behaviours like searching and self-monitoring and self-correcting). The teachers said that ‘prompts’ were for child action, reminding them of what they already knew what to do.

The Tutor then asked the teachers what their challenges were in their teaching. One teacher thought it was missed opportunities in writing.

The Tutor re-directed the teachers’ knowledge to the meaning of co-construction in learning. They understood that the child was a constructor of his own learning based on his own experiences and the co-construction was how the teacher helped the child ‘make the most useful links, so there is a better way of looking at it and refining it.’ In terms of a Tutor example of her own teaching and child confusion the teachers agreed that if the teacher was not a co- constructor with the confused child he would return to his ‘old ways’

The teachers introduced their children to be taught. The first teacher talked about her ‘focus’ and the Tutor asked her to think about saying ‘I am thinking about’ instead of what her ‘focus’ was. The teacher explained her assumption about the child’s learning: which was that the child’s reading at a high level (Level 21) was working (integrated) but not ‘integrated’ all the time. Her attention in her introduction was to ‘looking at parts in words from left to right, although she acknowledged that his ability to ‘predict’ had deteriorated in the last few days.
The Tutor took the teachers to Clay’s definition of reading as a ‘message getting problem solving activity’ and explained the quote in more everyday terms, i.e. ‘that means’, concluding with asking the teachers again what the challenges were at the high book levels they were now having the children read. She acknowledged that the teacher said one ‘visual responses’ and asked what the other part was. The teachers came up with the meaning of the texts and vocabulary.

The second teacher introduced her child and the Tutor mentioning her challenges as ‘strong book introductions’ especially for ‘the structure coming up’ such as ‘how the direct speech is written.’ The Tutor reiterated the two areas of their challenge after this child introduction as the ‘visual response’ but there was also ‘meaning’ and ‘structure’, and that in RR the author could not give them a script for that. The success of the children depended on how the teacher and the child interacted.

**The Lesson Observations**

The main characteristic of the teachers’ social interactions during the lesson observations was verbalising their observations and interpretations of the teacher-child interaction behind the screen initiated and uninitiated by the Tutor:

**Lesson One:**

* Maria: I’m wondering if he’s getting any meaning out of that? It’s very monotone and I’m wondering if he understands it.
* Jade: It’s not phrased
* Mary-Lou: He’s attacking the word
* Diane: It’s word by word
* Maria: Not predicting.
* Jade: Going from the visual rather than thinking what the story is about.
* Tracey: He might be relying on visual because of the language.
* Tracey: It might be language or structure or he’s not familiar with it.
* Maria: There’s a lot of print on the page, it’s quite small.
* Jade: ‘you know what to do put your fingers on it’
* Diane: Break the word.
* Shelley: It’s gone to the teacher level rather than him listening to himself.
* Tracey: No meaning.
Diane: It has to meet my approval or my standard.
Shelley: To have rehearsed the structure.
Lara: Can it sound that way?
Mary-Lou: To be listening to himself to make sure he’s getting some meaning.
Jade: (Say) Make it sound like talking.
Mary-Lou: Did that make sense?
Diane: Perhaps the meaning of the book.
Tracey: Maybe scaffold on each page to get meaning for him.
Jade: This is the part where such and such happens.
Lara: I’m thinking, what am I going to do at the end of the book?
Shelley: If you need it you have to do it then.
Jade: Maybe go back to the start and prompt for the meaning very strongly so that he has the meaning from the start.
Lara; he won’t be independent.
Shelley: Yes, he’s getting through it.
Diane: ‘Machine’ Just tell him. It’s a running record, so she shouldn’t be interfering.
Mary-Lou: he’s going from left to right.
Diane: He’s trying to sound it out.
Mary-Lou: Keep going.
Diane: Put in a word.
Shelley: They’ll stop
Jade: They’ll lose meaning.
Maria: It’s too hard.
Maria: (What’s not in?) Phrasing and fluency at this level.
Mary-Lou: Looking at what he relates to.
Diane: Thinking about the introduction to storybooks.
Lara: He should monitor his own writing I think.
Maria: What do you know that sounds like that?
Shelley: Working from what they know.
Lara: The child needs to own that exercise.

The minor social characteristic of the teachers was to relate what they were observing to their own teaching and thinking about their own lessons:

Shelley: When I go to sound boxes they automatically go to letters.
Maria: They don’t know the sounds a lot of them.
Mary-Lou: Maybe I didn’t do enough of the counter work you know introducing what the boxes were and there was a box for every sound.
Lara: I think we assume things too. You know, we’ve done it once or twice. These children you can’t make these judgments about.
Maria: Say it’s ‘build’ or ‘something’ and they make a choice.
Shelley: I have been trying that and it gives them the most success.
Maria: Yes, you’re giving them the vocabulary.
Diane: Then they check it and come up with the right answer.
Shelley: Most times.
Maria: No but you give them the choice and he can make the choice.
Maria: The challenge for the teacher is to think of the other choice and that actually starts with that letter you know what I mean?
Lara: No, it doesn’t have to start with that letter. It’s what it could be.
Maria: Oh, alright. OK.

Lesson Two

This is repeated in the second lesson: the main characteristic of the teachers during the lesson observations was verbalising their observations and interpretations of the teacher-child interaction behind the screen initiated and uninitiated by the Tutor:

Shelley: She’s sounding good.
Mary-Lou: I think she’s reading for meaning because she’s putting good intonation in her voice.
Lara: And it sound natural.
Mary-Lou: She’s not expecting that end part.
Maria: The additional parts that come at that level.
Lara: I think she’s got the meaning of the story so it might be the structure.
Mary-Lou: It’s not language they would use either at this age.
Shelley: ‘She doesn’t like our school does she?’ and she says ‘doesn’t she’.
Maria: She didn’t read the punctuation there.
Mary-Lou: Yeah, but she stopped and she went back and she started ‘just then’, then she went to ‘she thought’ and kept going, she stopped and she went back to ‘she thought’.
Maria: She re-read it?
Lara: Would you say that if she’s correcting the intonation that’s a higher level because there wasn’t an error in any of the words, so she’s thinking about how it would sound herself?
Maria: She’s going for accuracy.
Diane: To practice at the pool you might say.
Lara: Or to practice their swimming.
Mary-Lou: I think she’s writing a lot.
Maria: She’s writing in pencil, is that OK?
Mary-Lou: You could infer that she’s getting her ready for the classroom.
Maria: I think that the child has an hypothesis of her own and she’s testing them out – this child – with what the teacher is telling her. She knows quite a bit.

Maria: She’s got the ‘gh’ and then the ‘ing’.

Mary-Lou: No. It was actually a ‘ph’. She got a ‘ph’ and Jade said ‘Oh, that’s very good but in this word it’s ‘gh’ because she got the ‘ph’ down.

Maria: She substitutes the word. She’s got meaning because the substitutions right.

Diane: That was probably a good way to introduce that structure too, rather than all at the beginning.

Maria: That’s a vocabulary thing. Shine. Past tense.

Maria: She thinks she does.

Shelley: She doesn’t stop.

Maria: She takes risks too

The minor social characteristics of the teachers were:

to relate what they were observing to their own teaching and thinking about their own lessons:

Lara: If you were to choose that would you go back and re-read it?
Lara: So, let’s look at this?

Shelley: I would assume that everyone would know that, correct punctuation.

Maria: But we don’t

Maria: But she didn’t know about commas did she?

Maria: It’s because you’re more experienced.

Maria: She (the child) thinks she does

to questioning of knowledge by the Tutor:

Mary-Lou: When it doesn’t make sense.
Shelley: The structure.

The Discussion
The main characteristic of the teachers’ social interactions in the discussion were orchestrated by the Tutor, that is to follow: the discussion format; the redirection to session ‘themes’ and to lesson observations.

