



## ***APPENDICES***

| <b>List of Appendices</b>                                | <b>Pages</b> |
|--|--------------|
| A Interview Schedule                                     | 230-31       |
| B Transcript Extract                                     | 232-35       |
| C Examples of Memos                                      | 236-39       |
| D Set of Original Codes                                  | 240          |
| E Operational Definitions of Codes                       | 241-45       |
| F Summary of Coded Interview                             | 246-52       |
| G Matrix of Original Codes x Participants                | 253          |
| H Final Codes x Categories                               | 254          |
| I Code Folder Notes                                      | 255          |
| J Computerized Code File                                 | 256-57       |
| K Participant Interview x Codes                          | 258-61       |
| L Summary of Common Topics in code files                 | 262-67       |
| M Theme x Codes Grid: "Children as Social Learners"      | 268-71       |
| N Aggregation of sub-themes: "Teaching capable children" | 272-75       |
| O "A stronger role for children" theme grid              | 276-77       |
| P "More open planning and programming" theme grid        | 278-79       |
| Q The Impact of Reggio Emilia themes grid                | 280          |
| R The Influence of Reggio Emilia themes grid             | 281          |
| S Notes on Participants' workplaces                      | 282          |
| T Teaching in context themes grid                        | 283          |

## ***Appendix A***

### **Interview Schedule**

*The first questions are about your experience of Reggio Emilia. Later I'll ask about the context of your work.*

#### Part 1

How did you first hear about Reggio Emilia?

Have you done any workshops/courses/Study tour to Reggio Emilia?

Why did you decide to do the workshop/course/Study Tour?

At that time:

- What made an impression on you?
- What did you talk over with other people?
- Did you think about your working context?
- Did you think about your practice?
- Did anything make you uncomfortable?
- What other feelings can you remember from that time?

When you returned to work:

- Did you talk to anyone about Reggio Emilia? Who, and why these people? What did you tell them?

Apart from your participation in the RE-Search group, have you had any other exposure to Reggio Emilian ideas or practices?

Do you think your own ideas about early childhood education have changed as a result? What's changed?

Has your exposure to Reggio Emilian philosophy and practice strengthened any of your previous beliefs about what's important in early childhood education?

Are you trying to change your practice as a result of your exposure to Reggio Emilia?

What have you worked on/are you working on? How are you going about this?

Are there ideas or practices from Reggio Emilia that you think about now?

Are there things you think about because you feel uncertain about them?

Are your efforts visible to anyone else? How do you know?

Are there other things about what you do and how you do it, which you would change if you could? Do you think these are achievable? Why/not?

How would you characterize your feelings now about your encounter with Reggio Emilia?

*I would like to move the focus now from your ideas about your practice to your ideas about the context in which you work.*

## Part 2

How do you see your work context in comparison to the context that Reggio Emilian educators work in?

Has Reggio Emilia had an influence on how you perceive your centre and how it works?

If you had a magic wand and could jump five years what would you want to be different about your centre and how it works? Is this achievable?

If you had an extra hour a day what would you do with it?

Do you think Reggio Emilia will have a lasting impact on early childhood education in NSW/Victoria? Why/not?



**Appendix B**

**Transcript Extract**

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| CB | Mm, what appeals to you about the ideas you got exposed to in RE?   |   |
|    | What appeals to me is um making our teaching more child-centred, that appeals to me. I like that idea when they said we have two ears and only one mouth, so therefore we need we need to listen more. Um I like the idea of the chn had a solid time to explore a project of their choice. I was amazed, I sat and watched a child in one of the centres who was four maybe five years of age and he was working with design.  | Impression  |
| 04 | And he was then working in the sand try to make that design with out of shells and beads and whatever and he was engrossed in that activity and I sort of came in and out as he was doing it, looking at different things. And for the half an hour I was there he was totally engrossed in that project which um is I suppose foreign to us in some ways because we've always had this belief, whether it came from college or wherever it was that chn have a very short attention span but to see someone a child of four of five you know the younger they are the shorter it is, | Context comparison<br><br>Existing belief           |
| CB | Mm  |   |
| 04 | You know these kinds of things, these beliefs and theories you carry with you, you get from who knows where um and when you see a child engrossed in a project of his choosing. He was engrossed in that for half an hour he had planned it and he was doing it, I was really impressed with that. So the listening the choice of of projects, the idea of teachers getting together at the end of the day and talking about you know, every day talking about what they had done in the classroom and there was nothing wrong with conflict.   | Existing belief<br><br>Impression<br><br>Impression |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 04 | <p>I think we tend to shy away from conflict and that's seen as a bad thing whereas that, that's where learning happens and change happens I think too. And that was a very important part of their meeting can change and then moving on in terms of their learning. That really impressed me that there was this commitment to lifelong learning. They were also lifelong learners. One of the sessions that we went to and I think I went to the one on catness, um they were there to present to us, what they had done in the project and also the slides and everything they had there as well and they were sitting there taking notes on us. Someone actually commented on it "they're taking notes on us!" And they said we're here to learn from you as well. So you know there's, there's this constant you know that belief and the chn know that they're going off to meetings too and they are going to learn and so on. I like the idea of the atelier. The atelier was almost, um, a combination of a science room and an art room and um in some it was you know quite obvious it was very much an art room but in others you would see a very heavy emphasis on a collection of mushroom shells and whatever it might be. I like that idea and that they could, a small group could go and actually explore their project or develop their project a lot further in the atelier. But importantly they were also taught the skills of how to um there was a teaching component in teaching the skills of how to use a particular tool or whatever that might be. And those chn were very aware of how to use the different implements that they had available to them.</p> | <p>Context analysis</p> <p>Belief statement</p> <p>Impression</p> <p>Impression</p> <p>Impression</p> <p>RE definition</p> <p>Impression</p> |
| 04 | <p>I liked the idea of the class travelling with that teacher for 3 years. Um in a primary classroom you spend a term getting to know them, making them feel like a group and working together And that last six months is really enjoyable and then you have to hand them on to someone else and that can be very frustrating</p>  | <p>Impression</p> <p>Context analysis</p>  |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 04 | because you know, often you have all this information that you have collected over a year and you give it to the next group's teacher and they can't appreciate what you have, what a child you know, has achieved. They can appreciate it on paper but they don't necessarily appreciate everything else that happens whereas you do and you know how far that child has come you know, in a broader sense.   | Impression<br>rationale<br><br>Context analysis   |
| CB | Mm   |   |
| 04 | And so they're handing on the next year. I would really like to try you know having a group for two years. I know they're trying it at (former school). They've gone a fair way to really get to know chn very, very well and not have this problem that you know they walk in, and particularly at (present school) they get mixed around every year and essentially they might have one or two (tape slide). Some of them are quite terrified at the beginning of every year. You know there's this sort of you know, drop back. Particularly you see it in their reading. You know they've got to a stage in their reading at the end of the year and then at the beginning of the year..(slide) I think Reggio there's more questions than answers and (phone rings, tape stopped) | Practice aim<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Impression<br>rationale<br><br><br>RE definition    |
| CB | So you were talking about ideas that appealed to you or things that appealed to you in Reggio.   |   |
| 04 | I like the idea of bringing the day together for the chn. In one of the centres, it was interesting even though they essentially had this philosophy, centres could be you know some of them were not extremely different but you know were different. (Slide) That sheet outside and the communication with parents and sitting down with the chn and planning the day. I'm probably doing the planning you know the planning is coming from my own planning at the moment and I probably need to ... So I like that idea of looking at the day and what we were doing how it related to the day before trying to consolidate their learning a lot more and then reflecting at the end of the day.  | Impression<br><br><br><br><br><br>Impression<br><br>Practice analysis<br><br><br>Impression |



|    |  |                  |
|----|--|------------------|
| 04 | I also went to Reggio thinking that um I hadn't done a lot of reading about Reggio prior to that. Much of it was from (colleague) and um you know, what she had. I took ' <i>The one hundred languages</i> ' with me on the plane but I never got to read it (laughs)  | Pursuit          |
| CB | Was that informal kind of chatting with staff members that she did or was there some kind of formal presentation or workshop that she did?   |                  |
| 04 | There was a formal presentation to staff and then after that because it was a very small section of the school the prep-2/3 section which was wonderful. I think smaller centres are just sensational. Coming from that to (present school) its just huge. Really I mean that was another mind blowing thing.  | Context analysis |
| 04 | Yeah in a smaller setting you were able to do that cause you talked about it over lunch you talked about it over morning tea, very much a context that was very conducive to that sharing of ideas. And we had meetings every week where you know things might come up at the meeting, it wasn't sort of planned, things might come up or (colleague) might say what she'd seen. What was I talking about? | Context analysis |



## Appendix C

### Examples of memos

18/4/99

- Finalised the chopping up of interviews and filing into codes folders. Changed some coding decisions as I went.
- The tally marking of code occurrences by interview shows that most codes are common to all participants but some are limited to one or two interviews only.
- Will need to decide what to do with these – perhaps they'll get amalgamated into others. Eg: 7-Doubt becomes an exception to 3-Existing beliefs; 13-Engagement is one only of the many 12-Criteria of Success; 6-Strengthened belief is an example of 7-Confirmed belief; And so on
- Criteria of success continues to bug me as a code name. It's more about the ideas or concepts they value positively.
- Began the process of looking at the folders, deciding to start with those in the *Leftovers* category. (After the codes were allocated to the 5 questions). These 5 seemed to me to represent the participants own perceptions, they were the most descriptive of the codes, whereas the *Leftovers* of Category 6 seemed to me to be more my perceptions and definitions of what they were talking about, rather than theirs stated fairly directly.
- Began with *34-Practice Analysis* with the intention of going then to *Criteria of Success*. See *individual code files* for notes on analysis.

