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Veronica Elizabeth Morcom
This research examined the development of motivation conceptualised as negotiated participation in specific instructional practices, providing opportunities for student leadership in the classroom. The study was conducted at two primary schools by the classroom teacher, who was also the researcher. The instructional aim was to build collaborative learning communities where democratic values were espoused and debated to promote holistic discourses that supported student learning. In Chapters 6-9 the findings are reported as case studies of focal groups of students, which are in the form of publications.

A sociocultural view of learning (e.g. Rogoff, 1992, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978) is at the heart of recent conceptualisations of motivation and framed the current research. Thus, motivation is conceptualised as emerging from the social context and is manifested through both collaborative and individual action. This view of motivation as a socially and culturally situated concept, is further developed in the current research. Motivation is conceptualised as negotiated participation, learning is conceptualised as developing mature participation and not separated from motivation, and emotion is conceptualised as integral to learning and motivation. Conceptualising learning as working within affective zones of proximal development (ZPD) (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978) highlights the role of emotions in learning and motivation. It is argued in this dissertation that
foregrounding affective elements of students’ learning in the classroom is critical to developing mature participation. This underpins students’ motivation to learn. Qualitative research methodology was adopted because the focus was to describe and understand the world of the participants. By situating the researcher, with all their values and assumptions in the world of the students, the teacher/researcher developed understandings of the students’ motivation as they participated in the classroom instructional practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The data collection tools were chosen to access the participants’ views and actions. Such tools included classroom observation, sociometric surveys and reflective accounts of the children, their parents and the teacher/researcher. The teacher/researcher used photographs of classroom activities during interviews to stimulate students’ recall of the classroom practices. Documents related to school policies and classroom instructional practices provided additional contextual data to situate the research.

To elaborate processes of motivational development, Rogoff’s (1995) personal, interpersonal and community psychological planes were used to analyse the data. Motivation, at the Community Plane, is described as developing ways for participation, where the teacher’s role is crucial to creating collaborative learning communities. At the Interpersonal Plane, interactions create possibilities for motivation as negotiated participation, through modelling and scaffolding values and ways of participation. Personal transformation of understandings was evident on the Personal Plane, with the motivational aspect presented as students being prepared to participate in subsequent similar activities.
The findings from the current research were that more interactive collaborative strategies developed aspects of mature participation that sustained the students’ motivation for learning. Further, students developed mature participation and motivation when working within the affective ZPDs. The instructional practices may provide a model for the development of collaborative learning communities in other schools where holistic discourses are supported and the social practices are negotiated with students.
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A Sociocultural Perspective
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Student motivation is a complex and important concept “for improving classroom teaching and learning” (Hickey, 2003, p. 400). This statement highlights the connection between strategies teachers use in the classroom and student motivation and participation. Although most formal instruction takes place in classrooms, this instructional context has rarely been a focus of motivation research (Anderman & Anderman, 1999, 2009; Turner & Meyer, 2000). Instead, motivation research has mainly viewed student membership in classrooms as “irrelevant or ‘noise’ in our data analyses” (Turner & Meyer, 2000, p. 69).

Teachers are interested in student motivation as a key element in promoting positive educational outcomes. Thus, it is timely for research in classrooms to reflect on how students’ membership and participation in the classroom can be promoted and examined. Little is known about how students perceive supportive learning environments and their teachers (Anderman, Andrzejewski, Carey & Allen, 2011). Meyer and Turner (2006), who researched classroom contexts, argue that students need consistently positive emotional experiences in the classroom to create a climate that supports students’ motivation to learn. This is one focus of the current research.

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the development of student motivation, conceptualised as negotiated participation in a collaborative community of practice. Learning is based on negotiating a collaborative pedagogy, underpinned by values
education, to support students’ wellbeing and social and emotional learning. The current research is framed within a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978) to highlight the social origins of the integrated concepts of learning and motivation.

Examining student participation as part of the classroom social practices acknowledges the socially and culturally situated nature of learning and motivation.

The main impetus for the current research, for the teacher/researcher, was to address students’ motivational issues in the classroom. The reporting of the research data is presented as four publications (Chapters 6-9) which centre around four main themes and four student focal groups. These publications were chosen by the teacher/researcher to illustrate common motivational issues that were addressed in a collaborative classroom context. Learning is conceptualised as developing mature participation in collaborative activities. Motivation develops as students move from legitimate peripheral participation to developing mature participation in the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The integrated nature of emotions in motivation is conceptualised as working within the affective Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978), to develop mature participation. The affective ZPD is examined explicitly in Chapter 4 in relation to the social and cultural practices of the research classrooms. The present discussion pre-empts the links that will be made between the affective scaffolds the teacher/researcher used to develop mature participation in relation to social and emotional skills and student motivation.

The current research is embedded in changing discourses about education in Australia, centred on creating a vision for schooling in the twenty-first century. The
recently published Australian National Curriculum (Australia. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2010) incorporates holistic goals for schooling based on The Adelaide and Melbourne Declarations (Australia. Ministerial Council on Education, Department of Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1999, 2008), agreed to by the Australian Ministers for Education. The following extracts propose a vision for students beyond the confines of the classroom, laying the groundwork not only for students’ overall wellbeing but shaping their roles as future citizens.

Schooling provides a foundation for young Australians’ intellectual, physical, social, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development. (Australia. Ministerial Council on Education, Department of Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1999, p. 1)

The curriculum will enable students to develop knowledge in the disciplines of English, mathematics, science, languages, humanities and the arts; to understand the spiritual, moral and aesthetic dimensions of life; and open up new ways of thinking. (Australia. Ministerial Council on Education, Department of Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 2008, p. 13)

The Australian Government funded the Values in Action projects and concluded that “a range of evidence supports the impact of values education on improved student wellbeing, most especially the voices of the students themselves” (Australia. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2010, p. 6). Wellbeing was enhanced because students had a more active role in their education, rooted in values education. Hence, it can be argued that values education provides the practical and pedagogical structures to facilitate the development of an environment, embedded with the “values-rich ambiences of learning that include explicit values discourse” (Lovat, Dally, Clement & Toomey, 2011, p. 33). As students learn to volunteer to share their ideas with their peers, and develop values such as trust, tolerance and empathy, they are also developing life skills.
Often there are many social and emotional issues that impact on student motivation and learning. Some common examples include students who develop avoidance strategies so they do not participate fully in classroom activities. They may lack confidence and not enjoy working with their peers. They could be excluded by their peers or may display anti-social behaviour and quarrel, not knowing how to resolve problems. In the current research, the teacher/researcher structured the instructional context to support students’ social and emotional needs to develop confidence, increase friendships, and provide support to develop skills to resolve issues and minimise bullying. This was achieved through an explicit focus on negotiating the values that underpin a supportive and democratic classroom. The use of specific social practices encouraged discourses to teach students leadership skills and develop social and emotional skills within a collaborative classroom context. This approach was based on the assumption that these skills were foundational to developing mature student participation and academic success (Walberg, Zins & Weissberg, 2004).

The current discussion outlines the theoretical framework and related issues, as well as the basis for the instructional practices adopted in the research classrooms. In Figure 1.1, the three intertwining cogs represent an integrated approach to learning, motivation and emotions inherent in a sociocultural perspective. This figure highlights for the reader the development of the different areas reviewed in the literature that are central to understanding the theoretical and practical perspectives of the current research. Emotions have often been overlooked in research about student learning in the classroom (Meyer & Turner, 2006). It is argued that research models need to reflect an integrated approach to fully understand how the social origins and construction of motivation and emotions support students’ learning.
The introduction to the conceptual framework for the research, represented in Figure 1.1, is further elaborated in Chapters 2 and 3.

Figure 1.1 Introduction to the theoretical framework for the research: Learning, motivation and emotions

1.1 Conceptual and methodological challenges in motivation research

Many researchers are recognising that there are gaps in past motivation research, which has not recognised the contribution of contextual and social factors as part of individual motivation (Anderman et al., 2011; Beltman & Volet, 2007; Boekaerts, 2011a, 2011b; Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury & Walker, 2005; Walker, Pressick-
Kilborn, Arnold & Sainsbury, 2004). Using short-term intervention studies, earlier methods were mainly quantitative and often lacked detail about classroom interactions and context (Pressick-Kilborn et al., 2005). These methods were based on the assumption that learning and motivation are primarily individual constructs (Walker, 2010). The findings about motivation were presented in terms of the individual and individual functioning, which have provided teachers with options to develop supportive strategies for individual students (Boekaerts, 2011a). Even though there are well established models, providing a plethora of information concerning the effect of social factors on self regulation, they do not examine the effects of these factors on strategy use in collaborative classroom learning (Boekaerts, 2011a).

In an attempt to overcome these limitations, more researchers recognise the value of observing students during authentic collaborative activities in the classroom because it reflects the social context of teachers’ work. This approach prioritises social and contextual factors and provides findings that are meaningful and accessible to teachers (Meyer & Turner, 2002; Perry, Turner & Meyer, 2006; Turner & Patrick, 2004; Walker, Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury & MacCallum, 2010). Sivan’s (1986) seminal article also highlighted the primacy of these factors to develop students’ interest and learning, and the importance of emotional engagement in activities. This was a significant proposition, challenging long held views of how motivation research should be conceptualised.

Turner and Meyer (2000) further argue that mixed methods, including qualitative methods, partly address the issue of identifying social and contextual factors in classroom research. They also argue that rather than trying to isolate variables for the
individual or social, that using a single multidimensional construct may offer a viable option for research because

...a single multidimensional construct, such as cooperation, may be sufficient for capturing a research question about the collaborative context of the classroom. (Turner & Meyer, 2000, p. 79)

Turner and Meyer’s (2000) proposal offers a new approach that may address challenges for examining classroom-based research questions about motivation. It has taken some twenty years for a small number of motivational theorists and researchers to further develop these notions (Pressick-Kilborn, 2010; Walker, 2010; Walker et al., 2010). Conceptual and methodological issues which are currently debated in sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) are discussed further in Chapter 2. Rogoff’s (1995) interpretation of Vygotsky’s work is highlighted because it was useful to frame the analysis of the data presented in the research publications.

1.2 Emotions, learning and motivation

Increasingly researchers are recognising the importance of understanding that “teachers’ work includes dealing with students’ affective, as well as cognitive, response to the subject matter being taught” (Rosiek, 2003, p. 399). Likewise, emotions are central to classroom interactions and underpin motivation to learn, yet they “have not figured prominently in motivational or instructional research” (Meyer & Turner, 2006, p. 378). Emotions and motivation have developed as two distinct fields of research (Boekaerts, 2002, 2011b; Meyer & Turner, 2006). In addition to reframing motivation as a social concept in the classroom, linking emotions and motivation is another emerging trend. This emphasises the integrated nature of emotions and motivation which need to be studied simultaneously when conducting
research in the classroom context (Meyer & Turner, 2006). To highlight the affective aspects of motivation, Meyer and Turner’s (2006) conceptualisation of motivation and affect are interwoven and applied in the current research. Creating a supportive climate during the classroom social practices facilitates the teacher and students working within affective zones of proximal development (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978). This process reaffirms that emotions are essential to understanding the instructional context of the classroom and motivation, and is further examined through teacher scaffolding in Chapter 3.

1.3 Developing a collaborative classroom

Well documented research findings concur that there are academic and motivational benefits for students who experience group work in their learning in a collaborative classroom context (Dillenbourg, Baker, Blayne & O’Malley, 1996; Johnson & Johnson 2003; Johnson, Johnson, Johnson Holubec, 1994). But there are challenges to developing such a classroom. On a practical level, students may not have the prerequisite social and emotional skills to take advantage of collaborating with their peers (Volet & Mansfield, 2006; Wright & Lander, 2003). Students may lack confidence, feel anxious, fear failure or rejection by their peers or have physical and mental disabilities that contribute to developing a negative attitude towards learning (Bernard, 1996; Stanley, 2011). Teachers need to address these issues in a current climate where recent educational policy decisions, relating to student assessment and school accountability, may limit the use of collaborative learning.
At a time of increased educational accountability teachers are preparing students for National testing, requiring an individualised student focus, which may hinder the use of more interactive strategies. For example, the National testing for Literacy and Numeracy (Australia. Australian Curriculum Assessment & Reporting Authority, 2011), is conducted usually over one school week (in Years 3, 5, 7 & 9) each year. The results of these tests are reported to parents and used to measure students’ learning and to rank schools. These rankings are made public and may be seen by some parents as reflecting the quality of teaching at different schools. To achieve better student outcomes in these tests, parents and school principals may also perceive an individual approach, that focuses on subject based knowledge and skills, as more desirable than a collaborative approach.

Notwithstanding these factors the findings from major values projects, funded by The Australian Government (Australia. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2009a, 2009b), and similar studies drawn widely from international research (Lovat et al., 2011), reaffirmed the benefits of students taking an active role in their learning. Holistic approaches to education, provided through collaboration, supported academic outcomes.

Such findings point to the need for pedagogy that engages the whole person rather than a ‘separably cognitive’ person. In a word, the need is for holistic education... there is increasing evidence that such a focus impacts positively on and may actually facilitate academic learning. (Lovat et al., 2011, p. 32-33)

In the current research, teaching values explicitly (Lovat et al., 2011) was an integral part of the instructional practices and is examined further in Chapters 3 and 4. The instructional aim was to establish and maintain a climate for trusting relationships; the teacher/researcher structured the classroom environment to develop a self-supporting
framework for collaboration (Hart, 1992) which provided a context to teach
democratic values. Extending Hart’s (1992) research findings, the teacher/researcher
incorporated a variety of aspects from well established and researched programs
(Bernard, 1996; Gibbs, 2001) to develop a collaborative community of practice (Hart,
1992; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Student negotiation and collaboration was part of the
process to establishing a positive classroom climate, positive teacher/student
relationships and optimal student participation in the classroom (Lovat & Toomey,
2007; Lovat, Toomey, Clement, Crotty & Nielsen, 2009).

1.4 Background of the teacher/researcher

Having taught in the classroom for three decades, I have experienced many
educational initiatives that have shaped my role as an educator. Developing student
motivation and encouraging students to reach their potential has been at the centre of
my teaching philosophy. My teaching style is based on the belief that if teachers
support students’ wellbeing through the development of tools for participating, such
as social and emotional skills, then students are more likely to be motivated to learn
and achieve academic success (Walberg, Zins & Weissberg, 2004). This includes
developing teaching strategies to build student confidence and an ability to work with
others.

During the 1980s and 1990s, in the first two decades of my teaching career, I
benefited from the plethora of research about cooperative learning and the mechanics
of developing effective group work to increase student achievement (Ames, 1984,
1992; Ames & Ames, 1984; Antil, Jenkins, Wayne & Vadasay, 1998; Gillies, 2003;

Generally, in an educational context, the intention of using group work is to create student-centred learning and a shift away from more traditional forms of teaching where students worked individually, under the direction of the teacher, for most of the school day. Contrary to the findings of current Australian research in values education, parents and many educators perceive the primary role of education is to develop cognitive skills (Australia. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2010). Social and emotional skills are considered the domain of the home and the responsibility of teachers in the early years of schooling. Yet, it is widely recognised that social and emotional issues, such as those arising from student bullying, can impede a child’s progress at school (Cross, 2010; Slee, 2003; Spears, Slee, Owens, Johnson, & Campbell, 2008).

Another useful area of research that contributed to my understanding of the benefits of group work and collaboration was Gardner’s (1983) theory of Multiple Intelligences. His seminal publication widened the perspective of the role of education to include interpersonal and intrapersonal factors which highlighted the affective domain of learning. In subsequent publications Gardner addressed students’ different learning styles (Gardner, 1983, 1993, 1999a, 1999b, 2005) and focussed on how the social and individual attributes of learning could be integrated into the classroom instructional practices.
Other researchers supported the value of developing students’ social and emotional needs (Bernard, 1994; Gibbs, 2001). Goleman’s (1996) populist term of EQ (emotional intelligence) highlighted the importance of discussing positive and negative emotions in the context of developing social intelligence (Goleman, 2004, 2006). The main contribution of Goleman’s ideas was to question longheld notions that traditional intelligence tests are a reliable predictor of future success in life. Goleman’s ideas supported providing opportunities to develop students’ social and emotional skills as an integral part of my teaching practice (Goleman, 1996).

Creating a supportive classroom climate is important for students’ learning in relation to the concept of psychological safety and the issue of perceived threat. When students are overly stressed it is difficult for them to think clearly and they downshift into fight or flight mode in response to the perceived threat (Caine, Caine & Crowell, 1994). These findings emanate from neuroscience research and informed my teaching practice. I examined how other researchers and educators interpreted this research, to create brain friendly classrooms where students developed as confident learners, willing to take risks (Dryden & Vos, 1994; Fogarty, 1991, 1997; Rose & Nicholl, 1997).

I prioritised the social, emotional as well as academic aspects of my teaching to create a positive and caring classroom environment (Noddings, 1984, 1992, 2005), teaching social and emotional skills (Bernard, 1996) and creating a democratic framework (Gibbs, 2001) to reduce student bullying (Cross, 2010). I documented these practices as part of my classroom-based research. Setting goals and teaching students to reflect on their individual learning, as a result of working in cooperative groups, required an
understanding of the differences between cooperative and competitive learning goals (Ames & Ames, 1984). To maintain student motivation, I promoted learning goals that encouraged students to self-reference their progress, as opposed to comparing their achievement constantly with their peers (Ames, 1992). Students’ ideas were shared to model to other students how to participate in classroom activities. These ideas are examined in the publications (See Chapters 6-9).

By structuring collaborative classrooms and using social practices that included sociograms (Gibbs, 2001), I applied research findings about the benefits of supportive classroom environments for students’ learning and motivation (Anderman, 1999; Anderman & Anderman, 1999, 2009; Anderman & Kaplan, 2008). Sociograms, which are graphic representations of students’ peer relationships, are further explained in Chapter 3. Sociograms became a research tool, in that representations could be triangulated with other data, to identify changes in student participation and motivation. Due to social factors such as bullying, I became more strategic about where students were seated in the classroom to encourage supportive relationships and develop students’ ability to work in groups.

1.5 Background to the research projects

I conducted two classroom research projects with the students I was teaching in 2004 and 2007. The first project examined the teacher’s role to create a democratic classroom and formed the basis of my Master’s dissertation (Morcom, 2005). At the time of the Master’s research (2004-5) I had been teaching full-time for over 20 years. I became disheartened with the growing number of students who had social and
emotional problems affecting their behaviour in the classroom and the playground. Students’ absenteeism and bullying behaviours were school-wide problems that had been evident for several years.

It became increasingly difficult to implement cooperative and collaborative strategies in the classroom without first addressing students’ social and emotional issues. I negotiated the classroom social practices with students and developed confidence to explicitly teach values such as mutual respect, attentive listening and appreciating others (Gibbs, 2001). These values were foundational to establishing shared understandings with students about the benefits of working collaboratively.

The Master’s research (Morcom, 2005) reported on my role as a teacher facilitator and the outcomes of using sociometric surveys to strategically place students in supportive groups. The findings confirmed that when students negotiated the social practices of the classroom they encouraged each other to be respectful, creating a context where student leadership was possible. Students’ interactions were based on mutual respect and trust, resulting in pro-social behaviours which facilitated the development of collaborative skills. My students changed their behaviour, attended school on a regular basis and bullying behaviours decreased significantly.

After relocating to another school in 2005, I continued to develop my ideas, before commencing a second research project in 2007 with my students. This project built on the Master’s findings, with a greater focus on the students, examining the role of student leadership in a primary classroom. To empower students, I became more strategic, making time available to discuss issues that were important to them. I
developed specific instructional strategies that incorporated social practices to build a supportive collaborative classroom community. In 2007, I became a trainer to facilitate Tribes Learning Communities (Gibbs, 2001), further honing my skills to develop aspects of student leadership in a different direction that was not an explicit focus for Gibbs’ (2001) program. This part of my work became central to my motivation to continue classroom-based research, as the process increased student participation in the classroom.

During the data collection phase of the second project (2007), I started to record the preliminary findings which I presented as conference papers (listed at the beginning of the document). My classroom environment not only promoted organised group work but the conditions to structure a self-supporting environment through student negotiation of the classroom social practices. Sometimes I organised collaborative activities for a specific purpose, such as team building when new social groups were formed. At other times collaboration occurred spontaneously when students opted to work together. These notions are examined in the context of Hart’s (1992) classroom research discussed in Chapter 3.

Emotions and students’ affective development were central to my classroom practice and were reflected in how I conducted the research process. When students discussed how they felt about classroom activities, they became more aware of the language they were using and how they interacted with each other. They made greater efforts to be supportive because they enjoyed the mutual benefits of making friends and positive peer regard. In the motivation literature, a small number of theorists highlight emotions in the classroom and the role of emotions in motivation (Ainley, 2006,
2007; Anderman & Kaplan, 2008; Meyer & Turner, 2002, 2006; Turner & Patrick, 2008). Even though there is little classroom-based research to explicitly link emotions, motivation and learning, there is some recognition that these are interconnected processes (Anderman et al., 2011; Boekaerts, 2002).

In the research classrooms student leadership is a major theme and was the catalyst for students to develop mature participation and motivation to learn (See Research publications in Chapters 6-9). Two of the four publications use data solely from the 2004 study (not previously used in the Master’s project); one publication uses a combination of data from both studies and the fourth publication uses data solely from the second 2007 study. All publications are framed around the discussion of focal groups of students whose issues were representative of different motivational challenges for the teacher/researcher that are also common concerns for teachers. For example, ensuring all students develop confidence in their learning can be supported by creating a context that develops friendships so they are happy at school. Positive changes I observed in students’ behaviour throughout the two projects became the source of my personal and professional satisfaction and motivation.

1.6 Organisation of the chapters

The following chapters have been developed to provide a sense of coherency for the reader about the theoretical perspectives that shaped the research design and methodology, and to provide details of the classroom practices and instructional context.
In Chapter 2, the conceptual issues for motivation research are addressed. Vygotsky’s (1978) work captures the broader social, cultural and historical context in which social activities occur and learning and motivation emerge (Turner & Meyer, 2000; Turner & Patrick, 2004, 2008; Volet, 2001). Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory and the internalization model of learning are discussed as a viable theoretical framework for classroom-based research. Empirical research about leadership and collaboration within a community of practice framework is examined in Chapter 3.

There is a descriptive overview of the social practices used in the research classrooms in Chapter 4. The discussion contrasts theory (the affective ZPD) and classroom practice (the social practices), to make more explicit links to how the teacher used scaffolds to work within the affective ZPD. To frame the data analyses, Rogoff’s (1995) personal, interpersonal and community planes foreground the scaffolds for the affective ZPD that developed mature student participation (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978). Connections are made, between the classroom social practices and working within the affective ZPD, to demonstrate the learning, motivation and emotions as integrated processes (Meyer & Turner, 2006). The rationale for the methodological approach and the development of research tools, which are embedded in the classroom practices, are provided in Chapter 5.

In Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9, the four research publications examine the findings of four groups of focal students. These students experienced leadership opportunities and developed aspects of mature participation, supported by teacher scaffolding within the affective ZPD (described in Chapter 4). Addressing common motivational issues for
students, the teacher/researcher selected these publications to present the findings that would be of general interest to mainstream classroom teachers.

In Chapter 10, the discussion returns to reflect on how working within the affective ZPD supported students’ social and emotional development. The students developed mature participation which underpinned their motivation for learning, highlighting the link between social and emotional issues and students’ motivation. The theoretical and practical implications of the research are discussed, with suggestions for future research, before drawing conclusions about the current research.
CHAPTER 2

LEARNING, MOTIVATION AND EMOTIONS:
SOCIOCULTURAL THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES TO PARTICIPATION

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter the central concern is conceptualising learning and motivation as a social concept. Sociocultural theory is used to frame motivation as negotiated participation in collaborative activities. Rogoff’s (1995) participatory model of learning highlights current issues and tensions for conceptualising learning and motivation (Walker et al., 2010). Consequently different models of learning are examined to understand how participation is structured to support collaboration. Rogoff, Paradise, Mejia Arauz, Correa-Chavez & Angelillo (2003) and Lave and Wenger (1991) highlight the restrictions of a traditional assembly-line model of instruction, where student interaction is limited, suggesting a more collaborative view. Maintaining a focus on the social construction of learning, the model of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is introduced and examined as a framework for the implementing social practices that promote collaboration.

In Chapter 1, learning was introduced in the context of a collaborative classroom and conceptualised as developing mature participation in collaborative activities. The discussion in this chapter contributes to the current debate in motivation research through developing Vygotsky’s (1978) ideas, concept of zone of proximal development as potentially a motivational zone. Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural
theory of learning is reviewed to examine his internalization model of learning, as the basis for a sociocultural theoretical perspective to student participation and motivation. As Vygotsky died before he fully developed his ideas, other theorists, such as Bruner (1986) and Rogoff (1995), have interpreted and elaborated his concepts.

Two ideas that are prominent in Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory are the metaphor of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and notion of cultural and social development. Because they are used to frame motivation and learning in the analysis of data in the current research, these two ideas are examined further. The theoretical underpinning of Bruner’s (1986) scaffolding metaphor is examined to provide a framework for understanding how the teacher/researcher, through negotiation with students, scaffolded the classroom social practices. The role of emotions in learning and motivation is conceptualised through the extended version of learning within the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978) in this Chapter.

Figure 2.1 is a guide for the reader of the main sources of literature reviewed that are based on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory. It provides a summary of the source of the main discussion points to argue for the integrated nature of learning, motivation and emotions when conceptualising classroom research. The interlocking cogs in the background of the figure are a metaphorical representation of this integrated relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Emotions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature review</strong></td>
<td>- Goldstein and Freedman (2003) assert that teacher scaffolding within the affective ZPD requires a supportive learning environment to establish psychological safety (See sections 2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vygotsky’s (1978) internalization model, examines learning on two planes, the social and the individual (See section 2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rogoff’s (1995) participatory model of learning, uses the event or collaborative activity as the unit of analysis (See sections 2.3 &amp; 2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current research</strong></td>
<td>- The role of emotions in learning and motivation is conceptualised through the extended version of learning within the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning is conceptualised as developing mature participation in collaborative activities within a community of practice, which underpins student motivation (See section 2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Motivation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Goldstein (1999) and Sivan (1986) describe the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) as an interpersonal and motivational zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motivation develops as students move from legitimate peripheral participation to developing full or mature participation (Rogoff et al., 2003) (See section 2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motivation is conceptualised as negotiated participation in collaborative communities of practice (Lave &amp; Wenger, 1991; Rogoff et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.1 Conceptualisation focus of the research: Learning, motivation and emotions from a sociocultural perspective*
2.2 The context of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory

Vygotsky focussed on the social, historical and cultural aspects of learning and development in his writings at a time when there was political and social upheaval in Russia (Smidt, 2009; Wink & Putney, 2002). He became a prolific researcher, theorist and writer, who was able to capture these lines of development in his theory of learning. He was a psychologist and his family were non religious Jews. During Vygotsky’s life time there were discriminatory practices against Jews in Russia, which precluded many from attending university, but Vygotsky secured a place. He successfully graduated in 1917, the same year that the Russian Revolution took place. Germany had occupied Russia and it was two more years before Russian rule was reinstated. Then Jews were permitted to become teachers, paving the way for Vygotsky’s future as a teacher and a scholar. Unfortunately Vygotsky was stricken with tuberculosis and died in 1934, aged 37, so some of his writings were incomplete. For political reasons Vygotsky’s work was banned in Russia after his death, so translations were not available to the West until the 1960s.

In the last fifty years, Vygotsky’s ideas have become more prominent, influencing educational practice in the West. Themes such as collaboration and community pervaded Vygotsky’s writings. He believed in sharing knowledge and expertise with his peers. He also encouraged his children to use their cognitive resources to find answers to their questions and problems. During an interview, Vygotsky’s daughter recalls that her father

…. rarely gave his opinions to his children because he preferred for them to work things out on their own. When they asked questions, rather than give a complete answer he would draw them into discussions that resulted in a commonly agreed-on answer or decision. (Wink & Putney, 2002, p. xiv)
Vygotsky’s theories have been developed by other theorists in relation to learning and motivation. While recognising that sociocultural theory has the potential as a framework to capture the individual and social aspects of learning, only recently Vygotskian concepts such as ZPD, have been applied to explain motivational processes (Walker, 2010).

2.2.1 Zone of proximal development (ZPD)

Vygotsky (1978) used the metaphor of ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD) to describe the emergent development of learning and the potential for growth within the ZPD. In the process of learning, development and maturation, the ZPD is compared to natural processes of developing buds and flowers in the following quotation.

The zone of proximal development defines those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic state. These functions could be termed the "buds" or "flowers" of development rather than the "fruits" of development". (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)

When more capable others assist inexperienced learners to achieve their potential for learning (referred to as the fruits), the learners are encouraged to think beyond their current understandings (referred to as the buds or flowers) in the construction of the ZPD. In the following quotation, Vygotsky describes a dynamic process of good learning that is in advance of development. This implies teachers need to consider the level of assistance required, and how to sustain children’s growth within the ZPD.

The zone of proximal development today will be the actual development level tomorrow --- that is, what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow… the only good learning is that which is in advance of development. (Vygotsky, 1978, pp. 87-89)
The process of working within the ZPD prepares the child to later work independently. Assessment needs to reflect if the ZPD is the child’s “actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving” or their higher level of “potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Vygotsky argued that the latter should be the case because assessing fully developed competencies underestimates what a child can do and is at the lower end of the ZPD.

Thus, Vygotsky (1978) proposed a more dynamic and interactive model of learning and assessment, that is socially and culturally situated. He argued against traditional assessment instruments, geared towards assessing individual competencies when the individual is working independently (reflecting a narrow assessment). Instead Vygotsky (1978) asserted the focus on the ‘potential’ level rather than the ‘actual’ level of development to measure the threshold of what is about to be learnt, with assistance of more capable others.

Teachers play a crucial role to support students’ learning and development in the ZPD but also in allowing students to interact and collaborate during their learning. Vygotsky (1986) believed that children are active in the construction of their knowledge, which is embedded in a social context. “It is in the ZPD that the so-called ‘psychological tools’ (particularly speech) and signs have a mediational function” (Daniels, 2005, p. 8). The mediation of human activity through language and other cultural tools is fundamental to understanding that learning and development are social, cultural and historical processes in which new understandings are co-constructed (Valsiner, 1997, 1998). From a Vygotskian perspective, learning is a
social relationship in which cultural tools, developed by previous and current
generations, are used to participate in community activities that are transformed by
the learner in the process of internalization (Vygotsky, 1978).

2.2.2 Cultural and social factors in learning

Vygotsky was keen to build a deeper and richer understanding of learning and
development that incorporated historical, social and cultural experiences. He believed
these experiences generated the foundations of one’s consciousness and the
construction of higher mental functions. Vygotsky did not support behaviourist
notions that a study of the mind could be reduced to what could be objectively
measured. He proposed an alternative theory where the social and psychological
planes interacted in the social formation of the mind.

Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two
planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological
plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and
then within the child as an intrapsychological category. (Vygotsky, 1981,
p.163)

Based on the assumption that there is an interdependent relationship between social,
cultural and historical processes, a child’s subsequent learning is the result of
internalization of what was originally social, between people. When external
experiences on the interpsychological plane are transformed by the individual on the
intrapsychological plane, this process occurs within the construction zone of the ZPD.
The teacher’s role remains to situate the ZPD within a level that the learner does not
become bored or overly frustrated and give up. This would suggest that the conditions
of the social context for learning in the classroom need to support students taking
risks as they rise to meet educational challenges. For Vygotsky (1978), the social
context became part of the developmental processes because of its role in shaping higher mental processes.

2.2.3 Internalization model of learning

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of learning assumes that internalization of social processes requires participation by the individual in those processes to internalize knowledge. Internalization involves transforming social phenomena into psychological phenomena or making meaning though both external and internal interactions (Vygotsky, 1981). These external and internal processes are not replications of each other but internalization is the result of transformations of external process. Mental functions begin on the social or interpsychological plane, usually with more expert learners and then move to an inner intrapsychological plane where the child transforms their learning into their consciousness. This is the process of internalization. Central to this process is the role of social interaction, as an intermediary process, mediating internalization of knowledge and understandings.

Other theorists have interpreted Vygotsky’s work and developed conceptualisations of the process of internalization. There is debate concerning the boundary or separation between the social and individual planes and if such a boundary or separation exists. For example, sociocultural theorists such as Valsiner (1998), Wertsch (1985, 1991, 1993) and Walker et al. (2010) recognise the interdependence of the individual and social planes and their separation to conceptualise internalization. Other theorists (e.g. Rogoff, 1995) argue for a fusion of the social and individual planes.
In some ways, these theorists’ views focus on different parts of the process. Rogoff has a greater focus on the activity, and preparation for the next activity, whereas Valsiner focuses on the externalization of what has been internalized (for use in the next activity or situation). These differences in views are acknowledged but are not the focus of the arguments in the conceptual framework underlying this research. Rogoff’s (1995) interpretation of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, with a focus on activity, is used extensively in guiding the interpretations of the current research. In particular, Rogoff’s (1995) notion of participatory appropriation, in the context of Vygotsky’s (1978) internalization process, is examined.

2.3 Rogoff’s participatory model of learning

Rogoff (1995) asserts the social and individual planes are not separated during activities. The terms “appropriation” and “participatory appropriation” are used specifically to argue against the view of having boundaries. Children actively construct their understanding of an activity with their social partners and are mutually interdependent during the dynamic process of learning.

The concept of participatory appropriation refers to how individuals change through their involvement in one or another activity, in the process of becoming prepared for subsequent involvement in related activities. (Rogoff, 1995, p. 142)

Current learning becomes the foundation for future learning in subsequent activities as a cyclical process. Rogoff (1995) uses three “inseparable, mutually constituting planes comprising activities that can become the focus of analysis at different times” (p. 139). The community, interpersonal and personal planes do not have boundaries between the internal and external world of the child. Thus events, activities and practice cannot be reduced to properties of individuals. The activity or event is
the unit of analysis - with active and dynamic contributions from individuals, their social partners, and historical traditions and materials…None exists separately. (Rogoff, 1995, p. 140)

Despite Rogoff’s (1995) view that the planes do not exist separately, this does not preclude foregrounding each plane, with acknowledgment “of their inherent interdependence in the whole” (p. 140). Rogoff (1995) argues that Vygosky affirmed …the mutuality of the individual and the sociocultural environment, finding a unit of analysis that preserves the essence of the events of interest rather than separating an event into elements that no longer function as does the whole. (p. 140)

Rogoff’s (1995) interpretation of Vygotsky’s (1978) work adheres to a holistic sociocultural view of learning, focussing on individual development within the social and cultural context of interaction with others. Rogoff asserts that the social and environment cannot exist separately. Rogoff’s (1995) position presents challenges for contemporary sociocultural theorists researching how motivation occurs and how to conceptualise such research (Turner & Patrick, 2004; Walker et al., 2004) due to issues of boundaries between the social and individual. At what point does the individual become the social and at what point can we discuss them separately?

Research models that can address multiple factors in the classroom in relation to learning are needed. Nevertheless, in the current research, Rogoff’s (1995) analytical lenses have been very useful to frame the data analysis and synthesis in the research publications. In Chapter 4, the personal, interpersonal and community (Rogoff, 1995) lenses have also been used to describe the social practices of the research classrooms and elaborate the use of teacher/researcher scaffolds. Each plane (Rogoff, 1995) is foregrounded in turn to describe the scaffolds that supported student participation.
In the next section, Rogoff et al.’s (2003) and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) work is used to examine the terms intent participation and legitimate peripheral participation. As the concept of participation is central to the current research, these terms assist in identifying the characteristics of different patterns of participation (Rogoff et al., 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991). This work also builds on Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of assisted learning when working within the ZPD and the benefits of guided participation.

2.4 Participation structures in the classroom

Rogoff’s (1995) notion of learning through ‘intent participation’ develops understandings about how young children are inducted or guided into the practices of their communities (Rogoff et al., 2003). This idea of intent participation was developed as a result of working with young children, mainly living in Indigenous cultures. These children ‘listen in and observe’ adults, with the intention or anticipation of participation in mature activities.