The main difference was that the social interactions were less awkward than in the first and middle sessions; although there were moments of awkwardness, e.g. when a teacher did not follow the direction of the discussion or when a teacher gave ‘feedback’ to a teacher who taught without example. In most cases the teachers could easily summarise what they had observed and explain with example to be inclusive of the teacher who taught.

The teachers could express their reactions to their own teaching lessons in a reflective way, e.g. ‘I just don’t know what else to put in’ and ‘I wish I could just reach in and grab it (books) and show you that there are links you could make’. Jemma could explain her personal teaching theory to the group in a rationale way and accept the change to think of the ‘message getting’ focus of RR.

The teachers could explain how they came to the opinions they did to each other: ‘it was a trend’, and know how they formed them, linked to observations they could all identify with. They could also explain their own teaching with rationales and link their judgments about teacher effectiveness to child success.

The teachers showed that they were thoughtful in wondering about processing, e.g. Diane wondering about her fellow who could make a substitution the first time and re-read it properly without assistance when he re-reads it; and Jade surmising that it could be because it was the second review (they had seen it once already).

The teachers could get confused in agreeing what they had observed giving their examples for discussion and were extricated from their difficulty, which was a social difficulty when giving ‘feedback’ to another person, by the Tutor.

The teachers were more articulate about the examples of teaching they had observed to share some ‘replays’ with the teacher, who could then relate to the ‘feedback’ they were giving (three examples: ‘She doesn’t like our school does she?’ The sentence
ending with: ‘to practice’. And the phrase with the word substitution: ‘none of them for ‘neither of them’.)

The teacher who taught acknowledged that coming into the lesson with a pre-determined idea for teaching resulted in an example of where she ‘followed her own idea’ and did not follow the child’s observation of ‘commas in text writing. This was reiterated by another teacher who thought missed opportunities arose because teachers were focused on ‘one spot’.

In conclusion the main learning was leading in to flexibility in teaching responsiveness to children. The Tutor explained that flexibility in teacher interactions involved being a risk-taker yourself. A teacher commented on her learning thus:

As we are getting more experienced, well I’m more willing to take that challenge more, rather than when we were at the beginning, you...kept on the line and only wanted to get them from a to b in one piece.

APPENDIX M2: PRELIMINARY CODING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Raw data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category – input on learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you</td>
<td><em>Teacher</em>: Ah I think that that was probably the most valuable experience that we had, learning as a group throughout the year, and that same group continuously, <em>to get to know each other and trust each other and that</em>. It helps a lot. And … I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable. So even the lessons where you could see things weren’t going the right way, I think that was very valuable too because <em>you can then look at your own teaching, like that</em>. And, you know, maybe <em>see why some of your lessons don’t go the right way</em>. Or that you don’t get the outcomes that you’re looking for.</td>
<td>The teacher thought that observation at the screen was the most valuable experience and the continuity of the group membership helped for a context of trust. The teacher thought that observing at the screen precipitated comparing of oneself self with others or a self-reflective practice that is between the present and the past (–recursive) The teacher thought that observing at the screen precipitated self awareness that opens the learner up to involving the actions of others in her learning.</td>
<td>Trust in the relationship. Reflection Co-construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And to see very good teaching behind the screen is also important and also very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading.

Tutor:
Can you think about the group setting and the group dialogue when you were watching the lessons, how did that help your learning?

Teacher:
Ah right!
Yeah that helps because if... just makes you clue into what other people are saying.

So, you know other aspects of ...you might be looking at something and saying “Oh, this kid hasn’t got enough visual [information] ’, but someone else will say ‘Oh, I think this child, you know, is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect

The teacher thought that observing at the screen precipitated an awareness of quality in others in comparison with self and this shows the learner the way forward – to self improvement.

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen draws teacher attention to other points of view (the other/s) a sense of co-construction

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen brings the another perspective to think about.

Shifting the ZPD.

Co-construction

Co-construction
So there’s no point really watching a lesson behind the screen unless you’ve got that conversation going because… you’re not really going… you need to discuss it to learn don’t you? You need to… Well, I think you need to discuss your observations with other people… because their observations might be totally different.

The teacher thought that the discussion at the screen makes the learner aware that there are multiple perspectives (understandings) of the meaning of an observation (event).

Q2. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the discussion following the teaching?

Teacher: Um… I guess it, it… that like it just concreted what was said behind the screen while the person was teaching and the fact that in the group you did feel like you needed to let everybody have a say as well as you had to add. I think that that was probably a better lesson… you weren’t just sitting there and listening …

The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching revisited ideas in the same session and it sets the prior observation and dialogue in the mind of the learner. Dialogue enriches observation and both are enriched by further discussion.

The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching in the group learning involved sharing. It is a process of taking turns, adding to the conversation and being aware of the opinions of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-construction</th>
<th>Setting in the mind</th>
<th>Self development as a learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether you wanted to or <strong>not you had to put in your opinion</strong> and put in <strong>what your observations were or what you thought</strong>, and I think that’s very valuable,</td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching was a time when there was an expectation that everyone would express their opinion and be active rather than passive in their learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because <strong>some people from the group would sit back and not say anything</strong> if they were allowed to.</td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching non-participation was not permitted by the tutor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s good to be forced to talk to the group</strong>… as well as some people would probably just talk non-stop … so it works both ways. I think <strong>that was very obvious from the start of our training</strong>.</td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching role of the tutor was to require everyone to speak in order to create a dynamic of speaking and listening and this expectation was started from the beginning of the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That the group thing was about listening as well as</strong> … <strong>what your</strong></td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion Co-construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And how did it help your learning?</td>
<td>Um… I guess it made realise that … or I think I already knew that … it made me realise that you can… how much you can learn from other people. So, for my learning it just kind of… I guess it would have extended it. I do think that I know that you learn from other people … but because of that situation and because it was so regular… you know going into those Tuesday meetings…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>following the teaching the group learning required that participants take speaking and listening roles.</td>
<td>The teacher thought the in discussion following the teaching made the teacher realize much you can learn from others – self awareness of the resource of others. The teacher thought the in discussion following the teaching extended her understandings. The teacher thought the in discussion following the teaching the continuity of the meetings build the group dynamic – it allowed for continuity of learning in the same relationships.</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it was very encouraging because you knew you were going to come out with something else, or something new. So I think, you know, just that fact that um… that you knew that there was more coming … each week … I think … and that something different was to come every time.

And the group dynamic in that particular group was very open and honest. And there was a lot of trust there.

You know no-one would feel intimidated or … whatever… So…

Tutor: OK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of teaching for your peers?</th>
<th>Teacher: (pause) Um… how it made (pause)…?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor: What you learnt when you taught for your peers behind the screen?</td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching were encouraging because you would learn something new each time – sense of building knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher thought the discussion following the teaching was in a context of trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher thought that in the discussion following the teaching no member felt intimidated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher:
Um … I learnt that you can only do what you can do (laughs). So … I learnt that you just have to do your lesson exactly the same.
And um… just be very open-minded that you know that your teaching is for their benefit as well as your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen you can only do what you are capable of. (Self validation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self development as a learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the learner has to act authentically and know that the demonstration of teaching is for their learning as well as your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the teacher had to be open-minded in her learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self development as a learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the teacher needed feedback from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-construction-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And <strong>you need to want that feedback</strong>, because… you’ve got to be open to it otherwise…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think <strong>you’ve got to be open to the idea that you probably didn’t do everything right</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean <strong>everybody knows that they’re not doing the whole lesson correctly</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the learner should want the group feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the learner should be open to the idea that she probably did not do everything right (the would be criticism).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen the teacher should be aware that the group knows that the teacher is not doing everything correctly (there is | }
And in that way that helped me because I was, I think I was, or had been, and still are... very open to the idea of somebody... **I like people telling me that you could have done better.**

The first time I didn’t actually enjoy teaching behind the screen but after that initial one I did. I did actually look forward to teaching behind the screen because I knew something much bigger was coming afterwards.