22/4/99

As the cut up and file into 44 folders proceeded it became clear that there were very few overlaps from 01-08 in the topics mentioned in each code. The much more typical pattern was separate topics. This induced a panic as in I thought there were no themes. Then I thought maybe I've identified the themes already – in the codes, at least the ones with representation from all participants. Eg everybody *analysed their practice* to some extent though the topics varied. I also noticed that the analysis of *34-Practice analysis* was related to the things they mentioned in other codes such as *21-Influence*; *19-Impression*; and *1-Adaptation*.

- See *Code 34* document for detailed notes.

24/4/99

It occurred to me I should verify my feeling about the non-commonality of topics in the codes. So decided to go through each code and identify the common topics. Maybe they recur in different codes?

26/4/99

- this is giving me a better overall sense but opening questions that need answers. It now seems apparent that I have to re read the transcripts for particular practices eg documentation, collaboration etc. They may not be identified specifically as changes to practice but are nevertheless being mentioned.
- The practice codes need to be pulled together to get a better idea of the topics covered by each p.
- The systematic analysis I did of Code 34: Practice analysis seems to show relationships to influences and impressions as well as demonstrating 'searching for meaning'. But this type of analysis – looking for connections with other codes seems nebulous. I can't work out how to relate looking for topic connections, looking across participants and looking for process connections.

30/4/99

Identified the topics within codes that were common across participants. See summary document *Topics in Codes*. Combined some codes in doing this. This eliminated 10 codes, so I'm down to 34. I need to finish the systematic analysis within each code as what I've got so far is an overview.

Tried another approach to see what's there. Took one participant 08 and tried to map at least the codes that relate to thinking by laying codes 4 to a page (2 pages) and tracing connections. With 7 codes I then added *practice change* and *starting point* putting in topics in these codes. Its quite coherent but this participant was impressive analytically. The column layout would be better as boxes on a big page I think. There's also a lot of codes not covered but maybe it could be done by participant by question.

Now totally confused as to how to proceed. Some possibilities:

- Finish the code folders analysis, looking for common threads in topics at a more generalized level, but then what?

- Try and trace the connections between the five questions for each participant, given the absence of uniformity. The write up would then be more about each person's way of connecting to RE and to their own context.
- Code the transcripts for RE concepts eg image, documentation, projects etc. and use this in the analysis of their practice.
- What happens to the current codes – i.e. is there any significance in the fact that they all analyse their practice, talk about themselves, ask questions. The commonality is in the process not the content.

*30 July 99*

- Finished the summaries of each participant's ideas for each code relevant to Q2, and eliminated a couple more codes. Down to 31 now.
- Needed to look for themes across all the thinking codes as a group. This proved hard going until I realized I didn't need to account for each piece of data here. A summary of each participant could absorb the ideas that were all over the cactus.

I also kept trying to make it mean something as a whole and it wouldn't. I kept looking for patterns that weren't there until I realized the patterns lie at another level of analysis. I now think I need three levels of analysis before it makes sense:

- The common themes across participants
- The individual profiles of participants responses including my analysis of their responses to specific Reggio concepts.
- Possible groupings in the profiles to account for differences in responses and similarities in themes

The difficulty with process vs content codes continues. This may become clearer when I write the individual profiles and track people's analyses that way.

The other conceptual difficulty is going to be divorcing philosophical thinking from thinking about practice. I have a code called influence analysis and one called practice analysis, but the links need exploring.

10/11/99

*Some outcomes of analysis: possible framework of findings*

### **Providence and pursuit**

- Diversity of reasons for initial encounter
- Strong reactions
- Common stance against duplication
- Continued pursuit

### **Personal context: connecting the RE experience with personal/professional selves**

- Diverse connections to the past
- Diversity of perceptions of growth
- Blending the personal and professional

### **Philosophical context**

- Perceptions of RE as provocation (challenge & questioning) or confirmation
- Diverse philosophical connections: doubt, void, alignment and consistency
- Themes of influence: aesthetics, the capable child, social learning
- Diverse impressions and influence: Changed pedagogical beliefs and unaltered precepts

### **Practical context**

- Themes of influence: environment, projects, documentation, parents
- Connections to place: considerations of classroom, system and socio-cultural contexts
- Diverse practical connections: reconstructions of practice mediated by pedagogy and place

### **Projection**

- Connections to context of the future: diverse goals; perceived constraints; continued pursuit



***Appendix D***  
**Set of Original Codes**

| Code No. | Code Name              | Code No. | Code Name                   |
|----------|------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| 1        | Adaptation             | 23       | Influence analysis          |
| 2        | Bridging               | 24       | Lasting value               |
| 3        | Belief: Existing       | 25       | Metaphor                    |
| 4        | Belief: Changed        | 26       | Philosophical statement     |
| 5        | Belief: Confirmed      | 27       | Philosophical comparison    |
| 6        | Belief: Strengthened   | 28       | Philosophical analysis      |
| 7        | Doubt/concern          | 29       | Practice: Existing          |
| 8        | Context issue          | 30       | Practice: Changed           |
| 9        | Context comparison     | 31       | Practice: Confirmed         |
| 10       | Context analysis       | 32       | Starting Point              |
| 11       | Intra-context analysis | 33       | Practice aim                |
| 12       | Criteria of success    | 34       | Practice analysis           |
| 13       | Engagement             | 35       | Pursuit                     |
| 14       | Feedback: Children     | 36       | Question                    |
| 15       | Feedback: Parents      | 37       | Question: resolved          |
| 16       | Feedback: Staff        | 38       | Reggio Emilia: definition   |
| 17       | Feedback: Management   | 39       | Reggio Emilia: significance |
| 18       | Feedback Loop          | 40       | Response                    |
| 19       | Impression             | 41       | Self analysis               |
| 20       | Impression rationale   | 42       | Story                       |
| 21       | Influence              | 43       | Visibility                  |
| 22       | Concern                | 44       | Vision/Goal                 |



## ***Appendix E***

### **Operational Definitions of Codes**

**1    Adaptation**

Participants' beliefs about transferring Reggio philosophy or practice to another context. Includes ideas about duplication.

**2    Bridging**

Participant makes a direct connection between an impression, influence or some other impact code and something in her self analysis. In the former case the participant may be analysing the process of making sense of RE enough to get started.

**3    Belief: Existing**

Philosophical belief identified by participant as predating the experience of Reggio Emilia

**4    Belief: Changed**

Philosophical concept identified by participants as being modified by the Reggio experience.

**5    Belief: Confirmed**

Philosophical concept identified by participant as existing before the encounter with Reggio and being maintained after it.

**6    Belief Strengthened**

Philosophical concept identified by participant as existing before the encounter with Reggio and being strengthened by it. Some are identified as being strengthened

**7 Doubt/concern**

An idea or practice which bothers the participant. May predate Reggio or be an aspect of Reggio identified by participant as a concern.

**8 Contextual Issue**

An aspect of own or Reggio Emilian context that is an issue for the participant

**9 Context Comparison**

Similarities and differences between own working context and RE, directly identified by participants. Observable rather than interpretive.

**10 Context analysis**

Participant perception or interpretation of some aspect of the context of work. May or may not be directly comparative with Reggio.