Our term “intent participation” refers to keenly observing and listening in anticipation of or in the process of engaging in an endeavour. (We refer to both watching and listening in as “observation”, because it involves the sort of attentiveness and intentionality that we examine in this paper). (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 178)

In their research with Indigenous cultures, Rogoff et al., (2003) highlighted that children are not segregated from adult activities in the normal course of their daily lives. In comparison, children living in industrialised communities are segregated during “specialized child-focused activities” such as schooling. In such settings, there is an assumption that children can learn skills that will be used in future adult employment (Rogoff et al., 2003). These are very different participation structures
based on different assumptions of how to induct or guide young children into the practices of their communities. Despite the documented benefits for non industrialised communities that encourage intent participation, there is little research to understand the implications for industrialised communities where intent participation is limited.

How classrooms are structured to encourage participation and student collaboration remains a contentious issue with many classrooms based on an assembly-line model of instruction (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff et al., 2003). This model highlights the role of the teacher as the person making a majority of the decisions in the classroom. Knowledge is transmitted through an expert, usually the teacher, who determines how students will participate and what will be taught.

Intent participation involves a collaborative horizontal participation structure with flexible complementary roles. This contrasts with the assembly-line instruction’s hierarchical structure, organised with fixed roles in which someone manages others’ participation, acting as a boss. (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 184)

Rogoff et al. (2003) suggest a more flexible, collaborative structure where learners are encouraged to negotiate their responsibilities and use their initiative. Similarly, Lave and Wenger (1991) use the term legitimate peripheral participation. When one chooses to be on the periphery of participation, to ‘take part’ and ‘be present’, it is considered a legitimate form of participation, which is used in many cultures to allow novice learners to benefit from watching more experienced members of a community. Through these experiences, novice learners become ready to ‘fully participate’ in a community. The more experienced members provide a model and guide novice learners into the community.
Changing the organisation of traditional schooling “to engage in radically different participation structures” is challenging (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 188), partly due to past experiences of assembly-line schooling, which are entrenched in teachers’ minds. In terms of motivation and intent participation, Rogoff and colleagues (2003) argue that organising authentic activities which children value because they understand the purpose, allows children to make a genuine contribution. This is the basis for developing motivation, an important point that is often overlooked in traditional schooling.

Motivation is generally inherent in the obvious importance and interest of the activity. The purpose of the activity is understood, as is the relation of each step to the overall processes. (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 188)

In contrast, motivation for learners’ involvement in schooling is often induced with extrinsic rewards and punishments such as praise, grades and threats (Rogoff et al., 2003). This does not recognise the complex personal and contextual factors that can enhance student participation in democratic classrooms. For example, in the case of health promotion in schools, Simovska’s (2007) research identified key characteristics in the school environment that supported student participation. These were democratic structures and relationships, which are embedded in positive social norms, with time for discussion and reflection. Simovska (2007) argues that issues of personal development and empowerment are central to understanding why students become motivated to participate and contribute to decisions that affect their education. Teachers need to promote

….genuine student participation in learning, focussed on developing meanings, critical reflection and interaction between the individual and society is seen as one of the crucial elements of democratic and action-oriented teaching. (Simovska, 2007, p. 866)
Lave and Wenger’s (1991) community of practice provides a framework to discuss different types of participation structures, particularly when new members enter a community (Rogoff, Matusov & White, 1996). The models described in the next section differ in how participation is conceptualised and negotiated, providing guiding principles for establishing a collaborative community of practice.

2.5 Models of communities of practice

Communities of practice have been used in education and business sectors (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder, 2002). More recently, there has been recognition of the influence of contextual and social factors and the need to frame motivational research to include these factors (Walker et al., 2010). A community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) model provides an effective theoretical framework for the current classroom research. One of the defining characteristics of different types of communities of practice is how relationships and ways of doing things in the communities are framed.

Of interest for the current research is how participation is conceptualised within a community of practice when new members enter the community, a phenomenon which can create harmony or conflict. Are new members accepted if their ideas differ from those of the community? In Matusov’s (1999) four models of community, how new members are acknowledged indicates whether the community is receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things. The first three models (filter, funnel and linear), are indicative of members adopting the status quo where there is little change to how things are done. If new members do not or cannot adapt to the traditionally accepted
ways of doing things, their options are limited and they may choose to leave the community.

The ‘filter’ model is one of exclusion, where difference is not tolerated from the beginning. The ‘funnel’ model is one where difference is handled through marginalisation. The ‘linear’ model is a static and stable view of community that provides members with more time to assimilate to the group consensus but in the end difference is not accommodated. Primarily, these models aim to homogenise the community and offer little for collaborative classrooms, where motivation is conceptualised as negotiated participation, accommodating differences of opinion. In contrast, the fourth ‘ecological’ model accommodates diverse membership through the development of different, but compatible ways of doing things.

The compatibility is based on an ecological synergy of the diversity, mutual tolerance and adjustment, and open-endedness of the development of the way of doing things. (Matusov, 1999, p. 166)

Matusov’s ecological model is based on negotiation and collaboration to incorporate the ideas of new members as the community evolves and changes. Rogoff (2003) argues that “humans develop through their changing participation in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change” (p. 11). Using a sociocultural perspective to theorise the development of mature participation in a community requires unravelling complex interpersonal relationships. Both individuals and their communities develop as community relationships are negotiated over time. This suggests that the community needs to be flexible to accommodate differences.

Rogoff (1995) asserts “participation requires engagement in some aspect of the meaning of shared endeavours” (p. 147). This does not preclude the notion of
participation through actively observing as a legitimate peripheral participant.

Likewise, Campbell (2007) argues that the reciprocal process, where the individual makes sense of their culture through active participation, in turn reshapes the culture.

The individual is not a passive absorber of culture but actively engages in the learning of the culture and its reshaping to make meaning for the individual. (p. 138)

Encouraging the individual to participate in shaping the community of practice requires negotiation, tolerance and mutual respect, which are key features of an ecological model for a community of practice. From a sociocultural perspective of learning, with a focus on the social and cultural practices of the classroom, the ecological model offers flexibility. This model is constituted by multi-faceted relationships of mutual support where negotiation is embraced and innovation is possible. How participation is defined in a community of practice, to create contexts where teachers and students can negotiate their relationships, is fundamental to creating the affective ZPD.

Different types of communities of practice define how relationships and ways of doing things in the communities are framed (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Matusov, 1999; Rogoff, 1995, 1998; Wertsch, 1998). An ecological model of community of practice provides a context to develop students’ learning by working within the ZPD, to develop higher mental processes. This model may not suit students or teachers who prefer a traditional approach where the teacher structures community participation to make most of the decisions in the classroom related to student participation and learning.
2.6 Community participation

Matusov (1999) argues that to develop a community based on the dynamic ecological model, members need to be continually challenged and stretched to learn new skills. The acquisition of cultural tools and higher mental processes depend on the skill of the teacher/adult in working within a child’s ZPD. Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of the ZPD is often examined using Bruner’s (1986) metaphor of scaffolding where adults structure activities to guide children. Bruner’s (1986) scaffolding metaphor suggests a linear process. Building on Bruner’s ideas Cumming-Potvin et al. (2003) use the term multi-tiered scaffolding, to reflect a more dynamic and interactive learning process evident in collaborative classrooms or communities as described by Rogoff et al. (2003).

The implications for learning are that the individual is actively engaged through participation in shared endeavours. Applying the metaphor of multi-tiered scaffolding to students’ interactions, in the context of the classroom and to the family and wider cultural influences in society, provides multiple sources for learning. For example, in the context of Indigenous cultures, parents often scaffold their children’s learning, as they show interest in activities. As parents provide structures that increase in complexity, the children develop mutual involvement in shared endeavours.

The structuring of the activities in increasingly complex steps is done in the context of being able to see the overall activity in which the steps fit. (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 192)

Rogoff and colleagues (2003) argue that an assembly line approach to education does not always make explicit links to the purpose of an activity which may undermine students’ motivation to participate. Vygotsky (1978) asserts that it is the teacher’s role
to provide support or scaffolds (Bruner, 1986) for students to develop mental tools that ultimately develop independent learners (Levykh, 2008). Teachers need to be mindful of their ‘duty of care’ to students as they scaffold participation so students are not unduly stressed in their learning. Physical artefacts and tools such as books and computers can also provide scaffolds within the ZPD.

To differentiate between legitimate peripheral participation and marginal non participation, inbound and outbound trajectories, are useful notions to understand community participation (Wenger, 1998). These trajectories highlight enabling and disabling factors in becoming or choosing not to become a community member. Legitimate peripheral participation sets up a positive expectation towards fuller participation. Marginal non participation anticipates a lack of expectation towards fuller participation. These are useful notions when considering student motivation to develop mature participation in a community of practice because students have choices about their behaviour and how they interact with others. In the current research the social practices were established to set up the expectation of developing mature participation in the research classrooms.

To argue for legitimate peripheral participation in a community of practice, as a means to develop mature participation, suggests an ongoing process of negotiation where some learners may never develop mature participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Inward and outward bound trajectories (Wenger, 1998) are useful to understand how participation can be directed both towards and away from developing mature participation in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Scaffolding within
the affective ZPD may create inward and outward bound trajectories. This is examined further in the next section.

2.7 Scaffolding within the affective ZPD

The concept of socially shared cognition is becoming a more commonly held view of Western psychologists (Bruner, 1986; Rogoff, 1990, 1998; Walker et al., 2010; Wertsch, 1991). Similarly, an argument for the concept of socially shared affect highlights the significance of emotions in motivation and learning. To theorise the ZPD in terms of the emotions, Goldstein (1999) argues for more attention in research to the analysis of the ZPD as a relational or interpersonal zone, highlighting Vygotsky’s understanding of the central role of affective, personal relationships in cognitive development.

Different interpretations of Vygotsky’s (1978) work have not provided a clear direction about the role of affect. But Goldstein (1999) argues that Vygotsky understood learning, affect and motivation as connected and not separate processes. Over the last 20 years, a growing number of theorists have questioned research that precludes emotions and interpersonal relationships in understanding learning (Noddings, 1984, 1992, 2005; Meyer & Turner, 2002, 2006; Goldstein, 1999; Goldstein & Friedman, 2003), so it is timely to revisit this work.

Vygotsky (1978) argued that learning is socially constructed, which implies an affective or emotional link as humans work together. Goldstein (1999) states that teachers need to monitor the social climate of the classroom to build positive
interpersonal connections amongst students so learning can occur within the affective ZPD. To enter the ZPD and face challenges as they learn, students need to experience psychological safety, where they are comfortable to take risks. Thus, how a student perceives the classroom climate will determine their willingness to participate in activities and take risks.

These affective aspects of the ZPD are of primary and fundamental importance. Teachers must establish trusting caring relationships with learners for those learners to be willing to take risks required to enter into the ZPD. In other words, interpersonal connection must occur so that learning and growth can occur (Goldstein, 1999).

Teachers play a central role to lead student development through scaffolding positive relationships (Goldstein & Freedman, 2003). Students’ lower mental behaviours are characterised when students act impulsively. But students can be taught to control theses impulses and reflect on their behaviour. Through social interaction and scaffolding, within a supportive environment, students learn to reflect on their behaviour. Hence, it is necessary to examine how scaffolding the social practices of the classroom has the potential not only to transform the community and individual, but motivate and sustain mature participation and the development of higher mental functions.

The classroom climate or emotional tone is created by the students and teacher and their interpersonal relationships within the social practices of the classroom. As they work together in classrooms, teachers and students experience a range of emotions which affect their motivation to learn at a personal and collective level (Meyer & Turner, 2006). Taking turns and being respectful of different points of view need to be part of the values that underpin the classroom (Gibbs, 2001). Thus, the nature of
effective collaboration requires the teacher and students to focus on and understand the social aspects of learning.

Negotiation is a central component of developing collaborative communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Working within the affective ZPD creates opportunities to talk about feelings, which underpin emotions and the human element of learning. Goldstein (1999) argues that the interrelationship of affect and intellect was evident in Vygotsky’s work, yet translations and interpretations of this relationship have been overlooked.

The human element is certainly present in Vygotsky's own writings. Although it may have been overlooked in many of the summaries and interpretations of his work, Vygotsky himself saw affect and intellect as interconnected and inseparable. (p. 654)

In Goldstein’s (1999) and Levykh’s (2008) analysis of the ZPD, a necessary prerequisite for learning is positive interpersonal relationships between the teacher and students, based on trust. Levykh (2008) argues that this is a dynamic process of continual negotiation to sustain positive relationships and enhance learning.

Thus, the dynamic process of establishing and maintaining the ZPD is successful only when emotionally laden reciprocal relations between the learner and the instructor allow for participants’ comfort and trust, which are manifested in constant negotiation of the subject of inquiry and the way it is presented and acquired. (p. 97)

Levykh (2008) implies developing social skills to enhance relationships through working within the affective ZPD. Affective development is evident in how the students participate in classroom activities and collaborate with each other.

Establishing a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) requires attention not only to the choice of social practices but how these choices affect how people work together.
While recognising there are many factors contributing to personal and collective motivation, it is argued that collaborative classroom environments are conducive to students’ learning within the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999). The ZPD is extended to include affective aspects (Goldstein, 1999), which are embedded in classroom activities to develop mature student participation and motivation. Learning and motivation are sustained as a result of personal and social factors, which highlight the need for more holistic approaches to research that reflect the complexity of student motivation in real-life situations and incorporate different fields of research (Beltman & Volet, 2007).

2.8 Chapter summary

Contemporary motivation theorists recognise the limitations of current research models to fully explain individual motivation and learning and the need to include social and contextual factors (Anderman et al., 2011; Beltman & Volet, 2007; Boekaerts, 2011a; Pressick-Kilborn et al., 2005; Walker et al., 2004). In this chapter the discussion has centred on theoretical perspectives, originating from Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of learning, to highlight the ZPD and community participation. The notion of scaffolding was extended to the affective ZPD, and discussed in relation to classroom instructional practices, to foreground the role of emotions in learning. This leads into the next Chapter, which examines research related to classroom social practices and the implications for the research classrooms.
CHAPTER 3

LEADERSHIP, COLLABORATION AND COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE: 
DEVELOPING MATURE PARTICIPATION

3.1 Introduction

It is argued in this dissertation that creating a supportive classroom environment, where students can discuss their feelings and establish what is important for them, is critical to developing mature student participation and motivation. In the previous chapters a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978) framed the theoretical conceptualisation of learning, motivation and emotions. This chapter provides a review and discussion of research related to classroom social practices, in terms of concepts of student leadership, and issues for developing a collaborative community of practice. The implications for the research classrooms are elaborated and discussed.

In Figure 3.1, the review of research on leadership, collaboration and communities of practice is linked to the focus of the research on learning, motivation and emotions from a sociocultural perspective and to the practical aspects of learning, motivation and emotions as an integrated process in the classroom.
3.2 Leadership

Leadership has become something worthy of aspiration because it is symbolic of success (Sinclair, 2007). Two contemporary leadership theories are briefly examined in order to frame the conceptualisation of leadership in the current research. Much research has occurred in the United States of America over the last forty years, under
the umbrella of transformative leadership in relation to corporations. Drawing from Rost’s (1991) post-industrialised model of leadership, the relationship between the leader and followers is one of persuasion and influence. The purpose of this relationship is to affect “real change that reflects their mutual purpose” (Rost, 1991, p. 102). This model is social in nature and widely used in educational research. However, the implication that the students follow the lead of the teacher does not suggest collaboration where students have opportunities to contribute their ideas, and thus is not appropriate for the current research.

Sinclair’s (2007) critical review of leadership discourses and power relations opens up new possibilities for an adaptive leadership model, where,

Groups need to work out new ways to do organisational work rather than just apply the usual rules … leaders need to find ways of not colluding with this dependency. Acts of leadership involve helping focus the group on overriding purposes and values, rather than telling them what the solution is. (p. 68-69)

Instead, leaders need to value reflective thinking and experiential learning, as part of the process to becoming a leader. When conceptualising leadership in the research classrooms, reflection and shared responsibility were key elements of the process.

The definition of adaptive leadership reflects a process of sharing and learning to distribute the role of leadership amongst the teacher/researcher and students. Implicit in this model of leadership is skills can be learnt over time (Anacona, 2005). Keeping the focus on the social, leadership was conceptualised as a process, where the students and the teacher/researcher negotiated the criteria for a good leader. Students reflected on their progress towards meeting these criteria, with the support of their peers and
the teacher. As a result of this process, students became more aware of individual characteristics that supported or constrained the process of becoming a good leader.

3.3 Student leadership

In educational contexts, empirical research about leadership is usually associated with principals, teachers or older students at high schools, colleges, and universities (Anacona, 2005; Sinclair, 2007). In Western Australian primary schools, leadership is not typically associated with students in the lower grades or a majority of students. In most Australian primary schools, based on the view that students are expected to take more responsibility for their learning before entering high school, students in the upper primary grades are offered roles as sports captains and monitors, head boy and girl, and school councillors. These initiatives may be of value but do not widen the view of the majority of students about leadership because leadership is limited to a small number of students.

Sinclair (2007) reaffirms that assisting students to understand their capabilities also empowers them to realise their potential as leaders. In the current research, it is argued that the classroom social practices provide leadership opportunities for a greater number of students. When students have these opportunities, they develop aspirations to become a leader. Starting in the early years of school, with the support of the teacher and peers, students can learn leadership skills. William Yeat’s metaphor, that education is ‘not filling the bucket but lighting a fire’ (Sinclair, 2007, p. 37) implies the teacher’s role is to inspire and motivate students. A more interactive view for students aligns the teacher’s role as facilitator in this process (Putney &
Broughton, 2011). This allows students the opportunity to share responsibility when they are in the role of a leader. A collaborative learning approach caters for a more open-ended approach to teaching and thus allows for student leadership roles in the classroom.

Research, under the auspices of cooperative and collaborative learning, has many useful findings about structuring group work (Johnson et al., 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1994, 2003) but not specifically about student leadership development for all students in the classroom. To provide opportunities for students to develop leadership skills, they need to practice them in authentic contexts, such as being a leader of small social groups in the classroom. Understanding the theoretical origins of collaboration and cooperation allows an appreciation of how classrooms are structured and how the teacher’s role to initiate and organise group work can be established. If teachers are to allow students to develop leadership skills they need to consider the theoretical basis for their classroom decisions about how learning is structured. This is further elaborated in the first research publication in Chapter 6 (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008). A distinction is made in the next section between collaboration and cooperation to identify the nuances that determine the roles of the teacher and students.

3.4 Defining collaboration

The terms collaborative and cooperative learning are often used synonymously. Both terms refer to group work and imply active student participation. Yet their theoretical origins are quite distinctive and offer some clarification. Cooperative learning is
sourced from a social cognitive perspective of learning to support the development of
cognitive skills (Hill & Hill, 1993). Johnson, Johnson and Johnson Holubec’s (1994)
research provides a framework for developing group work. The five elements for
effective group work are: individual accountability; social skills or collaborative
learning; positive interdependence; face-to-face interaction and group processing
(Johnson et al., 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Group members are assigned roles
and complete an aspect of the task. Cooperative learning is highly structured to
maximise interaction between the students as they work towards specified outcomes.
The implications are that the teacher’s role is to structure the student groups and teach
the prerequisite social and communication skills necessary for successful group work.

In contrast, collaborative learning is a more generic term which refers to a less
structured group approach. It is characterised by students having more control and
teachers less control over the experience of working in a group (Bruffee, 1993; Hart,
1992). Collaborative learning is often used when referring to sociocultural or social
constructivist perspectives where knowledge is viewed as a social concept. This
implies a more open-ended approach to teaching. The teacher’s role, as a facilitator of
student learning, is to empower students to develop the skills to collaborate and
develop maturity in their learning to solve complex tasks. It is through the discussion
and exchange of ideas with others, who have different backgrounds, knowledge and
experience, that learning occurs (Gillies, 2003). However, there are issues working
with students in this way, which are discussed in the next section.
3.5 Issues with collaborative learning

Even though the social, psychological and academic benefits of developing collaborative skills are well established in research (Johnson & Johnson, 1989, 2003), schools have been slow to change their practice (Gibbs, 2001; Matusov, 1999; Rogoff, et al., 1996). Contemporary employers also seek applicants who have multiple skills that include an ability to work collaboratively, as a team member, and to demonstrate initiative and independence when required (Gibbs, 2001).

Part of the resistance for change in classrooms comes from parents, who are concerned that collaborative learning will not prepare their children for the competitive nature of the workforce. These concerns have been found in other empirical studies where parents’ expectations, based on past experiences of a one-sided approach in the classroom, became a constraint to developing collaborative practices (Matusov, 1999; Rogoff et al., 2003; Slavin, 1989). These researchers found that parents needed to experience the benefits of collaboration by working in the classroom with teachers and their children, but it took some time for parents to change their perceptions.

Conducted over several years, Rogoff et al.’s (1996) longitudinal research aimed to create collaborative learning communities, but faced challenges from parents and students. Introducing new participation structures into primary classrooms, students needed time to adjust to taking more responsibility for their learning, guided by teachers, parents and their peers. Adopting Lave and Wenger’s (1991) use of the term legitimate peripheral participants to describe students’ initial status in the process of
moving from the periphery of activities to mature participation, Rogoff et al. (1996) examined parents’ changes in a similar way. Through a process of observing and discussing the program, parents came to understand the new teaching philosophy.

For many new members of the community coming to participate in this program, requires a long period of being “legitimate peripheral participants” (to use Lave and Wenger’s term, 1991) - provided with some direct instruction but mainly with opportunities to observe, discuss and participate. (Rogoff et al., 1996, p. 399)

Rogoff et al. (1996) surveyed parents at the beginning of their study and again two years later. The results reflected a favourable shift, with the majority of parents supporting the new approach after two years. During the same period, there was an increase, up to fifty percent, in the number of volunteers in the classroom. Rogoff and her research colleagues noted that there were issues when newcomers see “particular practices in isolation as routines and attempt to follow them, but without comprehending how they fit together” (Rogoff et al., 1996, p. 400). A deeper understanding of the complexities of building a collaborative classroom philosophy may not be evident to parents, resulting in misinterpretations of their observations.

Collaborative classrooms are characterised as supportive environments, where students can express their emotions. The teacher/researcher’s focus in the current research was to create a participation framework that would enable the development of mature student participation. Implicit in creating such an environment is the need for students to develop social and emotional skills so they can accept more responsibility for their learning. In the context of student leadership and motivation, there is little research with primary students but Hart (1992) offers ideas for teachers interested in creating a framework to support student collaboration, which was adopted in the current research to also develop student leadership skills.
3.6 Creating a self-supporting framework for collaboration

The findings of several empirical studies concluded that students’ motivation and learning in the classroom were linked to how teachers structured the classroom to establish positive emotional connections. When teachers built collaborative relationships with their elementary and high school students, students were motivated to learn (Anderman et al., 2011; Battistich & Watson, 2003; Goldstein & Freedman, 2003; Noddings, 1984, 1992). Across different school settings, students concurred that it was important to them that the teacher found a way to support their social and emotional needs.

In Hart’s (1992) empirical studies in primary classrooms, as in Rogoff et al.’s (1996) research, there were preconceived notions that collaboration was based on the assumption that the teacher would initiate collaborative group-based student activities. Hart found that she needed to understand more about the background to the teacher’s structuring of a self-supporting environment for collaboration. Much of the teachers’ background preparation was not apparent at first so Hart needed to delve deeper to understand this complexity. In these classrooms, Hart observed

…collaboration was being developed as an integral element of the learning environment as a whole. Rather than ‘structuring tasks for collaboration’ it was more a process of ‘structuring a learning environment for collaboration’, with each of the elements contributing something to the whole and therefore needing to be understood in relation to the whole. (1992, p. 14)

Some of the elements of a self-supporting framework, identified by Hart’s (1992), were that students were not reliant solely on the teacher to organise group work or collaborative activities. Instead, students and the teacher initiated collaboration, at
times planned, and at other times spontaneous in nature. Hart made explicit links to the teachers’ previous groundwork and drew these conclusions.

Building a collaborative learning environment is not about whether or how often children work individually or in groups. It is about creating an expectation that children will share ideas, help one another, and make the most of one another’s resources, while the teacher is busy elsewhere… It is a gradual process, starting out from where teachers and students are and developing little by little, under their control, at a pace both feel comfortable with. (Hart, 1992, p. 21)

To develop a collaborative learning environment Hart observed that teachers had the expectation that students would share ideas and help each other. The implications are that teachers need to negotiate with students so students feel comfortable and part of the process where they have some control. Teachers need to establish a safe classroom and scaffold students how to share ideas to develop an understanding of the meaning of working collaboratively.

Activities, such as ‘Yellow pages’ (McGrath & Noble, 1993- listed in Table 3.1), assist students to become familiar with each others’ strengths and weaknesses and become resources for one another. Hart’s (1992) elements for developing a collaborative community are listed in the first Column of Table 3.1 below. Examples of the classroom activities that provided opportunities for the teacher/researcher to scaffold students within the affective ZPD are listed in the second Column. Some of these activities are discussed later in Chapters 4 and 5, to make specific links between the teacher/researcher’s scaffolds and the research tools.
Table 3.1 Hart’s (1992) elements of a self-supporting framework and corresponding classroom activities (scaffolding within the affective ZPD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hart’s (1992) elements</th>
<th>Classroom activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop the concept of children as resources for each other</td>
<td>Yellow pages activity to identify students’ strengths and weaknesses (McGrath &amp; Noble, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish supportive relationships</td>
<td>Class Agreements appreciate others/no put downs and mutual respect (Gibbs, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish an organised classroom environment</td>
<td>Timetables, daily classroom activities and routines displayed in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Make a commitment to collaboration</td>
<td>Timetables for daily Social Circle and weekly Class Meetings (create psychological safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scaffold the choice to collaborate</td>
<td>Student reflection logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide quality and scope of activities</td>
<td>Student leadership opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop a range of quality activities that involve collaboration</td>
<td>Team building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish an understanding of the purposes of collaboration</td>
<td>Discussions about “What makes a good team leader?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provide opportunities for all students to experience collaboration</td>
<td>Group logos designed and constructed by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Counter resistance to collaborative work</td>
<td>Discussions about bullying issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Model use of strategies/ Teacher support in the initial stages</td>
<td>Class Agreements negotiated and used during the classroom social practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Monitor how students collaborate</td>
<td>Class Meetings used as a reflective tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When collaboration is an integral part of the classroom the assumption is that students will collaborate if the teacher provides a supportive environment and develops positive student relationships. The teacher is able to scaffold positive student relationships with a focus on the social and contextual aspects of the classroom (Hart,
Teachers can prioritise their time more effectively with activities such as ‘Yellow pages’ ((McGrath & Noble, 1993)) and using Class Agreements to reinforce mutual respect. Combining these activities provides students with information about the strengths and weaknesses of their peers. Class Agreements promote values such as ‘appreciating others/no put downs and showing mutual respect’ (Gibbs, 2001). Students are encouraged to participate and move from the periphery of the group to develop mature participation.

It is central to the argument in this dissertation that a teacher’s role is to build a collaborative classroom community of practice to support students’ social and emotional needs as an integral part of their learning. In doing this, the teacher is able to address common motivational issues in classrooms. How the teacher/researcher used the social activities listed in Table 3.1 to structure a positive classroom climate for students to work within the affective ZPD and to enable motivational concerns to be addressed, is detailed in the next chapter.

3.7 Collaboration in the context of communities of practice

Common elements of communities of practice include “a set of relations among persons, activity, and the world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). Thus, communities of practice exist in many forms so individuals can be members of multiple communities, therefore having access to a variety of sources from which to make meaning. Similarly Wenger’s (1998) elements comprise of “sustained mutual relationships which can be harmonious or conflictual; shared ways of engaging in
doing things together and a shared discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world” (p. 136). These elements emphasise the collaborative nature of activities to generate shared understandings about how the community operates (Matusov, 1999; Rogoff et al., 1996, 2003).

Bruner (1986) argues that through negotiation and sharing, communal and cultural learning develops a sense of belonging to a culture, culminating in membership in society. Emphasising the social nature implicit in developing a community, Bruner argues:

Most learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture. It’s not just that the child must make knowledge his own, but that he must make it his own in a community of those who share his sense of belonging to a culture. It is this that leads me to emphasize not only discovery and invention but the importance of negotiating and sharing – in a word, of joint culture -- creating as an object of schooling, and as an appropriate step en route to becoming a member of an adult society in which one lives out one’s life. (p. 127)

To identify salient elements of the classroom culture that developed a collaborative community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and personal motivation, the current research examined the social aspects of participation in the classroom. Communal and cultural learning occurred in the research classes through leadership opportunities that promoted collaboration between teachers and students. Collaborative participation structures support a more student centred approach to learning (Rogoff et al., 2003).

3.8 Chapter summary

In this chapter student leadership, collaboration (Hart, 1992) and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) were examined as a basis for developing a
sociocultural (Vygosky, 1978) approach to classroom instructional practices that supports the development of mature participation. The next Chapter builds on this approach to examine how the social and cultural practices of the classroom can scaffold working within students’ affective ZPDs (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978), and foreground the affective aspects of learning when students discussed their feelings.
CHAPTER 4

THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PRACTICES IN THE CLASSROOM:
WORKING WITHIN THE AFFECTIVE ZPD

4.1 Introduction

Sociocultural theory offers the conceptual model for the current research, based on the assumption that learning and motivation are not separate but interconnected processes, inseparable from emotions. This Chapter describes how the teacher/researcher scaffolded students, though modelling and reflecting, to establish a supportive classroom climate and encourage student participation in activities. It elaborates the nature of scaffolds the teacher/researcher used to work within the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978).

Rogoff’s (1995) cultural/community, interpersonal and personal psychological planes are used to provide a multilayered description of the classroom social practices, in greater detail than was possible in the research publications. These analytical planes are compatible with communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and allow examination of the sociocultural milieu or classroom context (Vygotsky, 1978). Using the multidimensional concept of collaboration (Meyer & Turner, 2006), Rogoff’s (1995) framework is also useful to examine learning, motivation and emotions, as interrelated processes. Each of Rogoff’s planes is foregrounded in turn, providing an analytical and interpretive tool, to highlight scaffolding within the affective ZPD.
4.2 Community plane social practices for apprenticeship

At the community plane, Rogoff (1995) uses the metaphor of apprenticeship to examine how individuals participate with others in culturally organised community activities. In this section, the organised community activities that provide the foci of the social practices for the community plane are described and discussed. They are the five Class Agreements, the daily Social Circle and the weekly Class Meetings. These cultural practices are described in the research publications, in relation to developing mature student participation but do not explicitly explain how the teacher/researcher worked within the affective ZPD. In order to argue that emotions and motivation need to be studied simultaneously to fully understand student learning (Meyer and Turner, 2006) further explanation is warranted to guide the reader when interpreting the tables in this chapter.

The five Class Agreements, developed at the commencement of the school year with students, were mutual respect, attentive listening, appreciating others/no put downs, participation/right to pass (Gibbs, 2001) and personal best (Bernard, 1996). The teacher/researcher used the format of a “Y chart”, to negotiate shared understandings about each agreement and establish parameters for behaviour in the classroom. The Y Chart was constructed by drawing a large letter Y to create three areas which were labelled: Looks like… listed the related behaviours students would see; Sounds like… listed the related words spoken or heard and, Feels like … listed the feelings one would experience. These generic headings were applied to other Y charts for different concepts such as friendship, leadership and great group work. As a reflective tool,
these charts were referred to during social practices such as the daily Social Circle and weekly Class Meeting.

At the start of the year the teacher/researcher modelled the Social Circle to the students. All participants sat on the mat in the classroom, in a circle formation, before the Social Circle started. Each participant passed around an object called the *talking stick* and said: “My name is… and I feel… because…”. Only the person who held the talking stick could speak. An example of the student dialogue from the Social Circle is presented later in this chapter, in *Table 4.3*. During the week the teacher/researcher and students recorded the agenda items for the weekly Class Meetings. Students discussed issues at Class Meetings to learn how to resolve conflicts, which is integral to building shared understandings and community (Wenger, 1998).

In *Table 4.1* the community classroom social practices are listed (See Column 1). These practices promoted the values of the community and the processes to participate in the community. The second column presents examples of elements of the affective scaffolds for apprenticeship that the teacher/researcher modelled for students. Then students reflected upon their understandings as the basis to develop the shared values of the community. The links to opportunities for students to discuss and reflect upon their feelings have been italicised, highlighting that such discussions and reflections were an integral part of classroom social practices.
Table 4.1 Community social practices and scaffolds for apprenticeship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community social practices</th>
<th>Scaffolds for apprenticeship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Agreements</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/researcher scaffolded the students, during discussions, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a framework to support values and ways of participating through the construction of Y Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Looked Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sounded Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Felt Like (Emotions: how students feel)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand the importance of empathy, tolerance and mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Support positive relationships</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Social Circle</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/researcher scaffolded the students, during discussions, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Develop a language to express feelings</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Class Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/researcher scaffolded the students, during discussions, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Develop a framework to resolve issues</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted social practices from Gibbs (2001)*

The daily Social Circle and the weekly Class Meetings were timetabled as part of the normal classroom routine. These activities offered authentic contexts for students to develop a framework to support values and ways of participating that developed social competence and community cohesion. Each social practice was linked to an affective component. This was evident when the teacher/researcher questioned students about what they were thinking but also how they were feeling.
4.3 Interpersonal plane social practices for guiding participation

At the interpersonal plane, ‘guided participation’ focuses on the processes and systems of involvement between people as they communicate and coordinate efforts (Rogoff, 1995). The use of Sociograms, the adaptation of the Tribes Learning Community Process (Gibbs, 2001) and the weekly Class Meetings are the foci for social practices at the interpersonal plane, demonstrating how the teacher/researcher guided participation. These social practices were used to promote positive interpersonal relationships and student leadership opportunities, discussed in the research publications, but also demonstrated how students were scaffolded within the affective ZPD.

The teacher/research used The Tribes process (Gibbs, 2001) to guide the nature of the classroom activities and develop the three cyclical stages: inclusion, influence and community. The aim of the activities for each stage was to develop:

1. Group cohesion using team building activities (Inclusion);
2. Negotiation skills that supported student participation (Influence);
3. A sense of belonging and sharing where students took responsibility for their behaviour (Community).

These stages were cumulative and dynamic. They took time to develop over a school year but provided a framework for classroom social practices that promoted mature participation, as evidenced in the research publications in Chapters 6-9.

The weekly Class Meetings provided the forum for the teacher/researcher and students to prioritise and discuss issues to develop and sustain positive relationships.
The processes of modelling and scaffolding values and ways to participate in small social groups created opportunities to negotiate participation, which it is argued underpinned students’ motivation. Because students had the right to pass, the conditions for psychological safety were embedded in the social practices and processes. Working within the affective ZPD created a supportive classroom context for developing positive relationships.

At the interpersonal level, the Tribes Learning Community (Gibbs, 2001) process and weekly Class Meetings provided multiple avenues to systematically address students’ social and emotional needs. Sociograms were used to be strategic about supporting students to make new friends, learn how to be a leader and how to support a leader. Changing social groups each term allowed students to work with a variety of peers and experience different peer role models as leaders. Weekly Class Meetings provided the forum for students to learn how to appreciate different points of view, negotiate with each other and take responsibility for their actions.

Below in Table 4.2, the interpersonal classroom social practices are listed (See Column 1) and some examples of elements of the affective scaffolds to guide participation (See Column 2). To demonstrate that emotions were an integral part of classroom social practices, the scaffolds that provided opportunities for students to discuss their emotions are italicised.
### Table 4.2 Interpersonal social practice and scaffolds for guiding participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal social practices</th>
<th>Scaffolds to guide participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sociograms** | Teacher/researcher placed students in supportive groups to scaffold students to  
• Make new friends  
• Learn how to be a leader  
• Learn how to support a leader |
| **Tribes** (Gibbs, 2001) | Teacher/researcher changed students’ groups at least once a term to scaffold students to  
• Learn to work with a variety of students  
• Experience different peer role models |
| **Weekly Class Meetings** | Teacher/researcher scaffolded students to identify and resolve issues to learn how to  
• Negotiate  
• Express and appreciate different points of view |

Adapted social practices from Gibbs (2001)

All scaffolding processes were embedded with opportunities to discuss emotions and set an expectation of mutual respect amongst the teacher/researcher and students when feelings were shared. The scaffolds for apprenticeship and guiding participation, provided the basis for the teacher/researcher to develop scaffolds to appropriate ways of participating, discussed in the next section.