So I liked the feedback and... just that ability to show... or just that, sorry, opportunity to show, ‘this is what I’m doing’ and ‘what do all you people think?’ ‘What does it look like from the outside?’

You know it’s the same as videoing yourself teaching is very valuable... it’s a similar experience... because... not that you got to watch yourself... but with other people watching they told you what their observations were. So I thought that was very valuable.

The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen she liked learning how to teach better.

The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen she did not like it the first time but she did when she knew how the feedback would help her teaching.

The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen is an opportunity to show others how you are teaching and get their opinion of your teaching.

The teacher thought that in teaching for your peers behind the screen was valuable because the group members told you what their observations going to be criticism).

Self development as a learner.

Self development as a learner.

Co-construction

Co-construction
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Q4. Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of how this influenced your teaching the next day?

**Teacher:**
Mmm…um… I think it was very motivating actually, because I know that every time after going behind the screen, the next day you would, I would, just want to do it better, you know, and I know that I could improve and know that there were simple steps to…um…that the feedback coming in was ‘just as long as you do this this’ll work and if you extend that part of the lesson or if you go further with that idea, then you can improve’;
So, it’s very positive.

The learning from the group session helped the teacher the next day by motivating her to want to teach better.

The feedback from the group session to work on aspects or extend aspects of her teaching helped her improve her teaching.

The teacher thinks that the group learning from the session has a positive influence on her teaching the next day because it helps you to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor:</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self development as a learner

Shifting the ZPD

Shifting the ZPD
You didn’t sort of walk away… or I didn’t walk away from teaching behind the screen thinking you know ‘I can’t do this’, which you know, like with the kids, I think the teacher just has to believe that they can learn.

So it gave you the sense that ‘OK, you’re on the right track for where you’re heading so you can get better’.

So, I think motivating the next day and the next week. It just kind of lifted you and pushed you further.

**Q5. Think about me working with you at the school. How did you get the most out of this kind of learning?**

**Teacher:**
I think probably the most… that bigger thing was that… um …I think as teachers you get this idea of, especially when you’ve been with one student for a long time, this idea of what, where the problems are and where you’re going, and you coming in, a lot of the times for me, it just improve.

The teacher thinks that learning from the group learning from the session is based on a belief that you can learn.

The teacher thinks that the group learning from the session gives the teacher a sense of direction to improve her teaching the next day.

The teacher thinks that the group learning from the session lifts and pushes the teacher further the next day gives the teacher a sense of direction to improve her teaching.

**Self development as a learner**

**Shifting the ZPD**

**Scaffolding**
showed me that I was probably pushing the wrong aspect. For example, you know with one of the students I just kept going to the visual [information] and thinking that he couldn’t break the words and all this sort of stuff and just you know within a few minutes you probably realised ‘no, it’s the meaning’. So it just me aware that my prompts in that case should have been totally... were on the wrong track.

So I think that the most helpful thing is just that constructive criticism after the lesson. That’s what helps me is...To say this is the part that’s going well but... you can do this right... or shall we do this right? But yeah... just the ideas that came out of it afterwards.

This is what you’re prompting but you should be going in this direction with this child.

Because it just um... how can I say it... it just ah...kind of wakes you up a bit.

You know, you’re going on this track with this child and you’re thinking ‘I’m doing the right thing, I’m doing the right thing’ and ‘we’re going OK’ but when you come in and you say ‘well why don’t you try this?’ have a fixed idea or path of teaching when they are with a student for an extended period of time.

The teacher thinks that the feedback and constructive criticism from the tutor was helpful for her learning because it gave direction.

The teacher thinks that the feedback and constructive criticism from the tutor made her aware of her teaching.

The teacher thinks that the tutor feedback offers alternatives to what she is doing in her teaching.
and you try it the next day *and it works* and *then* it sets you on a different path.

So, it just wakes you up to the fact that just because you’ve been teaching him the whole time just mean that you’ve got the right idea or … it doesn’t mean that just because you’ve been teaching them all that time and you’ve done the assessments that the road that you’re heading down with that student is the right road for the student all the time.

So **going back to** that diversity and… um… I guess that **flexibility**…

of just that because that worked for one week doesn’t mean it’s working next week.

You know what I mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. Can you think of anything else that could have been useful for you?</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Scaffolding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Um… with your visit here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tutor:**
Mmm

**Teacher:**
I haven’t thought about that.
Not really, unless **maybe watching you teach a little bit more**.
Or maybe watching you teach our students for a little bit afterwards…which you did do on one occasion with one of my students.
So maybe if we if we taught the half hour lesson and **then you taught the weakest part** of the lesson?

Or, what you thought was the weakest, and then **showed us how it should be done**… or showed us some ideas for working with this student, which just goes back to the observation, I guess, of how the teacher’s teaching.

**Tutor:**
And explain how that would help you in your learning.

**Teacher:**
I think just the demonstration.

**I know myself if something’s demonstrated to me I learn it much quicker**.

The teacher thinks that observing the tutor teach more would be useful for her teaching and makes suggestions as to how the tutor could do this, e.g. teach the weakest part of the lesson, which she acknowledges did happen for one of her students.

The teacher thinks that observing the tutor teach more would be useful for her teaching would show her how to teach an aspect of the lesson.

The teacher thinks that observing the Self development of the learner

Scaffolding

Self development as a learner
than talking about it.

And it would just kind of concrete it… that this child could do better if you were doing something different...

which it did that time when you took one of my students. It was a difficult student and it showed me what to do with her to get her fluency. It just made me believe… oh, this child can do it, if I just put in something different. Yeah.

Tutor: OK

Q7. Did you discuss your learning in RR with other people

Teacher: In group or out of the group?

The teacher spoke with others about her learning outside sessions: ex RR

tutor teach more would be useful for her learning because she thinks that she learns more quickly by demonstration that by talking.

The teacher thinks that observing the tutor teach more would be useful for her learning because it would set it more in her mind that the student could improve if she changed her practices.

The teacher thinks that observing the tutor teach more, as she did with one of her difficult students, would not only show her how to improve the student learning but believe that it can be improved.

Setting in the mind

Scaffolding & self development as a learner
outside the session? Explain.

**Tutor:**
With other people… when you left an in-service session, were you discussing your learning?

**Teacher:**
Oh, OK… just anyone?
Yes, a lot.
I was discussing it with some of the staff at school, but usually the Reading Recovery or the Year 1 teachers.
And discussing it with other trained Reading Recovery teachers who are now back in the classroom and doing Reading Recovery, because there’s a couple of teachers that do that. Probably just discussing what we had done and also checking if I was on the right track or asking for specific advice with certain things, and I’ve discussed a lot in my other life which is violin teaching.

I’ve discussed it a lot with Suzuki teachers and parents of my violin students, because there’s a lot of similar aspects between Reading Recovery teaching and Suzuki teaching. The philosophy is very similar.

**Tutor:**
Just elaborate on that.

teachers and the parents of her Suzuki violin students.

The teacher spoke with ex RR teachers about her learning so far, checked with them if she was on the right track in her learning and sort their advice.

The teacher made her personal links between her new learning in RR and her music teaching.

Self development as a learner

Self development as a learner
**Teacher:**
For example with Suzuki teaching the parents will always come in.
They are interested in how their children learn.
And so I guess I’ve just discussed a lot while in Reading Recovery… we
do this when children learn to read, this is what happens and probably
just tried to say that when they learn to read they do this so when they’re
learning an instrument you know it’s like another language so it’s very
very similar.
So probably just giving the parents overall an idea of how children learn.

**Tutor:**
Now, it you are thinking about your learning what did talking to other
people in your school how did that help your learning?