**11 Intra-context analysis**

Non-comparative analysis. Participant is interpreting within her specific workplace

**12 Criteria of Success**

Valued outcomes which are described in the context of evaluative comment or review

**13 Engagement** (sub code of criteria of success)

Chn's intense involvement in play vs window shopping

**14-17 Feedback: Children; parents; staff; management**

Participant report of verbal or behavioural responses to practice changes or to philosophical information.

**18 Feedback Loop**

Participants articulate a connection between feedback or visibility and further or continuing practice change or confirming belief. Sometimes mediated by emotional response eg excitement

**19 Impression**

Participants' descriptions of aspects of Reggio Emilian philosophy and or practice which attracted or impressed them. RE terms are often used.

**20 Impression rationale**

Participant offers a reason for the attraction

**21 Influence**

Participant perception of impact of Reggio. A connection is made directly between Reggio and a statement of effect. Can make connection by reference to time or causation. (eg wouldn't have thought of that before). It may be made with or without a statement of value by participant. A change is therefore implied rather than stated.

**22 Concern**

An aspect of the experience of Reggio Emilia that is not totally positive or is troubling

**23 Influence analysis**

Participant gives a rationale for the impact of Reggio, or an insight into the process of this influencing.

**24 Lasting Value**

Participants' rationale for belief in the lasting impact of RE.

**25 Metaphor**

Expression used by participant. Meaning and metaphor both vary by participant.

**26 Philosophical statement**

An isolated idea ie it's not possible to determine what the participant thinks of the idea, its merely stated.

**27 Philosophical comparison**

Participant juxtaposes philosophers/theorists or philosophical concepts. May interpret this juxtaposition

**28 Philosophical analysis**

Participant perception or interpretation of a philosophical concept. May or may not be Reggio Emilian in origin

**29 Existing practice**

Description of practice(s) that predate exposure to Reggio Emilia

**30 Practice change**

Current practice which was introduced after or consequent to the encounter with Reggio Emilia; Previous practice which was discontinued after or consequent to the encounter with RE.

**31 Confirmed Practice**

Current practice that predates and postdates the Reggio experience and participant perceives to be validated by it

**32 Starting Point**

The first change to practice

**33 Practice aim**

Participant identifies a desired, post-Reggio change to practice, yet to be introduced, or to be further developed.

**34 Practice analysis**

Participant identifies a specific aspect of her own practice which is being examined in some way. Usually in post-Reggio context.

**35 Pursuit**

Action taken by participants after hearing about RE, in pursuit of more information.

**36 Questions**

Queries identified by participants as being consequent to their exposure to Reggio. They may be philosophical or practice related. They may be identified

as being pursued by the participant in their practice or they may articulate some conceptual confusion.

**37 Questions Resolved**

Participant identifies a rationale for a satisfactory resolution to a matter coded as 36

**38 RE definition**

Participant's description or definition of aspect(s) of Reggio Emilian pedagogy. rather than

**39 RE significance**

Participant ascribes meaning to aspect(s) of Reggio Emilian pedagogy

**40 Response**

Descriptions by participants of their reactions to their encounter with Reggio Emilia

**41 Self analysis**

Participants' statement about themselves and/or their experiences. Perceptions of feelings (not coded elsewhere), personality, teaching style, personal / professional experience etc.

**42 Story**

Participant narrative of events and often with quoted dialogue. Descriptions only; not otherwise coded

**43 Visibility**

A term for interpreted feedback: participant interpretation of others' verbal or behavioural responses, to changes made or related information given

**44 Vision/goals**

Broad intentions for the future identified by participants. Relates to philosophy as well as practice



## **Appendix F**

### **Summary of Coded Interview**

02

*“(It) just started sitting with me”*

B’s first exposure to the philosophy of RE occurred at a one-off workshop. As with the other teachers interviewed this was not her only exposure. She attended two annual weekend University seminars and then subsequently a four session course. Her pursuit of RE up to the point in time where *it’s almost steamrolled* might be characterized as an open-minded monitoring. She read articles, though not the book, attended seminars, thinking it *interesting* and even *really exciting*, but for B *nothing else happened - I didn’t take anything into my teaching (1/1)*. The crucial change occurred when this interest began to affect her practice. Prior to this she felt *it obviously sowed the seeds*, but she *couldn’t grasp anything at all*

She was nevertheless drawn on in her pursuit and recalled being impressed by the beauty, the engagement and work of the children and the approach to teaching she described as *looking at positives and working from there (2/14)*. B also recalled encountering the idea of interdependence, *a word I’ve used myself for a very long time*. She characterized it as *chn asking and working with each other and adults* specifically demarcating this idea from the notion of independence. However, the most powerful encounter in this pursuit *the thing that got me more than anything was ...the images of chn (2/2)*. B reported embracing this *quickly and readily* and attributed this effect at least in part to her own personality *I’m not cutesy*.

Such self analysis peppered the interview. B used it with personal narrative to explain her pursuit of Reggio and her starting point of change, albeit delayed.

B saw herself as someone who likes the challenge of ideas but doesn’t rush, preferring to think a lot, to question and debate with herself before changing her opinions. She nevertheless sees herself as someone who is willing to change her views, being interested in different viewpoints and interpretations. As part of the

challenge of intellectual openness, she recognizes the necessity of persistence and is willing to read again and again to achieve understanding.

Her pursuit of RE philosophy called forth this persistence but while B found it *intriguing* she also felt *as if I had nothing to grip hold of*. She felt it took time for understanding to develop. She characterized the process as ideas *that just started sitting with me, that made sense, that felt comfortable with me* (2/2). She also perceived a turning point in this process, her receipt of a *loan of knowledge*. She had questioned where to start in using RE ideas and was told, *to look at philosophy*. She found this *loan of knowledge* helpful because

*I need someone to put me on the right track and then I'm fine...cause that's how I learn, none of this discovery learning business! (2/13)*

B explained that the RE idea of the image of the child and the questions posed by Robertson (1997) about the contextualised images of children held within early childhood practice in this country, has *been the basis of myself looking at Reggio and my feelings of philosophy* (2/13).

Thinking analytically was not new to B. She made specific references to a range of 20th century approaches and discussed the beliefs she held prior to her pursuit of RE ideas. She described theoretically, philosophically and personally her rationales for accepting or rejecting ideas and illustrated her beliefs through discussions of specific curricula, such as music, literature and writing.

B had already firmly rejected thematic planning..

*So if they're interested, say in caterpillars, you move like caterpillars, so you draw, do paintings of caterpillars, all that sort of stuff. I've never, never been involved with that. (2/10)*

She cited Katz' "project approach" as an influence and concluded that pre-Reggio, the emergent curriculum was kind of in there without totally being in there (2/3) and believed this type of curriculum fits with me as a person. She rejected the 'set program' she viewed repeatedly while a student, believing the programs she saw lacked variety as well as teacher input and failed to reflect children's interests. She described as a revelation the realization that she didn't have to teach that way.



B operated a music program, process writing under contract and explored genre in literature with children rather than following a thematic approach to stories. B saw Kodaly as too structured while critiquing music programs she saw as a student as lacking in extension and development. She described her own music program as developmental and child-centred. She thought learning to write requires play and exploration and the recognition and nurturance of children's writing. She believed the process writing approach allowed children to function at their own level.

She had some time ago stopped writing specific objectives and rejected the use of checklists as regimented, based in a deficit model and therefore a waste of time. She believed that exposure to RE had confirmed her ideas about the capabilities of children and her doubts about her training with its

*focus on the individual, you plan for the individual, and its not like that in reality (2/2)*

Like the other participants in this study, B believed RE influenced her to question her ideas and practices. She felt that the way she works with children has probably not been affected much but thought *in my programming, definitely (2/3)*. In the interview B described several projects in great detail but then analysed the practice described, to highlight the significance of changes to her *way of teaching* post Reggio. Much of this change centred on project work.

B felt she maintained a problem solving orientation but the emphasis had changed to *the long-termness of them and throwing it back to the chn (2/4)*. She was asking children what they knew and wanted to know and provoking them to pose their own problems and ways to find solutions rather than providing answers. B characterized this as *working through the issues with the children* in contrast to *teacher input coming in (2/3)*. She felt she was being less superficial in *really looking at what they're interested in* and *really listening*. She expanded her pre-Reggio practice of using clipboards for observational drawing into indoor project work and introduced documentation. Her documentation served a dual purpose in capturing children's ideas and revealing projects to parents as they develop.