### 4.4 Personal plane social practices for appropriating ways of participating

When discussing the personal plane, Rogoff (1995) suggests that through participating in an activity or situation, the individual changes and this experience prepares them for subsequent similar activities or situations. This process is encapsulated in Rogoff’s (1995) metaphor of ‘participatory appropriation’ where
individuals transform their understanding and responsibility for activities through participation. Below, in Table 4.3, there are examples of students’ dialogue from the daily Social Circle (adapted from Gibbs, 2001) and agenda items from the weekly Class Meetings. In the second column the elements of affective scaffolds are italicised to highlight that emotions were an integral part of classroom social practices.

Table 4.3 Personal social practices and scaffolds for appropriating ways of participating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal social practices</th>
<th>Scaffolds to appropriate ways of participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Social Circle</strong></td>
<td>Teacher/researcher scaffolded the students through modelling and reflecting to assist students to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students said in turn: My name is __ and I feel__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy because I am going to Sarah’s house today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angry because my baby sister kept me awake last night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excited because I am going to Daniel’s party next week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sad because my rabbit died on the weekend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excited because I am learning to play tennis after school today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excited because we are going to Bali next week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy because my team won at the weekend and I got the coach’s award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy because we are getting a new car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angry because I had a fight with my brother this morning before school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excited because my mum is having twins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy because it is the weekend and I am going camping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angry because my cat scratched me this morning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy, sad and excited because I am going to Ella’s house after school, I lost my ring but it’s my birthday soon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Class Meetings- Common agenda items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am worried about having no one to play with when my friend isn’t at school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I never get to play with the sports equipment because the same people use it and don’t share.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nobody wants to play my games with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People in my group are not listening to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop skills to resolve issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take personal responsibility for actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dialogue from the Social Circle illustrates how the process generated language related to feelings or emotions. The affective teacher scaffolds included modelling to students how to participate in the Social Circle and weekly Class Meetings, to express their emotions and reflect on their participation, while referring back to the five Class Agreements. This process made explicit to students the expectation of showing mutual respect and listening attentively to peers when they were expressing their views. The respectful manner in which students built on peer’s ideas also made explicit that it was important to acknowledge the contribution of their peer by saying phrases such as: “I agree and I think that is a great idea and I think…” or “I think that’s a good idea but I disagree because…”.

The class agenda items had the potential to develop students’ ability to resolve issues and take responsibility for their actions. Underlying these agenda items the teacher/researcher inferred there were deeper emotional concerns for the students about feeling worried, frustrated, lonely or disrespected, which may affect motivation for learning. It is argued in this dissertation that linking behaviour with emotions in this way, the teacher/researcher scaffolded within the affective ZPD, when students’ discussed their feelings. The teacher/researcher encouraged students to express their feelings and ideas to encourage further student participation.

Ideas, such as ‘Cooperative Marbles in a Jar’ were generated by the students during Class Meeting discussions and modified as the students made progress towards behaving cooperatively. To provide a positive focus, that recognised when mutual respect and peer support were being given, students suggested that marbles were put into a jar for each group when students were being cooperative and rewards were
given as certain milestones were achieved. To further encourage peer support, all
groups needed to reach the same milestones before the reward was given. This
process allowed students from the more successful groups (who had earned their
marbles) to share their strategies with their peers. They explained how they worked
together and supported their leader. Having a less competitive approach to how the
marbles were earned, resulted in teams or groups supporting each other to achieve the
milestones. The consistent use of social practices of this nature in both research
classrooms provided opportunities for the teacher/researcher to scaffold students
within the affective ZPD and acknowledge the affective aspects of learning and
collaborating.

4.5 Chapter summary

This Chapter provided a description of the classroom social practices used to create a
self-supporting framework and build a collaborative community of practice (Hart,
1992; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff et al., 1996, 2003). Opportunities to work within
affective ZPDs (Vygotsky, 1978; Goldstein, 1999) were highlighted at the
community, interpersonal and personal planes (Rogoff, 1995) that developed mature
student participation. Through scaffolding within affective ZPDs the
teacher/researcher was able to discuss students’ emotions. In the publications and
discussion in the final chapter (Chapter 10) these social practices are linked to focal
groups of student who changed their participation. The agenda items listed in Table
4.3 exemplify common social and emotional issues that may undermine students’
motivation and become areas of concern not only for the teacher but for students.
This is argued underpinned their motivation and learning. In the next Chapter the methodological approach and research tools are examined, and further links to the use of social practices, to highlight how authentic classroom practices became a rich source of data.
CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY:
CONDUCTING QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

5.1 Introduction

This Chapter explains the choice of qualitative methodology and the approach taken for data collection and analysis. The social and cultural practices of the classroom and the teacher/researcher’s scaffolds provided a source of rich data and were an integral part of the research tools. Rogoff’s (1995) personal, interpersonal and community/institutional planes proved an effective framework to analyse the large amounts of qualitative data generated from the research.

Following an introduction to the research aim and questions, the methodological considerations are examined. Next further details of the research sites and participants, ethical considerations and research tools are presented. An overview of the research papers, in terms of the development of mature student participation, is provided at the end of this chapter. This provides an introduction to the data analyses used in the research publications (See Chapters 6-9).

5.2 Research aim and questions

The research aim was to examine the development of student motivation, which is conceptualised as negotiated participation in a collaborative community of practice.
The research questions are:

1. How does student leadership develop mature participation and contribute to student motivation?
2. What are the key features of scaffolds for students to develop mature participation?
3. In what ways does sociocultural theory support classroom-based research to examine student motivation?

The research questions reflect the practical and theoretical aspects of the research and the complex nature of classroom based research. In the earlier chapters the limitations of current research models to fully explain individual motivation and learning were introduced and the development of the teacher/researcher’s scaffolds to work within the affective ZPD. The assumption has been made that scaffolding within the affective ZPD is a legitimate educative role of teachers (Chapter 4). Each of Rogoff’s (1995) planes was used to highlight how scaffolding within the affective ZPD created the sociocultural milieu (Vygotsky, 1978) to support student collaboration. The role of emotions has been discussed, as part of the scaffolding process within the affective ZPD, to argue for the centrality of emotions in learning and motivation in classroom research (Meyer, 2009; Meyer & Turner, 2006, 2007). Qualitative research methodology is consistent with a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978) that framed the current research. In the next section the rationale for the use of qualitative methods and an action research process are discussed.

5.3 Methodological considerations

Qualitative research methodology aims to understand the world of the participant by situating the researcher with all their values and assumptions in that world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). This contrasts to quantitative research methods, aiming
to control variables, suggesting hypotheses and making predictions. Relying heavily on statistical methods, quantitative methods often lack the contextual details (Boekaerts, 2011a). The aims of the current research were not to predict outcomes or identify variables to be controlled but to describe and understand the development of student motivation. Without predetermining outcomes, the choice of qualitative research methods was less intrusive and provided flexibility to include a variety of perspectives evolving from the research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative research methods were flexible enough to take advantage of planned data collection and other opportunities that evolved from classroom activities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The action research process of 'plan, act, and reflect', prioritised the planning and targeting of data collection as integrated into the normal teaching program. Carr and Kemmis (1986) argue this approach is appropriate for problems grounded in the classroom and related to educational practice. For the teacher/researcher, a systematized approach to data collection during authentic classroom activities was necessary, not only for the feasibility of the projects but to maximise opportunities in the naturalistic setting of the classroom. The perspectives of participants (students, parents and teachers) were accessed through interactions during the normal course of classroom teaching and during school hours, and through interviews. Combining data from different participants, with contextual details, provided triangulation validity. The contextual details of the research sites and participants and the ethical considerations for the research are presented in the next sections before a discussion of the research tools and their links to the classroom social practices.
5.4 Contextual details of the research sites and participants

The research was conducted in the teacher/researcher’s classroom at two different Government primary school sites in the metropolitan area of Western Australia. Research at Bushlands Primary school was conducted as part of Project 1 in 2004 (Classroom 1) and at Seaview Primary school as part of Project 2 in 2007-2008 (Classroom 2, 2007). Based on the low socioeconomic status of mainly migrant families whose children attended the school, Bushlands was categorised as a priority school by the Western Australian Department of Education and Training. Many families relied on one income or the parents were seeking employment and spoke English as an additional language at home. Hence, under the auspices of the Commonwealth Literacy and Numeracy Program, the school qualified for supplementary funding from the Australian Government. Bushlands staff prioritised literacy, numeracy and pastoral care programs to address the needs of the students.

In contrast, Seaview was located in a high socioeconomic area. Many families had two incomes. Parents were either employed in a professional capacity or self-employed, running their own businesses. In response to the high academic needs of the students, Seaview staff prioritised higher order thinking skills. Even though the schools had quite different educational priorities, to develop students’ participation the teacher/researcher implemented similar classroom social practices for the research. The findings from Classroom 1 (2004) about the benefits of student leadership became the basis for the research conducted in Classroom 2 (2007) which

---

1 The research project extended across two school years (2007-2008) but the 2008 part of the research is not included in this dissertation.
examined *developing motivation through student leadership in the primary classroom*.

In *Table 5.1* (See below) the research focus and details of the participants for Bushlands and Seaview are summarised. Additional background about the two research projects reported in this dissertation is provided in *Appendix 1*.

Table 5.1 *Overview of the research focus and participants at Bushlands and Seaview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bushlands Classroom 1</th>
<th>Seaview Classroom 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research focus</strong></td>
<td>Mediating classroom culture based on democratic values and the teacher’s facilitative role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Participants**      | Years 4 and 5 students  
  *n* = 32, aged 9-11 years,  
  17 boys and 14 girls | Year 3 students  
  *n* = 25, aged 8-9 years,  
  *n* = 13 boys and 13 girls |
|                       | *n* = 32 family representatives (parents/guardians) who signed the consent letters with their children | *n* = 25 family representatives (parents/guardians) who signed the consent letters with their children |

It is common practice in Western Australian schools, when conducting classroom based research, to gain permission from the school principal and ethical approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the supervising university. For teachers who conduct research with their students, ethical issues can usually be resolved through discussions with HREC and university supervisors. The main concern is dependency issues between the teacher and students when the teacher is also the researcher. This is discussed in the next section and the role of the critical friends for each project.
5.5 Ethical considerations

Informed consent was required for both students and parents, due to the age of the students, with clear communication that there were no penalties or a need for explanation if at any stage participants wished to opt out of the project. The teacher/researcher’s ethical standing for conducting research was satisfied with the provision of a copy of the Public Sector Code of Ethics (in which the teacher/researcher had training) and a copy of a police clearance to conduct research. There are legal and ethical requirements embedded in the teacher/student relationship and an implied duty of care. The dependency issues for the classroom teacher conducting research with her students highlights legitimate concerns about collecting data of a personal nature (such as students’ feelings). It was clearly stated on the consent letters to parents and students (See Appendix 2) that there was no compulsion to agree to participate in the research and once consent was given a participant could later withdraw without explanation or disadvantage in any way. Consent issues for those students who may have chosen not to participate in the project may have affected the feasibility of collecting data about group dynamics. However, there was full participation for both projects.

Official parent meetings were held before the research started to inform parents about the aims of the projects. After data collection all data were stored in a locked cabinet to ensure security of data. Pseudonyms were also used for the research participants and the schools when reporting the findings to ensure anonymity. At the conclusion of each project the teacher/researcher presented the preliminary research findings to parents and their children at a semi-informal evening meeting.
For Project 1, enlisting the Deputy Principal of Bushlands as the critical friend and independent observer facilitated the research. Her main responsibility included managing student behaviour and in this role she was familiar with the students at the school and their families. She was in an ideal position to support participants if they had any concerns about the research. Often she would visit the classroom to congratulate students whose behaviour had improved. Likewise, for Project 2, the teacher who agreed to be the critical friend at Seaview had established community relationships through the normal course of her work as educational support teacher and student services coordinator. In her role as student services coordinator, she organised parent and teacher conferences in response to students’ needs. This meant she was fully conversant with the students in the research classroom and their ongoing needs. There were two students in research Classroom 2 with intellectual disabilities and they attended the educational support unit each morning at the school. Having two classroom teachers, one of whom was the critical friend to the project, and the other who could monitor the impact of the research on these students on a daily basis, provided another means of support for these students.

5.6 Research tools

Similar research methodology, research tools and classroom instructional practices were used at both schools. The research tools were chosen to access the participants’ views and actions as they participated in the social and cultural activities in the classroom. The summary below (See Table 5.2) demonstrates how the research tools were embedded in the classroom social practices. In Column 1 the social practices are grouped under Rogoff’s (1995) community, interpersonal
and personal planes (Previously presented in Chapter 4). The research tools and other data sources, reported in the research publications, are listed in Column 2.

Table 5.2 Classroom social practices and research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom social practices</th>
<th>Research tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community plane</td>
<td>• Classroom artefacts: Y charts for 5 Class Agreements and criteria for being a good leader and a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 Class Agreements</td>
<td>• Transcripts of video recordings and digital photographs of the DSC and WCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Daily Social Circle (DSC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weekly Class Meetings (WCM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal plane</td>
<td>• Sociometric surveys- student nominations for tribes or groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tribes groups (Gibbs, 2001)</td>
<td>• Teacher observations of behaviour in social groups and at WCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sociograms</td>
<td>• Written agendas for WCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weekly Class Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal plane</td>
<td>• Dialogue from the DSC (Refer to the example in Table 4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Daily Social Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Research tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Semi-structured student interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Appendix 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Semi-structured parent interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Appendix 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher/researcher’s observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students’ reflection logs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents related to school policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social practices, such as the daily Social Circle and the weekly Class Meetings, had multiple purposes and were applied across Rogoff’s (1995) three planes. For example, the daily Social Circle was a community building strategy (Community plane) but also provided the opportunity for the teacher/researcher to examine individual student contributions (Personal plane). Also the weekly Class Meetings developed a sense of community (Community plane) as participants resolved interpersonal issues (Interpersonal plane) and provided an opportunity to develop responsibility (Personal plane).
Other research tools included: classroom observations; reflective accounts of the children, their parents and the teacher/researcher; documents related to school policies such as student behaviour records; classroom artefacts developed with the students (Y charts), and photographs of classroom activities. In Classroom 2, video recordings were also made of the Class Meetings by the co-researcher\(^2\), with supplementary field notes and email correspondence between teacher/researcher and co-researcher. Details of the surveys and interviews used in Classroom 1 are reported in the Master’s dissertation (Morcom, 2005). For Classroom 2, the co-researcher conducted semi-structured student (Appendix 3) and parent interviews (Appendix 4). To present the preliminary findings, parent information evenings were conducted: twice a year, at the beginning of each project and at the conclusion of the research.

The level of detail for the research tools used in the four publications varies in relation to the purpose of each paper. For the 2007 research, interviews were used more extensively and there were changes to the interview schedules in response to developments in the research during the year. In the following table (See Table 5.3) there is a list of the publications and links to further elaborations of the research tools.

\(^2\) The co-researcher was also the university supervisor for the current research.
Table 5.3 List of the publications and links to further elaborations of the research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Links to research tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chapter 6- Paper 1: Making classroom social practices explicit: Developing motivation through participation in collaborative leadership opportunities. | Table 8.1 The Teaching and Research Elements of Data Sources and Their Purpose  
- Y Charts- Five Class Agreements (e.g. “Lift ups”)  
- Daily Social Circle  
- Weekly Class Meetings  
- Sociometric surveys and Tribes social groups  
- Parent interviews  
- Teacher observations  
- Student reflection logs  
- Team member of the week  
- Teacher encouragement awards |
| In addition, transcripts of dialogue from the weekly Class Meetings and teacher and student interviews were used to identify focal groups of students. |
| Chapter 7- Paper 2: ‘Motivation in action’ in a collaborative primary school classroom: Developing and sustaining teacher motivation | Table 3 Rogoff’s (1995) three planes of analysis, focus, purpose and data  
Transcripts of teacher’s and students’ reflection logs, teacher observations, and parent surveys were used to identify changes in student participation and motivation (p. 27). |
| Chapter 8- Paper 3: Bullies and victims in a primary classroom: Scaffolding a collaborative community of practice | Table 1 Summary of the frequency and range of data  
Table 2 Summary of diverse teaching and research tools  
Data from sociometric surveys, teacher observations and behaviour records were used to document the changes in the development of students’ participation and motivation, and behaviour as they moved into different social groups and took on leadership roles. |
| Chapter 9- Paper 4: Getting personal about values: Scaffolding student participation towards an inclusive classroom community | Transcripts of teacher’s and students’ reflection logs, teacher observations, sociometric surveys, behaviour records, and parent and student interviews were used to identify changes in student participation and motivation (p. 5). |
The next section provides details about the sociograms and interviews not able to be provided in the publications.

5.7 Additional details for the sociograms and interviews

Sociograms are a useful tool for classroom teachers to form groups in their classes that meet a variety of students’ needs (Gibbs, 2001) such as creating new friendships or supportive groups for students who did not have friends. The teacher/researcher asked the students to think about questions such as:

1. Is there anybody you have not worked with and would like to consider?
2. Is there anybody who may benefit from being in your group to make a friend or become a leader or vice leader?
3. Is there anybody you think needs a second chance and you would like to support them?

For each round of Tribes (Gibbs, 2001) students nominated different peers to form groups. The teacher/researcher used the nominations to structure supportive social groups. The in-depth details of these groupings are provided in the data analyses in the Master’s research (Morcom, 2005) for Classroom 1 (2004) where the focus was to document how the teacher/researcher created a democratic classroom. The same sociometric surveys were used for both classrooms and have been reported in the current research (See Chapters 6-9) in the context of teacher scaffolding within the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) to examine student motivation. Every 8-10 weeks new social groups were formed. Students remained in that group until the next round of Tribes. In Classroom 1, the focus for students was to develop friendships and curb the bullying behaviours of a large group of students. In Classroom 2, the main focus was to develop student confidence to become leaders and support peers who were already
leaders. These instructional and research foci may appear to be different but, for both research projects, students had common social needs to develop self-confidence and learn how to make friends.

To protect students who may not have received peer nominations, the outcomes of the sociometric surveys remained confidential. In the Tribes process, Gibbs (2001) advocates that groups stay together for the school year. In Classroom 1, where many students were bullied by their peers, 6-8 weeks provided an optimal period to resolve issues with the same peers in each social group. Then new groups were formed. This process allowed the teacher/researcher to redistribute student leaders to become role models for their peers in another group. The aim of these activities was to transfer responsibility for learning to the students.

Once the research in Classroom 1 concluded, the data were analysed through the lens of the teacher’s role to facilitate a democratic and collaborative classroom (Master’s thesis: Morcom, 2005). Drawing from the major themes documented for the Master’s thesis (relationships, leadership and friendships), the teacher/researcher decided to focus on student leadership to encourage mature participation in the 2007 research project. Over the next few years, the teacher/researcher prepared abstracts and papers for educational research conferences (listed in the preface at the beginning of this dissertation), using the theme of developing mature participation and motivation. Thus the interviews and teacher observations from the 2007 research (Classroom 2) were analysed in depth and feature more prominently in the research publications, with additional data not previously used in the Master’s dissertation, to provide new insights into student motivation and learning. The type of interviews is discussed in
depth to examine how the interview questions were developed throughout the 2007 research process to meet the changing needs of the research.

Different types of interviews range from highly structured, semi-structured to unstructured in-depth interviews. De Groot (2002) identifies advantages and drawbacks of different interview methods. For highly structured interviews, questions are predetermined, which may be viewed as an advantage because the responses can be compared if the same questions are used for all interviews. But this can also be a drawback because important data may be missed if the right questions are not asked. There may not be flexibility to ask further questions if clarifications or elaborations of the responses are needed. In contrast, an unstructured interview allows the interviewee time to express their story, from their perspective, in their words. However, time constraints to conduct such interviews may be prohibitive.

Semi-structured interviews use a combination of predetermined and open-ended questions, which were used for the current research. The interviewer can follow up on the responses to delve deeper to achieve a richness of insights. Turner and Meyer (2000) warn that the richness of data, from any type of interview, is reliant on the expertise of the interviewer.

The richness of insights provided by interviews is accompanied by a myriad of pitfalls. Regardless of the type of interviewing approach, the knowledge and skill of the interviewer and the relationship with the interviewee are paramount to capturing the most powerful meanings. (p. 77)

There are issues when the students are taught by the classroom teacher who is conducting the interviews. Students may provide answers that they think the teacher wants to hear. On the other hand the responses may be insightful because the students feel at ease talking to their teacher. In Classroom 1, the researcher was also the
fulltime classroom teacher so there were time constraints to conducting formal student interviews. This was only possible when there was an undergraduate teacher who could assist with the supervision of students. The main purpose of the formal interview for Classroom 1 was to establish the students’ understandings about the concept of friendship, the value of Class Meetings and Tribes (Gibbs, 2001). Students were given the opportunity to reflect on the use of artefacts, such as the Y chart, for leadership and friendship. The interview in Classroom 1 (2004) started by asking the students to complete the sentence, “A friend is…”, followed by this script as a guide.

1. How have Class Meetings been for you this year? What have you learnt?
2. What do you think the classroom may have been without Class Meetings?
3. How has Tribes been for you?
4. Have you been leader or vice leader? What was that like for you?
5. How have you felt about coming to school this year? (Morcom, 2005, p. 73)

There were important considerations prior to conducting interviews with younger children in Classroom 2. Taking into account some of the difficulties of conducting interviews with young students, the teacher/researcher discussed the questions and details about how the interviews would be conducted with the university supervisor overseeing the research, prior to conducting the interviews. Students may be limited in their ability to express their ideas and may not provide sufficient detail and or misinterpret the questions. Similarly, the researcher’s interpretation of students’ answers may not reflect the intended meaning (Karabenick et al., 2007).

For these reasons photographs of the classroom social practices and different tribes (peer leaders and vice leaders) were used during students’ interviews to stimulate recall of events in Classroom 2 (2007). The option of using photographs scaffolded the students to elaborate on their responses and minimised the need for the
interviewer to intervene further to explain questions or direct student responses. Thus photographs supported students’ ability to answer questions in their own words.

Because there were two researchers to share the workload, interviews were used more frequently for Classroom 2 (2007). Prior to conducting interviews, the co-researcher visited the classroom regularly, usually on a weekly basis. Students became accustomed to the co-researcher taking photographs and video taping the weekly Class Meetings and the Social Circle. The teacher/researcher organised the interview timetable. Students were interviewed in a quiet corner of the classroom during school hours. The co-researcher was an experienced researcher and conducted the interviews each term with parents and students (See Appendices 3 & 4). This format provided some consistency in the conduct of interviews. Each student and parent was interviewed individually, while the teacher/researcher continued teaching the regular instructional program with the rest of the students in the classroom.

Similar questions were used for all interviews, focusing on the students’ understandings of the social practices and their perceptions of the implications for their learning. For the first two interviews the initial focus was to allow students to talk about the purposes of the social practices and if they were helpful for learning. To support the students in interviews, photographs included authentic classroom activities, such as the Social Circle, Class Meeting, students working in a tribe, leaders in a group, and photographs of different classrooms. A series of questions were grouped together to provide students with similar prompts for the negatives and positives of the classroom instructional practices.

- What sorts of things does the teacher do to help the children have a say in what happens in this class?
• Does it help?
• In what ways?
• Why does it help?
• In what ways does it not help?
• What else?

For the third round of student interviews, additional questions reflected the progress of building a collaborative community and the skills required to make decisions. Photographs of the classroom, Class Meetings from the previous and current term, tribes making decisions with the group leaders, required the students reflect on their participation and evaluate their ideas. In terms of making decisions with their peers students needed to consider if having a leader and vice leader helped the group to get on with each other and make decisions. Students were asked to evaluate ideas they had developed, for managing classroom behaviour, such as the “zones” (E.g. discussion zones, working zones, quiet zones and thinking zones). Another idea was the seating arrangement, mixing desks in lines for students who preferred a more traditional arrangement and desks in groups for others. During Class Meetings students were asked to evaluate the success of these ideas by expressing their opinion so they had experience in reflecting on these ideas with their peers prior to the interviews.

Towards the end of this interview students were asked if there was anything else that made it difficult or easy to learn in the classroom. They reflected on what supported their learning. The closing question for the third interview made links to student motivation and student responsibility, as they were asked to reflect on these questions,

• What do you think makes you want to participate in your group? (In class activities? Working quietly by yourself?)
• In what ways? Why?
• What makes it hard? In what ways? Why?
Because most students had experienced a leadership or vice leadership role, the final interview questions were centred on the students’ perceived identity as a learner and leader. Students had the opportunity to reflect on their changing patterns of participation in the classroom.

The parent interviews were conducted at the end of the school year in Term 4, to understand how parents perceived the outcomes for their children as a result of the research. Parents expressed their opinions of the classroom social practices in terms of changes they had observed in their child’s attitude towards learning. This was reflected in the child’s level of self confidence, ability to listen and respect others and make decisions. These aspects were part of the Class Agreements that had been displayed in the classroom all year and referred to by the teacher and students. Other questions asked parents to reflect if their child had initiated conversations at home about school experiences in relation to

- Being a leader
- Gaining new friends
- Participating in the Social Circle and Class Meetings and other classroom practices.

The final question related to how parents perceived their child’s learning in a classroom where the social practices were negotiated and there were opportunities for students to become leaders. The questions were open-ended so parents could draw on experiences outside the school context. Parents’ responses supported students’ responses in regard to their perceptions of increased levels of confidence in themselves and the ability to make friend. The interviews conducted for parents and students were an important aspect of the data collection because they demonstrated that it took time for parents and students to understand the new processes in place in
the classroom. As the classroom practices developed, students and parents were keen

to express their views at the interviews. As the year progressed, the students grew in
confidence when answering questions and became more articulate, providing rich
details.

Data from the interviews were triangulated with additional data from the
teacher/researcher’s background knowledge about the students and their families,
gleaned through the normal course of a teacher’s work. The research publications
examine data of changing participation of focal groups of students whose stories
illustrated different perspectives to developing mature student participation. Similar
processes of going back over the data to establish links to focal groups of students
were used for all research publications. The rationale for the choice of student focal
groups is explained in the next section.

5.8 Rationale for choice of student focal groups

Drawing on the student focal groups, the teacher/researcher’s motivation for writing
papers was to make the findings of interest to teachers, and also address the academic
rigour of publishing in journals to disseminate the findings to a wider audience. The
publications examine common motivational issues that teachers address in the
classroom, such as developing student confidence and ability to resolve conflicts and
make friends. If these needs are not met, students do not participate fully in their
learning and often develop work avoidance techniques that can affect the learning of
other students. Thus selection of students for focal groups was based on the
motivation issue, evidence of change in participation and the quality of data available.
To be considered mature participation students needed to make conscious and informed decisions to support others’ learning and wellbeing. Students demonstrated mature participation by not behaving in anti-social ways or discouraging other students from participating. From a positive perspective, mature participation has been characterised for each focal group of students as demonstrating:

1. Leadership in the classroom to realise social and academic potential for Gemma, Martin and Lindsay (See Chapter 6);

2. An ability to resolve social issues in an equitable manner which underpinned students’ and the teacher’s motivation for Susan, Helen, Angela, Margaret and Eileen (See Chapter 7);

3. Pro-social behaviour to address bullying issues for Denis and Nathan (See Chapter 8) and

4. Inclusive behaviour to integrate students with special needs in mainstream classroom activities for Mary and Leslie (See Chapter 9).

These four perspectives were used for each student focal group and are examined in the respective publications (See Chapters 6-9). Then these perspectives are used as a summative heading in the discussion in Chapter 10. Below, in Table 5.4, the titles of peer-reviewed papers are indicated in the left column, reflecting different perspectives to developing mature student participation that were the focus of each publication. In the right column general aspects of mature participation are summarised, for the focal group of students that are also listed. Together, these publications highlight the social and complex nature of student motivation.
Table 5.4 List of publications and different perspectives to developing mature participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Different perspectives to developing mature participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6- Paper 1: Making classroom social practices explicit: Developing motivation through participation in collaborative leadership opportunities.</td>
<td>Demonstrating student leadership in the classroom to realise social and academic potential. Focal students: Gemma, Martin and Lindsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7- Paper 2: ‘Motivation in action’ in a collaborative primary school classroom: Developing and sustaining teacher motivation</td>
<td>Demonstrating an ability to resolve social issues in an equitable manner which underpinned students’ and the teacher’s motivation. Focal students: Susan, Helen, Angela, Margaret and Eileen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8- Paper 3: Bullies and victims in a primary classroom: Scaffolding a collaborative community of practice</td>
<td>Demonstrating pro-social behaviour to address bullying issues. Focal students: Denis and Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9- Paper 4: Getting personal about values: Scaffolding student participation towards an inclusive classroom community</td>
<td>Demonstrating inclusive behaviour to incorporate students with special needs in mainstream classroom activities. Focal students: Mary and Leslie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 Chapter summary

In this chapter qualitative research methodology, appropriate to in-depth classroom research, has been examined in addition to the ethical issues that needed to be addressed. Additional contextual details were elaborated for the use of research tools such as sociograms and interviews to supplement information in the publications. The rationale for the choice of focal groups of students, who developed mature participation, has been explained as an overview to the four publications.

Each paper is organised to provide a review of relevant literature before presenting the results, using Rogoff’s (1995) analytical planes, and the final conclusions.
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MAKING CLASSROOM SOCIAL PRACTICES EXPLICIT

Developing Motivation Through Participation in Collaborative Leadership Opportunities

Judith MacCallum and Veronica Morcom

INTRODUCTION

“I can’t do it” was a phrase Gemma uttered frequently. Like Martin and Lindsay, she initially found it difficult to participate in the collaborative activities in her classroom. We know that learning occurs from our observations, conversations, and our everyday experiences (Renshaw, 2003; Rogoff, 2003). By making explicit the social practices of the classroom to create a safe inclusive environment, teachers can provide opportunities for students to observe, make positive social connections with peers, and participate more fully in their own learning. Motivation develops with changing participation.
The three students described in this chapter, Lindsay, Martin, and Gemma, were initially peripheral participants in their classrooms. In each classroom the teacher negotiated a collaborative process that created a climate of trust and respect that supported fuller participation for all students. Lindsay, Martin, and Gemma attended two different schools but were taught by the same teacher. They had developed ways of participating that were familiar and comfortable to them, but marginalized their participation in classroom activities.

At the beginning of the year Lindsay enjoyed intimidating other students and was not really interested in academic learning. He had friends who also engaged in antisocial behavior and saw no reason to change his behavior. Martin was a “loner” and intellectually more able in many ways than his peers. He did not value group work as he had to “explain too much” to catch others up. He did recognize that he needed teacher assistance to become more confident when speaking in front of his peers. Gemma was very anxious about all her learning so did not cope well with challenges. Everything was “too hard.” These three students all lacked confidence in their ability to express themselves in front of their peers and needed teacher support and scaffolding to create conditions that would allow different ways of participating.

There is considerable evidence in the research literature of the interrelated nature of social and emotional awareness, knowledge and understanding, and participation in everyday activities (e.g., Battistich & Watson, 2003; Benard, 2005; Bernard, 1996; Fuller, McGraw, & Good-year, 1999; Hunter-Carsch, Tiknaz & Cooper, 2006; Masten, 2001; Zubric et al., 1995). Opportunities for working with others in formal and informal learning settings are an essential part of this development (e.g., Benard; Dewey, 1966; Rogoff; Vygotsky, 1978). Battistich and Watson maintain that much research on collaboration focuses on older students and they argue for the introduction of cooperative learning in early childhood education to enhance development of social and emotional knowledge and understanding.

An important question for teachers is how to create a classroom that supports students to participate fully in the social and cultural practices of the classroom and ultimately society. This chapter reports classroom research where the teacher made explicit the social and cultural practices of the classroom and taught students how to build positive social connections with their peers. She used class agreements and a daily social circle to develop social and emotional awareness, with a weekly class meeting to build shared knowledge and understanding. As social connections developed the teacher also scaffolded collaborative leadership opportunities within small social groups. In this context, motivation develops as students accept leadership responsibilities with their peers, supported by the
values that have been negotiated and underpin the classroom culture. Mutual respect and tolerance are embedded in the social practices of the classroom. The three students chosen for detailed study exemplify the changing patterns of participation observed in the two classrooms.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Teachers are in a position to assist students to participate in the social and cultural practices of the classroom in ways similar to the practices of the society in which they are growing up. Dewey claims,

A community or social group sustains itself through continuous self-renewal, and this renewal takes place by means of the educational growth of the immature members of the group. By various agencies, unintentional and designed, a society transforms uninitiated and seemingly alien beings into robust trustees of its own resources and ideals. Education is thus a fostering, a nurturing, a cultivating process. (1966, p. 13)

In order to understand the processes involved in this “nurturing” and “cultivating” process, it is necessary to examine these social and cultural practices as they take place in educational settings, in this case in primary school classrooms. From Rogoff’s (2003) perspective “humans develop through their changing participation in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change” (p. 11). Participation in the activities of the classroom, in this research, is understood in a similar way, with participation as the means through which the children’s motivation develops.

While there is a growing body of research on learning and development taking a sociocultural perspective, research on motivation has been slower to embrace these perspectives. Recent research is taking more account of the socially and culturally situated nature of motivation and its relation to learning (e.g., Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury, & Walker, 2005; Walker, Pressick-Kilborn, Arnold, & Sainsbury, 2004). From a sociocultural perspective learning is conceptualized as primarily a social activity and motivation emerges from the social context that is manifested through both collaborative and individual action. In the classrooms described in this chapter, explicit teaching and leadership opportunities created the context for changing students’ participation and developing their motivation to participate more fully.

In sociocultural theory, motivation is not usually separated from learning. For example, Vygotsky (1978) described the socially guided development of knowledge (both motivation and learning) through activity in the Zone of Proximal Development. Rogoff, Paradise, Mejia Arauz, Correa-Chavez and Angelillo (2003) refer to motivation as inherent in the “obvi-
ous importance and interest of the activity” (p. 193) when participation is “intent.” In this chapter, motivational development is conceptualised as the transformation of participation from peripheral participation toward more mature participation in the collaborative classroom. We are using Lave and Wenger’s (1991) notion of legitimate peripheral participation as “a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral constituent” (p. 35) as a guide. It leads to full participation, a term Lave and Wenger use “to do justice to the diversity of relations involved in varying forms of community membership” (p. 37).

According to researchers taking a sociocultural perspective this necessitates use of the activity or event as the unit of analysis (Rogoff, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1998), and thus moves the focus of research toward the mutuality of the individual and the sociocultural environment rather than on either the individual or the environment. Rogoff argues that “each is inherently involved in the others’ definition” (p. 140) with none existing separately.

So that the parts of an activity or event can be examined, Rogoff (1995) proposes three planes of analysis, corresponding to the personal, interpersonal and community processes. Rogoff maintains that development occurs in all planes, for example, children develop but so do their partners and their cultural communities. She argues that it is incomplete to consider “the relationship of individual development and social interaction without concern for the cultural activity in which personal and interpersonal actions take place” (p. 141). Thus in this kind of analysis, each plane in turn is foregrounded with the other planes in the background allowing “active and dynamic contributions from individuals, their social partners, and historical traditions and materials and their transformations” (p. 140).

The aim of the larger study on which this chapter is based was to examine children’s motivational development in primary classrooms using collaborative instructional practices to develop leadership skills. As a key part of these instructional strategies the teacher made explicit the social and cultural practices of the classroom and taught students how to build positive social connections with their peers. A second aim was to further develop the study of motivation within a sociocultural framework that takes account of personal motivational development and participation in the social practices of the classroom.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

The methodological approach proposed here, while not new per se, is seldom used in motivation research. In-depth study of a classroom over a school year using ethnographic approaches, however, has the potential to
provide the holistic detail missing from present conceptualisations of motivation (Nicholls & Hazzard, 1993; Pressick-Kilborn et al., 2005).

The research involved in-depth study of two different classes in which the second author was the classroom teacher (over two different years). School 1 involved a year 4/5 class of 32 students aged 9-11 years, and School 2 involved a year 3 class of 25 students aged 8-9 years. Data collection tools were chosen to access the personal, interpersonal and cultural/community psychological planes (Rogoff, 1995, 2003). An action research approach was used with multiple data sources including: participant observation of the class group; videotaping of classroom events, especially activity concerned with leadership opportunities; interviews/informal dialogue with children and parents; written surveys for both students and parents; reflective accounts of children, teacher, coresearcher, parents; documentation of instructional practices; sociometric surveys; and school records of behavior.

The teaching and research elements of the data sources, which are summarized in Table 8.1, were chosen to provide data that were authentic and took account of the perspectives of all stakeholders including, the teacher, parents, and students, as well as the administration at the schools.