**Teacher:**
Oh, OK.
Um… it probably just um… gave me more confidence I suppose with my
own teaching… in talking to other people and realising that yes they [the
teachers] have the same issues or they [the children] do the same thing in
their classroom or that they’ve [the teachers] encountered it before.
The teacher gained confidence in her RR teaching abilities when she
realized that other ex RR teachers at her school had the same issues when

---

Co-construction
So probably **discussion if anything is helpful because it makes you think about it a little bit more.**

So I think **it made me think what am I asking first**, when I’m going to these teachers, what am I going to discuss with her, **what am I wanting?**

And then the feedback…

And then afterwards… **I’ll maybe go back to the book and read that part again** because a lot of it was, **a lot of the advice that came back was, oh there’s part in the book,** you know, that says how to accelerate students, or yeah…

**it did help in the way that it reminded me just to go back to the book.** because it’s probably all…most of its written there. I mean all of its written there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>teaching the students she is teaching on RR.</th>
<th>The teacher thought that talking with other ex RR teachers at her school made her think more about the students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-construction</td>
<td>Co-construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher thought that when she talked to other ex RR teachers in the school she had to plan what she was going to ask and what she wanted in terms of feedback.

The teacher thought that when she talked to other ex RR teachers in the school they would refer her to sections in her RR texts.

The teacher thought that when she talked to other ex RR teachers in the school was helpful because they
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Reminded her to read the RR texts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q8. When you learn you know that you think about things, analyze things and you also have some feelings. Tell me, how did you feel during discussions at the screen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Emotive response to RR training – observing at the screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Scaffolding Reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher: When watching… the other people?

Tutor: Yeah

Teacher: Sometimes I felt a little bit frustrated um… and that … I felt that sometimes I couldn’t watch what I wanted to watch because we were discussing… but at the same time you have to do that at the same time… so sometimes I’d just want to be just watching the lesson … but the discussion was sort of already going along… which had to happen. I can see why that has to happen… it would be good to make a video so you’d be able to go back over it… but, it doesn’t…

Um… it made me feel a bit nervous sometimes I think … Just … sometimes watching people, that were doing, you know obviously doing a really good job and… I guess that makes you feel a bit nervous about your own teaching.

Um … Oh, you know, something I should be doing that I haven’t been
…just that… it really brings home… that, you know, this person’s doing that and that’s working…

and then suddenly **you think about your own teaching** and … it sort of makes it feel a bit… oh, I better start doing that tomorrow.

So, um… so they’re the negatives… oh, sort of negatives, really. And also **it is exciting to see from the outside … what’s happening**

… especially when a student is introduced and they’ve come on at a certain level and **you can see what they’re doing now ten weeks later**. I think that’s **very encouraging** whether it’s your student or not.

Tutor:
OK.

---

**Q9. How did you feel during**

**Teacher:**

---

**doing** and was not (**reflection present to past**) doing **and was not** (**reflection present to past**)

When observing and discussing lessons at the screen the teacher felt **motivated** to change her actions the next day on the basis of her reflection on what she was not doing.

When observing and discussion lessons at the screen the teacher felt **excitement** observing someone else’s teaching.

When observing and discussion lessons at the screen the teacher felt **encouraged** when she could observe change in the student’s learning a short time.

**Learner characteristic - emotion**

**Co-construction**

**Shift in the ZPD**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussions of lessons after the observations?</th>
<th>Um…</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Self development as a learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually quite confident to ask questions… I think…um</td>
<td>Sometimes I used to sit there thinking … I would have an idea in my head or a question or whatever and think … I’d think oh no everyone’s going off on a different path so I wouldn’t ask … um but usually, especially because of the discussion behind the screen, you’d feel quite confident that … you know, what’s being discussed, so we could continue discussing it afterwards… um (pause)</td>
<td>Emotive response to RR training – discussing after the observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>How would describe how you felt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Um … probably, probably a little hesitant … I think… yeah. I wouldn’t say that I … yeah. I didn’t feel oh look I know all the answers, what you’re supposed to be doing is right or wrong or whatever… Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher felt confident to ask questions the about what had been observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher felt that she needed to conform to the group direction of the discussion and hold back with different questions</td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher felt hesitation as she waited to see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
…um… I definitely think I waited for the discussion to start first to see where it was going.

And probably just… yeah… felt off a bit, a bit hesitant … when I shouldn’t comment … and what I should comment on … because…

I think it’s because sometimes I would think something and then, you know, the discussion would go somewhere else… and then I’d realise oh, no I’m on the wrong track or

… so I’d move on.

<p>| how the direction of the discussion was going before joined in. | Self development as a learner |
| When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher felt hesitation about what she should and should not comment on. | Awareness |
| When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher felt hesitation the group discussion would change direction and she would realize that her thoughts were not following the group discussion. | Scaffolding |
| When discussing the lessons after the observations at the screen the teacher shifted her thinking in the same direction as the group’s when she was aware of their direction. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. How did you feel during your discussions with the Tutor on school visits?</th>
<th><strong>Teacher:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Um… they’re good because I knew what I had taught … and I normally um… how the lesson had gone well or badly or … yeah, I guess just because it was my lesson and it was just me… um… I knew I could take that conversation wherever I wanted, so I felt very confident and… well, just more confident probably. Not, not because the group discussion is um… not so much intimidating or not because people aren’t easy to talk to, but just because you feel you’ve got a bit more focus because its about your lesson… yeah, probably just more confident to … to… direct the discussion and ask questions.</td>
<td><strong>Emotive response to RR training – during discussions with the tutor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When discussing with the tutor on tutor visits the teacher felt more confident than she felt in group discussions. This is because she felt that she was in control - she had taught the lesson, she was focused and felt more able to direct the discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11. Tell me one major insight you gained in this year of training in RR.</th>
<th><strong>Teacher:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Um… (long pause)</td>
<td><strong>Self development as a learner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the biggest ones… was probably that … just how it was potentially the input you put in and… that by giving the wrong input you can throw the child… so that was probably just one of the biggest things…</td>
<td><strong>Major insight:</strong> The importance of the teacher input and teacher expectations for the learner to catch-up in Reading Recovery has been clarified in her mind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’ve always known that teaching input is important but, um … it made really clear why, in a classroom setting, these children hadn’t gone with the rest of the group and weren’t in the right level in Year 1 because they just hadn’t heard the right words and they just hadn’t had the right teacher input, I think… and they’re often the sort of children who will look around if they get the chance in the group setting… um, yeah, they get lost.

And also they’re going from how important the teacher input is and how important our expectations are … for each child … it also brings the realisation that if they … often if they can catch up and if they confident, then they will go back into that group setting and continue to achieve because they have that groundwork.

Q12. When you come to teach the next day or even maybe later on, or when you have a tricky situation, do you feel that what was discussed in the group, or with the tutor, or what you read in your texts comes to your mind?

**Teacher:**
Definitely, yes.

**Tutor:**
Elaborate of that.

**Teacher:**
Yes, well I guess from all the discussions that we had, and all the

The teacher had the realisation that teacher input and expectations impact on whether students will go back to the class and continue to learn (because they have the groundwork.)

| What comes to mind in the problematic event |

When the teacher has a tricky situation, they will go back into the group setting and continue to achieve. Self development as a learner.
feedback as well as all the reading it is kind of like a reminder that there is an answer to everything … in Reading Recovery there is a way to do it and think

you’ve got to have that expectation of yourself and expectation of the lesson series that you are going to achieve that level that you set out to achieve… um … if you keep going back to the conversations that you’ve had and you keep going back to the book and keep up your reading and keep up your own professional development. Yeah, I would feel very confident in knowing that there’s a way ….

those voices saying… um… you know just like the prompts even coming into your head …

and going to the text… I think going to the text wasn’t as clear to me at the start of the year as it is now. So, I went into Reading Recovery situation she is guided by the understanding that there is an answer to the problem, a way to act and think.

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by her expectations of herself as a learner that she can achieve what she has set out to if she goes back in her mind to the conversations she has had with others and the RR texts.

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by the wording of the prompts that come into her head - internalized language. The co-construction of learning comes back to her mind.