B was now recording children's conversations and using photographs as communicative tools with parents about projects but was playing around with ideas for expanding documentation for parents. In contrast she felt *the recording I'm doing*

*for programming is sitting all right with me at the moment (2/10)*, having incorporated changes to emphasize interpretation and evaluation rather than preplanning. She felt this made her recording more open and broad.

Another major change was occurring with the environment. Partly because *some major things needed doing anyway (2/21)*, carpet, curtains and collage trolley have gone. Shelving for art materials and clay will arrive and the practice of rotation of equipment is to stop. B sees the perspectives of aesthetics, of cutting down work and of accessibility of materials to children as those that have informed the decision making regarding environment change.

The process of changing practice created uncertainty for B, but she was comfortable with her own questions. As well as wondering about a starting point for using RE ideas in her practice, she also questioned when projects should end. She continued to question the hegemony of objectives in recording. B felt some unease about the pace of changes to her indoor environment and wondered about her expectations of staff in the changes she was making and the aims she had.

Expectations of children also surfaced as questions. B explored aloud in the interview some philosophical contradictions. She explored the relationship between adult expectation and child choice. In the process she compared her own expectations of children with those evident in RE. She explored this in relation to practice in a project and also in relation to contract writing.

*I don't know if its so much from Reggio, but I mean it basically is to a degree, its got that institutional value to it I s'pose, of you know, under contract you're expected to do it ... it just conflicts a little bit with um, child choice because it is imposed, even though there's child choice in it, its an expectation that is imposed. I've not thought about all of this really before because I feel in Reggio, um, that the teachers will impose too. So I'm going to go away and think about all this (2/30).*

B recognized that in project work she expected children to represent their knowledge but child choice was less of an issue when it came to selection of projects. Here interest and thus choice, were paramount. Though she had deliberately grouped three children specifically on one occasion, B has not repeated this practice believing that interest based grouping is necessary to *hold the children (2/35)* through a project.

*B interprets parents' responses to projects and other changes as positive and very motivating. She believes the parents have embraced it and what's happening (2/25) and attributes this partly to her documentation. She sees the parents as interested in what the children are doing and able to discern 'the academic' in projects as well as in her writing program. Photocopying documentation, giving a roll of film to B with thanks, citing the use of child choice strategies at home and other direct comments confirm the parents' interest for B.*

She had also received a lot of positive comments from parents about the environment and this produced an effect on her motivation as well. She reported that it induced a heightened sense of responsibility to make it good!

She also found children's responses motivating. B believes the children are debating more with each other and is encouraged by children doing work on projects at home and bringing it in.

However, B found staff responses more problematic. She reported conflict with staff over some environmental changes and disagreement over philosophy. She saw 'the image of the child' and negative views of children's competence as one site of conflict and time demands of documentation as another. B perceived her teacher colleague as having *this barrier up (2/25)* and contrasted her own preference for

*someone throwing questions like that at me than someone saying 'no I've gotta keep doing check lists' and not be open to discussions (2/29)*

B also speculated that this staff member might feel under pressure and others might be feeling threatened. She attributed a management committee suggestion to not mention the word 'Reggio' again, as a reflection of this conflict rather than lack of support from this quarter. B felt that management supported the changes to the environment and her interest in Reggio but she noted that she went outside her employer organization for informed support.

B's speculation about staff comfort levels ranged across both changes already made and her aims for the future. However, while she found staff responses disappointing and adjusted the pace of debate and change accordingly, the direction of change remained.

B intended to continue minimizing the physical setting up work in the environment but looked forward to evaluating the changes and their impact. She also intended to

continue the discussions with staff, to keep debate over centre philosophy going, but focus meetings more effectively.

With the transfer of the centre's other teacher B stated her fears about a new unknown staff member and speculated on her desire for collaboration. She suggested it would be nice to work with someone in relation to the environment, hoped the new teacher has *a passion for teaching* and was open to discussion about practice. But she was prepared to work around these possibilities not eventuating.

She believed that she could overcome the injunction to not mention Reggio by having separate newsletters and meetings for parents of each group. She had specific ideas for future practice with her parents. B attributed to the influence of RE her desire for

*open communication but them talking to me as much as me talking to them (2/32)*

She envisaged two way interactions with parents in interviews and had begun to seek written information about parents' goals and expectations for their children. She wanted parent input in the recording of observations and the documentation of developmental records. And she intended to continue documenting 'highlights' for parents and to increase the accessibility of the documentation of projects for families.

Finally, B was curious about how RE might influence her music program and, intended to continue process writing but incorporate it *more within the program* particularly through project work. She saw this intended route with her literacy curriculum as *more natural (2/30)*. She also looked forward to observing children's reactions to the introduction of a word processor and printer.

B described her overall approach to the current and future impact of RE on her practice in terms of exploration. She stated that with any new ideas, she *won't just do it*; preferring deliberation, thinking and debate with herself. She thought that as she doesn't know Italian culture she needs to take the ideas, look at them, discuss them with staff. Using her own judgement is the crucial factor.

Her thinking about her literacy curriculum illustrated this. In B's view, contract writing *isn't very Reggio* but she believed this didn't matter because

*I'm still exploring. I'm not hung up on Reggio, this has got to be done the Reggio way, its just made me question. (2/30)*

This deliberative approach considered contextual issues. B perceived historical and cultural differences between her own context and that of RE. *The incredible social mix*, the multicultural backgrounds of staff had an impact in her centre, and she took advantage of the outside environment noting the impression that this was not a big focus in RE.

B also felt that the evolution of practice and support in RE contrasted with her own experience of isolation where the organization was willing to support her but lacked the expertise. This was particularly an issue with the indoor environment. She thought that preschool environments she'd seen were all the same so new ideas were not abundantly available.

She believed that she'd read a lot and was taking on *what I feel I can* given the isolation and lack of support she felt. This deliberative approach not only took into account the contextual possibilities but was also clearly guided by her beliefs. These were very clear in her assessment of some project work emanating from the US and influenced by Reggio.

*I don't think the Americans got it...they were the most wishy-washy projects...there was no challenge of the children. It wasn't extending their thinking. It wasn't treating the children as really capable (2/19).*

## ***Appendix G***

### **Matrix of Original Codes x Participants**



## Appendix H

### Final Codes x Categories

| <b>Exposure</b>      |                          |                 |                              |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 1                    | Adaptation               |                 |                              |
| 35                   | Pursuit                  |                 |                              |
| 40                   | Response                 |                 |                              |
|                      |                          |                 |                              |
| <b>Thinking</b>      |                          | <b>Practice</b> |                              |
| 3                    | Existing Belief          | 29              | Existing practice            |
| 4                    | Changed Belief           | 32              | Starting point               |
| 5                    | Confirmed belief         | 30              | Changed / confirmed practice |
| 21                   | Influence                | 33              | Practice aims                |
| 23                   | Influence analysis       | 44              | Vision/goals                 |
| 19                   | Impression               |                 |                              |
| 26                   | Philosophical statement  |                 |                              |
| 27                   | Philosophical comparison |                 |                              |
| 36                   | Questions                |                 |                              |
| 12                   | Criteria of Success      |                 |                              |
| 34 Practice analysis |                          |                 |                              |
|                      |                          |                 |                              |
| <b>Context</b>       |                          | <b>Other</b>    |                              |
| 9                    | Context comparison       | 41              | Self analysis                |
| 10                   | Context analysis         | 24              | Lasting Value                |
| 11                   | Intra-context analysis   | 42              | Story                        |
| 14                   | Feedback: children       | 25              | Metaphor                     |
| 15                   | Feedback: parents        |                 |                              |
| 16                   | Feedback: staff          |                 |                              |
| 17                   | Feedback management      |                 |                              |



## ***Appendix I***

### **Code Folder Notes**



## ***Appendix J***

### **Computerized Code File**

#### **Code 36: Questions**

##### **Definition**

*Queries identified by participants as being consequent to their exposure to Reggio. They may be philosophical or practice related. They may be identified as being pursued by the participant in their practice or they may articulate some conceptual confusion.*

##### **01**

- Is individual lost in emphasis on the group? (1/3)
- How to: re parents: participation; feel welcome, communicate values and practices; communicate through language barrier? (1/10)

##### **02**

- Starting point (2/1)
- Institutional expectations of chn (2/30)
- Use of objectives (2/18)
- Ending projects (2/15)
- Pace of changes to environment (2/11)
- Expectations of staff by teacher (2/16)

##### **03**

- Collaboration and 'the quiet child' (3/7)
- Difference between pursuit of security and of interest (3/7)
- Compare written philosophies (3/18)
- How to start? *Resolved*: already started (3/6)