The use of "Y" charts, sociograms, student interviews and surveys, parent surveys, and teacher observations are further elaborated within the context of this chapter. The teaching emphasis was explicitly about how to collaboratively create shared social and emotional knowledge and understandings, which included how to be an effective leader; how to enable students to scaffold and support the learning of others in small social groups as a leader or team member; how to "be your authentic self" in the process of creating effective learning communities through collaboration.

Rogoff’s (1995) personal, interpersonal, and cultural/community psychological planes were used as a starting point for examining the processes of motivational development. Rogoff uses the metaphor of “apprenticeship” to describe the processes at the Community Plane which involves active individuals participating with others in culturally organised activity with the purpose of the development of mature participation in the activity by less experienced people. The concept of “apprenticeship” necessarily focuses attention on the specific nature of the activity involved, as well as on its relation to practices and institutions of the community in which it occurs—economic, political, spiritual, and material” (p. 142). "Guided participation" describes the Interpersonal Plane, which focuses analysis on the processes and systems of involvement between people as they communicate and coordinate efforts. Direction in the activity is offered by cultural and social values, and people have choices as to where, with whom and with what they participate. At the Personal
Table 8.1. The Teaching and Research Elements of Data Sources and Their Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Research Elements of Data Sources</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class “Y” charts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart has three parts: “Looks like”—behaviors one would see and body language; “Sounds like”—actual words that could describe the concept or the conversations that may occur between students; “Feels like”—emotional response.</td>
<td>To establish shared understandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategy that uses students’ own language and make links with their knowledge and that of their peers (Bennett &amp; Rolheiser, 2001; Bennett &amp; Smilanich, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social circle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children sit in a circle and say how they feel. Conducted daily in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Building a “caring culture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Build “inclusion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted once a week and both the teacher and students write the weekly agenda</td>
<td>*Both the teacher and students raise issues of concern about any aspect of classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Democratic process of participative decision making (Glasser, 1969).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociograms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students nominate three peers they would like in their new tribe.</td>
<td>*The teacher created groups to promote new friendships and leadership contexts and opportunities to develop these skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using photos of the social circle, class meetings and group activities the students were asked to describe their understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To gain parent perspectives of changes in values, attitudes, and behaviors of their children in regards to friendship groups and leadership skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher observations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anecdotal notes taken daily of classroom interactions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student reflection logs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students wrote their personal reflections about classroom operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribes/social groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(developed from Gibbs’ concept of Tribe; Gibbs, 2001)</td>
<td>*Social groups of 4-6 students were formed each term based on the sociogram results and teacher observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Peers elected a leader and a vice leader for the duration of the tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Lift ups”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lift ups”—peers and the teacher write and give supportive comments to each other.</td>
<td>*Showing appreciation of others to build a caring culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Team member of the week”</strong>—voted by peers, after discussion in groups.</td>
<td>*Acknowledging the efforts of peers who provide social and emotional support to others or improve their behaviour or attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Teacher encouragement awards”</strong>—to demonstrate the teacher is aware of students’ efforts to cooperate.</td>
<td>*Providing authentic opportunities for peers and the teacher to build relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plane, Rogoff uses the metaphor of “participatory appropriation” to describe the process by which individuals transform their understanding and responsibility for activities through their own participation. It is “the personal process by which … individuals change and handle a later situation in ways preparing by their participation in the previous situation … a process of becoming, rather than acquisition” (p. 142).

This chapter examines the instructional practices of the teacher, the second author, in two different classes at two different schools to show how motivation can be developed through participation in collaborative leadership opportunities. The motivational development of three students, Lindsay, Gemma and Martin is described using Rogoff’s three planes. The personal plane is the focus for examining the three students’ motivational development, but in order to gain a more complete understanding of the process of becoming a full participant, the community and interpersonal planes are also examined.

COMMUNITY PLANE

A major purpose of the institution of school is to develop the social, emotional, and cognitive capabilities of each student, underpinned by cultural values promoting active citizenship (as detailed in The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century, MCEETYA, 1999). The first national goal is “to develop fully the talents and capacities of all students”, and four of the eight areas under this goal include:

- analysis and problem solving and the ability to communicate ideas and information, to plan and organize activities and to collaborate with others;
- have qualities of self-confidence, optimism, high self-esteem, and a commitment to personal excellence as a basis for their potential life roles as family, community, and workforce members;
- have the capacity to exercise judgement and responsibility … to make rational and informed decisions about their own lives and to accept responsibility for their own actions; and
- be active and informed citizens (MCEETYA, 1999).

The teacher used a range of strategies to make explicit the values underpinning the classroom practices at the two schools (these are explained in detail later in this section). Although the two schools were quite different the same kind of instructional approach was able to be adapted for both schools. The key characteristics of the two research
Table 8.2. The Key Characteristics of the Two Research Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 1—Primary School 2004</th>
<th>School 2—Primary School 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low socioeconomic area</td>
<td>High socioeconomic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing bullying issues across school</td>
<td>Some isolated incidences of bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State standardized test results below benchmarks for literacy</td>
<td>State standardized test results consistently above benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and numeracy</td>
<td>for literacy and numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on pastoral care</td>
<td>Emphasis on academic achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High emphasis on traditional methods of teaching and behavior</td>
<td>High emphasis on traditional methods of teaching within a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>competitive school/community culture with a reputation for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability—same principal for 6 years</td>
<td>Instability—Long-term principal left in 2006 and new principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values education priority for 3 years</td>
<td>appointed in Term 3 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher order thinking skills priority for 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools (Table 8.2) provide a means of understanding the institutional contexts in which this research took place. The teacher promoted a caring, inclusive, and collaborative classroom at both schools and adapted the learning program to meet the individual social, emotional, and academic needs of the students. She used the process of “guided participation” to scaffold students’ needs, after listening to the students’ discussions during the weekly class meetings, together with her observations of their behavior.

Both schools were predominantly traditional in their approach to student participation in classrooms with most teachers maintaining a high degree of control. Traditional views about the roles of teachers and students did not always support the values of a collaborative classroom. This posed challenges for the researcher performing the dual role of teacher to establish a collaborative classroom where there were opportunities for increased student participation. Many students and parents were unfamiliar with students taking more responsibility for how they participated in class activities and taking leadership roles.

School 1 foregrounded values education and pastoral care as a priority and School 2 foregrounded academic excellence, based on an established reputation in the community. Parents and students at both schools had their reservations about the value of collaborative learning and its contribution to academic learning. It could be inferred that promoting collaborative leadership opportunities within the context of School 1, where there was already a focus on pastoral care to address “bullying issues,”
would be valued to promote students taking responsibility for their behavior. Parents and teachers, however, perceived that the students needed more control to curb disruptive behavior in and out of the classroom, not more freedom and choices. At School 2 there was a perception that students' social and emotional needs were adequately addressed so primacy was given to the academic needs of students. Some parents perceived that academic progress may be adversely affected with collaborative activities where students were encouraged to share ideas and support each other in their learning. In both situations it appeared that students and parents needed to experience the long-term benefits of developing collaborative skills and participatory decision making.

The benefits to School 1 are well documented in the reduction of bullying in the school by these students (Morcom, 2005) and in School 2 students maintained their high academic levels and learned about how to collaborate with each other in the process. The feedback from parents at both schools provided evidence that the students were learning skills for life, which were valued by their families. Students at both schools stated unanimously that being in a variety of tribes throughout the year allowed them to make new friends and being in a leadership role was one of the most important outcomes for them.

**Collaborative Classrooms**

The teacher has appropriated a range of strategies that she adapts for use in her classroom each year. She uses the Tribes Learning Communities (Gibbs, 2001) as a basis for building a safe, caring, and inclusive classroom community as the underlying philosophy of Tribes supports a collaborative classroom that is built on democratic values. Tribes has been researched in the American-school context with evidence of improvements in social, emotional, and academic areas prompting more schools to reexamine their teaching and learning philosophies (Benard, 2005).

Tribes is a process that uses three stages "inclusion," "influence," and "community" to build an inclusive classroom that enhances the social and emotional development of the individual and supports collaboration (Gibbs, 2001). The teacher adapted the work of Gibbs (2001) and Bernard (1996) to negotiate five class agreements that underpinned the values of the classroom and provided the context to develop social and emotional awareness and build shared knowledge and understanding.

The Tribes process facilitates new, and less traditional, ways of interacting and participating in activities that provide opportunities to increase meaningful student talk and change patterns of interacting that improve student learning. For this reason strategies incorporating the Tribes pro-
cess were implemented at both research schools. During the Tribes process, as students experience the feeling of being included and valued by the group they begin to speak up more and conflicts may arise. The teacher then guides students in strategies to resolve conflicts and make decisions. Gibbs (2001) points out that “it’s important to remember that if groups ignore the underlying issues of the stage of influence rather than working through them, their capacity to work well together will suffer, and they will never appreciate the diversity of group members” (p. 145). Teachers often find this phase difficult to move through, and the teacher, as facilitator, has to make judgements about how and when to guide participation to scaffold group processes to develop collaborative problem solving skills. The teacher can provide lessons that give cues to students about how to facilitate the process but students need “space” to trial these ideas and take responsibility for their solutions.

Parental pressure to give more direction to students or not to engage in these processes at all is often based on their experiences of a traditional schooling where participation was dominated by the teacher and they never experienced this less traditional approach to participation. Rogoff and her colleagues allude to these difficulties, finding in their 2001 work that “parent volunteers often took several years to move beyond the issues of control that characterised their own assembly-line schooling, to develop a collaborative approach with the children” (cited in Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 188).

Teacher Scaffolds

Table 8.3 provides a summary of the general teacher scaffolds used to “guide” student participation. Rogoff’s three planes of analysis, cultural, interpersonal and personal, are used to list the common teacher scaffolds that were implemented during the year to facilitate the reflection process for students. At the cultural/community level the instructional strategies focused on setting the climate where open discussion was valued by all students and the parameters for behavior were established. The social circle was used every day so all students could feel included and connected to each other at an emotional level. The agendas for the weekly class meetings were collaboratively established by both the teacher and students. The teacher was positioned as a learner in this dynamic process with the students and was genuine in the pursuit of student ideas and opinions. The process was a “work in progress”, where all participants reflected on their values. The teacher set high expectations that the students were capable and able to be reflective learners. The process of reflection allowed progress to be made.
Table 8.3. Summary of Teacher Scaffolds to Guide Student Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural/community Explicit social practices</th>
<th>How to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use the class agreements to create the conditions for inclusion and caring so all feel safe to express their ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage students to express their feelings in the daily social circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use sociograms to facilitate positive interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make explicit to students bullying and exclusion behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make explicit what we value as a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support positive changes in the behaviour of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage all students to participate in the class meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate making group decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build on other people’s ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Tribal process/peers</td>
<td>• What are the challenges of leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What does being a good role model look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we encourage others in our tribe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we promote new friendships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we conduct a group discussion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we promote prosocial behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reflection</td>
<td>• How can I be an effective leader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the effect of my words and actions with my peers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do I need to change my behavior to lead my tribe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What sort of thinking will support my changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can I be more assertive with my tribe? (Martin and Gemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can I maintain my positive changes in behavior? (Lindsay)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second plane, interpersonal, describes how the teacher scaffolds were explicitly developed within each tribe to create the conditions for adaptive leadership where all participants worked together to achieve group goals. The process often required students reflecting on their personal attributes, part of the third plane, after participation in class meetings and group activities. The generic questions in the interpersonal and personal planes reflect some of the common issues that were addressed throughout the year in the establishment of a caring, safe, and inclusive classroom community based on collaborative values.

**Shared Responsibility**

From day one onward the process of inclusion, the first stage of the tribes learning community process, was established for all students as well as how to participate in this community. Self-reflection was an integral part of this process. Y charts were also developed to create shared under-
standings of the behavior and language that would further develop inclusive practices, and to indicate to the students the underlying values of the classroom community.

Early in the school year, the teacher’s dialogue with students highlighted the values and shared nature of her classroom practices. For example, at the beginning of day two of the year 8 class the teacher made a personal connection with the children by telling them something personal about her and her family—that it was her son’s first day at high school. Her words and actions prepared students for the sharing of classroom responsibility. She explained briefly to the children the proposed activities for the class for the day, and then reflected on her observations of children’s actions in the half hour before class that day, and asked the children “What do you think ...?” “I’d prefer you to ...” The teacher was consistent in reinforcing her expectation of students taking responsibility for their learning and behavior and constantly giving hints and feedback to the students to encourage attentive listening, mutual respect, right to pass and participation, no “put downs,” as well as doing their personal best.

In the first days the teacher’s practices revealed her focus on listening, thinking, learning, asking questions, and negotiating. For example:

She showed that her expectations were high, and explained to the class about a girl opening some high windows with a tool on a long stick “I’ve shown her what to do, I’m sure she can do it.” “Always ask, that’s the way to learn.”

“What could we do instead of talking when waiting to do maths? Thinking? Thinking about what we did yesterday? Everyone have a really good go at thinking quietly.”

“Rubbers, pop them away in your trays. I don’t mind you making mistakes, then I know how you are learning.”

After asking the children a question about patterns in maths—“what is the pattern, what goes after 10, 20, 30?” and waiting for hands to go up, she said, “don’t tell me yet, because some people don’t know. I want everyone to figure it out.” Then repeated the question but with some clues, “what gets repeated, what number gets repeated...”?

In reviewing seating in class, “What does good behavior look like? You can’t take someone’s place. You have to negotiate.”

**Social Circle**

The social circle was one of the first activities of the school day. On the occasion of the second social circle, the teacher said, “Remember, attentive listening, the person with this [stick] in their hand, say your name
and something about how you feel." The children passed the stick, said their name and how they felt—happy, tired, excited, hot, excited and hot, and so on. When they had all had a turn, the teacher began a discussion that encouraged children to reflect on what they had heard, "who noticed differences in what people said yesterday?" "What did you hear people say today?" "What did you hear was the main emotion?" This was followed by an activity that linked listening and how you feel. The social circle was repeated every morning as an opportunity for students to reconnect with each other, for each student in turn to express how they felt, but also pass if wished. When the researcher asked students to explain a photograph of a social circle, responses included (Student interviews, March 12-14, 2007):

- You learn how to let all the good things and bad things out (Gemma);
- I like saying how I feel (Jared);
- [learn] new words like how you’re feeling (Anna);
- If someone is feeling sad we know that they might need someone to play with (Crystal); and
- It’s nice to have in the morning to see how people are feeling (Marc).

Class Meetings

Class meetings were generally held once per week in each class, using a similar process. At the second class meeting of the year 3 class, held at the end of week 2 (February 9, 2007), one of the items was being run by Tina. When Trent offered a suggestion, a number of children were heard to say, “ooh, she’s already said that.” The transcript of the exchange shows how the teacher used this opportunity to explain a little more about mutual respect and how to respond to other’s suggestions.

Teacher: Thank you very much Tina [as Tina moves back to her place]

Teacher: While Tina was running that little part of the class meeting I was actually observing how people were behaving and how respectful you were with sharing ideas. This is something we have to practice. This is why we have class meetings too.

When people give their ideas [pause], what do we need to do, when they give an idea? What’s our job, as the audience?
Jared have you an answer for that? [Asks to go to the toilet, brief conversation]
[Other hands go up]
Derek: When people are giving ideas, what do we need to be doing as the audience?
Teacher: Amber, you need to listen to this. [overlapping with Derek]
Teacher: We need to be listening. How do we show that we are listening?
Anna: Look at the person.
Teacher: Look at the person. How else? It's a bit hard when we are facing this way. What other things do we do? Amber?
Amber: We sit up nicely and look at them.
Teacher: Ok, show some respect. And Alex?
Alex: And um [mumbles quietly], I was going to say that.
Teacher: You were going to say that too. That's really good.

In the preceding dialogue the teacher facilitated student reflection about the behaviors that demonstrate how students can be a "good audience" by listening attentively and using body language such as looking at the speaker and being respectful. The teacher was also setting an expectation that students will give ideas and other students will behave respectfully. The class meeting continued:

Okay, [slowly] if somebody says something you don't agree with or they repeat something, how should you respond to that? What should you say? Or what shouldn't you say?
[pause] So if somebody says something, like we had a few people that repeated ideas, because it is hard to hear; there is noise around the place and some people have got very soft voices. And a couple of people said something to them,
[pause]
And I want you to think now, if you're saying an idea and you've got, say, two things to say and you've only said one idea, and somebody has already said it and they say I've already said that, and you haven't even got the second idea out, how do you think that person might feel about getting to the second idea? If somebody has already said ooh, heard the first idea, like that. How do you think, William?

William: Um.
Teacher: How do you think they might feel? Do you think they would want to share their idea?
William: No.
Teacher: No, and Trent how did you feel, when you were told you were repeating somebody else’s stuff?

Trent: Not very good.

Teacher: Okay. You were trying to give a little of yourself, weren’t you, to the group, and share ideas. So if people say things that you don’t agree with, how, what would be a better way of dealing with it? What could you say to them? Amber?

Amber: We could just say, [pause] well um, we have already said that, but in a nice way, not in a mean voice.

Teacher: So in a polite voice. Not a mean voice. [pause while writing on the white board] Because the way you speak to somebody is very important, it communicates a lot to them, doesn’t it? And if you’re speaking in a mean voice that would put me off from contributing, I would just go like this urh, I’m not going to say anything at this meeting. And remember it’s important, we want the meeting to be safe, for everybody, to speak. [Tina and Caydan with hands up]

[Class general agreement]

And that means we have to always practice mutual respect. And this is how you practice it now, right now. So [gives a yawn] like this urh, when somebody’s speaking because that’s not really showing respect.

Amber: [adds in] It’s being rude.

The teacher was reinforcing the students’ right to speak and the expectation that this is a safe classroom for all participants and their ideas will be respected by their peers. Again the underlying values of the class agreements are reinforced when the discussion focuses on mutual respect, attentive listening, and no “put downs.” The meeting continued:

Teacher: And what would you like to say? [to Caydan]

Caydan: They may just be adding some information to what somebody said and the person that said it didn’t hear that.

Teacher: Yes, and, when we have got a quieter classroom you’ll all hear a lot better what each other is saying and when you all speak up a little bit more. It’s okay to repeat an idea, you can say I like that idea about ..., and say your idea on top of it. And we’ll learn all those things as we go along. Right now we have got one more item to do before we finish.

Teacher: Tina, you are bursting to say something

Tina: We could also mix our ideas up a bit ...
Teacher: So are you talking about that thing called compromise? Where we all get a bit of what we want.

Tina: [nods]

Teacher: Okay we’re going to talk about that too when it comes up with something else. Thanks for bringing that up, Tina.

[Amber asks to go to the toilet]

During the class meeting the teacher constantly modelled “mutual respect” and showing “appreciations” to each student by using students’ names and thanking them for their contributions. The teacher made explicit the role of an audience and how to “listen attentively” to participate effectively in a discussion, how to accept other peoples’ ideas and build on them. The students were also made aware of the process of making a decision by reaching a compromise and the fact that it may mean you do not get what you want this time. The teacher also made it clear to students that it was important that everybody felt “safe” to participate.

INTERPERSONAL PLANE

The teacher adapted the Tribes process (Gibbs, 2001) to create new Tribes each term for the purpose of developing effective interpersonal relationships in the classroom and new friendships. Shared leadership was promoted to further develop the support network created by these new friendships and a climate of trust. Many teachers do not use tribes in this way and the groups remain the same for the whole year. Each new round of tribes provided opportunities for different groups of students to find new ways of participating. Peers nominated new leaders and vice leaders for these groups, which were changed each term. This allowed time for new relationships to develop and inexperienced leaders to adapt their leadership style in response to the diversity of their group. During this process students examined and clarified their values to develop new ways of participating to facilitate their group becoming more cohesive and supportive of the diversity of all members of the group. In many instances leaders needed to examine and adapt their own patterns of behavior.

This process held varying degrees of stress for students when conflict arose as students were still developing their skills and confidence. The teacher’s role was to provide a safe and supportive context for change by scaffolding student processes to learn how to share ideas and value the opinions of others in the process of making decisions. Van Oers and Hännikäinen (2001) use the term “togetherness” to describe a dimension of social interaction when humans form groups. In an educational context where group or collaborative work occurs they argue that a sense of
togetherness or group cohesion needs to be present to allow groups to persist to deal with the conflicts and disagreements. Van Oers & Hännikäinen argue,

The main reason why discourses in collaborative learning processes ever lead to improved understandings is that participants in the process are willing to share their understandings and keep on doing so despite their disagreements and conflicts. (2001, p. 105, emphasis in original)

Sociocultural perspectives acknowledge the complexity of these guiding and learning processes, and as Matusov (1998) explains, the teacher is one of the learners in the classroom.

Guidance and learning are always a united collaborative process rather than being separable individual processes.... Learning is happening not only in the “novice” but also in the “expert”—the novice participates in shaping the guidance that the expert provides to the novice. This mutuality and simultaneity of guiding-learning processes is especially evident in a classroom ... the teacher constantly learns students’ values, knowledge (and its lack), interests, inquiries, and experiences through the process of guided collaboration and in building a classroom community. (p. 333)

Students who were nominated for leadership roles knew that their peers had placed their trust in them to follow the criteria established by the class for a “good leader.” Initially leaders were chosen for their apparent leadership skills, such as being academically able and confident. In the first round of Tribes in their respective classrooms, none of the three focus students were chosen as leaders. Martin and Lindsay were academically able and both lacked confidence in themselves. Martin worked hard and was very unassuming about his extensive talents, as evidenced in his school work. Lindsay was a gifted underachiever and chose to behave in an antisocial manner. Gemma was a student at educational risk for literacy and numeracy. As the year progressed Gemma, who was shy and lacking in self-confidence at the beginning of the year, was chosen by her peers because she was a caring person and a good role model. The three students needed to make personal changes in their behavior to maintain the respect of their group as they received feedback from the class about issues that were of concern, such as bullying and being a poor role model. How the students negotiated their roles within the collaborative classroom was a dynamic, reflective, and transformative process and allowed the teacher to scaffold new understandings for many students about how they perceived themselves in this process.

Ancona (2005) describes a model of leadership that is adaptive and distributed throughout the group members so the leader is working together
with the group to make things happen. It is through the process of doing, reflecting, following role models, and giving feedback that all members learn about leadership and about themselves as a person. Ancona's research refers to adults but it is also relevant to the students in this chapter, as they adapted to their new leadership roles and the changes in participation of their tribe members and examined "what worked best for them."

It is more important that you understand who you are and what works best for you, given your values, your skills, your likes and likes, and your personality. Some people undoubtedly come to leadership roles with more skills than others, but leadership can improve over time. (2005, pp. 8-9)

**PERSONAL PLANE**

**Lindsay**

Lindsay was a year 5 member of the year 4/5 class at School 1. He was a peripheral participant of the class in a number of ways. Although academically able, Lindsay was not a conscientious student and appeared to enjoy bullying his peers. He was not cooperative, consistently underachieved and often undermined the teacher. He limited his friendships to other students who also bullied and intimidated others. Once he experienced a different way of participating with his peers and received positive feedback for his efforts he widened and changed his circle of friends to include prosocial peers. These peers allowed new spaces to be created for Lindsay that resulted in transformation in his behavior and the development of empathy for his peers.

At the beginning of the year Lindsay had friends in an antisocial group who bullied and intimidated a smaller group of peers in the same class. During the year, Lindsay's interacted with more prosocial peers in his Tribes groups. Friendships with Dean and Daren in Tribes 1 and Eileen in Tribes 2 provided different peer scaffolds which encouraged Lindsay to change his behavior and his attitudes and values. Tribes 1 (term 1), was a positive experience for Lindsay who received compliments and social rewards from his peers and the tribe leader, Eileen, who valued his academic ability and sense of humour. Comments such as those from Henry (year 4) and Eileen (year 5) reflect their recognition of Lindsay's sporting and academic abilities, but also the initial challenges faced by Eileen in Tribes 1 when Lindsay was part of her team.

I learnt stuff about other people, if they are being left out, and if people are not getting along. When I listened to other people's problems I started to
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think for myself and I would sort out my problems. (Student interview, Lindsay, November 10, 2004)

You are a nice friend. You are good at getting people out by underarm at cricket. (Henry, “lift up” card, November 22, 2004)

I have been leader (Tribes 1) and it was hard to get Lindsay and Michael to do things because they took their time on purpose to get the tribe annoyed. They don’t do that anymore. I like Lindsay. He’s funny. (Student interview, Eileen, November 10, 2004)

It could be argued that Lindsay may not have valued such feedback if it was not given to him by peers whom he respected and were also his friends. Lindsay’s social circle now included students who were effective leaders, respected by their wide circle of friends and became his friend too, and this appeared to be the catalyst for Lindsay’s change in attitude and behavior (Teacher observations, term 2, 2004). He examined his behavior and understood that there were prosocial means of being noticed by peers, which maintained positive relationships and friendships. The importance of developing these friendships is illustrated in the first round of tribes where Lindsay joined the social circles of two of the most popular members of the class, Dean and Eileen (year 4 and year 5 students respectively), early in the year which had the potential to widen his circle of friends if he chose to change his antisocial behaviors. Dean and Eileen received many nominations from peers, as evidenced in the sociograms, and they were both positive role models. They were both chosen by the teacher to be leaders in the first round of tribes. Eileen had a major influence on all relationships in the classroom with both boys and girls during Tribes 1 and for the rest of the study in 2004.

Cooperation did not follow a linear process because the new Tribes created new contexts and opportunities for new partnerships and alliances. The sociograms provided evidence of Lindsay’s continuing friendships with class members who bullied others, such as Denis and Michael, as well as a trend of increasing his social circle beyond this group. Lindsay’s dilemma became one of choosing his friendships groups that would maintain his increased social status and peer respect while not alienating his old friends. During Tribes 3 Lindsay and Daren (Lindsay’s new friend in 2004) both chose to behave in an antisocial and disruptive manner and Jack (who wanted to be Daren’s friend and was chosen as the leader by Lindsay and Daren), all risked being ostracized by the larger prosocial group in the class. Jack was a year younger than Daren and Lindsay but his schoolwork demonstrated that he was a high achiever. In previous tribes, both Daren and Lindsay took pride in their work and produced high standards (Teacher observations, term 1 & 2, 2004). Daren and
Lindsay did not support Jack's leadership and Jack stated he did not want to be the leader anymore because it was too challenging and he did not enjoy it. In contrast to Jack's leadership, the other three tribes supported their leaders, who were mainly shy and unassertive students.

The experience of Tribes 3 motivated Lindsay to re-evaluate his position for Tribes 4 (Teacher observations, term 2, 2004). Lindsay's self-awareness had developed to such an extent that he recognized the difficulties of trying to be a part of a social group that had not adopted the prosocial values promoted in the classroom. If he was away from this group in the classroom he could remain friends with them and continue to stay on task and work hard, which was valued by him and his new friends. Lindsay made a private verbal request to the teacher that he be placed with Dean in Tribes 4 because he would behave and help Dean with his work. Dean was a friendly and caring student who had a sense of humour and did not take life too seriously. Dean's qualities were recognized and respected by both girls and boys, including Lindsay who wrote this card to Dean at the end of the year.

You are a good friend and you're really funny. You protect your friends from other people and you make lots of friends. We all like you as a friend. (Lindsay's card to Dean, November 6, 2004)

The teacher's tacit knowledge of these students allowed different spaces to be created with the changes in tribes. Lindsay continued to mature and make responsible choices. He was voted twice to be a leader by his peers. He demonstrated that he could be a responsible and empathetic leader and other observers such as peers, school staff and his parent noted changes in Lindsay's behavior. His mother commented on how he had "kept his nose clean" and his academic work was excellent (Teacher observations, term 4). Lindsay refined his understandings of leadership as he interacted and reflected on his actions and those of his peers in another leadership role in Tribes 5, where he was supported by Judy, who was his leader in Tribes 4. Lindsay came to understand that effective leadership was more about "self-responsibility" than being in "control" of others.

**Martin**

Martin was a member of the 2007 class. At the beginning of the year all students completed an activity to advertise to their peers their strengths and areas for peer and teacher support. Martin wrote that he could help his peers with writing and mathematics but needed the teacher's help
with "speaking" and to improve his handwriting (Yellow pages activity, February 8, 2007). When the teacher asked Martin to elaborate he stated that he was not a confident speaker and needed more practice in front of his peers. Yet when Martin conversed with the teacher and other adults he was an articulate and expressive speaker. However, he lacked the same confidence conversing with his peers.

In the first month of school the researcher noted that Martin was one of the children that sat "disconnected from others" when children moved to the mat or when children were asked to find a partner (Research notes, March 2, 2007). In addition the physical education teacher made comments to the class teacher about Martin's reluctance to participate in team games. During interviews with students in week 5 Martin explained, in answering a question about working with other students that "I like working by myself, [working with another person] can be a bit annoying. If I'm ahead I have to help them catch up and that's a bit hard." A few weeks later he was videotaped during a mathematics task (Teacher's observations, March 26, 2007), having an animated conversation with another student, whose friendship he wanted to gain (Sociogram, term 1, 2007).

During term 2 Martin began to participate more in class discussion. For example, following a "think pair share" discussion (Class meeting, April 2, 2007) about the outcomes of a class decision to trial marbles as a motivator, Martin offered that he and his partner Caydan had discussed that having marbles didn't work for them. Later that month, Martin put up an item on seating for a class meeting (Video record, April 30, 2007). At that class meeting he sat in a more central part of the class group on the mat with two of the boys he had worked with on each side of him (Simon and Caydan). He also contributed a suggestion on an item on copying work put up by Crystal. Martin's contribution provided the teacher with the opportunity to clarify the differences between tests and group work, which she framed around honesty.

Martin's participation was changing as he positioned himself to be a fuller participant, which was also evidenced by Martin's more central seating location on the mat during the first class meeting of term 3 (Video record, July 27, 2007). In term 3 he was voted as leader of Tribes 3. His leadership was not without difficulties, and when lack of support for leaders was brought up as a discussion item for a class meeting (August 10, 2007), Martin, as one of the leaders, was pointedly asked by the teacher "What are the leaders going to be thinking about? What are you now going to do in your group? Two leaders had very specific ideas, whereas Martin was reflective and seemingly uncertain prompting the teacher to challenge him to consider his options:
Martin: I think we should put the good people next to the bad, well actually that would be good for the good people, we tried that last term. Well, um ...

Teacher: You have to decide Martin, you need to decide, do you want to be a leader?"

Martin: [quickly answering] Yes.

Teacher: Are you prepared to do what needs to be done and listen to your group? They've all stood up this afternoon. You've heard what they had to say.

Martin: [Nods]

Teacher: Listen to what they have to say and try out a few things.

When asked about what helped him learn best, Martin said "I think groups, I can have my say and people understand my view. I can say what about? I can object also. I object a bit." He liked having a say in class meetings and team discussions because "people can learn to speak up, so that they can start early and be better later." (Student interview, August 14, 2007). He changed his attitude about working with his peers even though he realized that "some people have very silly and annoying personalities and there are others who are good role models. I like working on my own but enjoy working with some people too" (Martin's student reflection log, November 9, 2007).

During the latter part of the year Martin's confidence had grown to such an extent that he volunteered to model to his peers how to be a storyteller for an activity where his peers would later choose their favorite story to retell to the class (November 2, 2007). Martin chose "Jack and the Beanstalk" and retold the story succinctly, using an interesting voice that engaged his audience and clearly demonstrated his excellent command of oral language. After a cooperative activity creating a group dragon, where students reflected on their group's contributions, Martin wrote that he had solved a lot of problems and rated himself as the most cooperative member of the group (Martin's reflection log, October 26, 2007). Four of the other six group members, including Gemma, who was also in Martin's group that term, independently rated Martin with the highest participation level.

Martin's increase in confidence also coincided with increases in participation in the physical education lessons, which he had not really enjoyed at the beginning of the year. The physical education teacher made unsolicited comments to the classroom teacher, after taking team sports with Martin's class (November 14, 2007), and stated that "I have noticed a dramatic change in the attitude of this young fellow." The teacher noted that Martin's body language was really positive and Martin smiled.
Martin developed strategies that assisted his leadership role, "Listening to other people's comments helps them to accept your comments ... doing your best really helps, they trust you more and accept you more as a leader" (Student interview, December 4, 2007). Martin's mother reaffirmed that her son had also developed decision-making skills and optimism. In terms of decision making she said that "he used to jump to decisions," now he has "improved with patience and optimism that there will be a way" (Parent interview, December 4, 2007).

Even though Martin was initially reluctant to express his opinions he became eager to participate in class discussions, giving his opinions while being respectful toward peers with whom he disagreed. He developed strength of character to stand by his opinion and wrote in his reflection log that he did not think people should change their minds solely to please a friend, even if there were social repercussions for disagreeing with group members. This was an interesting statement for a student who was a "loner" in the past and had now made new friends. Gemma agreed with Martin's opinion and added that "you need to think for yourself."

Martin was a very interesting student who reflected deeply on the values that were promoted in the classroom, such as respect and honesty. He set himself very high standards in his work and he showed that he was a caring and sensitive student. Martin preferred to work alone but reflected that he had enjoyed working with his peers. He stated in a student interview (August 14, 2007) that he had worked mainly with one other person in the past on tasks and had sometimes been allowed to choose his partner. However the variety of partners and small group opportunities across the curriculum this year had allowed a greater variety of personalities with whom he could work and so he started to realise that he could enjoy group work and his peers had something to offer him, even if he did not need their assistance with the task. When Martin was interviewed at the end of the year he stated that the best thing about the year was "when I was a leader in Tribes 3" (Student interview, December 4, 2007).

Gemma

Gemma lacked confidence in her abilities and often did not persist because she perceived she could not meet challenges. She was very dependent on teacher feedback to reassure her that she was on the right track and would often not start, or stop her work when she had difficulties. At the beginning of the year Gemma's mum stated that Gemma had been depressed and withdrawn over the last few years, due to family events. She spent many hours with her toys talking to herself and did not want to engage with her peers. Her mother believed that this had slowed
Gemma’s development and academic progress at school (Gemma’s parent survey, term 1, 2007). Gemma had been identified as a student at educational risk by her year 1 and 2 teachers for literacy and numeracy (2005-6). During further discussions with Gemma’s mother she stated that Gemma’s behaviors at primary school mirrored her own school experience. She also lacked confidence in her abilities and often did not persist because she perceived she could not meet challenges. She was anxious in any “testing situation.”

Early in the year Gemma was always on the periphery of the group when there were class discussions on the mat. She gradually repositioned herself on the mat toward the center of the group. Over the first half of the year Gemma changed her behaviors to asking more questions and “having a go,” which made her realize that she was capable of completing most tasks set in the class independently without continual feedback. At the first class meeting of term 3 (Research notes, July 27, 2007) she was willing to be more active in discussions and put her hand up to give suggestions. Earlier in the day, Gemma stated “I feel happy” during the first social circle of term 3 (Video recording, July 27, 2007).

During Tribes 2 (term 2, 2007) Gemma was voted as a leader by her peers because she was caring and supportive of others. She had some confident peers in her tribe and former leaders, who were willing to support her, but there were also two boys and one girl who were very argumentative and she found facilitating the group process to make decisions was frustrating. Initially, Gemma had some difficulties with her group. In one exchange, she said “I am organizing where everyone sits, and Jared said, ‘Gemma is bossing me around.’ After the teacher had a little discussion with the group about bossing, Crystal said, “She’s not bossing you around.” Jared wanted another chance and another student suggested that everyone was excited that day with a new Tribe and that “tomorrow will be better” (Research notes, April 2, 2007).

Earlier, Gemma had stated that she would support others if she became a leader (Student interview, March 12, 2007). As the weeks progressed Gemma facilitated group discussions and learned how to keep everybody involved by using their names and asking them to speak in turn while other members listened. She developed active listening skills and became more confident in her interpersonal relationships with her team. She encouraged team members to remain committed to participation during discussions to make decisions. Gemma gained the respect of her group because she was patient and allowed everyone to have a turn. Her self-reflections demonstrate that she started to understand the process of reaching a group consensus and that her contributions were valued by the group too.
Gemma was often embarrassed when receiving compliments from the teacher or her peers. She would hide her eyes with her hands and cover her face. At the first class meeting of term 3 (27.7.07) Gemma was still near the periphery of the group, while sitting on the mat. The teacher was talking about leadership, stating that Gemma had been an effective leader, Gemma removed her hands from her eyes and gave the teacher eye contact and smiled, accepting the compliment,

Gemma you don't mind us talking about that now because you're among friends. Gemma you have just grown so much in your confidence and it is lovely to see. Now you can relax a little bit, you don't have to be a leader unless you want to be. You've got the skills right inside of you to support the next person in your group who is going to be a leader. (Transcript from video, class meeting, July 27, 2007)

She began to trust her abilities and received positive feedback from her peers and the teacher. At the beginning of the year Gemma had written in her self-reflection log "I can't do it. When stuff goes wrong for me it's too hard to handle." After her first leadership role in term 2 she wrote "I can handle it."