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by
thinking oh yes you read this and it’ll give you a few clues but it’s not just that it’s going back to it and re-reading and it’s looking at it, looking at the main chapter but thinking about different students also helps… you know your focus what you need to get for the students and then in reading certain parts of the book again and again does help.

Tutor:
So you tell me about the voices… what it is that comes to your mind.

Teacher:
Oh (laughs)
Um… when you get to a difficult situation?

Tutor:
Yes, if you’re in a tricky situation what is it that comes to your mind?

Teacher:
Um… probably the voices behind the screen… so understanding that the RR texts are a resource which she did not understand at the beginning of the course. The co-construction is with the author on the basis of knowledge. When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by understanding that the RR texts are a resource that you use thinking about individual students and their learning needs

Co-construction
Tutor:
So you hear teacher’s voices?

Teacher:
I think so, yeah and yours’…

I guess when I’m teaching sometimes I kind of think now if Catheryn was watching me or if um …I was behind the screen in this situation and the lesson wasn’t going well or whatever, what would they be saying?

What can I picture them behind the screen saying? Because when you are behind the screen you are thinking what are they saying behind there? And I think that’s helpful to sometimes put yourself in that situation in your own room and hear those voices… yelling out prompts or yelling out ‘it’s not about the visual’ you know, ‘it’s about the meaning’ or… yeah I think you can kind of imagine what people would say in that situation… but only because I’ve been on the other side in the conversation… watching other people… you know the discussion that goes on… you know what they’re looking for…

I think probably the main voice is yours and then um… because we’ve had to do that, you know someone starts the conversation and then someone carries on the conversation… that’s kind of helpful in your own teaching I think, because you think what would they say?

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by reconstructing her learning experiences and taking the position of the other person which she says she can only do because she has had experience teaching behind the screen and observing others teaching.

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by reconstructing her learning experiences and the tutor’s voice is
And then where would that go? Now what would they say?

Oh they’d say I’m not prompting for meaning or he doesn’t understand the text or he doesn’t understand the structure … but then also what would they say after that? Pointing out the possibilities of the answers to it… so… yeah probably …just answering behind the screen … and the voices in your head.

When the teacher has a tricky situation she is guided by reconstructing her learning experiences and imagining and searching through the possibilities of what others would say.

[Note: what comes to mind is the situation and the structure of the language interaction]
**Tutor:**
You will not have as many group meetings. You will not have Tutor visits. So what do you think will mainly guide or influence your teaching?

**Teacher:**
Um, probably… the fact that I will go back to the book… um… and I think I really known from my Suzuki teaching and my teacher training that it doesn’t matter how well you think you’re doing it there’s always a better way and that you have to keep learning.

Um… because I’ve been doing Suzuki teacher training for ten years and it’s so similar in this on-going professional development and the on-going teacher training it just… I just know myself that it doesn’t matter if you’ve been teaching for ten years there’s still a better way to do it.

So, I think I’ll probably keep reading the book, go back to the books and also just keep up the discussion with other teachers in the school.

But I also think, knowing about the cluster visits now that they’ll be very

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the teacher works independently in the field her thinking will be guided by reading the RR texts (the co-construction then continues with the author)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self development as a learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the teacher works independently in the field she will be guided by knowing that teaching can always be improved upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the teacher works independently in the field her thinking will be guided by her discussions with keeping up the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
valuable probably the most valuable thing next year will be… once
we’ve finished the training… is going to be those cluster visits.

And I think talking to people that are doing the same job at the same
time, um … is the most important thing. Sometimes talking to the
classroom teachers, even though they’ve trained in Reading Recovery,
they are now classroom teachers.

Q14. In this course you have observed teaching with the
group, discussed teaching in a
group, read texts, you have had tutor visits, how important was it
for you to learn with other people?

Teacher:
Oh… the most important thing I think is to learn with other people
because you get their ideas and you get their feedback and that… that’s
important…that’s what it’s all about.

I think I would be a totally different teacher if I wasn’t learning with a
group. You can’t… I just don’t think it makes for good teaching… in the
same way that classroom teachers… you know… classroom teachers that
never go to in-services they don’t have that … um … idea that this is all

conversation with other (ex RR )
teachers at her school and by other
organized RR teacher interactions.

When the teacher works
independently in the field her
thinking will be guided by her belief
that it is important to keep talking
with people who do the same work
that you do.

Co-construction

The teacher thinks that it is important
to learn with other people because
you share ideas and get feedback for
your own teaching.

Co-construction

The teacher thinks that it is important
to learn with other people because
improvement in teaching comes from
having feedback.

Shifting the ZPD
community… I don’t think develops. **You don’t become a better teacher by yourself**… you have to have… **it depends on that discussion**… you have to have feedback … that isn’t always …

I think that’s very helpful… to have **constructive criticism** and **also to have discussion** about somebody else’s teaching …

it’s a different pressure [constructive criticism] you can just discuss what you do, your observations… so… probably the most important thing in any sort of teaching, or any sort of learning is that group dynamic.

**Tutor:**
Thank you.

| Tutor: Thank you. |
| The teacher thinks that it is important to learn with other people because you can not only have feedback for yourself but you can also observe the teaching of others |
| Co-construction |
Emerging themes – Question

Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the observations of two lessons at the screen?

Theme: Co-construction

Categories: Co-construction

- **Learning from observing how the other interacted with the child**

Well it worked because I was able to watch what other people were doing and listen to what they were doing… but also watch how they interacted with the child and how they were using what they were learning in the RR group and through their reading, and applying that. B

OK, in the group setting, in terms of observing the lessons, I found it very helpful to see two things. First at the very beginning it was good to see other people make mistakes that I had made Je

and towards the end it was really interesting to see how they responded to the children and made an attempt to be flexible and that helped me with ideas and um… confidence too, that sometimes you don’t always get it right. Je

and to see whether what the focus of the teacher behind the screen, or what they had talked about married with what we were observing from the child as well. L

- **Learning through group dialogue**

  - Cluing into what others are saying and interpreting and getting feedback about your own thinking

Yeah that helps because it… just makes you clue into what other people are saying. So, you know other aspects of …you might be looking at something and saying “Oh, this kid hasn’t got enough visual [information] ”, but someone else will say ‘Oh, I think this child, you know, is being prompted the wrong way’ or whatever, so it just brings the other aspect to think about. J
So there’s no point really watching a lesson behind the screen unless you’ve got that conversation going because… you’re not really going …you need to discuss it to learn don’t you? You need to…Well, I think you need to discuss your observations with other people…because their observations might be totally different. J

Um, well it was an opportunity to observe someone in real time, with the group, so we were able to make comments as we observed the lesson. It was a good way of bouncing your ideas, so you could verbalise what you thought you were seeing and to see whether the group felt the same way or whether they saw a different aspect or saw something else, L.

So it was just a good, yeah, a good experience to you know, observe in real time, have an opportunity to voice your own opinions and then be able to get feedback from your peers as to whether what you were seeing was really happening, yeah, L.

- **Bringing to your attention what you have not thought about before**

  Oh, alright. OK. Um, well it sort of brings things forward for you, in your mind that you maybe haven’t thought of before, and makes it so you’re seeing something in action and you’re talking about it rather than just looking. Mar

  Um I think that the group helped me see points, or the discussion around with the group, helped me see points that I wasn’t aware of before or I hadn’t actually observed, um or taken notice of … Mar

  and then also having you know the tutor there to sort of direct the conversation and to draw your attention to other things that perhaps you may have missed, that were important, or relevant, or that showed a bit of insight as to what was happening with that child. L

  The group I think helped me focus a lot on particular aspects…um… like working with the child to make meaning, which we have been working on. That was really helpful because I was trying to go all over the ship and trying to do everything at once… and they focused my thinking for the next day, on one aspect, rather than trying to do everything on one lesson which I was trying to do. So I found that really beneficial because they really focused me. Je

- **Learning through building on ideas of group members**

  With the discussion that was going on while the teachers were working it was really um… it was nice to focus on one area and be able to just unpick that and make comments even if they weren’t …correct, it was okay, everyone would pitch in and build on ideas, and I found that very helpful. I didn’t like being on the other side but … the discussion was really helpful to me. Je
Learning through talking about the common experience

and I think you can participate more in the discussion by having done a similar thing or even on the opposite end of doing something totally different.