##### **04**

- Teaching practices re chn showing understanding of text (4/31); re chn having to cross contexts (4/18); re handraising & chn managing group interactions and role of teacher (4/18) re managing resources for creativity of chn and teacher; promote chn's theorizing (4/6)
- How to appeal to senses? (4/6)
- Conflict and cultural difference (4/22 & 23) Always been fluffy (4/23)
- Chn's superficiality: is it cultural? Chn's difficulty with reflection: is it fractured timetabling? (4/4)
- What would Reggio think? (4/19)
- Source of parental interest: declaration of lifelong learning approach? (4/27)
- Adult input in chn's work? (4/19)

## 05

- chn's independence and mothering (5/13)
- Is it Reggio? (5/6) *Resolved*: doesn't matter different culture (5/6)
- Starting point (5/6 & 36)
- Planning & regulations? (5/25) How to: Planning & chn's interests?(5/11)  
*Resolved*: need planning for well balanced curriculum (5/11)
- Project hypotheses? (5/11)
- How to implement philosophies? (5/11)
- Interests, industriousness and outdoors? (5/32)
- Do chn draw to a formula? (5/24)

## 06

- Leadership and staff relations (6/26)

## 07

- Own practice and child's social knowledge? (7/12)
- Are we researchers working with chn's ideas? (7/13)
- Are we making learning visible to parents? (7/13)
- What culture am I passing on? (7/1) *Resolved*: Less integrity, superficiality vs depth (7/1)

## 08

- Where will project come from? (8/16)
- Teaching practices: when to teach didactically? When/how to scaffold? (8/7)
- Is there a curriculum in K? (8/20)
- Using situations to pose problems? (8/8)



## **Appendix K**

### **Participant Interview x Codes**

**08**

*(If) "education was a tree, Reggio Emilia knew how to feed the roots (but) in Australia we throw everything at the leaves" (8/27)*

#### **Exposure**

08 subscribed to the RE Information Exchange - Australian newsletter for two years, attended a 1day course, a six session course in May 96 and then at the instigation of 07 went to first RE Winter Institute in 97.

#### **Adaptation**

- It's a science program. They use the arts to develop the knowledge base to prove or disprove the hypothesis (8/13)
- US not been influenced by it, they'd copied it (8/20)
- Advertising a Reggio approach – *none of them do and none of them ever will. We are not Reggio we'll never have it. It's like a gestalt. We will never have all the pieces, we will have some of the pieces, maybe we just take the pieces that are really valuable for us. And do we really want to copy them? Don't we really want something that's uniquely ours?* (8/31)

#### **Impression**

- struck by philosophy; (8/2)
- wonderful sense of respect (8/4 & 6) integrity and respect
- social democracy in centres and community (8/6) valuing of freedom of speech and thought (8/7)
- sense of belonging to the community and pride (8/7)
- deep awareness (8/13)
- aesthetics; plainness (8/4)
- teachers belief in chn (8/1) in chn's abilities to do things for themselves (8/1)
- image like Montessori, rich strong powerful (8/2)
- sense of design, simple, practical design (8/4)
- education begins at birth (8/4)
- collaboration; creativity (presentation) (8/13)
- collaboration from birth (8/4)
- alphabet letters for babies; communication table for toddlers (8/5)
- atelier, materials visible, practically accessible (8/4)
- questioning (8/8)
- powerful ladies (8/11)

## **Belief**

- chn empathic
- created the selfish society – focus on individual child
- confirmed 08
- chn empathic
- belief in chn's capabilities
- consult & discuss with chn
- RE confirmed rather than changed ideas
- Strengthened importance of explaining to parents significance of teachers and chn's actions
- Chn not teacher as focus

## **Changed**

- scaffolding rather than withholding information about skills of drawing;
- chn & collaboration: more ideas and more interesting for everyone

## **Phil. Statement.**

- care and education inseparable

## **Phil. Comp.**

- links **Impression: image** and **own history** to Montessori. Compares Montessori (start from concrete to abstract) to RE project. Perceives RE as more in-depth; saw Montessori 'cycle of activity' in RE; cites Carlina citing Montessori: never teach what a child can learn, as compatible with own philosophy. Montessori critiqued for lack of creativity; Steiner for being too method driven but creative
- perceives RE as taking best from both and combining.
- Compares Forman with "our thinking" as closer to RE, perceives cognitive constructionism as 'fits very nicely'.

## **Practice aim:**

- read more Gardiner, Dewey, Vygotsky.

## **Influence**

- question everything you do; we didn't really question & evaluate (8/9 &31)
- read philosophers/theorists (8/34)
- look of environment; accessible materials (8/4)

**Concern:** adult produced puppetry vs chn's own work (8/11)

**Concern:** not seen much outdoors at RE (8/34)

## **Questions**

- Where will project come from? (8/16)
- Teaching practices: when to teach didactically? When/how to scaffold? (8/7)

- Is there a curriculum in K? (8/20)
- Using situations to pose problems? (8/8)

### Self analysis

- lack of own knowledge & skills: felt dumb (8/10)
- connects practice change: projects to feeling: fear of not finding the next one and personal quality: need to understand

### Practice analysis

- relates to **Influence**: RE as standard;
- Projects and events-driven programming;
- Philosophy permeating practice: empathy, friendships

### Practice change

- No existing practice
- **SP**: read for two years hadn't done anything (8/3) ; started with envt, from necessity (8/15) open shelving; accessible to chn from more than one direction(8/4); doors white for shadow screens; create entrance foyer; chn's photos in portable frames; 2 mirrors in corners to see things from more than one perspective; set it up as open-ended as possible (8/15) looks fairly plain by comparsion (8/21)
- Changed way I questioned or gave information (8/8); took advantage of opportunities to pose problems; *wouldn't have thought about it before* (8/8)
- Much more drawing, revisiting during projects eg goldfish *more than thirty times now in different ways. They've produced it in clay and the difference between the first and the latest drawings is just astounding.* (8/10)
- Two chn painting (8/30)

### Criteria of success

- no apparent connections to other codes
- relevance to chn of events
- chn as focus, as instigators; teacher role to question

### Feedback

- chn using observation skills, huge difference in thinking (8/10)
- parents: gave talk to parents, enthusiastic and supportive, understood about paintings coming home, right about selfish society (8/12)
- colleagues *we have to get back to the curriculum* , one teacher interested and pursued books (8/13)
- excitement when see chn doing wonderful things, reinforces what I believe (8/10) makes me feel this is the way, this is what we should be doing



## Context

- Babies not isolated like here (8/4)
- Introduction of written language early as one of 100 languages; infant typewriter, communication table –something we had totally missed. (8/5)
- Staffing and funding (8/11); fewer resources being put into ec here (8/27); wrong priorities remedial rt ec (8/27)
- Influenced by cultural diversity society richer, we're still trying to find our culture and history everybody comes back from RE and starts looking for it. Our chn can think practically, we're optimistic and materialistic which interferes with parenting (8/29)
- Learn from atelieristas skill wise (8/11)
- They teach trust, we teach mistrust; regs making it worse – chn not taught to be independent, just taught you can't be trusted to do things for yourself and be on your own(8/12)
- Buildings: big room, noise level, small groups difficult (8/12) prevented by regs, can't have simultaneous indoor/outdoor (8/24)
- Our centres all look the same, all doing the same thing, beach and sea this very minute (8/20)
- Huge difference: our chn need instant gratification; distressed if not finished; RE chn know it can go on for months; created from the early years right through. (8/17)
- parents very centred on own chn; reciprocal lack of respect parents and chn; spend money on education but do nothing with chn themselves (8/26)
- Crept into kindergartens We had started transmitting info rt helping chn discover (8/7); worksheets, colouring in, Mickey Mouse stuff on the walls (8/32)
- Don't understand the hypotheses of projects properly; RE projects often start with hypoth. And development of project is to prove or disprove (8/20); need to get better at deciding what's a project and what's a theme sort of interchangeable (8/19)
- Aust chn lack 4 years of collaborative experience. (8/26)
- Chn's culture of discussion among themselves, here teachers see themselves as being the focus (8/27); documentation is different no child – child discussion like there is in Reggio.; sitting down at dinner and discussing chn part of that, not something we do (8/29)
- *If education is a tree, in Australia we feed the leaves and in RE they feed the roots.* (8/27)
- Analysis of returning teachers: diversity of SP; lot more documentation, wanting to be better than they were at working towards light at end of tunnel (8/15)

## Lasting Value 08

- independent schools picked up on it dramatically (8/31)



## ***Appendix L***

### **Summary of Common Topics in Code Files**

24/4/99

#### **1. Adaptation**

- not copy RE: all 8
- some common ideas on how & what to do instead but not common to all

#### **2. Bridging**

- very few eg's. All seemed to be drawing the self into an explanation of influence.  
So subsumed into **23. Influence analysis**

#### **3. Existing belief**

- 3 participants mention chn's capabilities; rest are one-offs.