Gemma showed that she was able to observe activity and then contribute in the latter part. Her confidence appeared to grow. At a class meeting in term 3 (August 10, 2007) she put up an item with Tina. In the discussion around an item about supporting leaders (immediately before her item) she contributed, "I haven't been supportive but people need to help them if people in the group are not very good." Then for her item she did not speak until the item was nearly over. The conversation was around support and asking for help and then she asked the next person with their hand up for their suggestion.

As the year progressed, Gemma's academic skills developed to a satisfactory level and she wrote that she was "now able to write longer stories" (Gemma's reflection log, November 9, 2007) and her friendship group widened. She had an increase in social engagements and more invitations to birthday parties than in previous years (Gemma's parent interview, November 15, 2007). Both Gemma and her mother stated that her confidence had increased and she was happy at school (Student and parent interviews, term 4, 2007).

**DISCUSSION**

The three students described in this chapter were on the periphery of collaborative and academic tasks and not reaching their potentials. They seated themselves on the edges of the class group for discussions at the
beginning of the year. When all students were asked to reseat themselves on the mat part way through discussions these students still chose the extremities of the group at the beginning of the year. Lindsay seated himself at the back of the room with his friends, who were also antisocial, so he could "grin and jeer" at other peers whom he bullied, which often disrupted class meetings. Martin and Gemma lacked confidence to participate and listened attentively on the fringes of the class group until they felt safe to start to contribute. They were supportive of their peers to the extent they did not disrupt discussions. In both classes the teacher guided participation to position students towards full participation in discussions in a positive way by valuing their initial contributions. These students took on roles they would not normally volunteer to do and they learned from listening and watching others.

The teacher was enthusiastic during discussions and made positive comments which encouraged the students to participate. Scaffolds for being part of the audience were suggested with questions such as, "How do you show you are listening? If you agree or do not agree with ideas how do you do it so others feel safe to speak as we want the meeting safe for all students?" The teacher promoted diverse opinions by modeling to students how to say that they like an idea and how to build on it.

The five class agreements "mutual respect," "attentive listening," "appreciating others/no put downs," "participation/right to pass," and "personal best" underpinned the values of the classroom community and were the basis for the negotiation of social practice at a classroom and small group level. The "right to pass" was an important agreement because it created the conditions for psychological safety and personal well being, with the expectation of eventual full participation to collaborate. It also legitimized being a peripheral participant by allowing community members to participate as an observer and listen in to others with intent, as described by Rogoff et al. (2003). This is a tradition prevalent in many indigenous American communities where children learn by keen observation and listening-in on activities of adults and other children.

Learning through keen observation and listening, in anticipation of participation seems to be especially valued in communities where children have access to learning from informal community involvement. They listen with intent concentration and initiative, and their collaborative participation is expected when they are ready to help in shared endeavours. (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 176)

Creating the conditions for "intent" participation in a collaborative classroom allows students to move with ease in and out of roles, to adapt leadership and be flexible to the needs of their group. Responsibilities are
shared through fluid negotiations to develop group consensus-based decisions, accommodating the diversity within the group.

In the intent participation tradition, experienced people play a guiding role, facilitating learners' involvement and often participating alongside learners—indeed, often learning themselves. New learners in turn take initiative in learning and contributing to shared endeavours, sometimes offering leadership in the process. (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 187)

Renshaw (2003) discusses the importance of establishing dialogue between members of the community to allow the potential for greater insights that may arise from different points of view.

The emphasis on unspoken consensus suggests a movement from diversity to uniformity. It can be argued that coming together around agreed goals, belief, strategies and activities in the classroom is a necessary condition for the recognition of difference and the exploration of diverse viewpoints. There seems to be an irreducible tension here. (Renshaw, 2003, p. 367)

Leadership for all students required the ability to listen and value the opinions of others, suspend judgement, as well as being able to express an opinion and take a stand. Students learned about both the positive and negative aspects of their peer's personalities and that there may be social consequences when there were disagreements over ideas. Both Martin and Gemma were aware of the challenges of leadership when trying to facilitate making a decision with their group. They had been in groups where students argued and shouted above others to get their opinion heard and also disengaged from the discussion to gain the attention of their peers in an effort to influence the group decision. Martin and Gemma demonstrated inclusive leadership characteristics such as checking with each member about decisions being made and trying to make sure everybody was participating. When the three students were asked to name the "best thing" about the year they all stated that being a leader was the best because their peers believed in them enough to vote for them. Some students felt like Gemma, who did not believe she would get the opportunity at all and did not believe she could do it. Both parents and students confirmed at the end of the year during their interviews that the opportunity to be a leader had many benefits. It meant students' talents were appreciated. Students realized that they could not have their own way all the time. They became better at not being shy, did not give up on hard tasks and had more self-control.

The leadership roles provided opportunities for participation with intent by allowing a process of self-reflection to manage adaptations to new roles and relationships. Students were provided with peer and
teacher feedback, which facilitated their personal growth and potential. Their experiences mirrored Ancona’s description of adult leaders who “learn through experiences what is most important to them and how they can be effective with others (2005, p. 15). The students stated in their reflection logs (November 29, 2007) that they felt “proud,” “responsible,” “important,” and “encouraged by my team.” Another reflected, “You have to be a good role model and nice to others.” These feelings of being supported changed the way these peripheral students participated because they became empowered by the process of reaching out and connecting to others. Rogers-Healey from the Australian Virtual Centre for Leadership for Women states that this metamorphosis needs to happen to influence others in the process of collaboration.

I don’t believe we can effect change in anyone else if we are unable to change ourselves first and foremost. By reaching out to others, we validate ourselves, our visions, our hopes and if, perchance someone else identifies with a spark of our vision we set in motion a catalyst for collaboration. (Rogers-Healey, personal communication, October 29, 2007)

CONCLUSION

This chapter focuses on the effort of one teacher who made a difference in her students’ lives by making explicit the social and cultural practices of the classroom. Her instructional practices developed social and emotional awareness and built the knowledge and understanding needed for students to become more mature participants. This entailed promoting prosocial behavior within the context of everyday classroom experiences, making explicit democratic values that underpin a collaborative classroom, exploring beliefs about “self” and making choices about how to interact with peers to meet personal needs in ways that also acknowledge the feelings of others, seeking to understand and address antisocial and negative thoughts and feelings of students. Students were encouraged to negotiate how they participated in collective activities through the classroom meetings. The students changed their patterns of participation to more mature participation within a context that supported change in the classroom and motivational development.

The instructional practices described in this chapter could be adapted by teachers keen to create a classroom, which supports students’ social and emotional development to allow them to participate fully in the social and cultural practices of the classroom and their communities. Van Oers and Hännikäinen (2001) would argue that it is important to identify the conditions “for transforming a class collective into a learning community
that is based on togetherness” (p. 105) if we are to be successful in sustaining motivation to participate in such communities. Studying changing patterns of student participation in a classroom provides a window into the thoughts and feelings of students, as they become more mature participants.

The evidence from the three case studies reported in this chapter support Hattie’s (2003) contention that the classroom teacher is the main factor in making a difference to students’ learning outcomes. These students attended quite different schools and yet achieved very similar outcomes. As they developed shared social and emotional knowledge and understanding, the students became more mature participants in collaborative activities.

It is the person who gently closes the classroom door and performs the teaching act—the person who puts into place the end effects of so many policies, who interprets these policies, and who is alone with students during their 15,000 hours of schooling. (Hattie, 2003, p. 2)

NOTES

1. Rogoff et al. (2003, p. 185) contrasts intent participation and assembly-line instruction. Characteristics of intent participation include: collaborative, horizontal participation structures; communication through joint action; learning through observation during participation in shared endeavors; experienced people guide while participating and learners take initiative; motivation in the importance of the activity with the relation of steps to purpose understood; and assessment during shared endeavors to aid learning.

2. The first four agreements are from Tribes: (1) mutual respect; (2) appreciating others/no putdowns (social skills); (3) attentive listening (communication skill); and (4) participation/right to pass (safety and inclusion). The last agreement is from Bernard’s “You Can Do It!” program, (1996): (5) personal best (promotes ways of thinking and behaving that build success).
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‘Motivation in Action’ in a Collaborative Primary Classroom: Developing and Sustaining Teacher Motivation
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Abstract: This paper examines how the process of scaffolding students to solve their social issues developed mature participation for both the teacher and students. A sociocultural perspective framed the research as the underlying assumption is that students learn from each other, mediated by the teacher or more capable peers. The study provides evidence that teachers play a significant role in mediating positive relationships amongst peers, which in this case, sustained the teacher’s motivation to engage in the challenging and at times exhausting process. The teacher used weekly class meetings to negotiate with students how to share ‘power’ and model democratic decision-making. The ‘bottom-up’ approach of this research, links not only to teacher motivation but contributes to much needed research on how teachers can effectively cater for the diversity of students in their class, through their professional learning and development.

‘Motivation in action’ was chosen as the title for this paper because the teacher (first author) used an action research process (Grundy, 1995; Tripp, 1995) as a vehicle to engage in innovative practice and ongoing professional learning. The research was conducted in a metropolitan school in Western Australia. A process of planning, implementing, collecting data and reflecting (Burns, 2005) to respond to students’ social and emotional needs is a cycle that complements the teaching process. The explicit teaching of the social practices of the classroom included teaching leadership skills because students scaffolded each other in how to be a leader. These data provided evidence that collaborative practices were becoming well established in the classroom (Morcom & MacCallum, 2007). Teacher motivation was sustained to continue to develop these skills because the teacher’s professional understandings were developing which enriched the teaching experiences with the students. She was able to meet the complex demands of parents, students and the school administration as well as innovate in her classroom (Morcom, 2005; MacCallum & Morcom, 2008).

Theoretical Perspectives

Sociocultural theory is historically related to the work of Vygotsky (1978) and provides an account of learning and development as culturally mediated processes, where motivation is not usually separated from learning. A sociocultural perspective was chosen as a theoretical framework for the study because it highlights the social
nature of motivation and classrooms as essentially social environments where learning takes place (Daniels, 2001, Renshaw, 1998). According to researchers taking a sociocultural perspective this necessitates use of the activity or event as the unit of analysis (Rogoff, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1998), and thus moves the focus of research away from either the individual or the environment towards the mutuality of the individual and the sociocultural environment. Rogoff (1995) argues that “each is inherently involved in the others’ definition” (p. 140) with none existing separately. There is now an emerging body of research that gives primacy to the social and cultural aspects of motivation and its relation to learning (Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury & Walker, 2005). In this paper two assumptions are made about learning and motivation: (a) Learning is conceptualised as primarily a social activity and motivation emerges from the social context that is manifested in both collaborative and individual action; (b) Motivational development is conceptualised as the transformation of participation towards more mature participation (see Rogoff in explanation directly below) in the collaborative classroom for both the teacher and the students (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008).

Vygotsky (1978) used the concept of zone of proximal development (ZPD) to theorise the kind of pedagogy likely to promote significant learning and therefore motivation. He recognised the relevance of interpersonal interactions between the learner and more capable others and defined this ZPD as the distance between a child’s “actual development as determined by independent problem solving” and the “potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). If the tasks are adjusted to the learner’s level, with appropriate scaffolds and support in place, then the learner is not only challenged but highly likely to be successful, as they develop strategies to cope with ‘challenge’ and the anxieties that may arise. The bi-directional exchanges occurring in the ZPD illustrate the ‘dynamic interdependence between the social and individual worlds’ and the fact that ‘they are distinguishable and qualitatively different from each other’ (Walker, in press).

‘Learning’ and ‘motivation to learn’ are viewed as being mutually interdependent with both arising from the social context of the classroom. In order to keep the focus on the ‘social origins of motivation’ Rogoff’s (1995) personal, interpersonal and cultural/community psychological planes are used to examine the processes of motivational development in the analysis of the data. Lave & Wenger’s (1991) notion of legitimate peripheral participation as ‘a descriptor of engagement in social practices that entails learning as an integral constituent’ (p. 35) is further developed in this paper as a result of the innovative instructional practices that were implemented (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008). The term ‘mature participation’ refers to students who further developed their problem solving skills. It is important to realise that there are two complementary processes at play for the teacher and the students respectively as they become mature participants in the classroom. Firstly, the teacher was using strategies with the students to facilitate their development to ‘fuller’ or ‘mature participation’ in the classroom by explicitly teaching the values that underpin a collaborative classroom. Secondly the teacher was also developing and refining the instructional strategies to understand her role as a facilitator, to develop expertise as a mature participant in the classroom. In this paper the focus is on the teacher’s motivational development from partial to mature participation as expertise was developed.
Aim

The focus of this paper is to examine the teacher's motivation to develop and sustain innovative classroom practices that gave students a 'voice' and some 'choice' in a context where traditional methods were encouraged to address behaviour issues. The research specifically involved the first author as the classroom teacher and the 32 Year 4/5 students aged 9-11 years in the class. The purpose was less about 'fixing' student behaviour and more about 'negotiating' an inclusive classroom environment. The underlying assumption is that learning is socially constructed so primacy was given to the social context where student and teacher participation was occurring. The two examples used in this paper illustrate how a group of students resolved their social issues and provided feedback and evidence to the teacher that they were taking personal responsibility for their actions. Students were scaffolded by the teacher to solve their social issues during the weekly class meetings which were conducted throughout a school year. It could be argued that the student action then scaffolded the teacher as she continually developed her practice.

The Context of the Research

The profile of the school is summarised in Table 1 with details about the student profile, academic performance, class composition and school priorities. This school provided challenges for the teacher to develop the students' social and academic skills with an increase in antisocial behaviours across the school. Class sizes were at the maximum, so the students' desks used most of the floor space which created problems when arranging the furniture for group work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Profile</td>
<td>Majority of students with 'English as an additional Language'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Standardised Testing For Literacy And Numeracy</td>
<td>Poor results with many students at or below state benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Composition</td>
<td>'Composite' year levels e.g. year 4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Priorities</td>
<td>Values Education to support pastoral care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Bullying' intervention school-based programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy and Numeracy support programs for students at educational risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Profile of the school

Plan, Act, Monitor and Reflect

An action research process was used to provide a systematic procedure by which the journey of negotiating a collaborative classroom could be documented. As the teacher and students integrated new knowledge, the data collected provided
evidence of changes in behaviours (Grundy, 1995; Tripp, 1995). An inductive approach was used to inform both the teaching practice and the research outcomes. Reducing raw data and identifying the themes was an inductive, ongoing process. The variety of data sources from all stakeholders, including the students, parents and teacher, provided a rich source of evidence that could be triangulated to improve validity when using qualitative research methods (Patton, 2002). This is an important aspect of qualitative research to create an interchange of ideas to develop understandings between researchers and make clearer the usefulness of the findings to practitioners.

Table 2 provides a summary of the main topics for discussions at the class meetings. Column 1 provides a timeline of the school terms in which the major class meeting discussions arose (column 2) and the emerging themes for the major research project at school 1 (column 3). The challenge for the teacher was to develop strategies that would make a difference in a situation where there had been little positive change in student behaviour for the past few years despite pastoral care programs implemented at the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Class Meeting Discussions</th>
<th>Major Research Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 1, 2</td>
<td>Facilitating Relationships</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lift students’ awareness of their behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bullying/teasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2, 3</td>
<td>Facilitating Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet the challenges of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership and social networks for Tribes 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 4</td>
<td>Facilitating Friendship</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lift students’ awareness of discriminatory behaviours that constrain inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ construct of friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cliques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contingency friendships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discriminatory behaviours (inclusion and exclusion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Timeline of the teacher’s facilitative role for a school year

Each week the students and teacher wrote the agenda items for the class meetings. After the items were prioritised for discussion all students were encouraged to actively participate and offer their ideas. The teacher constantly sought clarification from the students during the meetings and through their reflection logs and informal interviews. The phases of the study identified critical periods whereby emerging themes surfaced, such as student leadership in term 2. These phases were not linear in the sense that each emerging theme was exclusive to that phase but at the time student leadership emerged the teacher observed that students were displaying more cooperative behaviours. Students also realised that effective leadership also assisted the process of developing harmonious relationships and friendships. By the end of term 3 deeper levels of engagement amongst the students resulted in the issue of sustaining and maintaining friendships as the focus for class discussions. The two exemplars used in this paper occurred in this phase and will be discussed later.
Methods

Qualitative research methods were chosen primarily because they were flexible enough to accommodate different viewpoints, without predetermining the content or themes of what would emerge from the data gathered in the naturalistic setting of a classroom (Patton, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Research taking a sociocultural perspective needs methods that allow documentation of participation in authentic activities such as classroom meetings, encompassing the personal and interpersonal actions of the participants. It is important to also understand the wider institutional and community context in which these actions are occurring. A range of qualitative data was collected from multiple sources to gain the perspectives of all stakeholders. These included written reflection logs of the teacher and the students, and interviews and surveys of parents about their child’s social and emotional development to provide evidence of behaviour outside the school context.

The teacher’s reflective journal was used to examine evidence from multiple sources of data to understand the development of mature participation for the teacher in collaborative instructional practices. In Figure 1 the phases of the study are organised to position data sources within a timeline provides the term dates, emerging themes and data sources over the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>2.2.04-9.4.04</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>26.4.04-9.7.04</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11 Week Term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td>(10 Week Term)</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 4</td>
<td>(9 Week Term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Phases of the study to position data sources within a timeline

The emerging themes also reflect the discussions that were happening during class meetings. Students selected different peers, using sociograms, to form new social groups each term. They also selected leaders and vice leaders to lead their groups. Different leaders were selected for each new round of groups that resulted in most students experiencing a leadership role.
Using Rogoff’s Planes

So that the parts of an activity or event can be examined, Rogoff (1995) proposes three planes of analysis, corresponding to the personal, interpersonal and community processes. Rogoff’s (1995) three planes were used to fore ground different elements that became important to developing and sustaining the teacher’s motivation to implement collaborative practices. Rogoff maintains that development occurs in all planes, for example, children develop but so do their partners and their cultural communities. She argues that it is incomplete to consider “the relationship of individual development and social interaction without concern for the cultural activity in which personal and interpersonal actions take place” (p. 141). Thus in this kind of analysis, each plane in turn is fore grounded with the other planes in the background allowing “active and dynamic contributions from individuals, their social partners, and historical traditions and materials and their transformations” (p. 140). The teacher identified key areas of professional development that were undertaken to support the teacher and students’ development to mature participation. Student interactions with each other and the teacher are important at the interpersonal plane and the school and wider educational issues are important at the community plane. Table 3, see below, provides a summary of Rogoff’s three planes of analysis; the metaphors/ terminology used; the focus; the purpose and the links to data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planes of Analysis</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/ community</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Active individuals participating with others in culturally organised activity</td>
<td>Teacher’s development of innovative practice leading to mature participation for the teacher</td>
<td>• Teacher’s reflection log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent interviews and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Guided participation</td>
<td>Focuses on the processes and systems of involvement between people as they communicate and coordinate efforts.</td>
<td>Reciprocal relationship of teacher and students guiding each other to fuller participation</td>
<td>• Weekly class meetings-agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent interviews and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Participatory appropriation</td>
<td>Individuals transform their understanding and responsibility for activities through their own participation</td>
<td>Teacher’s understanding of the developing instructional practice “… a process of becoming, rather than acquisition” (Rogoff, 1995, p. 142).</td>
<td>• Teacher and student reflection logs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Rogoff’s (1995) three planes of analysis, focus, purpose and data

Rogoff’s planes are used as a means to organise data and are elaborated upon in the following sections of this paper, starting with the community plane.
In this section, the community plane foregrounds the historical and institutional aspects that contextualise the educational system in Western Australia in which this teacher was developing innovative instructional strategies to develop collaboration and mature participation. Values education was a priority at the school, which reflected a wider call by the Australian community that state schools become more proactive to dispel the growing ‘values neutral’ stance that was evident during the 1990s and early 2000s. ‘Values for Australian Schools’ programs were funded by the Australian Government (2009) to facilitate values education being taught in a planned and systematic way to develop student well being and future Australian citizens (Lovat & Toomey, 2007). General and abstract ethical principles, such as ‘justice for all’ and ‘beneficence’, were in the government policies about social justice and equal opportunities. Values education was viewed as a complex process and partnership between the school, family and the community.

Our values provide the framework for our whole lives— they shape our thoughts, feelings and actions. The development of values is a complex, ongoing process but the formative processes occur in our early lives— through the dominant influences of home, family and school. (Australian Government, 2009, p.1)

Therefore values education was not only viewed as fundamental to a great education but a means for students to develop protective factors through positive relationships with their family, school and community. The evidence also supported ‘that values-based education can strengthen students’ self esteem, optimism and commitment to personal fulfilment; and help students exercise ethical judgement and social responsibility’ (Lovat & Toomey, 2007, p. xiii). After consultation with the wider community the Western Australian government agreed on legislation that five core shared values would be used as a general framework for teachers to foster democratic principles in their classrooms (Curriculum Council, 1998). Values such as ‘mutual respect’ provided the foundation to create a safe, caring, inclusive and democratic classroom and develop mature student participation. Funding was also provided by the WA government to provide teacher professional development to develop student-centred research based pedagogies such as cooperative learning and collaborative learning to improve student outcomes (Ashman & Gillies, 2003; Bennett & Rolheiser, 2001; Gillies, 2003; Gillies & Ashman, 1996). Teachers need to be motivated to take risks, which may not always be supported if traditional pedagogies are embedded in the culture of the school and supported by the parents and school administration. Staff at the research school agreed to prioritize ‘Values Education’ for a four year period and this teacher was the school coordinator. It was important that all stakeholders had evidence of changes in their children’s attitudes towards each other to gain parents’ support and maintain teacher commitment to the processes.

It is evident from Australian and State government initiatives that values education was a vehicle to promote active citizenship but also supported the social and emotional needs of students (Lovat & Toomey, 2007; Lovat, Toomey, Clement, Crotty & Nielsen, 2009). The next section will examine the interpersonal plane and the relationships that developed in this classroom between the teacher and the students as they guided each other during class meetings to develop mature participation.
Interpersonal Plane

Rogoff (1995) uses the term ‘guided participation’ to emphasize the mutuality of individuals and their social partners as they communicate and coordinate their involvement and participation in socioculturally structured, collective activity such as a class meeting. She argues that ‘participation requires engagement in some aspects of the meaning of the shared endeavors’. The teacher and students were developing understandings to seek common ground as part of the process of communicating and coordinating with each other. Rogoff (1995) asserts that this process is how participation in a community grows between members within cultural activities:

Communication and coordination with other members of the community stretches the understanding of all participants, as they seek a common ground of understanding in order to proceed with the activities at hand. The search for common ground as well as to extend it involves adjustments and the growth of understanding. (p.148)

The teacher was maturing in her understanding of how to seek common ground with the students in her facilitative role through fuller participation with the community. As the year progressed more students chose to become active participants in activities which motivated the teacher to continue to develop understanding how to continue the implementation of collaborative instructional practices. The teacher was facing similar challenges to the students in adapting to students’ changing social and emotional needs and being proactive to promote positive values in the role of a facilitator. The teacher’s facilitative role developed with the students as they participated in class meetings which is summarised in Table 2.

At the beginning of the year, the teacher focused on building positive relationships which required students to be aware of their behaviour and how it impacted on their peers. The teacher supported this focus with ‘team building’ activities to assist students to develop a caring attitude towards each other. The class discussions changed from a focus on building relationships, to ‘how to be a good leader’. Students were making many friends and this provided the foundations for students to support each other in leadership roles. Once many students had experienced leadership roles their relationships matured and became more complex because there were members of a wider social network. These social networks created new contexts and opportunities for new partnerships and alliances. When there were social problems in the playground, there were often more students involved and this may have increased the time taken to resolve issues so other solutions needed to be created. The teacher’s aim was to maintain positive social cohesion and establish a process that was manageable for all participants. The teacher noted in her reflection log during term 3:

Cooperation does not follow a linear path. The issues of sustaining friendships are becoming more important. I have noticed that this term the item ‘getting along’ has reappeared. This reaffirms for me that the majority of students value pro social attitudes and behaviours because they are looking for other ways to solve these problems. I still have concerns about how to manage the really large friendship group that has developed amongst the year 5 girls. There are many strong personalities and some students such as Angela are jealous of the attention that Eileen receives. I have noted the body
language of Angela when she is not partnered by Eileen because Eileen chooses or is chosen by someone else. The increasing use of reflection logs to assist students to take responsibility for their behaviour seems to be working well, as I have had fewer complaints from the students. Maybe this could be used when there are playground issues that remain unresolved... (Teacher reflection log, Term 3, Week 6 - 2.9.04)

The teacher was encouraged by fewer complaints in term 3 from students, with group work progressing well. This reduced the stress often associated with the emotional aspects of interviewing parents and students when social issues arise. It was usual practice to hold a discussion with the whole class and write in reflection logs what students were learning. During Term 4, two incidences occurred involving the same group of five year 5 girls, who returned to class upset after lunch. This group used the strategy of writing the 'facts' in their reflection journals after such disagreements and then reading what they had written to each other. It was a process that allowed everybody to have their 'say' and encouraged honesty to maintain friendships (which the students stated was their personal goal). The teacher had scaffolded and supported the students with discussions about friendships and issues of inclusion and exclusion to develop shared knowledge and understandings. The following extracts are from the reflection logs of Susan, Helen, Angela, Margaret and Eileen and describe incidents that took place in the school yard during lunch.

_Incident 1_

I accidentally hit Helen on the arm and then I said, “Sorry”. Then she whacked me in the eye. Then she walked off. Then Angela and Claire and I told the teacher. (Student reflection log, 9.11.04, Susan)

Susan whipped me and she said sorry. I said, “Don’t hit me again!” Then I was doing a move off and it hit Susan in the head. I said, “Sorry. Are you ok? She said, “Get lost!” They told the teacher but I refused to go to the teacher so I got my name in the book. (Student reflection log, 9.11.04, Helen)

Susan was skipping and accidentally hit Helen on the shoulder. Then Helen got mad and hit Susan on the face and then realised what she had done. She went to say sorry to Susan but Susan told her to go away and Helen was upset and she ran off to me. Helen had a mark on her shoulder. (Student reflection log, 9.11.04, Angela)

Susan was skipping and Helen was behind her. The skipping rope had hit Helen on the shoulder. Susan said sorry then Helen said, ‘That hurt!’ Then Helen folded her rope in half and whacked Susan on the cheek. Helen dropped the rope and ran off to Angela. I was next to Susan. Susan had a big red mark on her cheek. Helen had a mark on her shoulder. (Student reflection log, 9.11.04, Margaret)
I heard a whip and then I heard Susan say, “Ow!” Then I saw Helen go over to Angela and Susan was crying and there was big mark on Susan’s face. Susan was saying that Helen purposely hit her”. (Student reflection log, 9.11.04, Eileen)

The underlying values of mutual respect and honesty are clearly illustrated in the girls’ words. It was evident that Helen accidentally hit Susan during a skipping game and Susan overreacted by hitting Helen deliberately in the eye. Susan walked off and refused to see the teacher, leaving Helen crying. When the girls returned to the classroom they were still upset about what had happened. Once they read their versions aloud to each other Susan apologised to Helen. Helen forgave her and there were more tears and hugs. The girls admitted their responsibility so they could maintain their friendships. The process took about 10-15 minutes of class time and the students resolved their issues without blaming each other. One could argue this process saved many more minutes/ hours in follow up calls and notes to parents (Teacher reflection log, term 4, 9.11.04).

The teacher reviewed her reflection log (26.11.04) and noted that tensions between Angela and her friends had escalated in Term 4. Angela was visibly upset when the class were voting for the faction captains and Angela wanted to be a captain. Angela was in the same faction as Eileen. Eileen was the most popular girl in the class with both genders, as evidenced in sociograms and teacher observations. Angela had struggled all year with the fact that Eileen had so many friends as she wanted Eileen to be her ‘special/ exclusive friend’. In the developing collaborative context Angela needed to resolve these issues as she risked losing all her friends including Eileen. In the second incident, Angela became verbally abusive towards Susan, Helen, Margaret and Eileen in the playground as described in the following extracts from the student logs?

Incident 2

We were putting up our hands then Angela walked off. Then she said, “I feel left out!” Then Angela said to Eileen, “You are so mean!” and much, much more to her. (Student reflection log, 25.11.04, Susan)

Angela said to me that she didn’t want to play with Eileen so they were talking and then Eileen and Angela were crying. I said to Eileen, “What’s wrong?” She said that Angela had called her a spoilt brat and a b… (Student reflection log, 25.11.04, Helen)

Well at lunch me, Eileen, Angela had a fight and Angela called Eileen a spoilt little brat and said she has no feelings and doesn’t care about her friends… (Student reflection log, 25.11.04, Margaret)

Well first Angela thought that it was unfriendly to ask what is wrong if she walks off. She yelled at me and called me a spoilt little brat who doesn’t have feelings and she hates me and a lot of my friends… (Student reflection log, 25.11.04, Eileen)
I was feeling left out and I wanted to just play with Susan and Helen so I told Eileen and I said, “Every time I run somewhere Eileen says to me, ‘Why are you upset?’ and I say, ‘I am not!’” (Student reflection log, 25.11.04, Angela)

Again a similar process ensued where the students used their reflection logs and shared what they wrote. The students managed this process with minimal teacher intervention and took responsibility for their behaviour, which provided evidence that they were moving towards ‘mature participation’ in the classroom community. The next day Eileen’s mother came to the classroom for an informal chat.

Eileen’s mother explained that Eileen had to deal with Angela’s emotional outburst since pre-primary and the tension between them is a result of her daughter’s large friendship group. She encouraged her daughter to be patient with Angela and walk away when Angela threw a tantrum. But Eileen had also stated that she kept forgiving Angela but doesn’t know if she wants to do it anymore (Teacher reflection log, 26.11.04).

This situation resulted in a subsequent class meeting where the teacher facilitated discussions about negative emotions such as ‘jealousy’, ‘feeling hurt and rejected’ ‘anger’ and the role of ‘forgiveness’ to scaffold students’ understandings towards mature participation. The teacher wrote in her reflection log that ‘Angela realised that she risked losing all her friends if she persisted with this behaviour (Teacher reflection log, 11.12.04).

These two incidents illustrate the development of mature participation for the students but also the teacher as she scaffolded complex social situations to develop positive relationships with and amongst her students. The reflection logs provided a ‘safe place’ for the students to write their observations and feelings and gave the teacher clues about the ‘scaffolds’ that would support the students. It was usual practice for students to read orally from their logs but not to read each others’ logs. They always had the ‘right to pass’ if they did not want to read their logs out loud but students were always willing to participate. The sharing of the student logs amongst the group allowed all students to hear each other’s perspective without interruption and engage in a shared endeavour to make meaning of the situation. The class meeting provided the ‘safe space’ for students to express their perspective and negative emotions so they could make choices that promoted their well being. They could make adjustments and growth in their understanding and seek common ground as part of the process of communicating and coordinating with each other.

At the interpersonal plane the teacher and the students were guiding each other. The students were providing information about their thinking and behaviour in their reflection logs and at class meetings. The teacher was integrating professional learning that included the wider view of values education and philosophy, cooperative and collaborative learning to implement innovative instructional practice. These approaches were not only being integrated in the classroom practice but also being used for the teacher’s research about her facilitative role in this process (Morcom, 2005).

The next section, the personal plane, will examine how the teacher developed her understanding of changing her practice as she participated in these cultural activities in a school climate where teachers were feeling overburdened with increasing workloads. The personal plane will examine why this teacher was motivated to increase her workload further and continue to conduct classroom research.
Personal Plane

As students developed mature participation with each other, as evidenced in respectful behaviour and growing friendship groups, the teacher was encouraged to develop and sustain classroom practices that scaffolded their further development. Modelling high expectations to students through the class agreements: 'mutual respect, participation and right to pass, no putdowns and appreciating others, attentive listening and personal best' based on Tribes (Gibbs, 2001) and the ‘You Can Do It’ program! (Bernard, 1996) students were left in no doubt that the teacher valued respectful relationships. As the teacher’s expertise to implement innovative practices in the classroom developed so did the students’ ability to model these behaviours to each other. The teacher used cues from the children to continue to develop the practice and observed how their participation was changing as the social practices in the classroom were becoming established. The class meetings and reflection logs became important strategies that provided evidence of how the dynamic and complex process unfolded.

This process of using weekly class meetings occurred over a school year and when considering ‘participatory appropriation’ it is important to realise that ‘time’ is an inherent part of the event. It is not divided into ‘past, present and future’ but the event ‘is an extension of previous events and is directed towards goals that have not been accomplished’ (Rogoff, 1995). This development was part of a dynamic process that involved changes over time. There is an assumption that learning occurs from the interdependent relationship between the individual and the social context and that in this process, active participation itself, is how the participants gain facility in an activity. Rogoff (1995) stated that when a person participates in an activity they are a part of that activity and not separated from it.

The participatory appropriation view of how development and learning occurs involves a perspective in which children and their social partners are interdependent, their roles are active and dynamically changing, and specific processes by which they communicate and share in decision making are the substance of cognitive development. (Rogoff, 1995, p.151)

The teacher recognized that the reflection logs allowed students to think through how they were going to express their feelings to their peers when an incident needed to be resolved. Students matured in their interpersonal relationships and their desire to cooperate and maintain their growing friendship groups. After reviewing the transcripts of student reflections, as in the exemplars in this paper, it became evident that students were developing a growing awareness of their need to take personal responsibility for their behaviour. The teacher developed her understanding of how to facilitate and scaffold future activities, in response to student needs by implementing professional learning in the areas of collaboration, cooperation, philosophy and values education. The process was intellectually challenging but also a source of motivation. She was regularly surprised and excited by the students’ development towards mature participation and their ability to respond to teacher scaffolds. In order to make explicit how to maintain friendships the teacher listed ‘annoying’ and ‘positive’ behaviours with the students. She noted how easily the students understood the purpose of such activities and used the charts as visual cues with each other (Teacher daily work pad notes, November, 2004).

There were challenges to address the multiple ZPDs so students were sufficiently challenged but not overwhelmed in the process of developing mature
participation. The active participation of the teacher in the process with students developed her skills and appreciation from students in the form of handwritten small cards on a regular basis that provided evidence that students were making progress with friendships. One comment ‘thank you for teaching me friendship stuff- awesome’ was typical of the cards received (Margaret, 24.11.04).

Discussion

One of the challenges of investigating from a sociocultural perspective how motivation was changed is that of capturing the ‘process of change’ rather than ‘static points over time’ (Valsiner, 2006). Thus dynamic participation needs to be identified, and events and interactions examined over time. ‘Motivation in action’ was evidenced in the dynamic interplay between the teacher and her students which was sustained through classroom meetings and developing mature participation. This view of learning recognises the dynamic interplay of the teacher within the institutional, interpersonal and personal planes with the focus ‘on the active changes involved in the unfolding event or activity in which people participate’ (Rogoff, 1995, p.151). The exemplars about a group of girls who resolved their conflicts with minimal teacher intervention, as the year progressed, was possible because the teacher scaffolded a process that provided a framework. This framework had been negotiated with the students to develop a shared understanding of a democratic classroom where students had choices. The outcomes may have unfolded differently if the teacher had not developed communication and decision making skills to allow students to negotiate their participation.