I think you can participate more in the discussion by having done a similar thing or even on the opposite end of doing something totally different and being able to bring that back together and just the whole group’s perspective and experiences.

Learning through what others think

um where… and also clarify my observations to make sure that what I was observing was what I should be observing or was it like an accurate direction of where I was to observe or what I was looking at …um…and to clarify my understanding of a particular point through what other people sort of had input to. Mar

Theme: Comparing Oneself with Others

Categories: Comparing Oneself with Others

Learning Through Identifying and evaluating oneself against what the other person is doing

And I was able to also personalize it and see… reflect on what I was doing. So I could see myself in what the other person was doing. Or I could see myself in what they were doing or weren’t doing. So I could see what I was doing or not doing. So I found that really valuable to be able to watch someone doing something and following it through. And I could observe myself in a way. I could personalize it. So I found that really valuable.

Well what I found was that when I looked at the two teachers I wasn’t really conscious in the end of about what they were doing. I looked at what they were doing and thought what am I doing? And whatever actions they did or didn’t do made me reflect on what I do and what I don’t do?

And … I found watching people behind the screen, whether they did the right thing or not was valuable. So even the lessons where you could see things weren’t going the right way, I think that was very valuable too because you can then look at your own teaching. like that. And, you know, maybe see why some of your lessons don’t go the right way. Or that you don’t get the outcomes that you’re
looking for. And to see very good teaching behind the screen is also important and also very valuable because that’s where you need to be heading. J

Well, in my head I was sort of was going through what I would do in that situation and ticking off the pluses and the minuses. Mar

and you sort of then look at your own lesson and you think were you doing it the right way and if not then you come back [to school] and you correct yourself. Mau

So it’s like… you’re very critical of your own teaching while you’re watching it … because …you just wonder and you see I’ve done that and that’s not right… so I come back and change my way of teaching then. So I find it very useful the behind the screen observations of lessons, in that respect. Mau

Yes I did that, no I don’t do that, and that’s something that I should do. So that’s how that helped. Mar

I think it helps you to sit back first of all I suppose and see if one of the practices that the teacher has done you’ve done as well. It brings it back to your own experience. T

Theme: Trust in the relationship

Categories: Trust in the relationship

- Learning with the same group

Ah I think that that was probably the most valuable experience that we had, learning as a group throughout the year, and that same group continuously, to get to know each other and trust each other and that. It helps a lot. J

- Learning with a group that is there to ‘get you through’

And it was nice to know that you know, you make mistakes, of course, when you’re learning new things and people were there to help and to … to get you through… and be the best person you can be. Je

Theme: Internalisation
Categories: Internalisation

- **Learning through linking knowledge and experience**

  Oh yes, um…no, that was good because it made me think quickly…I had to think of things, and I guess it was like with the children, to make links, that we’re making links from the text, to your brain, to the lesson, to what people are saying. So, I think it helped clarify a lot of things. Shel

- **Learning to ‘set things in your mind’**

  Well it brings it forward in your mind if you can verbalise it I guess, when you’re watching it it’s like watching television and you’re talking to someone when you’re watching television about something what’s going on. It sort of puts it more concrete in your mind. Mar

---

Theme: Scaffolding

Categories: Scaffolding

- **Shaping the performance**

  Well I find that it helps me when we are talking on the other side of the screen about how the lesson’s going because then we know what to do and what not to do …Mau
**Emerging themes - Question**

Can you explain how your learning in the group setting worked for you in terms of the discussion following the teaching?

**FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION**

**Theme: Co-construction**

**Categories: Co-construction**

- *Learning through linking what you have seen and discussed in the group, to guiding texts (artifacts), to your own experience*

Well I don’t think it would have worked as well if we didn’t have the discussion following the teaching because it wasn’t being critical of what the person was doing behind the screen. It was looking at what they could have done, what they should have done, what they did do. So, what worked, what didn’t work. Why it worked or why it didn’t work. And then we would refer back to the text. So we would find that support. So if we were facing the situation ourselves, which we do, we’d know where to go in the text to get support. B

- *Learning to understand the guiding texts (artifacts) through observed examples*

It was um… it was good to go back to the book…um, sometimes I had read things and they hadn’t sunk in and having the group discuss it really clarified um … my … my initial response to the text and it refined it again… and the group seemed to be all about that … really focusing my thinking and my learning in response to whatever the topic was for the day. Je

And I found that very useful. Um… made it more meaningful I think, because it was coming from the text, but related to what we had observed. Je

I think that a vital part of my learning was the discussion afterwards because it brought us back to the book um…and it brought us back to pages that I had already read in the book but sometimes didn’t quite understand, um …and through things that different people have said it actually made different points um… clearer, to me… Mar
and it sort of like …gave me a better understanding of …um what Marie was trying to say in the book by having a physical example, to say ‘oh okay that’s what she was talking about when she said that …particular point.’ Mar

Well I think no matter what the area was about, whether it was familiar reading or the writing, um… whatever we were discussing, you know, whether we should let the child make errors or we shouldn’t let them make errors, whatever it was, or prompting, um …I always learnt something for myself that I could go away and work on,’cause I think, as I said, when you see somebody else doing things it kind of um illustrates it for you, rather than just being somebody talking it to you or just reading the book. The book’s very helpful but when you actually see it in action it highlights what you should be doing or what needs to be done, for myself. D

The discussion was always good because we tried to pull out some relevant points from our observations behind the screen and then we were able to again like just talk and reflect about we’d seen in the lesson, but then go back to the text, and find in the book the relevant sections that supported or didn’t support what we were seeing that was happening. So, it confirmed some ideas in some ways and reinforced them. L

- Learning through contributing to the discussion and listening to others

the fact that in the group you did feel like you needed to let everybody have a say as well as you had to add, I think that that was probably a better lesson …you weren’t just sitting there and listening …. J

whether you wanted to or not you had to put in your opinion and put in what your observations were or what you thought, and I think that’s very valuable, because some people from the group would sit back and not say anything if they were allowed to. J

It’s good to be forced to talk to the group… as well as some people would probably just talk non-stop … so it works both ways. I think that was very obvious from the start of our training. That the group thing was about listening as well as …. what your thoughts were. J

you felt that whatever you said , if it was wrong, somebody would say ‘ Oh but Jen… you know… did you think about it this way? Or did you go to this part of the text? Je

Theme: Intersubjectivity and internalization

Categories: Intersubjectivity and internalization
• **Learning with a group extends your thinking**

I guess it made realise that … or I think I already knew that … it made me realise that you can… how much you can learn from other people. So, for my learning it just kind of… I guess it would have extended it. J

I do think that I know that you learn from other people … but because of that situation and because it was so regular… you know going into those Tuesday meetings…it was very encouraging because you knew *you were going to come out with something else, or something new*. So I think, you know, just that fact that um… that you knew that there was more coming …each week … I think …and that *something different was to come every time*. J

but all you felt whenever you said something was people going, ‘oh yes! But *have you thought about… a little bit further along? Or have you thought about that a bit more?*’ Always very comf—… not comforting! … very supportive Je

plus the group there’d usually be a *new idea brought up that I hadn’t even thought of*, so it just helps to extend your thinking. Shel

Once again it enables you to see, Ok that was a different way of doing something, why did the teachers do it like that, why did the student perhaps in react in that way, can *I take that back home with me, how can I do that with my own children?* T

• **Learning to ‘set things in your mind’**

Um….I guess it, it… that like it just *concreted what was said* behind the screen while the person was teaching …J