#### **5. Confirmed belief**

- 3 more mention chn's capabilities: 04 & 05 are the exceptions though 05 mentions independence and empowerment of chn. 02 specifically prefers interdependence. Most of the rest are about chn with a couple focused more on teaching.

#### **6. Strengthened belief**

- 1 reference only re parent communication. Subsume into **5. Confirmed belief**

#### **4. Changed belief**

- 4 mention image: the change from need to capability; including 04.
- 3 mention the individual/collaboration.
- Rest are one-offs mainly related to teaching practices

#### **7. Doubt/concern**

3 only: 1 related to chn's capabilities and RE pushing, then resolved;  
other 2 about non-engagement of chn and precise programming of Special Ed.  
Recode

## 8. Contextual issues

- 4 issues, 2 participants: subsume into 9.

## 9. Context Comparison

- nothing common to all
- 5 mentioned outdoors, 04, 07 & 08 the exceptions
- 3 funding; 2 staffing
- 3 parent involvement
- 3 multicultures
- lot of other one-offs

## 10. Context analysis

- 01 is represented in 9, above but not here in 10
- 5 raised regs in differing aspects
- 3 referred to isolation
- some topics from 9 are repeated here
- lot of one-offs

## 11. Intra-context analysis

- almost no commonality, 2 mentioned divergent philosophies
- relatively few eg's of this code from each participant

## 12. Criteria of success? (needs new name - there are other things they value)

- nothing common to all
- 4 parent communication
- 3 engagement
- lot of one-offs

13. Engagement subsumed into 12.

## 14 – 18. Feedback: chn, parents, staff, management, loop

- 01, 08 not represented re chn; nor re management: 4 only, not 06, 07
- all represented re parents & staff but varied levels
- despite some interest, a lot of disquiet about staff responses

- much more generally positive comment about parents: 4 referred to feedback re changes – 3 re documentation
- where a loop was evident, 6/8, several only one response but tenor is of encouragement

## **19. Impression**

- common to all 8: image/capabilities
- 4 impressed by beauty, aesthetics
- 4 by chn's involvement/engagement
- 3 by aspects of the atelier
- 3 by the environment
- a lot of one off's

## **20. Impression rationale**

1 only re individualism and society: subsume into **7. Doubt/concern**

## **21. Positive Influence**

- 5/8, cited questioning of practice and 1 more of the self
- 3 teaching practices
- 4 child focus/interests
- some shared by 2 participants and many one-offs which may have commonalities at a more general level

## **22. Influence as a concern**

- 3 only, all by 08: lack of own skills; adult puppetry; outdoor practice in RE

## **23. Influence analysis**

- all unrelated
- 02 & 03: no eg's and 1 only from 04 & 08

## **24. Lasting Impact**

- all 1 or 2 mentions: generally positive ( to be expected)

## **25. Metaphor**

- all use one, 06 uses several. In some cases they capture a lot of the person and attitude to RE but not for all. Still worth exploring however, if an overview of each participant is to be presented.

### **26–28. Philosophical statement, comparison, analysis**

- 2 only participants made an analysis but all made at least 1 belief type statement but with almost no overlap. 01 & 06 make no comparisons, other 6 do. The most common being Montessori and MI: each with 3 mentions.

28. Philosophical analysis subsumed:

- 4 responses: recoded to 2xcontext analysis, 1xinfluence and 1xconfirmed belief

### **29. Existing Practice**

- 5/8 participants: 04, 07, 08 not represented here
- mostly general descriptions varying between what was wrong with existing program to practices which were consistent with RE; 1 eg of parallel practice

### **30. Changed Practice**

- gaps here that need to be investigated: eg they may not talk about documentation as a change but may nevertheless talk about it; eg only 1 p. cites projects as a change but more are using this!
- no one thing immediately consistent across all 8
- recording and documentation of varying aspects feature
- environment; parent communication; teacher-chn communication
- collaboration?? Etc???

need to consider together with **34. Practice analysis & 21-23 Influence & 19. Impression**

31. Confirmed practice subsumed into 29: Existing practice

### **32. Starting Point**

- all covered; 3 with the environment, others varied. 02 & 04 are not very clear.

### **33. Practice aim & 44. Vision**

- distinction between these 2 codes seems to have been lost: so amalgamated
- all 8 contributed but also range in numbers of contributions and ideas
- only common factor: collaboration with staff
- goals for chn, parents, staff, the environment, school/centre, other
- needs further analysis: who covered what

### **34. Practice analysis**

- variety in the number of responses per p.
- some analyse pre-RE practice; others post
- there are links between this and either an influence or impression the p. nominated
- they draw conclusions about effects on teaching, on chn: sometimes quite specific conclusions; sometimes more general
- some, not all, are linked to ideas about adaptation

### **35. Pursuit**

- variation in methods of first exposure but all pursued it; variety of opportunities taken up; none was a one-off "in-service"; all did more than mere attendance.
- Almost all refer to the need/benefits of talking with others
- Relates to references to isolation?

### **36. Questions & 37: Questions, resolved**

- almost no overlap
- 3 questioned the starting point
- 2 "is it RE?"
- but all asked se at least one question
- variety in about what
- 1 p. answered 2 of her several questions

### **38. RE definition**

- 5/8; most with one or two observations; 04 more prolific

39: RE significance subsumed into 38.

**40: Response****41: Self analysis****42: Story**

- all require further analysis

**43. Visibility**

- 3/8 referred to documentation
- 1/8 to environment

Documentation needs to be traced separately, it's not surfaced here

**Interpreted Feedback**

- 3/8 made reference to parent or staff views
- subsume into relevant feedback folder

**Memo: Summary**

- strong reactions, emotive language: exposure was exciting and motivating
- they are all adaptors: all believe in not copying RE
- the other common belief (either existing or changed by exposure) relates to chn's capabilities
- all were impressed by the image of the child/chn's capabilities
- most common influence 5/8 was questioning of practice
- starting points, changes to practice, and considerations of context, vary
- feedback from parents was positive and encouraging; more ambivalent about staff
- yet collaboration with staff was the only common practice goal





## ***Appendix M***

### **Theme x Codes Grid**

#### **“Children as Social Learners”**

| •  | • <b>Existing Belief (3)</b>   | • <b>Impression (19)</b>  | • <b>Influence (21)</b>   |
|----|--|---|---|
| 01 | •  | •   | •   |
| 02 | • interdependence ...I feel we, we push too much in independence 2/2 | •   | •   |
| 03 | •  | •   | • social side of things so impt. Learning , friendships (3/18 & 24); show respect for chn's social desires 3/24   |
| 04 | •  | • co-learner and co-constructor of learning (4/13)  | •   |
| 05 | •  | • developing a sense of community – getting chn to value exchange and conflict and dialogue and really value each other 5/31                                  | • that learning is a social process and that they need to be with a group of chn to really learn 5/22   |
| 06 | •  | • collaboration was something I hadn't thought really deeply about (6/5)  | •   |
| 07 | •  | • social dimension: child embedded in the group vs little isolated achievement machine (7/12)<br>• learning through grouping, integration, multi-aging (7/4). | • I think that the Vygotskian work has made me question the social dimension of what I do. And I've thought... how it affects the chn, how we learn from one another.7/12 |
| 08 | • focus on the individual –selfish society 8/5                       | • individual's contribution to group vs reverse 8/5<br>• collaboration from birth (8/4)<br>• I talked a lot about collaboration (to parents and staff)8/13    | •   |