The teacher’s focus on her actions with the students and how they modelled and negotiated the classroom culture required her to examine her own beliefs and values. She was cognisant that her words and actions had an impact on the students’ learning; her issue was the quality of the difference she wanted to make in these students’ lives. As the teacher and students transformed their behaviour and learning the teacher was encouraged and motivated to sustain this rigorous process. Parent and student feedback from interviews revealed a growing awareness that they were active participants in a process that was making a positive difference in their lives, outside school. This is evidenced in the following extracts from parents’ surveys:

Huong has been getting along with people he didn’t like before. It has helped him see how easy it is to work together and be nice to each other. There are lots of changes. He has been vacuuming the house, cleaning it, washing windows.
(Parent survey- Huong, 20.10.04)

I totally agree with groups in the classroom. It helps build understanding of each other, respect and communication skills. The friendship groups have grown bigger. He has gotten to know more people. (Parent survey- Dean, 20.10.04)

The critical friend to the project was also the deputy principal who provided another source of feedback and motivation for the teacher. She wrote an unsolicited note after an open night in November for parents that she attended:

Students have developed very sophisticated understandings of friends and how friendship groups work. Leadership skills have developed which facilitates collaborative work. Some
students have developed PPK- they have transferred to outside the classroom (playground and at home) in order to use their skills to solve problems. All are very happy to be at school. There is a huge change in the number of students from class arriving at the office due to playground disagreements. Some students were regular offenders and have recognised the change in themselves by saying they are rarely in trouble and rarely go to the office. When students are interviewed by the Admin. staff they are polite, assertive and honest which allows the problem to be sorted out rapidly. (Critical Friend/Deputy Principal, 7.12.04)

Researchers interested in a sociocultural perspective recognize the challenges of examining motivational development in a classroom context (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008; Pressick-Kilborn, Sainsbury & Walker, 2005; Hickey, 1997). Models such as Rogoff’s planes of analyses help to unravel this complexity because they allow aspects of the institutional, interpersonal and personal to be fore grounded while keeping the ‘whole’ in view. The class meetings allowed the teacher to focus on how the students were participating and the reflection logs provided additional evidence and understanding of how students were developing during this dynamic and complex process. Rogoff (1995) would argue that a focus on the planes and how students are participating and developing is useful for understanding change and how people learn.

...focusing on how people participate in sociocultural activity and how they change their participation demystifies the process of learning and development. ...we look directly at the efforts of individual, their companions, and the institutions they constitute and build upon to see development as grounded in the specifics and commonalities of those efforts, opportunities, constraints, and changes. (p. 159)

This was an empowering process for all participants that developed mature participation and teacher motivation to sustain the process. (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008; Morcom, 2005; Morcom and MacCallum, 2007). The cyclical and dynamic process of changing participation was not linear and it is difficult to isolate particular events that were the catalyst for the changes that did occur, as the process was gradual and complex. The teacher was transforming her understanding of and responsibility for activities through her participation with her students, as the students’ actions scaffolded her understanding of their needs. ZPDs were further extended with peers leaning from peers, providing opportunities for multi tiered scaffolding (Cumming-Potvin, 2009). All students had opportunities to experience the support of peers in their leadership roles which broadened their views about the range of skills leaders needed to possess such as, ‘being able to listen to others’ and ‘having a caring attitude’. The classroom teacher was ‘motivated by these actions’ to continue to model these qualities for her students.

The two incidents described in this paper could have been a source of student and teacher stress if structures had not been implemented to cope with ongoing issues. As the participation of the students improved and matured, the classroom context was changing and the teacher could focus on the students’ learning and maintain positive student cohesion. Collaborative learning strategies provided the framework (Hart, 1992; Friend & Cook, 1992) and the impetus for class meetings to be conducted to develop and sustain teacher and student collaboration.
An outcome of this research for the teacher was improved morale and motivation to further develop planning that facilitated students' educational needs within a collaborative classroom. The teacher's facilitative role was a critical aspect that sustained participative decision making and personal growth for all participants. The teacher's motivation was developed through professional development and striving for excellence in the classroom. Teacher motivation to engage in the particular social practices such as class meetings (Glasser, 1969) was the result of reflecting on pedagogy that supported collaborative practices. Teacher motivation emerged from the sociocultural practices of the classroom and was sustained through ongoing engagement with these practices which included observation of the changes in students' patterns of participation to maturity.

Conclusion

Although this paper is about a small sample of students and the analysis is limited to one classroom and one teacher, there are wider implications for research relating to teacher motivation. Teachers are motivated and reinvigorated with a sense of purpose and meaning in their teaching when they connect with their students and this reciprocal process improves educational outcomes for the long term (Lovat et al., 2009; Van Oers & Hännikäinen, 2001). Research supports 'that teachers are the most important factor in student achievement' (Carey, 2004; Hattie, 2003; Haycock, 1998). Teachers also shift and sort information for its usefulness and are not always willing to adapt to new ideas for a variety of reasons (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). Therefore understanding what motivates teachers to try new ideas and change their practice is a key to facilitating this process. One could argue that for this teacher, the research process was a source of motivation because she became more skilful at facilitating students' problem solving skills so they took more responsibility for their behaviour (Morcom, 2005). Student leadership roles became the catalyst for changing students' participation and confidence to behave in ways that translated into mature participation. The teacher developed and sustained motivation to engage in this challenging process because the students demonstrated that they valued mature participation as a worthwhile goal.

This research provides evidence that teacher motivation is linked to teacher wellbeing which is promoted by values-driven, visionary and responsive teaching. The 'bottom-up' approach of this research, driven by the teacher in response to the needs of her students, links not only to teacher motivation but builds on much needed research on how teacher professional learning and development can effectively cater for the diversity of students in their class,

- there exists comparatively little research that has explored how teachers actually understand, engage with, and respond to diversity in the classroom...what is currently lacking in the literature in this area is research which takes a broader view of diversity and explores the experiences of teacher in different contexts. (Humphrey, et al, 2006, p. 307)

Teachers are constantly meeting a diversity of demands from students, parents and the community. Understanding how a teacher's motivation to teach is developed and sustained may address the issue of how to make classroom teaching more accessible to attract and retain teachers. This teacher would argue that the process is empowering and validates the passion to educate!
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Bullies and victims in a primary classroom: Scaffolding a collaborative community of practice

Veronica Morcom and Wendy Cumming-Potvin
Murdoch University

This paper is based on a year long research project that examined changes in participation of 31 students in a Year 4/5 classroom, where bullying was occurring. The teacher (first author and researcher) facilitated authentic learning opportunities to make the social practices explicit during weekly class meetings. A socio cultural perspective and an action research process framed this qualitative study. Data sources included school behaviour records, sociograms, semi-structured interviews, teacher observations and students’ reflection logs. Rogoff’s planes provided the analytical framework to examine how to scaffold a collaborative community of practice. The case studies of two students, Denis and Nathan, provide exemplars of how the teacher scaffolded students’ social understandings within small social groups through collaborative leadership opportunities and values education. Results spanning the school year indicated that Nathan, like many of his peers, developed confidence to make new friends and become more assertive. Although Denis took longer to adopt pro-social goals, by the end of the school year, he refrained from bullying Nathan. The significance of this research supports recent findings that a focus on the social dynamics of the classroom can bring about positive change in student behaviour.

Introduction

Teachers are well placed to promote students’ social understandings that encourage mutual respect for peers and prevent bullying as positive relations are developed in the classroom and at school (Davidson, Lickona & Khmelkov, 2007; Noddings, 2005; Van Oers & Hännikäinen, 2001). It is widely accepted that ongoing bullying has harmful effects for all parties; if their behaviour goes unchecked, children who act as bullies are likely to behave in anti-social ways when they leave school (Rigby, 2003). Traditionally there has been a focus on the perpetrators and victims but more recent research has extended this focus to include peer relationships that contribute to this complex situation (Cross, 2010; DEEWR, 2009). Focussing on the social dynamics in a classroom involving Year 5 students who were bullies or victims, this paper tracks the cognitive shifts displayed as these students began to experience the benefits of positive peer relationships.

Slee (2003) argued that a key feature of bullying involves an imbalance of power between the bully and the victim, which can be manifested on a physical, verbal or psychological level. Similarly, Spears, Slee, Owens, Johnson & Campbell (2008), defined bullying as being characterised by an imbalance of power and consisting of a sub-set of aggressive behaviour in which there is deliberate intent to repeatedly harm. Whilst the target of the aggression experiences the behaviour as unwanted, the perpetrator may perceive the experience to be enjoyable. Research findings also confirm that when students are given opportunities to discuss values explicitly, student
well-being is enhanced, bullying is reduced and conditions for learning are improved (Lovat, Toomey, Clement, Crotty & Nielsen, 2009). Related research about the brain and emotions asserts that when students experience psychological safety, they are in a better learning state (Bernard, 1996; Goleman, 2006). Therefore, creating a caring, collaborative and student-centred classroom provides scaffolding to develop psychological safety and social and emotional understandings at school (Hart, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Walberg, Zins & Weissberg, 2004).

As evidenced in formal school assessment and reporting, the two Year 5 case study students (Nathan and Denis), did not demonstrate a positive attitude towards formal education, which affected their academic progress. Since Year 1, when the boys commenced primary school, Denis had bullied Nathan on a regular basis. School behaviour records also revealed that these types of bullying and victimisation incidents were widespread in the classroom and the playground affecting students' well-being and disposition to learn. To counter these issues, the research project aimed to scaffold student and teacher engagement in classroom social practices to develop collaborative leadership opportunities. To this effect, students would become motivated to behave in a pro-social way (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008). This long-term process facilitated the establishment of a collaborative community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Theoretical perspectives

Sociocultural theory, zones of proximal development and scaffolding

Sociocultural theory provides an account of learning and development as a culturally and socially mediated process, which is well suited to research examining the cultural and social milieu of the classroom. Vygotsky (1978) believed an adult or peer (someone other than the learner) could mediate or translate knowledge about society and culture (see Ashman & Gillies, 2003, p. 199). A sociocultural perspective of learning is often used to theorise interaction in collaborative classrooms (Daniels, 2001) because assumptions are made about the importance of developing communication and interpersonal skills (Antil, Jenkins, Wayne & Vadasay, 1998; Friend & Cook, 1992; Renshaw, 1992). In the present study, the teacher/researcher mediated classroom practice using knowledge about students’ social dynamics to scaffold social and cultural understandings that developed pro-social behaviour.

Vygotsky (1978) used the concept of zone of proximal development (ZPD) to theorise the kind of pedagogy likely to promote significant learning. He recognised the relevance of interpersonal interactions between the learner and more capable others and defined this ZPD as the distance between a child’s “actual development as determined by independent problem solving” and the “potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Since the 1980s, researchers such as Bruner (1986) have interpreted Vygotsky’s work and adopted the metaphor of scaffolding to conceptualise how adults can support children’s learning through graduated, strategic steps that create ZPDs.
More recently, educational researchers have agreed that teachers need to play a central role to scaffold students’ participation in the classroom to improve learning outcomes (Lutz, Guthrie & Davies, 2006; Ranker, 2009; Webb, Farivar & Mastergeorge, 2002). Turner & Patrick (2004) concluded that students' motivation to participate in class activities is related to teachers' pedagogical practices and a classroom environment which supports participation by developing collaborative work habits. Cooperative and collaborative pedagogies promote students working together in small groups to learn from each other (Hart, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Effective group work can be viewed as a reciprocal process where support from more able peers and the teacher may assist less able students to seek and receive assistance (Webb et al., 2002).

Cumming-Potvin, Renshaw & van Krayenoord (2003) asserted that students play a more central role in this dynamic, interactive process where the concept of ZPD is extended during guided participation. Therefore it can be argued that ZPDs are not a fixed attribute of the learner but vary as the students interact with each other. In the context of the classroom interaction discussed in this paper, multiple ZPDs were operating between the students and provided a feedback mechanism to the teacher about the quality of peer relationships.

Community of practice and Rogoff's planes

A community of practice can be viewed as “a set of relations among persons, activity, and the world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). This concept implies that because individuals are members of multiple communities, their interactions and learning within these communities provide a variety of sources for meaning making. Thus, Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of a community of practice offers a guiding principle to better understand learning as participation in the social world, including the classroom context, and how teachers scaffold students from legitimate peripheral towards mature participation. Included in Wenger’s (1998, p. 136) indicators for a community of practice are: sustained harmonious or conflictual mutual relationships, shared ways of engaging in doing things together and a shared discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world. In this paper, legitimate peripheral participation is conceptualised as students observing and learning from others on the periphery of activities because it is their choice and not as a result of being excluded by peers due to bullying. Mature participation is conceptualised as students demonstrating pro-social behaviour with peers; this learning can also include a leadership role in a small social group.

The theoretical framework of this project drew particularly on Rogoff’s planes (1995) to analyse the social practices of the community on three levels: the school institution (community plane), the students’ relationships in the classroom (interpersonal plane) and the case studies of Nathan and Denis (personal plane). Rogoff’s broad or community plane examines the purposes of the institution of school. Dewey (1938) argued that the development of character is built through our interpersonal relationships within a community, which deeply affects how we behave in the world. He was a strong advocate for the central role of teachers as agents of change to reshape
and improve society based on democratic values that promote the collective good (see Connell, 1980). The interpersonal plane examines the everyday events where individuals engage with each other. At this level, in this research, sociometry was used to examine how to create small supportive social groups which responded to existing interpersonal bonds to foster future opportunities for friendships. At the micro level, Rogoff’s personal plane examines how students transform their understanding of and responsibility for activities. Through their own participation in class activities, students change and, in the process, become prepared to engage in subsequent similar activities. In this research the case studies of Denis and Nathan were used to examine how scaffolding various small groups supported changes in participation for these boys over one school year.

Whilst the three planes are first foregrounded separately, the integration of all three planes is required to provide a holistic analysis of the data. As such, Rogoff’s planes (1995) are integrated into the analysis to examine how a collaborative community of practice was scaffolded in a primary classroom over a period of one school year. As scaffolding takes place in different contexts, such as the playground or classroom, and with multiple partners, the breadth and depth of the ZPDs can be affected. As such, a community of practice framework can promote understanding of how “multi-tiered scaffolding” (Cumming-Potvin et al., 2003) and learning occurs. More precisely, Vygotsky’s concept of scaffolding and ZPDs can be positioned within the concept of a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which Sun (2008) argues provides a more effective theoretical framework for classroom research.

This extended process complements a focus on the social context within Lave and Wenger’s (1991) community of practice. Combining the concepts of multi-tiered scaffolding and ZPDs operating in a collaborative community of practice clarifies how student learning occurs. “The individual is not a passive absorber of culture but actively engages in the learning of the culture and its reshaping to make meaning for the individual” (Campbell, 2007, p. 138).

Research context

The data that follows considers Rogoff’s (1995) community plane as it is about the research school and the related government policies that impacted on the direction of the research. The state primary school site was situated in the northern metropolitan region of Perth, Western Australia at a time when values education was on the Commonwealth Government agenda. To develop and share effective whole school approaches for values education (Curriculum Corporation, 2008; DEEWR, 2009), the Commonwealth Government injected funding for values research projects across all Australian school sectors under the umbrella of the National Values Project (2002-2009). Some primary and secondary schools involved in these projects addressed social issues such as bullying (Australian Government, 2005) through whole school approaches to teaching values explicitly. To address pastoral care issues at the school where the study took place, staff agreed that a whole school values education approach was needed to meet all students’ social and emotional needs; this approach supported
existing legislation in Western Australia, requiring that five core values be taught explicitly in all schools (Curriculum Council, 1998).

The school's national testing for literacy and numeracy (Curriculum Corporation, 2010) were evaluated as below the benchmark for acceptable literacy and numeracy levels; an analysis of school data by the administration confirmed that, since 2000, standardised testing results had declined on a yearly basis. Together with the declining academic results, there had been an increase in anti-social behaviour, resulting in pastoral care programs where volunteer adult mentors were assigned to individual students to provide guidance during instructional time. From 1999 to 2003, the commercial program 'You Can Do It!' (Bernard, 1996) was implemented with some success, but it did not curb persistent bullying in the school. At the same time, the school elected to participate in a pilot study for the WA based 'Friendly Schools Project' (Cross, 2010), in which students completed surveys to provide evidence about the nature and frequency of bullying incidents. As a requirement of this project, teachers organised activities to assist students in becoming more proactive about reporting bullying incidences. In response to the complexity of collecting data in a classroom, a combination of qualitative research methods was combined with an action research process to develop a tribes community of practice. (Gibbs, 2001)

**Qualitative research design: Action research and tribes community of practice**

Qualitative research methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Patton, 2002) was selected because non intrusive methods were required to fully understand students' points of view about their relationships. According to Richards (2005), qualitative data are complex and contextualised records of observations or interactions which are not easily reduced to numbers. These records are purposefully constructed by the researcher from a diverse range of sources; data are not just "lying around, like autumn leaves, ready to be swept into heaps" (Richards, 2005, p. 37). Because the teacher/researcher conducted this project in the normal context of her teaching duties, there were many demands on her time, therefore an action research process (Burns, 2005; Grundy, 1995; Tripp, 1995) was combined with qualitative methods to collect data in a systematic way that did not predetermine outcomes, but targeted data collection from authentic classroom activities.

The process of plan, negotiate, implement and reflect (see Tripp, 1995) provided flexibility to negotiate with diverse stakeholders in the community of practice and to take advantage of opportunities to gain feedback during the school year. As illustrated below, Table 1 summarises the frequency and range of data collected from diverse sources that were triangulated to examine how a collaborative community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) was developed to address bullying issues. The focus of data collection centred on the social practices of the classroom and student reflections to identify the cognitive shifts they were making towards pro-social relationships.
Table 1: Summary of the frequency and range of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/researcher observations</th>
<th>Students' reflection logs</th>
<th>Formal parent interviews</th>
<th>Parent information nights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal interviews</td>
<td>School behaviour records</td>
<td>Parent surveys</td>
<td>Student interviews-end of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency and range of data sources provided rich information related to Rogoff's (1995) three planes. For example, data from parents not only held clues about their perception of the classroom community but also information about their child's development within and outside the classroom community. Similarly, triangulating students' data with parent information and teacher observations, as well as the content of student reflection logs, provided a clearer understanding of the students' cognitive shifts in behaviour. At a macro level, community data about behaviour collected by the school administration (mainly about playground events), was triangulated with sociogram outcomes and parent and teacher data to create social groups that supported all students' social and emotional growth.

As presented below in Table 2, by implementing diverse teaching and research tools, values were made explicit through the five class agreements: attentive listening, mutual respect, participation or right to pass, appreciating others/no put downs (Gibbs, 2001) and personal best (Bernard, 1996). In order to use students' background knowledge and develop shared understandings, class charts were made to describe these five agreements. The teacher/researcher made reference regularly to these charts to further scaffold social understandings during the daily social circle and weekly class meeting (see Glasser, 1969). These teaching and resource tools provided valuable data about the classroom community of practice that evolved.

Table 2: Summary of diverse teaching and research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and research tools</th>
<th>Tool provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class charts</td>
<td>Negotiated class agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established shared understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Social circle</td>
<td>Developed vocabulary to express feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoted a safe and caring culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Class meetings</td>
<td>Encouraged a democratic process of participative decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built a collaborative community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three cyclical stages of Gibbs' (2001) Tribes process provided a framework to develop the necessary skills towards a community of practice. The first stage, inclusion, provided ideas about team building before the first tribe was formed. Even though team building activities continued throughout the year, the focus shifted to student leadership skills to develop the second stage, influence. In this stage students learnt how to listen to other people’s points of view and to solve problems. The last
stage, community, was built throughout the year by using a daily social circle to promote a safe classroom and weekly class meetings to encourage students to take responsibility for their behaviour and learning.

Tribes (Gibbs, 2001) Learning Community ideas were adapted to create a process that complemented the development of a collaborative community of practice. At an interpersonal level, using sociograms promoted a feeling of togetherness because the formation of groups was based primarily on students' social and emotional needs. Embedding pro-social values further, sociograms were used to encourage students to develop wider friendship networks by nominating three peers from both genders with whom they would like to form a friendship. The first nomination was used to place students in their tribe; the other nominations were used if the final grouping would result in students being placed with non-supportive peers, as in the case of Nathan being placed with Denis. Each new social group or tribe provided authentic opportunities for students to develop new friendships and experience the positive attributes of their peers. Assumptions were made that when a child's interpersonal preferences are used, new groups have the potential to be more cohesive and social adjustment is enhanced (Ashman & Gillies, 2003; Bennett & Rolheiser, 2001; Bennett, Rolheiser & Stevahn, 1991). Iverson, Barton and Iverson, (1997) also concluded that there were no adverse effects on students when using sociograms.

Presentation of data: Sociograms and school behaviour records

In this section, extracts from the school and class data for Nathan and Denis are presented to provide comparisons, prior to discussing the case studies at a micro level. Collecting data from a variety of sources provided a more accurate reflection of how interpersonal relationships were developing. For this reason, data emanating from school behaviour records were combined with the sociograms, classroom behaviour records and teacher/researcher observations to further categorise a student's overall behaviour as either pro-social or anti-social each term. This criterion was considered important when the classroom focus was to develop pro-social behaviour.

There were five rounds of Tribes and sociograms during the year, with one occurring each Term except in Term 2 when there were two rounds of Tribes. Denis's peer nominations for each sociogram [3, 4, 0, 2 and 2] and Nathan's [1, 0, 1, 1, and 1] reveal that they received peer nominations for most rounds of Tribes with one exception each, both occurring in Term 2. The students who nominated Denis and Nathan were mainly the same group which played with the boys in the playground (Teacher reflection log, Terms 1, 2, 3 & 4, 2004). Denis received a larger number of peer nominations than Nathan but remained in the anti-social category each Term. Even though Denis did not have playground behaviour records in Term 4, he reverted occasionally to anti-social behaviours in the classroom (Teacher observations, Term 4, 2004). Nathan remained in the positive behaviour category for each Term, except for Term 2. At the beginning of Term 2, Nathan was becoming more assertive in the playground and retaliated when he was verbally abused by his peers (School behaviour records, Term 2, 2004). When Denis was not nominated in Term 2, his usual group of friends had chosen other peers from their new pro-social network (Sociograms, Tribes
3, Term 2, 2004). At the same time Denis’s anti-social behaviour was escalating, as evidenced by his 12 recorded misdemeanours (School Behaviour Records - SBR, Term 2, 2004) (see Table 3 below).

All teachers who were on playground duty systematically recorded bullying incidents which identified the students involved and provided a written record to all teachers each week. These records confirmed the ongoing bullying and/or victimisation incidents with a large group of male students across four Year 5 classes, including the research class. As there appeared to be few positive student role models, the challenge for the teacher/researcher was how to break this cycle of bullying in a way that would develop student responsibility and commitment towards pro-social goals.

Table 3: Extracts from school behaviour records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Nathan and Denis had six SBR records in Term 1, with Denis initiating bullying behaviour towards Nathan. However, from Term 2 onwards, Nathan developed friendships which included boys who usually participated in bullying behaviours with Denis. From this point on, Nathan’s playground records indicated a continual decline, providing evidence that his new friends may have also become a protective factor to prevent students such as Denis engaging in anti-social behaviour with Nathan.

In Term 2, Denis’s anti-social behaviour escalated, when most of his peers had made a decision not to engage in anti-social behaviour. Denis’s closest friend, Lindsay, befriended Nathan. Lindsay also requested not to be placed in the same group as Denis. Articulating his thoughts, Lindsay commented: ‘I want to keep my nose clean’ (Student reflection log, Term 1, 2004). Denis did not follow his peers in adopting pro-social behaviour as in the past he had held the ‘balance of power’ with his peers, which one could argue, he was now losing. Despite Denis’s resistance to adopt pro-social goals, the teacher/researcher recognised potential leadership qualities, for Denis remained popular with the majority of his friends, as evidenced in peer nominations from the sociograms each Term. It appeared that Denis was able to elicit loyalty from his peers, even though they chose not to engage with him in anti-social behaviour.

While the two case study students, Nathan and Denis, showed a significant decline in reported behaviour records by the end of the year, their journeys during the school year were quite different. Extracts from student reflection logs, parent surveys and interviews and teacher/researcher observation logs and reflection are examined in their journeys.

**Nathan's journey**

From the beginning of the school year, Nathan, as evidenced in his body posture and general demeanour, could be described as a nervous student, who lacked confidence
(Teacher observations, Term 1, 2004). During the first parent interview in Term 1, Nathan’s parents requested that he be separated from another student, who was his only friend at the time. They perceived the association with this student as preventing Nathan from making new friends. To support Nathan his parents were also accessing professional help (Teacher Reflection Log, Term 1, 2004).

Nathan was often the last person to be seated during lessons when students formed a circle for class discussions. This situation may have gone unnoticed but it occurred several times during the first weeks of Term 1. The teacher/researcher remarked that to prevent Nathan from sitting down, Denis signalled to his peers by using hand gestures to suggest that all spaces had been taken. The teacher/researcher made connections that Nathan’s nervous disposition and lack of friends was due to repeated instances where students such as Denis colluded with their peers to exclude Nathan at every opportunity. Reflecting on Slee’s definition (2003) of bullying where there is an ‘imbalance of power’ as in the case of Nathan and Denis, Nathan experienced physical, verbal and psychological abuse at the hands of Denis. When Nathan tried to participate in class discussions, the teacher/researcher observed Denis ‘rolling his eyes’ and heard him whisper to his peers ‘loser’ to indicate his disrespect for Nathan (Teacher observations, Term 1, 2004). In definitions of bullying, reference is also made to ‘repeated instances over time’. For Nathan it had been over several years, where his self-worth had been eroded and his peers demonstrated little respect or compassion for him.

As the year progressed, Nathan chose to stay mainly on the fringes of groups, even though more students were willing to befriend him. During Term 2, Nathan’s parents realised Nathan needed support and that a leadership role might assist him to develop more friendships.

I think at times Nathan is quiet and a bit of a loner. I would like to see him try to be a leader in the hope of changing some things. I think groups are all right if all in the group get a fair go. Groups based on friendship are all right if the work and learning still gets completed. Nathan doesn’t seem to want to mix too much. I’m not sure if he is mature for his age. At home he has tantrums and seems to fight and argue with his sister over childish things. (Parent survey: Responses from Nathan’s parents, Term 2, 2004)

It took time for Nathan to develop trust, but he did make friends who supported him as a vice leader in two Tribes towards the end of the study. As illustrated below, Nathan’s reflections from Terms 3 and 4 revealed that he was beginning to understand the skills he needed to develop mature participation and control his behaviour.

If you are mad your friends will not want to play with you. I think we should have a lot more self control. When someone treats you unfairly you have lots of choices. I think that you if you got teased or got bullied that you should walk away and have some time out. You can go and talk to a teacher or if it is really important you can go to the principal and talk about it. You can laugh it off and walk away. (Student reflection log, Nathan, 19.8.04 - Term 3)
I have felt included in the playground and in my group. Our group has been getting along. I try to be a good friend by not being bossy. (Student reflection log, Nathan, 28.10.04- Term 4)

A good leader has to be honest, caring, obedient and trustworthy. I was the sitter and now I am the helper. I want to be the ideas person more (Leadership survey, Nathan, 25.11.04, Term 4)

By the end of the year, Nathan shifted from being on the periphery of group work to fuller engagement or mature participation. He developed confidence to express his ideas and realised that his peers would listen because he had gained their respect.

Denis's journey

From the beginning of the year, Denis, as evidenced in his body posture and general demeanour, could be described as a confident student, who had a wide social group of friends that followed his lead in the playground and classroom (Teacher observations, Term 1, 2004). During the first parent interview in Term 1, Denis's mother expressed concern that her son's behaviour was "out of control" (Parent interview, Term 1, 2004). She was aware of his anti-social behaviour at school and the negative impact it was having on his school work. After three months at school, Denis made a positive shift in his thinking about class activities. He wrote: "My group is fabulous because we get on with our work" (Denis's reflection log, 29.4.04), which encouraged the teacher/researcher who also noted more occasions where Denis was being cooperative in class activities (Teacher observation log, Term 1, 2004).

As evidenced in the school's behaviour records from the first half of the year, it took longer for Denis than most of his peers to adopt the values of the classroom community. There were glimpses of positive changes when Denis completed school work in class and allowed others to speak without making audible comments to intimidate whoever was speaking. He enjoyed group work and the support of his peers which indicated that his friendships were important to him. Still, Denis found it difficult to relate to students whom he had bullied in the past, such as Nathan. The following two examples from Term 3 and 4 illustrate the severity of Denis's disrespect for Nathan.

I have been punching, kicking and pushing Nathan in the line. In the playground I have been fighting with Nathan. (Denis's reflection log, 9.8.04, Term 3)

On a regular basis, opportunities were provided in the classroom community for all students to receive 'lift ups' (positive messages) from each other. Despite Denis's anti-social behaviour he received 'lift ups' from students such as Lindsay, who were now positive role models. When Denis noticed that his friend Lindsay was talking to Nathan and being friendly, Denis wrote in his reflection log on the same day:

He (Lindsay) was a good friend with 'N*A*T*H*A*N- hee hee. (Student reflection log, 28.10.04, Term 4)
Nathan's name was written in large letters and followed by the words 'hee, hee' which Denis used when he was teasing other students. A couple of weeks later, in Term 4, Denis wrote that he was enjoying working with others and appreciated the support, which is evidence that he had made cognitive shifts about his behaviour. He developed the skills of collaboration, which required him to cooperate with others and take turns. Realising the benefits of being a leader, Denis regretted that he was not given the opportunity by his peers as it may have motivated him to adopt pro-social goals sooner.

I enjoyed group work because you get to do it together and not on your own. I learned to get along and take turns. I wasn't voted leader and I wanted to be because I wanted to have a go. I would have had to behave more and I would have. (Denis's interview, 12.11.04, Term 4)

Denis's responses in the Term 4 leadership survey (25.11.04) revealed an awareness of the parameters for acceptable behaviour: "Leaders are good and don't muck around". Still, Denis continually challenged the leaders in his group. He saw his group role as being a joker, but would like to be the ideas person. At the final parent night in Term 4, Denis's mother reported that he had improved his behaviour at school and home. During the evening, the teacher also observed Denis sitting next to his mother attentively and respectfully, which sharply contrasted to his behaviour during the teacher/researcher interview at the beginning of the year (Teacher observations, 29.11.04).

Discussion

The theoretical background to this article conceptualises the learner as a historical and cultural subject positioned within a social network where they are a member of multiple communities of practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1995). Central to this concept is the assumption that when students interact with others, collective ZPDs are created and opportunities for multi-tiered scaffolding occur (Cumming-Potvin et al., 2003; Vygotsky, 1968). In the present study, the social practices were embedded in a culture of caring, sharing and collaboration. Rogoff's (1995) planes framed the analysis to interpret how the data provided evidence of Nathan and Denis's cognitive shift in behaviour towards pro-social behaviour and mature participation.

At an institutional/school level, commercial and mentoring programs were integrated in the behaviour management and pastoral care policies to support students' social and emotional well-being. As a result of involvement in the Friendly Schools Project (Cross, 2010) teachers developed an understanding of the complexity of bullying and victim issues and the need to involve all stakeholders in the solutions. Student-centred pedagogies, such as collaborative learning (Hart, 1992) combined with Tribes Learning Community of practice (Gibbs, 2001) provided the context to negotiate these changes in the research class. By drawing on students' social networks through the research tool of sociograms, these pedagogies allowed the teacher/researcher to use alternative approaches to building positive relationships. Particularly at the beginning of the year, because mutual respect and empathy were not core values reflected in many students' behaviour, a pro-active approach was needed.
At an interpersonal/classroom level, the introduction of Tribes Learning Community of practice (Gibbs, 2001) provided a context where students negotiated class agreements that made transparent the social issues in the classroom and the gaps in students’ social knowledge. Social practices such as the weekly class meeting and the daily social circle provided a more explicit approach to identify discriminatory practices, to support every child’s right for respectful relationships. Placing Nathan and Denis in different groups to widen their circle of friends also allowed multi-tiered scaffolding to occur with different peers who acted as role models. When teachers understand the sequential nature of developing classroom groups and can accurately diagnose the skills of group members, as with the use of sociograms in this research, they can influence growth in a planned and productive way (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1983). For Denis and Nathan, ZPDs (Vygotsky, 1978) were extended when they were placed with peers from whom they could learn effective leadership skills such as Lindsay, who was a group leader and later became a mutual friend of both boys. Teacher/researcher intervention was critical to scaffold students’ social understandings to redress an imbalance of power between Nathan and Denis.

At a personal level, a focus on the creating positive social networks supported students’ aspirations to make more friends and develop mature participation in the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). For students to engage in this challenging process, they needed a willingness to negotiate with each other and to co-construct their understandings of their relationships within new parameters of mutual respect. The personal journeys of Denis and Nathan illustrate the complex issues involved when parent, student, and teacher perceptions are explored and challenged. For Nathan mature participation resulted in developing greater self-confidence and assertiveness to make more friends. In contrast, for Denis mature participation was developing compassion and tolerance and redirecting energies to form new relationships, based on mutual respect.

Prior to the interventions of this study, the effects of ongoing bullying for Nathan had been extreme, with the need to seek professional help for managing conflict. He had been undermined by Denis for a prolonged period so the teacher/researcher needed to be aware that it would take time for him to re-establish his self-confidence and respect. Nathan’s parents also needed to change their views about student leadership. As Nathan became a happier child at home, who was more optimistic about learning at school, his parents supported the cognitive shifts he was making to become more assertive. As illustrated in an extract below, taken from his interview, Nathan developed new strategies and friendships, which improved his attitude towards formal learning.

It has been better this year because I haven’t been getting in trouble a lot like last year. I was in trouble last year for fighting with Michael and Denis because I keep away from them. I think school is pretty fun because I play with Damon. Peter is friendly with me because he doesn’t tease me. (Student interview, Nathan, 9.11.04)

As Denis reflected on his interactions with his peers, he changed his attitude to develop a reputation based on his positive attributes and became happier to be at school: “I
have been happy to come to school because there’s nothing to do at home and I have friends at school” (Student interview, Denis, 11.11.04). This long term process allowed Denis to experience the positive aspects of a wider social network in the classroom where it was unacceptable to behave in an anti-social manner. These experiences translated into pro-social playground behaviour, where it became the norm not to bully others. Although Denis had more freedom to choose to continue to bully others in the playground, as the year progressed, his peers and friends became more proactive in reporting bullying incidences to the teachers. This fact may have deterred Denis. However, at another level Denis was now happier coming to school to be with his friends, which one could argue, was the determining factor in his cognitive shift to cease bullying others.

Conclusion

Few would refute the benefits of assisting students to develop communication skills to learn to solve social issues and develop friendships (Battistich & Watson, 2003; Chilcott & Gregg, 2009). The question is not whether intervention should occur when bullying is happening (Rigby, 2003) but what is the most effective process to address the problem and provide lasting solutions. This teacher/researcher utilised a practical approach through explicit and targeted scaffolding of social knowledge framed within a Tribes Learning Community of practice (Gibbs, 2001). Students developed new shared understandings about the social responsibility to redress an imbalance of power (Slee, 2003) and became proactive in preventing bullying because there was a focus on the social practices in the classroom. For the teacher/researcher, collaborating with students to encourage mature participation through scaffolding became a motivating factor to continue engaging in a demanding outcomes-related process (Morcom & MacCallum, 2009). Results spanning the school year indicated that Nathan developed confidence to make new friends and become more assertive. Although Denis took longer than his peers to adopt pro-social goals, he refrained from bullying towards the end of the school year. These results support other research focussing on social networks and peer groups of bullies and victims to provide alternative approaches to resolve such issues (Cross, 2010).

Despite this project’s limitations, which are linked to the small number of participants in a case study approach, these findings have implications for how schools are structured. It is every student’s right and responsibility to learn in a safe and supportive environment. Creating classroom opportunities for collaborative and independent work (Antil, Jenkins, Wayne & Vadasay, 1998; Gillies, 2003; Gillies & Ashman, 1996) as well as mechanisms for negotiating the meaning of working in each of these contexts (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992), necessitates engagement in courageous conversations about values. From a theoretical perspective, drawing on Rogoff’s three planes to examine these complex issues on a community, interpersonal and personal level, offered a holistic approach to translate theory into practice and scaffold ZPDs for a caring and collaborative community of practice.
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The development of an inclusive community is underpinned by values that support an appreciation of diversity. This paper is based on a larger research project, 'student leadership in a primary classroom', which developed different ways for students to interact with each other. The focus not only promoted full student participation in classroom activities but also benefited students such as Mary and Lesley, who had intellectual disabilities, because they were included too. Mary and Lesley attended an Educational Support Unit (ESU) in the morning and returned to their mainstream classroom in the afternoons. The teacher/researcher scaffolded collaborative values explicitly through the social practices of the daily social circle and the weekly class meeting, which provided authentic learning opportunities for students to discuss values. Students developed leadership skills based on inclusive values that were modelled by the teacher. Transcripts from video recordings of classroom activities, teacher observations, as well as student and parent interviews conducted throughout the year provided evidence that students also reflected on their personal values. As a result, Mary and Lesley’s movement between their ESU class and the mainstream class each day was seamless because they were welcomed in both contexts and their participation was encouraged, appreciated and validated.