It helped me in that way because it um …I would be ticking off in my head points that I did while that person was teaching and then when we come to discuss it afterwards it helps to *solidify in your mind* more. Mar

**Theme: Clarification**

**Categories: Clarification**

• **Learning through discussion helps clarify what you are unsure of**

It helps you to clarify points that maybe you were talking about and *things that you weren’t sure of maybe.* [in the observations] Mar
Um… working with the group after observing two lessons at the screen helped to clarify things, things that we had picked up during the lesson Shel

**Theme: Self validation**

**Categories: Self validation**

- *Learning that helped to affirm thinking*

  it helped to affirm what I was thinking ...a lot of the time I was thinking things but sometimes...maybe not courageous enough to say it, but then when someone in the group would say it I’d think ‘okay, yes, I did think that’, so that helped to affirm...Shel

**Theme: Self Motivation**

**Categories: Self Motivation**

- *Willingness to take on board positive criticism*

  if there is something that needs to be changed with my teaching it’s always with a very positive way, you know... the positive criticism you might call it from the group, and I’m always glad to take it on board because we’re here to learn and I don’t mind positive criticism and the group is very supportive so I like that. Mau

**Theme: Trust in the relationship**

**Categories: Trust in the relationship**

- *Learning when you don’t feel intimidated or threatened*
And the group dynaShel in that particular group was very open and honest. And there was a lot of trust there. You know no-one would feel intimidated or … whatever… J

I liked the fact that um… we all got to say something and it was a non-threatening environment… it was very easy… it was easy to sit back and listen but it was just as easy to sit back and to contribute as well, with the text at hand. Je

- **Learning with a ‘good mix of people’ who are happy, friendly and relaxed (set up in first 30 minutes of sessions)**

I think it was just a really good mix of people, nobody… um, just personalities, I think worked very well together. I think that was important. And we seemed to come together and be quite happy and friendly to talk about things. We… the, the time at lunch-time um… prior to us beginning sessions was always a great chat time and people just relaxed and for some reason we just clicked right from the beginning into a very relaxed and non-threatening group… and I thought that was really great. Je

- **Learning without a dominant personality in the group**

It could have gone the other way and been quite scary… it could have been… you could have had somebody who was a very dominant personality and every time you said something they’d shoot you down in flames…

- **Learning that is mutually supportive**

but all you felt whenever you said something was people going, ‘oh yes! But have you thought about… a little bit further along? Or have you thought about that a bit more?’ Always very comfort… very supportive Je

Well I find that discussion is good in the… because the group is very supportive of each other. And if there is something that needs to be changed with my teaching it’s always with a very positive way, you know… the positive criticism you might call it from the group, Mau

So, I found that mutually supportive in that way too that we were teaching each other. We were learning from each other and we were supporting each other. B
Question – emerging themes

**FEELINGS OBSERVING AND DISCUSSING**

- When you learn you know that you think about things, analyse things and you also have some feelings. Tell me, how did you feel during discussions at the screen?

---

**Theme: Co-construction**

**Categories: Co-construction**

- *Feeling that I had to learn to contribute socially in discussion while observing*

Sometimes I became so engrossed in watching that I wasn’t discussing enough myself. So that’s something that I felt that I improved with, that was able to do better over the time.

- *Feeling of frustration between wanting to observe and discussing*

Um… sometimes I felt a little bit frustrated um… and that … I felt that sometimes I couldn’t watch what I wanted to watch because we were discussing … but at the same time you have to do that at the same time… so sometimes I’d just want to be just watching the lesson … but the discussion was sort of already going along…which had to happen, I can see why that has to happen … any time allowed…it would be good to make a video so you’d be able to go back over it… but, it doesn’t…J

- *Feeling that you had to be aware of protocol for interacting*

Um…I felt… I felt like I really had to be on my toes… (laughs) … really focusing…um… and following the rules. I think once or twice I kind of started saying something but then I had to pull back because I thought ‘no it’s not my turn’. you know you have to be aware of other people and what they’re saying and you can’t jump in… you can’t …jump in if they haven’t finished … and that sort of thing, so you have to be aware of the protocol. Shel

- *Feeling that you had to learn your role to contribute to the discussion*
I think initially giving roles as you did helped everybody speak up and everybody join in the discussion. So I think if we didn’t have those roles initially then people would generally just sit back and listen. So there was a person that would think of initially the topic that we would discuss and then we would have some people following up on that. I think this happened because maybe this could have happened... they could try this... and different branches off that.

• *Feeling challenged to bring together what you are observing, thinking, what you have been reading and carry on discussing while observing*

So I felt that it was challenging to be verbalizing and to bringing together what you were observing, what you were thinking, what you’d been reading and to carry on the discussion while you were still observing. So I felt that was challenging but it was also a worthwhile thing. B

• *Feeling that being able to make connections quickly ‘was a mixed bag’*

But there were other times when things popped into my head really quickly [fingers click] and I was... ‘oh, okay, I can make that link and I can make that connection’... but it was sort of... it was a real mixed bag... Je

---

**Emerging Theme: Trust in the relationship**

**Categories: Trust in the relationship**

• *Feeling that you want to do the right thing by the others in the group*

And, I felt that our discussions were honest. I felt that people were being honest and that they were really trying to do the right thing by the person who was teaching and by the discussion, by each other. B

• *Feeling that you do not want to be critical because you do what was done*

but you’re also feeling for the person because you know ‘Oh God I did that! Or whatever’ so you don’t want to be critical, you want to be um... give positive reinforcement, you don’t want to um... let them down, you want to support them, so you give them supportive talk. Mar

• *Feeling comfortable with others discussing own teaching*
I always felt comfortable. I don’t think … well speaking personally, I never felt uncomfortable with people discussing the lessons and that. D

Um… I always felt quite comfortable to have a bit of a say as to what I thought what was going on… I really liked that, those opportunities to do that… um…so I always felt quite comfortable and… yeah. L

- **Feeling apprehensive unless knew her opinion was right**

I felt very apprehensive to put my point forward unless I knew that I was right. And there would be times when I was more confident with the group situation Mar

- **Feeling had to be right to contribute to the group**

I would actually say things that weren’t quite right but then that would actually make me step back and not say anything for a couple of sessions, or whatever, just in case, I wasn’t… I preferred to sort of listen and then only put my opinion forward if I knew that it was the right one…I don’t know, right’s not the right word, but… um something that’s going to help, be helpful, maybe. I don’t know how to explain it. Mar

---

**Theme: Comparing yourself with others**

**Categories: Comparing yourself with others**

- **Feeling that you examine what you are doing based on the observing others**

I felt I went a bit quiet um and I know you would be trying to get us to discuss things… but I think its part of that process… where I see what they’re doing and I think ‘oh!’ … I start examining what I’m doing… I’m not really caring particularly what they’re doing … I just see them as reflecting their idea of Reading Recovery and I see how that fits in with me. D

Um… it made me feel a bit nervous sometimes I think …Just …sometimes watching people, that were doing, you know, obviously doing a really good job and…I guess that makes you feel a bit nervous about your own teaching. Um … Oh, you know, something I should be doing that I haven’t been doing… just that …it really brings home…that, you know, this person’s doing that and that’s working… and then suddenly you think about your own teaching and …it sort of makes it feel a bit …oh, I better start doing that tomorrow. J
the talk is trying to work out actually, where that person should be, or where you are and you're comparing yourself to that person. Mar

also it is exciting to see from the outside what's happening especially when a student is introduced and they've come on at a certain level and you can see what they're doing now ten weeks later. I think that's very encouraging whether it’s your student or not. J

Theme: Self Validation

Category: Self Validation

Um... well I felt you feel good about the fact that you actually know what they’re doing. Mar

Theme: Internalisation

Categories: Internalisation

- Feeling inadequate because couldn’t get thoughts clear ‘in my own mind’ quickly

Sometimes I felt inadequate. I um... wasn’t always... I couldn’t always gather my thoughts and get them clear in my own mind. I needed more time. that’s probably me as a person... who likes to take things and mull them over. Je