| •    | • <b>Confirmed Belief (5)</b>   | • <b>Changed Belief (4)</b>  | • <b>Other (36; 26; 23)</b>  |
|------|---|--|--|
| • 01 | •   | •  | • if you put all the emphasis on the group how can you focus on the individual child? 1/3/36 (Question)  |
| • 02 | • interdependence: chn working with each other and adults vs independence 2/2 | • from training ‘focus on the individual, plan for the individual, and its not like that in reality’ (2/2)                             | • expertise recognized in sharing it vs singling out an individual child 2/35/26 (philosophical statement) )   |
| • 03 | •   | •  | • What about ‘the quiet child’ that doesn’t associate in a group 3/7/36  |
| • 04 | •   | • collaboration: ‘so much more learning that can happen with interactions’ 4/18  | • Because learning is a social thing, all learning is, chn’s learning, our own learning. Its so much easier & so much better & so much richer when you can talk to people about what you’re doing 4/37/26  |
| • 05 | •   | •  | •  |
| • 06 | •   | • (chn) collaborating: that has & still is taking a long time to understand in such an individual orientated and focused community 6/5 | •  |
| • 07 | •   | •  | So actually looking at the social dimension has made me do several things, for parents to understand more carefully the value of their child being within a group and for family to understand that the school is part of the everyday life of their child now. And its such a very important aspect for them to know one another really well 7/12/23 (influence analysis) |
| • 08 | •   | • a group of chn working together : more ideas and more interesting for everyone 8/18  | •  |

| •  | • <b>Changed Practice (30)</b>   | • <b>Practice Aims (33)</b>   | • <b>Other (36; 34)</b>  |
|----|--|---|--|
| 01 | •  | •   | •  |
| 02 | •  | •   | •  |
| 03 | • programming documents modified to show chn's social involvement (3/18)<br>•  | •   | •  |
| 04 | • Listening to each other, talking in turns r/than putting up hands, <i>making the whole interaction go through me</i> ; sitting in circle <i>makes the whole situation equal</i> (4/18) | •   | • why do we have to put up our hands? Why does the whole interaction have to go through me? Why can't it occur between them? 4/18/36 (questions)<br>• ...the work that had been done by chn who were 4,5,6 I wondered how much adult input had taken place...4/19/36   |
| 05 | •  | •   | •  |
| 06 | •  | • but they were not really collaborating together ...they don't tend to work together really, so how to get them to do that is the bridge that I have to make 6/5   | •  |
| 07 | • And I plan very carefully what I wanted on that video. I wanted to show the social aspects of learning 7/18  | • I like the idea of a declaration of intent. We tend to have this in our school as a like an aim for the year or a, you know, in general curriculum planning. These areas are fine but why not set these as intentions in terms of social dimension of the class, and in terms of er, for the staff 7/12 | • So I came um to thinking more carefully about the spaces that educate and looking carefully at where those social understandings were developing from. And there are lots of things that are happening that I've actually organized and managed that has allowed that to happen 7/12/34 (practice ananlysis) |
| 08 | •  | • being influenced by Reggio and collaboration and how we you know we need to encourage our chn to be more collaborative because its only, its that wealth of ideas together, that comes up with the wonderful solution 8/30  | •  |

## ***Memo***

### **Children as Social Learners**

Everyone except 01 who recognized the difference between her training and the emphasis on the group and had questions about it. 03 also had questions but unlike 01 expressed belief in importance of social learning and respect for chn's friendships. Their practice reflected this difference also. 01 worked with babies in family grouping and seemed to bring the staff with her with image driven changes – learning about chn's abilities.

02 had her beliefs confirmed and extended, for the others this made an impression and had an influence on practice, principally in the use of projects, though 08 now encourages children to paint together and 06 used the same situation as an example of her trying to come to grips with the idea of collaboration. This was not a term they all used. Yet 04 wanted chn to listen and discuss with each other – a change echoed by 05 who was still the adjudicator of discussions

How many of them used the word collaboration?

01: no

02: no

03: no

04: no

05: in relation to staff

06: yes

07: yes in terms of her own need thought of "the social dimension" also more broadly in terms of social democracy and social issues eg youth suicide

08: yes in reln to chn

**NB: Explore connections** between Chn as Social learners theme, environment theme and projects.



## **Appendix N**

### **Aggregation of sub-themes**

#### **“Teaching capable children”**

|   | <b>01</b>                                 | <b>02</b>   | <b>03</b>             | <b>04</b>              | <b>05</b>   | <b>06</b>     | <b>07</b>     | <b>08</b>      |
|---|---|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Sub-themes</b>   | <b>Transcript page number/code number</b> |             |                       |                        |             |               |               |                |
| Child-centred / child-focused                             | 7/21<br>11/26                             | 9/3         |                       | 5/21<br>23/26<br>20/30 |             |               |               | 21/5           |
| Children’s Exploration / experimentation                  |   | 11/3        | 3/3                   |                        |             |               |               |                |
| Children’s engagement / involvement                       | 7/12                                      | 2/19        | 20/12                 | 7/19                   |             |               | 7/12          |                |
| Process vs product  |   |             |                       | 13/12                  | 2/19        |               |               |                |
| Creativity  |   |             | 17/5<br>8/30          | 6/33<br>1/30           | 5/4         |               |               | 13/19<br>33/27 |
| Really listening / looking / paying attention / awareness | 22/21                                     |             |                       | 18/4<br>8/19<br>4/33   | 5/4<br>3/19 | 6/21<br>13/30 | 14/21         | 13/19          |
| Taking time / slowing down                                | 20/5                                      |             |                       | 5/19                   | 3/19        | 12/30         | 14/21         |                |
| Working with children’s interests / relevance             | 7/21                                      | 9/3<br>11/3 | 7/21<br>18/30<br>7/12 |                        |             |               | 7/12<br>15/30 | 23/12<br>19/5  |
| Discover / Work from children’s strengths / not needs     | 21/4<br>22/4<br>13/33                     |             |                       |                        |             |               | 6/3<br>16/4   |                |

### Teaching capable children

|    | Existing Belief (3)   | Impression (19)  | Influence (21)   |
|----|---|--|--|
| 01 |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focusing on what we think they should be learning, rather than chn's interests (1/7);</li> </ul>                                  |
| 02 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Music curriculum needs teacher input, child interest, variety, extension &amp; development; Kodaly too structured; developmental, child-centred approach. 2/9</li> <li>Learning to write requires play and exploration; writing recognized and nurtured; chn operate at own level; process writing under contract; 2/11</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the involvement, the work of children was definitely there 2/2</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>   |
| 03 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role of teacher: encourage experimentation not entertain 3/3</li> </ul>  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>follow interests; investigate interests(3/7)</li> </ul>   |
| 04 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I like the idea of the chn had a solid time to explore a project of their choice 4/5</li> <li>And for the half an hour I was there he was totally engrossed in that project 4/7</li> <li>listen more 4/8</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be more child focused 4/5/21</li> </ul>   |
| 05 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>slowing down to listen and really observe (5/3)</li> <li>impressed by product not process (5/2))</li> </ul>   |  |
| 06 |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Really began to value depth and really started looking at chn 6/6</li> </ul>  |
| 07 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>role of teacher to develop 'what they have' 7/6</li> </ul>   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>listening vs telling (7/14)</li> <li>and taking longer to work through something small in a much more careful way 7/14</li> </ul> |
| 08 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deep awareness (8/13)</li> <li>creativity (presentation) (8/13)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>   |



|    | Confirmed Belief (5)  | Changed Belief (4)  | Other (26; 12; 23; 27)  |
|----|---|---|---|
| 01 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>having lots of time for chn 1/27;</li> <li></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>be sensitive to differences, promote strengths, provide opportunities 1/21</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>priority to give undivided attention to those chn when they're there 1/11/26</li> <li>'results': engagement, harmony, initiative, brilliance of work, knowledge exposed. (1/6,7,8/12</li> </ul>  |
| 02 |   |   |   |
| 03 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>creativity and expressing that, runs pretty parallel with Reggio 3/17</li> </ul>   | Stifling their creativity 4/1/4   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- related to <b>Influence</b> – small groups, investigation, interests happening 3/7/12</li> <li>- engagement re indoor/outdoor program 3/20/12</li> </ul>   |
| 04 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teacher to listen more (4/18)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>schools are for chn; need to be more child centred; chn should have fun 4/23/26</li> <li>you've got to have what they're telling you about their pictures, the process behind it 13/12</li> </ul>  |
| 05 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>equity of time rather than listening 5/5</li> <li>I always believed I could never show them a picture from a story book or help them or draw one myself cause that was hampering their creativity. So that was one truth that really stuck in my mind.5/4</li> </ul> |   |
| 06 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>freedom to go in/out 21/12</li> </ul>  |
| 07 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See chn not in terms of needs or what I need to teach them but what they're good at 7/16</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What was it I did that created that feeling athat yes we're I here, we're engaged in the the learning, we're interested 7/7/12</li> </ul>  |
| 08 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So I'm assuming that yeah that there was this dependency on the teacher and the teacher being the focus and the assistant being the focus, where I'm trying to make her understand that the chn are the focus and you're the follower. 8/21</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>relevance to chn of special events 8/23;</li> <li>what I don't like about Montessori is how lacking in creativity it is. And Steiner is very creative but r it's fairly method driven too. Monday's clay day and Tuesday's painting day, although it has a creative aspect and Reggio seems to have taken what I valued in both of them and put them together. And that's why I thought it was very good and why I wanted to see it 8/33/27</li> </ul> |