Keywords: inclusive classroom; sociocultural perspective; values education

Introduction

The development of an inclusive community is about appreciating and celebrating diversity. Even though there is a debate about the role of the school in values education, there is growing evidence that teaching values explicitly support inclusive practices (Ainley 2004; Lovat and Toomey 2007; Lovat et al. 2009). The classroom practices for the study reported in this paper supported students’ social and emotional needs by developing a caring environment to create a sense of belonging for all students (Noddings 1992). Details of the social dynamics of students over a school year provide evidence of how social acceptance develops when a teacher becomes strategic to create a caring and democratic classroom (Morcom, 2005; Morcom and MacCallum, 2007). This paper provides a focus on two students, Mary and Lesley, who had intellectual disabilities and some of their peers who supported their inclusion in the
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classroom activities. The results show that all students benefited when the teacher/researcher promoted full student participation in classroom activities, by explicitly teaching collaborative values.

In the first section that follows, theoretical perspectives about inclusion and integration situate subsequent discussion about the choice of a sociocultural perspective, which underpinned the interpretation of the data. Rogoff's three planes of analysis (1995) framed the discussion of the development of social practices that supported the inclusion of Mary and Lesley in classroom activities.

**Theoretical perspectives**

**Inclusion/integration**

Inclusion is a philosophy that has its roots in the social justice and the civil rights movements, which support the deinstitutionalisation of students with special needs. Multiple definitions of inclusion exist but a common factor is the inclusion of all students in the same mainstream setting for their education (Kemple 2004). In the past, students with disabilities were segregated from their mainstream peers in 'special schools', with the intention of catering to their individual needs. This may appear a convincing argument but resulted in discriminatory practices that reinforced negative community perceptions for these students as a group that was 'different'.

'Integration' was a term used in the 1980s to describe a process of integrating students who had sensory, physical and cognitive impairments so they could participate in the mainstream classroom (Tutt 2007). A shift in terminology, to 'inclusion' in 1990s, placed the onus on 'schools to alter their ethos and practices to ensure that all children are included as a right' (Allan 1999, 14). Attending regular mainstream classes with additional support is now viewed as a basic human right for these students. Yet, negative attitudes persist. Some mainstream teachers feel they do not have the necessary skills to support these students (Pearce and Gray 2009), and in the past, students and the community had limited contact with people with disabilities (Government of Western Australia, Department of Education and Training 2009). The latest statistics reveal ‘one in five West Australians has a disability, and like the rest of the community strives to lead a diverse and fulfilling life’ (Government of Western Australia, Department of Education and Training 2009).

The 'Every Child Matters' agenda (Tutt 2007) in the UK asked educators to question how they were making provisions for students with special needs:

- What provision is necessary to maximise this child's mental and physical health?
- How can we help this child feel safe from bullying or being placed under undue pressure?
- What circumstances are necessary to ensure this child enjoys his or her education and therefore has the greatest chance of making a success of it?
- How can we help to give him or her chance of contributing positively to the life of the school and to have a sense of belonging?
- Where will he or she have the best chance of learning the skills he or she will need to achieve a productive life? (118)

The recurring themes in these questions are reflected in the Australian Government's (2008) National Goals for Schooling, which makes provisions for all children
to reach their potential to ultimately lead a productive life. Australia's first national ‘Early Years Learning Framework’ for early childhood educators (2009) reinforces the need for students to establish a ‘sense of belonging’ when they start school.

Experiencing belonging – knowing where and with whom you belong – is integral to human existence... Belonging acknowledges children’s interdependence with others... Belonging is central to being and becoming that shapes who children are and who they become. (Australian Government 2009, 7)

In Australia, the principles of inclusive education are embedded in Commonwealth and State Legislation with the enactment of the Disability Discrimination Act (1992) and the Disability Standards for Education (2005) that has put inclusion on the agenda. These acts were developed to ‘clarify the obligations of education and training providers to ensure all students with disabilities are able to access and participate in education without experiencing discrimination’ (Government of Western Australia, Department of Education and Training 2009, 12). Parents have a legal right to choose to place their children in mainstream schools, placing the onus on schools to cater for the educational needs of all students who are enrolled.

Teachers are concerned about the most effective way to support student and parent aspirations for inclusion to occur in the mainstream classroom (Forlin 2004). In this paper, the authors argue that changing community attitudes starts with creating a caring (Battistich et al. 1997) and collaborative (Hart 1992) classroom where all students participate fully in the social and cultural practices. There has been a gap in establishing a theoretical base for inclusion policies (Dixon and Verenikina 2007), so consideration needs to be given to not only the practicalities of classroom implementation to provide the ‘least restrictive’ environment for all students but also how theory can support an inclusion philosophy.

**Vygotsky’s sociocultural perspective**

A sociocultural perspective conceptualises learning as primarily a social activity (Vygotsky 1978). Thus, participation in the cultural activity of the classroom is the source of learning and development, with a focus, in this study, on collaborative activities. Collaborative pedagogies are based on a set of assumptions about the importance of communicative processes, interpersonal skills and community formation (Bruffee 1984; Hart 1992).

It could be argued that the teacher’s role as a facilitator in the process of assisting students to participate in the social and cultural practices of the classroom mirrors their future role as active citizens in a democratic society (Dewey 1961; Morcom, 2005). Dewey claims ‘a community or social group sustains itself through continuous self-renewal, and this renewal takes place by means of the educational growth of the immature members of the group’ (1961, 13). In the current research, the social and cultural practices of the primary classroom were examined to identify teacher scaffolds that developed full participation.

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of disontogenesis or atypical development is useful to frame a practical approach to classroom provision. According to Dixon and Verenikina (2007, 199), Vygotsky argued that ‘disability is a sociocultural developmental phenomenon’, and ‘disability consists of “primary disability” (organic impairment) and the “secondary” disability (distortions of higher psychological function due to social
factors). When considering the primary disability, there may be limitations to the rate of the development of social skills and knowledge acquisition.

Contexts such as the regular classroom provide a child’s social milieu in the course of development and if access is denied problems will be intensified for the secondary disability, which maintains negative societal expectations and attitudes (Dixon and Verenikina 2007). These students become more restricted in their social development when there are further delays or differences that are characteristic of many people with disabilities. Providing the best opportunities for these students to maximise social interaction alongside their peers not only alleviates the development of a secondary disability but also may improve community perceptions about inclusion, which is often based on misinformation and prejudice (Stromstad 2003).

**Zone of proximal development/scaffolding**

Using a sociocultural perspective provided the theoretical context to theorise the type of interaction occurring in a collaborative classroom (Daniels 2001) with respect to ‘zones of proximal development’ (ZPDs) and scaffolding. Vygotsky (1978) used the term ‘ZPD’ to explain the gap between a child’s independent and potential levels of functioning, when assisted by a peer and an adult. Many theorists, including Bruner (1986), have built on Vygotsky’s ideas about how ZPDs occur. Bruner used the metaphor of scaffolding but described graduated, strategic steps that create ZPDs, implying a linear process. Other researchers further argue that the notion of ‘multi-tiered scaffolding’ is a more precise term for how learning takes place (Cumming-Potvin, Renshaw, and van Krayenooord 2003, 55) as multiple ZPDs are operating in a regular classroom among students as well as with the teacher.

Although Vygotsky (1986) developed the concept of ‘ZPD’ as a result of examining the qualitative differences in the development of children with disabilities, this work has had little impact on the educational methodologies used with students with disabilities in Australia (Dixon and Verenikina 2007). The interaction of more experienced experts with less experienced learners creates qualitatively different ZPDs for each child as he/she develop towards his/her potential. A focus on ‘potential’ level rather than ‘actual’ level of development becomes more important if opportunities are to be created where authentic learning is to occur. Even though this concept raises practical issues for teachers to scaffold students within their ZPDs, Vygotsky argues that this method needs to be applied to all students’ learning, particularly students with special needs because social deprivation exacerbates behavioural traits such as passivity, dependence and lack of social skills. Children need opportunities within the ‘normal social milieu’ such as the classroom to develop their social skills at their own rate, even though their development may be qualitatively different.

**Methodology**

A qualitative approach is particularly suited to examining how individuals make sense of their world in the naturalistic setting of the classroom, without predetermining the research outcomes (Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Patton 2002). Collaborative pedagogies are based on the assumption that the social, emotional and academic learning are not separate entities. The child is placed at the centre of their learning, as they participate in the cultural and social activities of the classroom with their peers (Gibbs 2001; Johnson and Johnson 2003).
The study was conducted in a metropolitan state school in Perth, Western Australia, located in a mid- to high socioeconomic area with an excellent academic history (Curriculum Corporation 2010). The researcher was the teacher of a Year 3 class of 25 students (aged 8–9 years). Students with special needs were withdrawn from mainstream classes in the mornings to attend an Educational Support Unit (ESU) on the school site and participated in the mainstream classroom in the afternoons. This usual timetable was varied in the research classroom so that Mary and Lesley could be part of research activities in the mornings.

An action research process (Burns 2005; Grundy 1995) was combined with qualitative research methods to develop a systematic approach to data generation. Planning, implementing and reflection are common cycles for a classroom teacher, which were also utilised to take advantage of opportunities that could be planned as sources of data. The researchers were developing an understanding of how to scaffold students’ leadership skills through self-reflection and self-critical inquiry. The ongoing collaboration with all participants within an action research process allowed the exploration of new ideas and solutions.

Data sources included video recordings of classroom activities, reflective accounts of the children and the co-researchers, documentation of instructional practices, sociometric surveys, school records of behaviour and in-depth interviews with students and their parents each term. The range of data collected was sourced in authentic classroom opportunities for social interaction and student reflection on values. Rogoff’s (1995, 2003) personal, interpersonal and cultural/community psychological planes provided the framework to organise mainly qualitative data. Using data from different sources provided opportunities for triangulation to validate findings.

Findings and discussion

The notion of inclusion as a ‘multi-layered’ concept is explicated using Rogoff’s (1995, 1998) three foci of analysis: the personal, the interpersonal and the community planes. This analytical framework is useful to investigate how individuals interact in their social world through examining parts of an activity or event as it specifically encompasses all aspects of the sociocultural milieu in which an inclusive classroom is being developed. It also provides an organisational framework to examine the critical aspects of this milieu, which is complex.

Development occurs in all planes, for example, children develop but so do their partners and their cultural communities. Rogoff (1995, 141) argues that it is incomplete to consider ‘the relationship of individual development and social interaction without concern for the cultural activity in which personal and interpersonal actions take place’. Thus, in this kind of analysis, each plane in turn is foregrounded with the other planes in the background allowing ‘active and dynamic contributions from individuals, their social partners, and historical traditions and materials and their transformations’ (Rogoff 1995, 140). Foregrounding each plane in turn realises the contributions of that plane while maintaining that all planes are needed for a holistic and meaningful analysis and interpretation of the data.

Rogoff’s institutional/community plane

The community plane foregrounds the larger cultural values and practices in which the activity is embedded, whether that community is described at the level of classroom,
school or wider community. The social norms and cultural practices are evident in this plane and also the values that underpin these practices, which Rogoff (1995) asserts shape individual and collective participation.

Central to any definition of democracy is the need for people to interact, participate and become empowered to make decisions (Ballard 2003; Dobozy 2007; Stromstad 2003). Ballard (2003, 29) suggests looking for new identities that ‘share power, value interdependencies, and create environments that foster and sustain democratic participation and social justice’. The notion of building community is implicit in the combined themes of social inclusion, collaborative activity and shared decision-making. Cooperative learning and collaboration are about students working together (Ashman and Gillies 2003). More able peers scaffold and support the learning of each other, including the students with special needs. The teacher’s role is to actively promote acceptance of students with special educational needs among their peers (Dukmac 2010; Frederickson 2010).

As part of the research project, the teacher scaffolded student participation towards an inclusive classroom community with the explicit teaching of values in the normal routines of social practices in the classroom, including the daily social circle and the weekly class meetings (detailed later). As students explored their personal values about how they interacted with their peers, they broadened their views about leadership and the benefits of encouraging all students to participate. In particular, being proactive to make the classroom social practices explicit allowed the negotiation of values that underpinned ‘collaboration’ such as mutual respect, tolerance, caring and cooperation, which supported students’ development of interpersonal skills and benefited Mary and Lesley.

*Class agreements* provided an avenue for the co-construction of the meaning of the personal and interpersonal values underpinning classroom practice (mutual respect; participation/right to pass; attentive listening; appreciating others/no put downs and personal best). They provided the scaffolds for boundaries for behaviour that established the classroom climate and created psychological safety for participation. Students’ understandings about values such as caring, sharing, tolerance and how to belong to a community were central to an inclusive classroom.

**Rogoff’s interpersonal plane**

The focus at the interpersonal plane is the communication and coordination of activities between participants. The interpersonal plane describes ‘the system of interpersonal engagements and arrangements … which is managed collaboratively by individuals and their social partners in face-to-face or other interaction’ (Rogoff 1995, 146).

In the context of this paper, Mary and Lesley had multiple partners – peers, teachers and adults – in different contexts such as the playground, the classroom, the ESU and with other mainstream teachers to create opportunities for multi-tiered scaffolding to occur. One could argue that the breadth and depth of the ZPD were affected as they faced their learning challenges in multiple contexts and with multiple partners. Thus, ZPDs vary ‘as a function of the interpersonal relationship and interaction between participants rather than as a fixed attribute of the learner’ (Cumming-Potvin, Renshaw, and van Kraayenoord 2003, 57). Providing a collaborative classroom supports learning opportunities for multiple ZPDs to occur though participation and interaction in learning activities. Sociograms, where students nominated their peers in response to the question: ‘Who would you like to get to know better?’, allowed the teacher/researcher to establish small social groups of four to six students based on social, emotional and
academic needs. As a result, Mary and Lesley worked with a variety of peers throughout the year, which may not have occurred without teacher intervention.

The teacher/researcher used three cyclical stages of Tribes Learning Communities (Gibbs 2001), inclusion, influence and community, to develop an inclusive classroom. As students progressed through these stages, they considered how they adjusted to their new social groups each term; influenced the group and resolved conflicts to be able to work together and celebrated group achievements. Combining knowledge of the Tribes process with the four common stages of group development provided scaffolds for how the teacher supported group work by finding common ground; developing modes of sharing influence; pursuing academic goals and reflecting; and self-renewal processes (Schmuck and Schmuck 1997).

Team building and group identity activities were integrated across the curriculum such as creating an animal or imaginary creature to reflect group interests; decorating a group shoe box; choosing a group name and creating a logo. The process of reaching a consensus within a group during these activities was challenging but taught valuable life skills such as taking turns; listening to each other; agreeing and disagreeing in a respectful manner as well as making decisions. These life skills developed interpersonal and group skills, so students could work together which supported the values that underpinned an inclusive classroom.

The daily social circle and the weekly class meeting were timetabled as part of the normal routines and provided authentic contexts to develop competence in social relationships through peer modelling and teacher scaffolding about student leadership (Morcom and MacCallum 2007). The social circle included all students and provided a positive routine to start each day. Students held a ‘talking stick’, which was usually a toy, taking turns to say their name and how they felt. The predictability of the session allowed students to feel at ease participating to the level they desired with the ‘right to pass’, if they did not wish to speak. Mary and Lesley, who had limited oral language, participated successfully by stating their name and mostly said, ‘I feel happy’. The less tangible elements of this activity were that sharing one’s feelings became an authentic process for connecting to others, building trust and developing a shared vocabulary for feelings and values. It was an activity in which everybody had a voice that was validated as peers listened respectfully to each other.

In order to encourage full participation of all students, including those who are more vulnerable, such as students with special needs, ‘values’ became central to the class discussions. These strategies allowed a deeper examination of discriminatory practices and opportunities for students to solve problems, reassess their values and learn from each other. The changes in students’ behaviour, in their actions and words, provided evidence that students were applying their understanding of the class agreements. During weekly class meetings, shared responsibility to resolve issues resulted in a commitment to improving the outcomes for all students.

The values that underpinned the community, as articulated in the class agreements, provided the context for interpersonal values to develop among students where they behaved respectfully towards each other. At the beginning of the year, the teacher noted that several female students positioned themselves as ‘an agent of the academic and social development’ for these students (Allan 1999, 35) and would volunteer to assist or partner them in activities (Teacher observations, Term1). These students modelled for their peers how to be patient and caring towards Mary and Lesley in partner and group work. The challenge of partner work with peers was a recurring issue in a collaborative classroom not only for these students, but also for others who had few
friends or limited social skills. As part of a ‘whole class approach’, students were encouraged to partner peers who were not their regular friends. As a result, most students had worked with a range of peers throughout the year.

On the second day of the school year, when students were asked to form partners with each other, the teacher/researcher allowed Mary and Lesley to be part of a ‘three-some’ so these students were each paired with more capable peers for discussions. Each pair of students completed a listening exercise in two parts where poor listening skills were first demonstrated, followed by ‘attentive’ listening skills, to compare how participants felt in both situations. During the ensuing discussion, Mary and Lesley were unsure how to participate but Lesley responded ‘wasn’t eyes on me’. Mary did not speak, which was usual for her. In subsequent discussions, Lesley made an oral response even though it was limited compared with her peers, but she usually contributed. During this process, the teacher/researcher modelled to all students an expectation to participate. In the next section, Mary and Lesley’s participation at a personal level is evidenced in their words and actions during classroom activities such as the social circle and student interviews.

Rogoff’s personal plane: Mary and Lesley

The focus at the personal plane is individual activity and how participants change as a result of their engagement in the activity. Rogoff (1995, 142) suggests the operation of a ‘personal process by which, through engagement in an activity, individuals change and handle a later situation in ways prepared by their own participation in the previous situation’.

Mary lived with her grandmother, who was her primary carer and she had no siblings. She was small in stature for her age compared with her peers. At the beginning of the year, the classroom teacher observed that Mary rarely initiated communication unless she was encouraged to do so and usually responded with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. Due to her limited oral vocabulary, she often used facial expressions and noises to express her feelings. She had a very short attention span but persisted when she was given individual assistance in class (Teacher observations, Term1).

Mary relied on the classroom teacher and her peers for support in the afternoons when she returned to the mainstream classroom and often fell asleep at her desk. One could argue that she had exerted so much energy concentrating during her morning activities that she was exhausted. As the year progressed, she was able to stay focused for longer periods of time, but the issue for the teacher remained about how much assistance she should receive. Mary would permit peers and the teacher to complete the task for her and when she was left to continue on her own she would stop working.

Lesley lived with her parents both of whom held employment in a professional capacity. She had a happy and friendly disposition and was keen to participate with her peers in the classroom and playground. She had been placed in the same class as Mary since pre-primary and usually sat with her in class and played together in the playground. Even though she had a larger oral vocabulary than Mary, there were limitations in her ability to communicate with her peers. When she was asked a question or to make a decision, she needed additional assistance and ‘think time’ before she could respond. She was eager to ‘have a go’ even though she became easily frustrated when she had difficulties with a task. She appeared shy but would initiate conversations with her teacher and peers when she had something to share.

The teacher observed that peers showed genuine concern and protective behaviours towards Mary and Lesley if they were upset and noticed when they were not included.
When there were opportunities for each team member to write how they would support their tribe, Mary and Lesley dictated to the teacher:

Lesley: We will listen to each other.
Mary: Behave well. (Student team building classroom activity, Term 1, 2 March 2007)
Lesley: Respect other people in your tribe.
Mary: Good. Do good writing. (Student team building classroom activity, Term 2, 23 April 2007)

In the following mainstream curriculum activities, provisions were made to include Mary and Lesley by withdrawing them from their ESU lessons. The novel *The Indian in the Cupboard* provided the stimulus to study Native American Culture in depth and a range of tepee activities. Initially, the students, including Mary and Lesley, constructed their own tepees prior to the process of designing and decorating a class tepee. Mary and Lesley participated: first, in the group discussions conducted in the morning to decide on the choice of a group symbol; secondly, in the painting of each group’s symbol with each group member painting a section and lastly, each group member painted their handprint around their group symbol.

The process of creating a large class tepee involved every student and created a sense of ownership, belonging and pride in the final outcome. It became a symbol of ‘appreciation’ because peers took responsibility to notice the positive elements with their peers and nominated each other to spend special time in the tepee. One could argue that adults and peers supported and guided Mary and Lesley’s participation and mediated more sophisticated levels of engagement during these activities (Rogoff 1995; Vygotsky 1978).

The teacher/researcher used the class tepee as a central focus and incentive to encourage team work through weekly group nominations where peers nominated a ‘team member of the week’ to have increased special time in the class tepee. To encourage wider social networks, students were allowed to choose a partner to go into the tepee with them. The challenge for the teacher was to assist all students to have a voice in this process and assist peers to widen their notion of ‘teamwork’. Class discussions centre on ‘noticing student improvement in attitude and behaviour’ to include all students and maintain a positive focus. However, sometimes students such as Mary and Lesley were overlooked. In the following extract, both students’ responses demonstrate that they understood the process of nominations and providing a reason.

When the groups were nominating peers to be team member of the week Lesley chose Tamara who often partnered her, giving her reason ‘trying all week, doing her best’. Similarly Mary nominated her friend Margaret and gave her reason – ‘Likes me. Helps me’. On this occasion no one nominated Mary or Lesley. This situation was discussed with the students who came up with the idea that group members chose ‘team member of the week’ for Monday–Thursday, as there were four teams, and on Friday the teacher made the choice. This meant that students who may be overlooked by their peers had an additional opportunity provided by the teacher’s nomination. (Researcher’s journal, 10 August 2007)

When Mary and Lesley were asked in the student interviews how things had changed since the beginning of the year for friendships, they were able to name their new friends. Lesley added ‘They be good friends. Kathryn good friend. Play with me. Play with me at lunch and recess’. She also named an effective student leader and said, ‘He does good work’. Mary could also correctly name all the peers who
had been in her tribes over the year (Student interviews, Term 4, 2007). One could argue that the responses relating to friendships reinforce the importance of relationships for all students for their emotional security and sense of belonging. Lesley's mother wrote that she was 'eager to participate in activities, socially confident, and appeared more "sure" of herself, could make decisions and be more confident that she had made the right choice' (Parent Survey for Lesley, September 2007).

**Implications for classroom practice**

The purpose of building an inclusive classroom culture based on democratic values adds credence to the position of all students' right to participate. This paper provides evidence of the benefits of the teacher scaffolding participation to develop a sense of belonging (Van Oers and Hännikäinen 2001) for all students within a caring community (Battistich et al. 1997; Dukmac 2010; Noddings 1992; Slade 2008).

Developing leadership skills created another context for including all students. As students develop their social and emotional skills, they develop empathy and an ability to support others. In particular, for Mary and Lesley, opportunities to socialise with their peers supported their self-confidence and their inclusion in classroom activities. Mary and Lesley's movement between their ESU class and the mainstream class each day was seamless because they were welcomed in both contexts and their participation was encouraged, appreciated and validated.

This research was about negotiating the values that developed a broader understanding of responsibilities of student leadership within small groups to build an inclusive classroom. Students examined their personal values through the community social practices and group work. They were given choices about how and with whom they worked. The use of inclusive pedagogies, such as collaborative and cooperative learning, which are underpinned by democratic values to promote social justice empowered students to investigate their discriminatory practices and take personal responsibility for the changes they needed to make. The values that underpinned a caring, collaborative and inclusive classroom, such as mutual respect, tolerance and appreciation of diversity, were firmly embedded in students' ways of being with each other.

**Conclusion**

'In this fast-food society, simple solutions to complex problems are embraced far too often' (Esquith 2007). There were no rule books or 'shortcuts' to success. The process of raising awareness and a group consciousness to teach students how to care and support each other took time and a personal investment and commitment for all, including the teacher, who positioned herself as a learner. The community's identity was collaboratively negotiated and constructed by 'getting personal about values education' to develop participation and promote inclusion. There is still much work to be done at all levels, school, teachers and students but above all on ourselves (Allan 1999, 2003; Dobozy 2007). The question remains about the value students place on being respectful towards each other, which is the basis of developing an inclusive classroom, school and ultimately society.
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CHAPTER 10

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.1 Introduction

An ongoing concern for teachers remains how to engage and motivate students in the classroom. To address this concern the teacher/researcher conducted classroom based research with her primary students while teaching at two schools in 2004 and 2007. In this dissertation it is argued that developing a collaborative classroom supported students’ social and emotion needs and developed mature participation and motivation for learning. Based on the assumption that students need to develop communication and social skills and learn to work together, the teacher/researcher’s role included scaffolding problem solving skills that promoted pro-social and inclusive behaviours. The teacher/researcher also had an expectation that all students would learn to participate and encouraged students to move from legitimate peripheral to develop mature participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

The final conceptual framework in Figure 10.1 illuminates how the current research has helped to explain both the theoretical and practical aspects of learning, emotions and motivation as integrated processes, where collaboration is the unifying concept. This figure builds on ideas examined in Chapters 1, 2 and 3 (See Figures 1.1, 2.1 & 3.1), to illustrate the integrated nature of learning, motivation and emotions and the description of affective scaffolds (Vygotsky, 1978) in Chapter 4. Learning is conceptualised as a single multi-dimensional concept of collaboration, to examine
student motivation and learning. Emotions are conceptualised using the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978) to include emotions and motivation as “part of the collective experience…” (Meyer & Turner, 2006, p. 388). The three bidirectional arrows symbolise the scaffolding processes.

Theoretical

*Learning* is conceptualised using a single multidimensional construct, such as collaboration, as a viable option for classroom-based research (Turner & Meyer, 2000) to develop mature participation.

Practical

Scaffolding student leadership opportunities, through modelling and reflection, provides a strategy to develop collaborative classroom social practices.

Theoretical

*Emotions* are conceptualised using the affective ZPD (Goldstein, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978) to include emotions and motivation as “part of the collective experience…” (Meyer & Turner, 2006, p. 388).

Practical

Create supportive learning environments to encourage students to take risks to develop collaborative strategies.

Theoretical

*Motivation* is conceptualised as negotiated participation in collaborative activities within a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), highlighting the social origins.

Practical

Create a motivational zone for students by teaching within the optimal level of challenge so teaching is within their affective ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978).

*Figure 10.1* Theoretical and practical implications of the research: Learning, motivation and emotions from a sociocultural perspective.
The following research questions reflect the practical and theoretical aspects of the current research, summarised in Figure 10.1, and are reviewed before the discussion of the focal students to highlight aspects of mature participation. After that, the practical implications and theoretical implications of the research are considered, ahead of suggestions for future research and the final conclusions.

10.2 The research questions

How does student leadership develop mature participation and contribute to student motivation?

In the current research qualitative data were analysed to make decisions about the classroom practices and how the teacher scaffolded leadership development to create a supportive learning environment that encouraged students to take risks. Collaborative learning environments are created when students take responsibility for their learning and resolve social issues. Scaffolding student leadership opportunities, through modelling and reflection, provided a strategy to develop a collaborative and supportive classroom environment. Data from sociometric surveys and teacher observations were used to document the changes in the development of students’ participation and motivation, as they moved into different social groups and took on leadership roles (Morcom, 2005; MacCallum & Morcom, 2008). Students needed multiple scaffolds from the teacher to support their leadership efforts such as being in social groups that would support their efforts to change. The teacher/researcher needed to monitor the development of group dynamics to create an appropriate affective zone for each student that had a balance of challenge and support. When students were interviewed they reported enjoying the responsibility of being a leader,
learning how to resolve social issues and the positive peer regard they received when they helped their group members. These aspects are connected to students’ feelings and are evidence of the positive outcomes of working within the affective ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) that, it is argued, created a motivational zone for students.

In what ways does sociocultural theory support classroom-based research to examine student motivation?

Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and Rogoff’s (1995) analytical planes are compatible conceptual frameworks to examine and highlight the social aspects of learning in the classroom and to understand student motivation. For Vygotsky (1978), the social context became part of the developmental processes because of its role in shaping higher mental processes. The role of the teacher and others in shaping students’ learning has been examined in the publications, through the concept of the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). The concept of participation in collaborative activities is the unit of analysis to examine motivation as negotiated participation in a collaborative community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Each of Rogoff’s community, interpersonal and personal planes provided an investigative and interpretive tool, to examine scaffolding within the affective ZPD, where motivation and learning are assumed to be interrelated concepts.

Sociocultural theory is useful for classroom based research to examine motivation, using the concept of zone of proximal development (Vygosky, 1978) as a model for how teachers can create educational experiences where the learning stretches students beyond their existing level. Through scaffolding within the ZPD, students in the research classrooms expressed satisfaction in their learning when they took
responsibility and were a positive role model for their peers. These affective components of learning highlight emotions as integral to student motivation.

What are the key features of scaffolds for students to develop mature participation?

Teachers encounter a plethora of complex issues in the classroom, including understanding students’ characteristics and how they impact on motivation. In the current research, discussing collaborative values with students provided opportunities to highlight students’ emotions as an integral part of learning and motivation as they developed mature participation. This supports Meyer and Turner’s (2006) arguments that emotions and motivation need to be studied simultaneously to fully understand student learning in the classroom. Working within the affective ZPD also created supportive learning environments where student responsibility and leadership were fostered. It is argued in this dissertation that teacher scaffolding, working within the affective ZPD, developed positive relationships and mature student participation. Students stated that they made new friends as they learnt to participate in the classroom social practices because they learnt more about how to work with others.

Data are used in the publications to document how the classroom social practices scaffolded (Bruner, 1986) students’ learning to develop mature participation. Table 10.1 provides a summary of focal students’ individual characteristics that the teacher/researcher observed (See Left Column). Teachers also use agreed criteria to identify and track students who may require additional support during their schooling. For example, students such as those who are identified as being a “Student at Educational Risk” (SAER) or a “Talented and Gifted Student” (TAGS) would require
additional educational support to meet their needs. The Right Column of Table 10.1 presents a summary of the outcomes or changes, as a result of the teacher/researcher’s scaffolds, for the focal group students when they received additional support.

### Table 10.1 Summary of students’ characteristics and changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ characteristics</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 6: PAPER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Gemma* (Year 3) lacked confidence in herself and her abilities. Student at educational risk (SAER). | *Gemma*  
Increased Gemma’s friendship circle  
Developed self-confidence  
Started to take risks in her learning |
| *Martin* (Year 3) did not enjoy working with similar aged peers. Talent and Gifted Student (TAGS). | *Martin*  
Developed an appreciation of the value of collaboration with peers |
| *Lindsay* (Year 5) displayed anti-social behaviours and did not enjoy academic activities. Talent and Gifted Student (TAGS). | *Lindsay*  
Supported by his peers when he was a leader |
| **Chapter 7: PAPER 2**    |         |
| *Susan, Helen, Angela, Margaret and Eileen* (Year 5) were friends who quarrelled. | *Denis*  
Made pro-social choices supported by his peers  
*Nathan*  
Increased friendship circle  
Developed self-confidence |
| **Chapter 8: PAPER 3**    |         |
| *Denis* bullied *Nathan* (Year 5). *Nathan* was also a Student at educational risk (SAER). | *Denis*  
Made pro-social choices supported by his peers  
*Nathan*  
Increased friendship circle  
Developed self-confidence |
| **Chapter 9: PAPER 4**    |         |
| *Mary and Leslie* (Year 3) were students who had intellectual disabilities. They qualified for additional support with a teacher assistant in the mainstream classroom. | *Mary and Leslie*  
Placed in supportive social groups throughout the year  
Widened their friendship circle |
When new classes are formed at the end of each year, students are chosen by their current teachers and the administration, to ensure an equitable distribution of social, emotional and academic needs for the following year. At both research schools there were similar year levels cohort groups taught by other teachers who were not part of the research classes. As the teacher/researcher was also the classroom teacher, she had access to prior school reports, written by previous teachers about the academic achievements of the students. Social and emotional remarks were also indicated through the anecdotal teachers’ comments and scores for attitude and behaviour on the students’ biannual school reports. Other system wide information was available from the results of State and National testing for Literacy and Numeracy conducted prior, during and after the research projects. State testing was replaced by National testing in 2008.

1. The Western Australian Literacy and Numeracy Assessment- WALNA. (Australia. Western Australian Literacy & Numeracy Assessment, 2005)
2. The National Assessment Program: Literacy and Numeracy- NAPLAN(Australia. Curriculum Corporation- now Educational Services Australia, 2010).

The 2004 research students completed the WALNA test in 2004 (In the current Year 5 cohort) and again in 2006 (Year 7 cohort). The critical friend for the 2004 research reported to the teacher/researcher that the comparative data for the Year 3, 5 and 7 cohorts (who sat the tests in 2002, 2004 & 2006 respectively) were available to the school. These data demonstrated that the 2004 research group students from these Year level cohorts had made noticeable academic gains in Literacy and Numeracy when compared to other students in the same cohort group. The Table in Appendix 1 provides a sample of Year 5 Students who were at Educational Risk (SAER) for Literacy and those who were Talented and Gifted (TAGS) and underachieving from
the research class. When their Year 3 and Year 5 results for Writing are compared these students performed above expectations.

For the 2007 research students (Year 3 cohort) who sat the WALNA test, their results could also be compared for subsequent NAPLAN tests in 2009 and 2011 (Years 5 and 7 cohorts respectively). The students’ academic reports for the 2007 cohort, written by other teachers, were reviewed by the teacher/researcher. Comparative details (available to the teacher/researcher) are not provided in this dissertation because of the need to preserve confidentiality and anonymity. Across both research classrooms, the most notable academic gains were for the students who had been categorised as ‘Students at Educational Risk’ for Literacy and Numeracy, Nathan (2004) and Gemma (2007), and the ‘Talent and Gifted Students’, Lindsay (2004) and Martin (2007).

It is difficult to establish a causal link between the research students and these trends, because it can be argued that the students may have achieved these results despite the intervention of the teacher/researcher, due to other factors such as maturity. However, the data from parent and student interviews supported that students’ confidence increased during the research years which supports the contention that attending to the social and emotional aspects of learning motivates students to achieve their personal best. In the next section the discussion of the student focal groups highlights how meeting social and emotional needs also developed motivation for learning. Each aspect of mature participation that was the focus of the publications is italicised preceding the discussion of each student focal group (From Papers 1-4 respectively).
Following the discussion of the student focal groups more general comments about
the outcomes of the social practices are made.

10.3 Reflection on the student focal groups: Working within the affective ZPD

Leadership in the classroom to realise social and academic potential (Paper 1)

Students such as Gemma, Martin and Lindsay chose to position themselves on the
periphery of classroom activities (MacCallum & Morcom, 2008) but for different
reasons. When the teacher/researcher reviewed the video footage, field notes, parents’
and students’ interviews and students’ reflection logs, these students became a focus
as they reflect common concerns for teachers. Gemma’s mother was worried that
Gemma had little interest in school work and was at educational risk in Literacy and
Numeracy. She was also concerned that Gemma had few friends. This had been
evident since Gemma started formal schooling. Both Martin and Lindsay were
identified as very capable in previous school reports. Martin lacked self-confidence
and an interest to interact with his peers. Whereas Lindsay appeared confident but
behaved in an anti-social manner. Gemma and Martin had the potential to be
overlooked because they did not disrupt other students’ learning. In contrast, Lindsay
(YEAR 5 student) brought attention to himself with his anti-social behaviour in the
classroom and playground.

The findings reported in the first paper illustrate that developing friendship groups for
all students, based on pro-social values assisted them to develop self-confidence and
leadership skills. Gemma developed new friendships, self-confidence and risk taking
with learning. For Martin and Lindsay, once they became leaders, they developed an
appreciation of the value of collaboration. All students moved from being legitimate peripheral participants (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to fully participating in the social practices of the classroom and improving their academic learning.

An ability to resolve social issues in an equitable manner which underpinned students’ and the teacher’s motivation (Paper 2)

Susan, Helen, Angela, Margaret and Eileen were Year 5 students who participated fully in the classroom social practices, developing collaborative values such as caring and empathy (Morcom & MacCallum, 2009). When differences of opinions occurred earlier in the year, the discussions became intense, with the use of emotive language that was often abusive and aggravated the situation, preventing a resolution. As their social network widened, these students needed to learn new strategies to deal with an increase in situations when there were disagreements.