Theme: Self awareness

Categories: Self Awareness

- Feeling could get to the literal part of the discussion (what was happening) but not the analytical part (why)
I was really good at the first part of the discussion but not perhaps taking it to the next level. I was often tending to go more for a literal level rather than doing that analytical level. I would tend to do that at home, at night, when I was thinking about it. I wasn’t quick enough always to do the analytical part. I was very much working at the literal level. Je

- **Feeling that your learning develops over time**

  …you’re also aware that you don’t know that much anyway … so you’re learning all the time …Mar

- **Feeling that the role of teaching for others is easier than observing and discussing someone else’s teaching**

  Well as I said once I’m behind the screen and I can’t see the other people I know they’re there but I just become the teacher, and I’ve got my student there and I’m there to teach him and do my work and that’s what I do. I know I’ll get feedback later on and that’s okay, but while I’m behind the screen I do…but before that I do tend to, you know, I think anyone would feel I might … Am I to do the right thing? … Am I going to have the right prompts? And you say the right thing but I think once you’re behind the screen it just starts coming natural … I don’t know. Mau

- **Feeling that this was real learning so you had to make the most of the opportunity**

  but I felt I just…I had to make the most of that opportunity because learning at the screen … you just have to … try and take in as much as you can at that time, because that’s the real learning. Shel
Question – emerging themes

FEELINGS

Follow-up DISCUSSIONS

. How did you feel during discussions of lessons after the observations?

__________________________________

________________________________________________

Theme: Co-construction

Categories: Co-construction

• Feeling Supported by the Group – to extend, to improve, to refine, to offer positive reinforcement

Well, when it was my lesson that was being discussed I felt again that I was being supported and that my learning was being extended. So I felt that it was a positive experience for me, as a person who had been teaching. B

Um… oh I think that… it’s a little bit different and only a tidgy bit different if you’ve been teaching behind the screen… but I think everybody was… we were there together, trying to improve each other and through that to learn more about the whole process ourselves. D

The group was very supportive… and I was very lucky to drop into such a supportive group. And … and again, making a mistake in answering something… um sort of, not phrasing things well or not making myself clear was never a problem because someone would always pick up and support me through that… so, um.. yeah, the discussions I felt[were] very supportive. J

and then [after positive reinforcement] discussion would move on … so we’d sort of go further than just there, which was good, we’d sort of get an answer, if you like, and give you something to chew on when you go back the next day. Mar

• Feeling your idea is different so you don’t ask

sometimes I used to sit there thinking … I would have an idea in my head or a question or whatever and think … I’d think oh no everyone’s going off on a different path so I wouldn’t ask … um but
usually, especially because of the discussion behind the screen, you’d feel quite confident that … you know, what’s being discussed, so we could continue discussing it afterwards.

- **Feeling confirmed in what you think**

Sometimes you want to say something and someone else has said the same thing, but you also learn at that time from people because they say things that um …you say ‘yes, that’s right she shouldn’t be doing that…or yes she’s doing a good thing.’ And it starts making you think that…so I think our discussions are good too …because we learn a lot from them, from each other. Mau

- **Feeling comfortable to listen to others**

and it was a good opportunity to sit back and sort of listen to what others have to say as well, so it was always a comfortable setting, yeah. L

---

**Theme: Trust in the Relationship**

**Categories: Trust in the Relationship**

- **Feeling supported and supportive of each other**

And then again I felt a great collegial feeling of discussion and that people were contributing and supporting. So found it a very positive experience. B

I didn’t feel threatened. I felt supported. Je

So, yeah I always felt comfortable and um I thought as a group we got on well together. Yeah. I felt that we supported each other. I don’t think anybody would have got the feeling they were an outsider or they weren’t up to scratch or they should feel wounded about their efforts, or whatever. Um… I think it’s been very helpful. I’ve never felt uncomfortable in that group. D

you always felt at ease I suppose is another word for it … you could walk into the group and you could see that everybody was willing to, not pay respects, but offer that positive criticism about what had happened, and there was no reason to feel like that everyone was going to fire out all these
questions at you. You always felt that they were always supportive of you. So no I was very at ease in discussions. T

- **Feeling comfortable in the group**

Um, again like I just sort of felt comfortable to discuss anything that I had seen…L

But I always felt comfortable enough to choose, and sit back and listen and learn that way… or whether to contribute and to learn that way. Je

so I was more willing to take risks when I was more comfortable in the group. Mar

I always felt comfortable, and I always knew that whether I was the person who had been teaching behind the screen or somebody else, that the discussion was going to be positive and constructive, so I think everyone felt comfortable in that situation, and I always did. Shel

---

**Theme: Emotive Response**

**Categories: Emotive Response**

- **Feeling informal interactions before and after the session were more relaxed**

…it was conversation between the group members, but it was casual conversation, it wasn’t directed at anything… it was like ‘oh, how did you go with that? Did you have any problems with that? Yeah, I had a problem with this ‘….um…you know like, and I felt confident to just say it but it was one on one… but as soon as the session started it was official. It was…like it was real stuff…you know, that was the training part of it, so…and then afterwards I would be more relaxed again, because you could confidently say ‘oh, I didn’t understand that before, but now I do.’ Mar

- **Feeling confident because you knew how to interact**

How did I feel? Um … I felt a little bit more confident because there was um… more… well we sort of knew… how to approach it. We sort of had discussed that…and then we would give positive reinforcement to the person, so that was good Mar

- **Feeling hesitant about contributing**
Um … probably, probably a little hesitant … I think … yeah. I wouldn’t say that I … yeah. I didn’t feel oh look I know all the answers, what you’re supposed to be doing is right or wrong or whatever…Probably …um… I definitely think I waited for the discussion to start first to see where it was going. J

And probably just … yeah… felt off a bit, a bit hesitant … when I shouldn’t comment … and what I should comment on … because…I think it’s because sometimes I would think something and then, you know, the discussion would go somewhere else… and then I’d realise oh, no I’m on the wrong track or … so I’d move on. J

Well at that time I feel um… sometimes you feel that if you say something it might be wrong and then [what] the group might think… on the other hand the group is not like that … Mau

when I want to say something I sort of, I don’t blurt it out at once, I sort of wait, and then someone else says something and then I say ‘yeah, well that’s what I was thinking but I didn’t say it.’ So I do hesitate sometimes to give my opinion. The opinion is there but I have but I hesitate. Mau

Well the feeling is because I might be wrong. And what if I’m wrong? Are they? And then I think well if I’m wrong maybe I’ll learn? But then I don’t want to be wrong. I just don’t want to. You know, that’s why I hesitate sometimes. Mau

Again it was more it was like a clarification discussion, do you know, like sort of… when I would understand something a bit better I would ask a question that clarified that what I was then understanding was the right direction Mar

• Feeling of a lack of confidence (everyone is listening to you, you may say the wrong thing)

I didn’t feel confident all the … I didn’t feel confident because that’s not my personality. Je …in that situation where everyone’s listening … you’re in a situation where every single person there… is listening, you just feel like you’re being …um… that … that everyone’s going to hear you … and, I don’t know, if just a different …um …situation to be in. Mar

if I was confident that what I was saying was, was you know, like sort of, like the right thing, then I would join in but I um …yeah, I think towards the, at the very beginning I didn’t say hardly anything, during the thing. I’d speak before we started and after we finished… but I wouldn’t say very much at all, um but towards the end of it, when I was more confident in the group situation, I was more confident to, to get it wrong… and, and…without having it too much… of a … backlash for me. Mar
If I get it wrong, I tend to … close down and think I’m stupid… so I didn’t really like saying anything in case, like of in front of other people, in case other people thought I was stupid. so I tend to not say anything… but as I was more confident in the group I knew that they wouldn’t think that, if I got it wrong they would just think that I was learning the same as them… so I was more willing to take risks when I was more comfortable in the group. Mar