As the students became more committed to resolving their issues to remain friends, they initiated using reflection logs and conflict resolution strategies modelled in the classroom. They wrote in their reflection logs how they perceived issues. To negotiate classroom social practices and further scaffold students’ skills, the teacher/researcher explicitly taught values, establishing a positive expectation that students could be trusted to support each other. This minimised the need for teacher intervention because students were now considering the points of view of their peers to resolve issues, reaffirming the teacher/researcher’s confidence and motivation to continue to develop such processes to empower students.
The situation for Denis and Nathan is a complex social issue (Morcom & Cumming-Potvin, 2010). Denis bullied Nathan for many years and the peers who were bystanders did not intervene to support Nathan. The school administration, other teachers, and the school psychologist intervened with some success, providing bystanders with alternative behaviours to support students who were bullied. Unfortunately this did not prevent all covert and overt bullying described in the paper. However Denis did stop bullying Nathan. Denis’s peer group did not ostracise him during the year but they chose not to support his anti-social behaviour.

In this paper the positive outcomes, particularly for Nathan and his family, reaffirmed for the teacher/researcher the legitimate educative role to intervene in such situations to model and teach pro-social behaviours, developing mature student participation. Affective scaffolds included placing both students in different groups where Denis would benefit from positive peer role models to make pro-social choices and Nathan had the opportunity to make friends. The situation required a multifaceted approach that gradually allowed students in Classroom 1 to experience the benefits of positive peer regard through student leadership. The positive changes in students’ behaviour encouraged and motivated the teacher/researcher’s motivation to further develop these practices. The feedback from parents about the changes they noted at home with siblings and other family members indicated that the benefits of the classroom programs were extended beyond the school to the community.
Mary and Leslie were students with intellectual disabilities. Their stories draw attention to the complex issue of inclusion and the importance for all students to experience a sense of belonging (Morcom & MacCallum, 2011). Increasingly, in the mainstream classroom, there are more students with special needs who also need support to be included. Teachers need to understand how to support students within the affective ZPD to develop social and communication skills, underpinning mature participation. After lunch, when Mary and Leslie returned from their lessons in the Educational Support Unit to the regular classroom, they participated in the same classroom activities as their peers. Seaview’s school motto was Grow with Respect. This motto was consistently discussed in relation to student behaviour and achievements at the weekly school assemblies by the principal, school councillors and teachers. Thus, there was a community and school expectation of positive regard for peers and adults as part of the school’s proud tradition.

When there were opportunities to choose partners for group work and practical projects, Mary and Lesley’s participation needed the support of the teacher/researcher to encourage more able peers to partner these students. The challenge for the teacher/researcher was to negotiate a collaborative classroom where all students fully participated, to the extent possible. This included other students working with Mary and Lesley, despite the academic challenges of the task and difficulties with communication. Mary and Lesley did not initiate interaction with their peers to be a part of their social group. They both had very gentle and unassuming dispositions and could easily be unintentionally ignored. However, in this case not only the
teacher/researcher, but a small group of peers, encouraged these students to participate in classroom activities. This modelled to other students that Mary and Lesley had a legitimate right to be included in all classroom activities. Affective scaffolds for these students included placement in groups where they were supported by peers, and inclusion in class activities that supported inclusive values, as illustrated in this research publication.

There were many challenges to establishing shared understandings and commitment with students about the parameters for behaviour (Morcom, 2005; Morcom & Cumming-Potvin, 2010). Enlisting the support of peers, through developing wider pro-social friendship groups during the research, was central to antisocial behaviour ending, as illustrated in Paper 3. When Denis did not have a large bystander group who supported his anti-social behaviour he made the decision later in the year to avoid the negative consequences of his actions. He ignored Nathan, which allowed Nathan to develop confidence to make new friends, including those who had been bystanders in the past.

The process used by the teacher/researcher centred on negotiation, not coercion, and it took time for community members to develop shared understanding and appreciation of a supportive classroom culture where they experienced mutual respect. As students listened, on the periphery during discussions, they learnt how to contribute to develop mature participation. They also learnt that other students had similar concerns and were willing to take risks to share with their peers. This process built trust and empathy amongst the students, which further encouraged participation and collaboration. To sustain participation and develop students’ confidence to express
differing points of views, the five Class Agreements were negotiated at the beginning of the year and referred to throughout the year. Values such as caring, sharing, tolerance and respect were promoted to create a supportive classroom climate for collaboration. Critiques of the community building process, argue not enough attention is given to the complex and often ‘messy’ relations that exist in such a process (Linehan & McCarthy, 2001). The teacher/researcher was attentive to the students’ relationships and this focus provided the impetus to build a cohesive classroom community. These outcomes are further discussed in the wider context of the research social practices and values education in the next section.

10.4 Practical implications of the research

The practical implications of the research lie in teaching values explicitly as an integral part of the instructional strategy to develop mature student participation and learning (Lovat & Toomey, 2007; Lovat et al., 2009; Wink & Putney, 2002). In the current research, a more dynamic and interactive collaborative model of teaching, using specific social practices, included negotiating the values of the community. The five Class Agreements adopted for the current research, allowed students and the teacher/researcher to express their opinions in a safe, supportive environment. From an educational perspective, collaborative teaching can achieve multiple goals that develop interpersonal and personal skills (Antil et al., 1998) to support students’ social and emotional learning and wellbeing. Collaborative classrooms provide supportive contexts because students are encouraged to support each in their learning. Hart’s (1992) self supporting framework, examined in Chapter 3, and the teacher scaffolds suggested in Chapter 4, provide teachers with guidelines. But teachers need
to understand how to observe students and then act to scaffold values that promote collaboration.

Highlighting values such as caring, sharing, cooperation, collaboration, tolerance and working hard to achieve your personal best, made explicit links to the values underpinning the Class Agreements. Linking students’ background knowledge, to contribute to the construction of Y charts, made them meaningful for the students. Students were supported to take risks with their learning because this process also created the conditions for psychological safety.

The practical challenges for teachers are to identify how to scaffold students’ within their affective ZPD, so students are given time to decide when and how they will participate and take responsibility for their learning. As the year progressed, the students became more reflective, taking responsibility for their participation and behaviour. For example, during the Social Circle, the teacher/researcher initially provided different objects for the talking stick while modelling to students how to narrate stories about different personal items that held a special memory or an emotional significance. Gradually students brought in toys and items from home which added variety and interest to this social practice. This student initiative also added a further human dimension to the classroom as students shared the reasons these objects were significant to them. Students voluntarily sat in a circle on the mat, before the official siren rang to signal the start the school day, without direction from the teacher/researcher.
Another example of changes in students’ participation was during weekly Class Meetings. The agenda items characterised common motivational areas of concern not only for the teacher but for students, as illustrated in Chapter 4. Students who initially did not have friends and then made friends, needed support to resolve conflicts to maintain friends (Morcom & McCallum, 2009). Students who bullied other students needed support to change how they perceived their victims, by getting to know them better and observing positive peer regard from other students, who were also the bully’s friend (Morcom & MacCallum, 2010).

Creating a collaborative classroom context where student participation was negotiated required a focus on how participation was conceptualised and how mature participation could be developed through positive interpersonal relationships and student leadership. The process of conducting the daily Social Circle and weekly Class Meeting fostered a classroom culture of open communication based on trust, tolerance and mutual respect. These social practices developed opportunities to discuss feelings, which were evident in the social practices described in Chapters 4. This reaffirms the integrated nature of the affective elements of a teacher’s educative role (Rosiek, 2003). Using authentic activities required learners to take emotional and intellectual risks, particularly during the Social Circle and Class Meetings. Students not only shared their ideas but expressed how they felt. In the publications the focal students were supported by their peers and the teacher/researcher, as they made decisions about their participation. Students developed skills to contribute and participate in a positive way towards developing a collaborative classroom community. Teachers interested in adapting these social practices need to consider how to scaffold student leadership opportunities and encourage students to take risks,
through modelling and reflection. Teaching students within their optimal level of challenge creates a motivational zone or ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978).

Motivation, at the Community Plane (Rogoff, 1995), is described as developing ways for participation as an apprentice with a focus on community values. The teacher/researcher’s role was central to structuring the classroom as a context for collaboration. At the Interpersonal Plane, the teacher guided participation, creating possibilities for motivation as negotiated participation through resolving interpersonal issues. Personal transformation of understandings and motivation was evident on the Personal Plane, when students were prepared to participate in subsequent similar activities. It is argued that more interactive and collaborative strategies developed aspects of mature participation and students’ motivation for learning. The theoretical implications of the research are discussed, in the next section, in relation to how emotions and motivation are linked to the social practices and students’ learning.

10.5 Theoretical and methodological implications of the research

An integrated and holistic approach to classroom based research for motivation, learning and emotions needs to incorporate or redefine models for research that are multidisciplinary and holistic, using longitudinal research designs (Turner & Meyer, 2000). Advocating holistic discourses to support a more interactive and collaborative view of learning (Rogoff et al., 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991), where “qualitative methods help us understand the black box that the classroom has become”, is argued as the way forward in classroom research (Turner & Meyer, 2000, p. 71). The single multidimensional concept of collaboration is proposed in the current research as a
useful concept for classroom-based research to integrate research for motivation, learning and emotions.

The methodology adopted to collect data in the current empirical studies established motivation as a socially and culturally situated concept (Pressick-Kilborn et al., 2005). A variety of qualitative research methods, embedded in an action research process, provided rich descriptions of interpersonal and contextual factors. The use of qualitative methods, which were embedded in the classroom instructional practices, afforded a rich source of data to examine student motivation in the context in which it developed. Collecting data over a school year provided additional contextual details, to support the interpretation of the data, often lacking in short intervention studies that traditionally conceptualised motivation as an individual concept.

Contextualised findings provide more externally valid information for teachers because they help explain the why and how behind student-teacher interactions. This situated knowledge is important for teachers who reflect on their practice and desire to create classroom environments that involve students in their learning. (Turner & Meyer, 2000, p. 71)

Despite the small sample of students in the projects, using qualitative research methods, in the authentic context of the classroom, provided situated knowledge and details for the teacher/researcher to examine student motivation. The research papers explain in depth details of the why and how of student interactions. The papers were also a reflective tool for the teacher/researcher to direct the research projects and the development of social practices in the classroom throughout the year. In the current research, drawing on Rogoff’s three planes to examine complex data about student motivation, offered an integrated approach to translate theory into practice (Richards, 2006). Scaffolding with the ZPD to develop a collaborative community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) created the self-supporting framework (Hart, 1992) for
collaboration. Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of teachers assisting students within the ZPD, to achieve more than one could achieve alone, also implies there are interpersonal and affective aspects of learning.

Conceptualising participation in collaborative communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), using Vygotsky’s (1978) metaphor of the affective ZPD and Rogoff’s (1995) analytical planes identified the multiple community, interpersonal and personal variables that contribute to motivation. The strength of this perspective is that the three planes provided a holistic analysis and interpretative framework for collecting rich data over time. From a sociocultural perspective of investigating motivation, one of the methodological challenges, is that of capturing the process of change. This is multidimensional and dynamic, rather than static points over time (Valsiner, 2006).

Thus, using multiple data sources from parents, students and teachers for triangulation created a complex rich resource to capture the process of motivational development. Even though the longitudinal research projects facilitated the collection of rich data over time, the process was flexible, to account for the irregularities of schooling. Due to the many interruptions to the school timetable, for whole school events such as swimming lessons and assembly practices, instructional time in the classroom was often compromised. Using research as part of professional learning, the teacher/researcher was committed and motivated to ensure critical social practices, such as the weekly Class Meetings were rescheduled so data were not missed about students’ development. In the next section future research is examined in the context learning within the affective ZPD, based on the assumption that positive student
relationships are at the heart of good teaching and learning (Hargreaves, 2001; Meyer, 2009).

10.6 Future research

More research is needed about how to set up collaborative classrooms where teachers can support student motivation and learning (Fried, 2011). Thus, such research may prepare teachers for this challenge in the classroom and assist students to manage their emotions in their learning when they are challenged. Recording student’s changes in participation during classroom social practices in the research publications provided insights into how positive classroom environments are created to support student motivation.

Understanding how positive classroom environments develop and are sustained is essential for improving educational opportunities through the quality of instructional interactions, which have relationships and emotions at their core. (Meyer & Turner, 2006, p. 390)

It is not common practice in motivation research to study cognitive and affective elements simultaneously, as an integrated process (Meyer & Turner, 2006; Sivan, 1986). To provide research that is accessible to teachers, would suggest conducting research in the classroom, reflecting the authentic context of the classroom to include contextual details. Future research that links academic learning and motivation with the benefits of teacher scaffolding within the affective ZPD, foregrounds the affective elements of learning and motivation. The current research is a small scale study but illustrates the longitudinal nature of change in student participation and the centrality of how the teacher structures the social aspects of the classroom. Promoting social and emotional learning through values education, student leadership and building a
collaborative classroom community highlights the social aspects of learning and motivation. Qualitative research methods, to examine students’ changes in participation require longitudinal studies that can capture contextual details of the classroom in which the students are learning. Future research with students and classroom teachers, in their classrooms, needs to consider these factors.

An area not explored in the current research is students’ perceptions of power in the classroom when using collaborative structures in a community of practice (Linehan & McCarthy, 2001). Issues of power are introduced in Morcom and Cumming-Potvin (2010) where students are given leadership roles, to ensure all students have a voice, but there are broader issues of power. In the Classrooms 1 and 2 the teacher/researcher negotiated with students, with the aim to share and distribute the power in the classroom. However expectations about the role of the teacher/researcher required further explanation to parents about the aims of the research, to support the development of student leadership skills in the classroom. Future research could critically examine power distribution, equity and expectations in the development of mature participation.

In the next section the conclusions are framed in terms of the research questions and student outcomes when teachers promote collaborative learning. Teachers set up expectations of legitimate peripheral participation to develop mature student participation. Then the potential for this research to be used in teacher education and professional learning is discussed before the conclusions for the methodological and conceptual issues of the research.
10.7 Conclusions

In a climate of flux and change, where there is high unpredictability for what the future holds, student participation and motivation remains a central issue for teachers and researchers. The conclusions drawn from the publications are that collaborative teaching afforded students a different way of participating with peers and developing mature participation. Arguing a case for legitimate peripheral participation in a community of practice, suggests an ongoing process of negotiation and teacher expectation for students to participate and develop mature participation. Therefore teachers need to scaffold students within the affective ZPD to create zones where they are suitably challenged. This enables students to develop the social and emotional skills that support a different way of participating in the classroom.

To sustain participation and develop students' confidence to express differing points of views, the five Class Agreements provide the basis for developing values explicitly with students from the beginning of the year. Values such as caring, sharing, tolerance and respect were promoted to create a supportive classroom climate for collaboration. However some learners may never develop mature participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). But through ongoing negotiation, students can come to understand the values of a collaborative classroom community and make informed choices about their behaviour. Nonetheless, using authentic activities required learners to take emotional and intellectual risks, particularly during the Social Circle and Class Meetings. Students not only shared their ideas but expressed how they felt. The classroom climate is a critical factor in how students interacted with each other to reduce
marginalisation by their peers. At times students disagreed but they learnt to be respectful towards each other.

The findings of the current research support teachers being proactive, to create a classroom climate and use social practices that address the students’ social and emotional needs. There were students in the research classes who experienced anxiety or had social and emotional issues which were addressed by the teacher/researcher through the processes of developing a collaborative community of practice. Students understood the value of learning with others and the benefits of being an active participant in classroom activities. This was a positive outcome for the teacher/researcher to continue to develop ideas that contributed to student participation, learning and motivation.

Teacher education, in a climate of educational accountability and rationalism (Hargreaves, 2003) can not afford to ignore the social and emotional needs of students. Regardless of an increase in the incidences of children who experience anxiety and depression from a young age, educational practices have been slow to respond to this worrying trend (Bernard, 1996; Stanley, 2011). From an educational perspective, collaborative teaching can achieve multiple goals that develop interpersonal and personal skills (Antil et al., 1998) to support students’ social and emotional learning and wellbeing. Teachers’ efforts to encourage student participation and collaboration may be thwarted if there is an over emphasis on competitive learning environments where success is only measured against the achievements of others (Ames, 1984, 1992; Anderman, 1999; Anderman & Anderman, 1999, 2009).
This research has potential for teacher education, in the implementation of undergraduate courses that prepare teachers for working with students to promote social and emotional skills as an integral part of classroom practice (Goldstein, 1999) and conducting their own research. The action research process places teachers at the centre of the reform or innovation and contributes to their professional learning (Carr & Kemmis 1986; Darling-Hammond, 2003; Grundy, 1995).

New methodologies and theoretical frameworks that can explore complex and interpersonal relationships, incorporating emotions in motivation and learning, are essential to understand classroom learning contexts (Meyer & Turner, 2002). Reflected in the choice of qualitative methodology is the potential to provide depth and detail about the context in which the research is conducted (Meyer & Turner, 2002). The teacher/researcher recognised the value of observing students during authentic collaborative activities in the classroom because it reflected the social context of the teachers’ work. Collaboration has proved a suitable multidimensional concept to research motivation and learning in the current research.

The challenge remains for future research to take into account “emotions as part of the collective experience that can explain emotions in relation to motivation and learning as an integrated process, not as a precursor or outcome” (Meyer & Turner, 2006, p. 388). Teachers make judgements about the usefulness of research, adapting new ideas into their teaching practice (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). Research findings about student motivation need to support teacher’s work in the classroom. In the current research the process of conducting research contributed to the teacher/researcher’s
knowledge and experience to “structuring a learning environment for collaboration” (Hart, 1992, p. 14) but also to address common motivational concerns of the students.

Creating appropriate goal orientations and classroom structures to support individual learning and motivation has been the major focus for motivation research in the past (Ames, 1984, 1992; Slavin, 1983). New trends in motivation research highlight the social aspects of learning and motivation (Pressick-Kilborn, 2010; Walker, 2010; Walker et al., 2010), within a sociocultural perspective (Rogoff, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978), offering new conceptual and methodological choices for research. Through the expression of emotions, students and the teacher can also develop closer emotional connections and this reciprocal process improves educational outcomes for the longer term (Lovat et al., 2009; Van Oers & Hännikäinen, 2001).

An integral component of effective teaching is to develop a level of emotional connection with students which also makes “emotional understanding possible” (Hargreaves, 2001, p. 1060), and thereby facilitates learning. Using collaborative and cooperative models of learning (Hart, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Johnson et al., 1994) can provide scaffolds to transfer responsibility for learning to the students. Specific programs such as Tribes Learning Communities (Gibbs, 2001) provide effective holistic frameworks for creating opportunities for students to develop positive relationships based on mutual respect and the skills to collaborate and make friends. Building supportive classroom contexts with students sustained their motivation for learning, but also the teacher/researcher’s motivation to examine current research about collaboration and motivation to improve the social and academic outcomes of all students. This research has contributed to knowledge about
the relationship between student motivation and learning and teacher scaffolding within the affective ZPD in the classroom.
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Appendix 1: Background to the projects

Bushlands Project 1 (2004)

Title: Mediating classroom culture based on democratic values and exploring the teacher’s facilitative role

Research aims: Classroom 1

1. Develop pro-social behaviour and

2. Develop an understanding of how to scaffold classroom activities to facilitate this process to support students.

This project was instigated by the teacher/researcher in response to the increasing incidents of bullying behaviour amongst students at Bushlands elementary school. Three years prior to the project, staff at Bushlands agreed to a whole school focus on values education and pastoral care. This was an attempt to support students’ social and emotional needs and counteract bullying problems. As a school wide initiative, teachers provided additional pastoral care programs in classrooms, with the implementation of the commercial ‘The You Can Do It!’ program (Bernard, 1996).

The school chaplain visited classrooms each week to conduct activities that demonstrated to the students caring values. Before the end of each session, the chaplain asked for student volunteers so that peers could make comments about the positive attributes of these students. For example: He is a good friend because he plays with me; He is caring because he helped me when I fell over; He is kind because he lent me a pencil when I did not have another one. The students looked forward to this session each week and developed an understanding of the benefits of showing their appreciation to their friends.
An adult mentoring program, where students met with an adult each week for one hour, provided additional support for students and teachers. The students were withdrawn from the classroom and usually participated in activities that had been negotiated between the mentor, student and teacher. Sometimes these activities included school work but usually the mentors created tasks that centred on the students’ interests, such as playing a board game or doing a craft activity. These whole school initiatives met with some success and led to a review and update of the School’s Behaviour Management (SBM) policy. The purpose of the review was to include new ideas and strategies to create a more positive focus and allow students to take responsibility for their behaviour.

Rather than applying negative consequences when a student misbehaved, such as ‘time out’, different strategies were trialled, particularly to address the needs of students who were consistently misbehaving. One strategy was to discuss student misbehaviour as a ‘shared concern’, rather taking an accusatory stance where the student may become defensive. The aim was to encourage student self reflection and an opportunity to change behaviour before another meeting with the teacher. For instance the teachers would say that they had heard some students were doing inappropriate things in the classroom such as ridiculing other students when they spoke. In this discussion responsibility for the misbehaviour was implied rather than being explicitly stated. Therefore the student did not become defensive but rather became reflective about a better way of dealing with similar issues in the future.

Opportunities for professional learning for teachers were provided for ‘The You Can Do It!’ program (Bernard, 1996), which created a shared understanding about the purposes of the program and how to support students.
Teachers also agree to participate in a State wide research project, conducted by a local university in conjunction with the Health department, as an initiative to address student bullying. The staff at Bushlands committed to becoming a trial school for the development of the Western Australian ‘Friendly Schools Project’ (outcomes reported in Cross, 2010). Teachers openly discussed the difference between ‘bullying’ and ‘dobbing’ with students and encouraged them to report antisocial behaviour at school. Students were asked to identify areas in the school, such as in the playground, where they felt safe and unsafe. These discussions made explicit to students that teachers were taking their concerns seriously as they developed the School’s anti-bullying policy. Together these measures made inroads into understanding the complex social issue of anti-social behaviour.

At a District level, professional learning was prioritised to assist all schools to develop decision making skills within an ethical school culture framework (Changing School Culture: Ethics in Leadership, 2004). The code of ethics was based on three principles: justice, respect for persons and responsible care (Department of Education and Training, 2004). The implication of this code for teachers was to develop an understanding of their professional responsibility to create a safe environment at school and update teachers’ skills. Developing the Master’s research project (Morcom, 2005) partially responded to this responsibility by addressing the issue of ‘bullying’ as central to creating a safe classroom, and identifying teacher scaffolds to facilitate a classroom culture based on democratic values.

All male students in the Year 5 group (Classroom 1) held previous school behaviour records where they were either the victim or instigator of anti-social behaviour or part
of the bystander group that encouraged such behaviour. In contrast, the Year 4 group held no such behaviour records. For these reasons, the initial focus of the research was about developing positive interpersonal relationships amongst students as reflected in the research aims. After analysing the data, student leadership emerged as the catalyst to motivate changes in student behaviour and build collaborative and democratic classrooms, as reported in the Master’s thesis (Morcom, 2005). This evidence became the starting point for the 2007 project.

Seaview Project 2 (2007-8)

Title: Developing motivation through student leadership in the primary classroom

Research aims: Classroom 2:

1. Develop collaborative student leadership skills (2007);

2. Examine how the students progressed the following year (2008)

In 2005, after relocating to a new primary school, the teacher/researcher continued to provide school leadership in values education. The cultural context at Seaview was quite different from Bushlands. Unlike Bushlands, where much of the student anxiety stemmed from the bullying that occurred at the school, Seaview students were generally well-behaved and respectful towards each other and their teachers. However some students became overly anxious, when faced with stressful situations such as testing. There were many experienced teachers who had in excess of 20 years teaching experience in the classroom and taught in a traditional manner. This was a similar situation Bushlands. But the parents at Seaview had a greater presence in the school, assisting teachers with classroom activities, and valued a traditional approach.
Parents expressed their preference for a more traditional, one-sided approach to education, as described by (Rogoff et al., 2003), during teacher/parent interviews. One of the reasons for their preference was that many students sat highly competitive entrance assessments for private schools, so parents were keen for their children to be well prepared. It was becoming more common for students to sit these tests at a younger age, when vacancies occurred at private schools, to secure their place. Thus, it could be argued that the school context was not conducive to changes in the classroom to promote a more contemporary view of learning, where students were encouraged to collaborate and share their ideas with each other.

The school community at Seaview was proud of the long held tradition of academic excellence where many students excelled in National testing for Literacy and Numeracy. Since the inauguration of the Western Australian State Government’s annual testing of literacy and numeracy, conducted with all students in Years, 3, 5 and 7, students at Seaview consistently achieved above average scores. This resulted in all students in these year levels at the school achieving above the state benchmarks (Australia. Western Australian Literacy & Numeracy Assessment, 2005). In 2008 this test was replaced with the National Assessment Planning for Literacy and Numeracy administered Australia wide on an annual basis (Australia. Australian Curriculum Assessment & Reporting Authority, 2011).

Conducting values education programmes at Bushlands was considered essential by the staff and principal, to support anti-bullying programs and teach students social skills. But at Seaview student behaviour management was not an issue because students were considered by the principal and staff as independent, confident and self-
directed learners. Consequently the majority of staff and parents supported the focus on higher order thinking skills to improve academic learning. Therefore the development student leadership skills for Project 2, one would assume, would be attractive to parents because their children were well prepared in terms of confidence and a positive attitude to learning. Yet parent perceptions were mixed and some were dubious of the benefits of such a program that encouraged all students to aspire to become leaders.

As with Rogoff et al.’s, (2003) empirical research to introduce collaborative practices, it took some parents a couple of years to understand the benefits for their students. During Project 2, parents’ and students’ preconceived notions, that leadership was limited to a few academically talented or confident students, changed to a more collaborative and supportive perception. Students’ personal attributes that of being a kind and caring person, became valued as leadership traits and an integral part of a leadership role. This widened their perspectives beyond the more competitive notions of leadership, to also developing personal qualities that could support other students to become leaders. The outcomes of this process is further elaborated in the current research publications, reaffirming that parents did support the leadership program as students developed mature participation. Families also experienced benefits when students discussed school issues at home and used some of the problem solving strategies with their siblings when there was conflict.

For Project 2, the teacher/researcher worked as a co-researcher with Associate Professor Judith MacCallum, funded by a Research in Excellence Grant (REGS), Murdoch University (2007). As co-researchers and collaborators, different roles could
be assigned to manage the workload during the research. The teacher/researcher focussed on facilitating the social practices, such as the weekly Class Meetings with the students, while the co-researcher filmed the classroom activities and wrote accompanying field notes. Discussions between the co-researchers took place at the time of recording events and interpretations were made to progress the project. This process assisted ongoing targeting of data collection and how the semi-structure interviews were conducted each term.

The new research focus in Classroom 2 changed from examining the teacher’s facilitative role (Morcom, 2005) to examining students’ motivational development, using collaborative instructional practices that simultaneously developed student leadership skills. The major findings of Project 2 were that when students were given the opportunity to become leaders, they developed mature participation underpinned by collaborative values. Motivation was conceptualised as negotiated participation in the classroom social practices. The following year, in 2008, when the students were in a new Year level (4) and taught by different teachers, the research was extended with a target group of 12 students (and their parents). In 2008, twelve Year 4 students (aged 10 years) and their parents signed the consent letters with their children to agree to further interviews as a follow up and part of the 2007 Project. The research publications report on the findings of focal groups of students who were taught by the teacher/researcher in 2004 and 2007.

The findings from Classroom 1 and 2, reported in the Research publications, were also used as the basis to mentor the Year 4 teachers (2008) who were now teaching the research students from the 2007 research class. These teachers continued to
develop their ideas and contribute in the following years after Project 2 finished in 2008.

The teacher/researcher became the Western Australian cluster coordinator for the Values in Action Schools Project (VASP), funded by the Australian Government (2008-2009). The project examined ways to promote and report ‘values’ to parents by involving them in authentic collaborative activities, developed by the cluster coordinator and the teachers during the project. The findings are reported in the final Values in Action Schools Report (Australia. Department of Education, Employment & Workplace Relations, 2010). This report is available online at:


Other preliminary findings related to the teacher/researcher’s role of mentoring teachers have been reported elsewhere, as listed below.


Appendix 2 Consent letter to parents and students (February, 2007)

Dear parents,

I am continuing research that builds on my Masters Degree at Murdoch University, which I completed in 2005. I will be co researching with Dr. Judith MacCallum from Murdoch University to investigate: *Motivation through leadership development in the primary classroom.*

In particular this research will examine children’s motivational development over the 2007 school year, using collaborative instructional practices to develop students’ leadership skills. The research Dr. MacCallum and I are doing would be conducted as part of my normal teaching duties to establish effective learning environments. In order to conduct the research, we will tape or video tape some Class Meetings and activities, interview students and survey parents.

I am seeking your consent for you and your child to participate in this research and to publish the findings and use them in teacher education. I am also seeking your child’s written informed consent. All data are treated as confidential and will be stored securely at Murdoch University for a period of five years. Participants’ identities will be protected as much as possible in any report or publications emanating from the project (i.e. pseudonyms will be used for the names of participants).

Please note that you and your child may withdraw consent at any time during the study without any disadvantage to your child. If you have any queries you may contact myself at the school, Dr MacCallum (phone number), one of the critical friend’s for the project, Mrs. Martin at Seaview Primary School (phone number) or Murdoch University Human Ethics Committee (phone number).

Regards
Mrs. V. Morcom
Year 3 classroom teacher
Please tear off and return the permission slip below after you have signed it. We have read the information above. We understand that all information collected will be treated as confidential and will not be released by the researchers unless required by law. We agree for certain activities to be tape recorded or videotaped.

Any questions we have asked have been answered to our satisfaction.

I agree for my child to be part of this research and have discussed the study with my child. I agree that research data gathered for this study may be published or that short video clips may be shown at conferences or for educational purposes, provided names or other information, which might identify my child are not used.

However at any time we know we can change my/our mind/s without disadvantage to my child.

Yes, we are happy to participate in the research:

Student’s name __________________signature _______________ date______

_______________________   __________________   _____________________

Parent/s guardian/s signature      Dr. Judith MacCallum   Mrs. Veronica Morcom

Date                  Date                  Date

No, we would prefer not to participate in the research:

Name _____________________ signature _____________________ date______
Appendix 3  Student Interviews, Term 1, 2, 3 and 4 (2007)

Student Interview, Term 1 and 2, 2007  Name _____________

Hello. I’ve been coming to this school and your classroom over the last few weeks. I’d like you to explain some of the activities and what you think and feel about them. Is that OK? Mrs Morcom and I have taken some photos and I have some photos to show you.
Here’s the first one.

1. Show photo 1 (Social Circle)
   Can you tell me what’s happening here? Does this happen very often? What do you usually do when you have a Social Circle?
   Can you tell me a bit more …?

   (What sorts of things are good about working this way? Do you like working this way? How do you feel about working this way? Are there things that are not so good about working this way?)

   Here’s the next one.

2. Show photo 2 (Class Meeting)
   Can you tell me what’s happening here? Does this happen very often? What do you usually do when you have a Class Meeting?
   Can you tell me a bit more …?

   (What sorts of things are good about working this way? Do you like working this way? How do you feel about working this way? Are there things that are not so good about working this way?)

   Here’s the next one.

3. Show photo 3 (working in a Tribe)
   Can you tell me what is happening here? (I noticed that sometimes Mrs Morcom asks you to work in your Tribes.) Does this happen very often? What usually happens when students work in their Tribe?

   Does working that way help you learn? Can you explain?
   Does working that way help you want to learn? - Helps you keep going with that work. activity….
   Can you tell me a bit more …?

   (What sorts of things are good about working this way? Do you like working this way? How do you feel about working this way? Are there things that are not so good about working this way?)
Here's the next one.

4. Show photo 4 (leaders in the groups)
I noticed that there is a leader and vice leader for each Tribe. Can you explain?

For leaders: Does being a leader/vice leader help you learn? Can you explain?
Does being a leader help you want to learn? - Helps you keep going with that work, activity….

What do you like about being a leader? Not like?
Can you tell me a bit more about being a leader …?

For Tribe members: Does having a leader and a vice leader help you learn? Can you explain?
Does having a leader help you want to learn? - Helps you keep going with that work, activity….

Would you like to be a leader?
Can you tell me a bit more …?

(What sorts of things are good about working this way? Do you like working this way? How do you feel about working this way? Are there things that are not so good about working this way?)

5. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about learning in this classroom?

6. Show photos 5 and 6 (other classrooms)
I have some photos of other classrooms (different desk arrangements- in rows and groups). When students sit at their desk in this classroom, do you think they learn the same way as you do in this classroom? What do you think might be the same? What might be different?

What about this classroom?

End of interview
1. Here is a picture of your class this term. What sorts of things does the teacher do to help the children have a say in what happens in this class? Does it help? In what ways? Why does it help? In what ways does it not help? What else?

2. Here is a picture of Class Meetings last term and this term. Do Class Meetings help you have a say in what happens in class? In what ways? Why? Why not? Do you think the class uses Class Meetings better this term than earlier in the year? In what ways? Why? Why not? Anything else?

3. Here is a picture of Tribes making decisions about TMW and group leaders. What things help a group make a decision? In what ways? Why? What things get in the way of a group making a decision? In what ways? Why? Do you think the groups are more able to make decisions this term than earlier in the year?? In what ways? Why? Anything else?

4. Do you think having a leader and vice leader helps the group to get on with each other? In what ways? Why? Why not?

5. Do you think having a leader and vice leader helps the group make decisions? In what ways? Why? Why not?

6. How have you found being a leader or vice leader? or group member? What works? What doesn’t work? Why? What have you learned about yourself?

7. Does the teacher intervene in your group very often? Would you like the teacher to intervene more often? When does the teacher need to intervene? In what way? Why? Anything else?

8. Here are some zones. (refers to zone for working e.g. thinking zone, quiet zone) How do the zones work for you? Do you think they help your group? The class? In what ways? Why? Why not? Anything else?

9. Here is a photo of the class again. The class has been organised in different ways. Does the way the class or your group is organised make a difference to how you learn in this class? In what ways? Why?

10. What else do you think helps you learn in this class? Or makes it hard for you to learn? In what ways? Why?


End of interview
Student Interviews, Term 4, 2007

Name __________

Foci: perceived identity as a learner/leader and changing patterns of participation; characteristics of other leaders in the class. Use Y chart for Leadership and photos of all tribes, with leaders and vice leaders labelled

1. When you were a leader what behaviour or words did you use?

2. What parts were difficult for you to do?

3. How did being a leader change how you approached a problem with your friends?

4. What did you learn about making decisions?

5. What else did you learn as a leader?

6. How have things changed since the beginning of the year for:
   - Confidence
   - Joining in discussions
   - Anything else?

7. Describe that person

8. Describe that person

9. Do you think anyone can learn to be a leader?

10. Can you be a good leader if you do not have
   - Respect of your group members/friends?
   - Attentive listening
   - Doing your best

   Anything else about this class this year?

End of interview
Appendix 4 Parent Interviews (2007)

Parent Interviews, Term 4, 2007

1. How have you found this class this year?
2. Have you noticed any changes in your child over the year?
   - Confidence
   - Listening
   - Respecting others
   - Doing their best
   - Decision making
3. Any other changes? Positives? Negatives?
4. What kinds of things has your child told you about?
   - Being a leader
   - Gaining new friends
   - Social Circle
   - Class meeting
   - Tribes
   - Contributing
   - Rewards in class
5. Do you think your child has learned something about him/herself this year?

Anything else?

End of interview
### Appendix 5 Comparative Year 3 and Year 5 results for Writing

This table shows the WALNA Writing test results for a selection of students from the Year 5 research class which is compared to their Year 3 results. These tests were marked by examiners who were not teachers at the school and the data has been collated and analysed by a local university for the school. The students selected were at Educational Risk (SAER) or Talented and Gifted (TAGS) students. The expected increase in these scores over two years is 60 points for Bushlands. The mean score for this group of eight students is 182, well above the expected average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004 Year 5 Gender</th>
<th>2002 Year 3 Progress</th>
<th>2004 Year 5 Progress</th>
<th>Background social issues in the classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAER/TAGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 1- SAER</td>
<td>- 44</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>+ 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 2- SAER</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>+ 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 3- SAER#</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>+ 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 4- TAGS</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>+ 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 1- SAER</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>+ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 2- SAER</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>+ 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 3- SAER</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>+ 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 5- TAGS#</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>+ 173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Denotes two students who were case studies from the focal groups, examined in the research publications in Chapters 6-9.