|    | Practice Aims (33)  | Changed Practice (30)   |
|----|---|---|
| 01 | •   |   |
| 02 | •   |   |
| 03 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we're looking at the philosophy...there's no word in there that says creative at all (3/8)</li> <li>• So my 18 chn or 22 that I'm having this year they're um, when their photo goes home there'll be more to it. There'll be more like what that child's shown an interest in in that year (3/18/30)</li> </ul>   |
| 04 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I guess a lot of my research at the moment is how I can make whatever they do um more creative for them, that I can get them having theories and creating their own 4/6</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stereotyping activities (all the same stencils) now I would ask them to draw – <i>Reggio is so child centred look at what the child can do (4/20)</i> barometer for what would RE think (4/20)</li> <li>• Things like um just giving worksheets to chn. Why do we give worksheets to chn? They're, its stifling their creativity. Why don't we get them to do the story map or what ever or the cloze activity? (4/1)</li> </ul> |
| 05 |   |   |
| 06 |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I shut up a lot more, I talk far too much. And I still protect chn a lot too (6/13)</li> <li>• Pace of work processes slower, whereas once we would have sped up and got through a whole lot of stuff : <i>things take a lot longer to work through (6/12)</i></li> <li>• I think I involve the chn more in the planning than I used to 6/12</li> </ul>  |
| 07 |   |   |
| 08 |   |   |

## MEMO

- 07 encapsulates these themes: *How do the staff work with the chn - are we researching ...and working with the ideas that are being expressed?* 7/13.
- There's also restrictive teaching practices 4/31/36 and 08 wants parents to understand problem solving rt worksheets. Questions about Australian chn's superficiality 4/4 and 7/1 though 7/1 is about superficiality vs depth of cultural transmission; also 02 and the question about institutional expectations re contract writing; Questions about the place of didactic teaching particularly re skills with art materials 8/7
- **Questioning** is different for some: 6/12/30 and 8/8/30; 06 sees it as a change from transmitting as does 08 who poses problems And *so I've spent a lot of time since Reggio trying to look at when I'm transmitting information. When is it appropriate to teach something didactically or transmit it and how could you do it better if you scaffolded it? So and that's a really tricky, that's I mean its something that we have to be constantly working on and constantly working on. And the other thing that struck me in RE was the questioning. I was just so excited about the way they ask questions. And when I came back I really, really tried to change the way that I questioned or gave information (8/8); Way I talk to chn has changed...because I see them differently. So I want to know things that I never thought I'd bothered to know before, never even thought to ask. Ask questions differently, used to always ask questions I knew the answer – saw myself as being a transmitter of information (6/12)* Also T seen gradually as a resource by chn 7/13/30
- **Explore: As chn's role expands teachers role changes**



## Appendix O

### Theme grid

#### “A Stronger Role for Children”

|   | 01                                 | 02             | 03    | 04           | 05   | 06           | 07   | 08            |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|------|--------------|------|---------------|
| Sub-themes  | Transcript page number/code number |                |       |              |      |              |      |               |
| Chn's initiative / instigation / pose problems          | 7/12                               | 3/21           |       |              |      |              | 11/5 | 21/12<br>8/36 |
| Consult / plan with / discuss / make decisions with chn |                                    |                | 22/33 | 17/4<br>8/19 | 16/4 |              |      | 19/5          |
| Chn to have Freedom / choice / control /responsibility  | 20/5<br>8/12                       | 13/33<br>30/33 | 22/33 | 4/19<br>7/34 |      | 11/4<br>22/4 |      | 11/21         |

| •    | • Practice analysis (34)   | • Practice Aims (33)  | • Other  |
|------|--|---|--|
| • 01 | •  | •   | • they show so much initiative, they get so involved...the constructions that went on...they all chose it by themselves 1/8/12 |
| • 02 | •  | • writing'll be more choice going (2/13) vs existing contracted process writing 2/27<br>• comfortable with choice but incorporate process writing more within the program (2/30)  | •  |
| • 03 | •  | • chn can take o a lot more responsibility than what they have in their own envt inwhat they want to do. I'd love to be able to sit in the morning with 25 chn and say 'what do you want to do today guys?' and go from there 3/22/33 | •  |
| • 04 | Engagement with choice; T let go of learning – chn take responsibility 4/7 | •   | •  |
| • 05 | •  | •   | •  |
| • 06 | •  | •   | •  |
| • 07 | •  | •   |  |
| • 08 | •  | •   | •  |

| •  | • Existing Belief (3) | • Impression (19)                                       | • Influence (21)   |
|----|-----------------------|---|--|
| 01 | •                     | •   | •  |
| 02 | •                     | •   | • not giving answers but provoking chn to pose problems 2/3/21     |
| 03 | •                     | •   | •  |
| 04 | •                     | • chn's responsibility for classroom and learning (4/4) | •  |
| 05 | •                     | •   | •  |
| 06 | •                     | •   | •  |
| 07 | •                     |   | •  |
| 08 | •                     | •   | • <b>Concern:</b> adult produced puppetry vs chn's own work (8/11) |

| •    | • Confirmed Belief (5)  | • Changed Belief (4)   | • Other   |
|------|---|--|---|
| • 01 | • giving chn lots of opportunities to make choices 1/20   | •  | •   |
| • 02 | •   | •  | •   |
| • 03 | •   | •  | •   |
| • 04 | •   | • teacher not to solve all problems chn to be part of decision making 4/17/4     | •   |
| • 05 | •   | • purpose of discussion not didactic, for serious things, serious questions 5/16 | •   |
| • 06 | •   | • Trusting them more 6/11<br>• Chn more powerful and in control 6/22             | •   |
| • 07 | • Own child-rearing practice: problem solving, think for themselves, open to ideas 7/11   | •  |   |
| • 08 | • I think I've always consulted the chn; noticed their interests & would always discuss (interests) with the chn 8/19<br>• Chn not teacher as focus vs dependency on the teacher 8/21 | •  | • chn as focus, as instigators; teacher role to take step back or question 8/21<br>• How can I turn this into a learning experience where the chn can, can um, solve the problem I guess, solve the problem themselves 8/8/36 |



## Appendix P

### Theme grid

#### “More open planning and programming”

| Sub-themes                     | 01                           | 02    | 03    | 04            | 05             | 06    | 07             | 08             |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|
| More Open / less structured    | 7/21<br>6/21<br>7/3<br>20/29 | 11/30 | 20/33 | 10/19<br>8/34 | 12/30<br>11/30 | 11/30 | 15/21<br>31/30 |                |
| Not Thematic / advanced        | 6/29<br>22/30                |       | 18/30 | 15,30/3<br>4  |                | 11/30 |                |                |
| Emergent vs imposed curriculum |                              | 3/29  |       |               |                |       | 16/4           | 20/34<br>23/12 |

|    | • Existing / Confirmed Practice (29)   | • Changed Practice (30)  |
|----|--|--|
| 01 | • Thematic planning months in advance (1/6); regimented program and daily routine (1/7); my gut feeling always was to have a more relaxed, unstructured way of being with chn (1/20) | • now giving up the advance planning, teacher determined guided by chn <i>before its what I wanted to do, now they are guiding me</i> (1/22)   |
| 02 | • elimination of checklists; stopped objectives 2/3<br>• emergent curriculum: not totally; planning from what chn were doing 2/3   | • Its my projects. It's a lot more general. There'd be an evaluation and then discuss with the chn about this and it would just be pretty open actually...rather than what we're going to do next 2/11   |
| 03 | •  | • programming documents modified to show chn's interests (3/18)  |
| 04 | •  | •  |
| 05 | •  | • planning: two monthly projection (satisfy regs) plan for wk but record evaluatn and keep it 5/12<br>• Planning & regulations? (5/25) How to: Planning & chn's interests?(5/11) <i>Resolved</i> : need planning for well balanced curriculum (5/11)   |
| 06 | •  | • Planning: I moved out of that sort of boxing of things. I'm more interested in what happens, talking about it after and thinking about where it might go r/than pre-planning things (6/11)   |
| 07 | •  | • Setting intentions and referring back – a declaration of intent (7/12)<br>• Planning very open; not prescriptive things; many ways to do the things on the list of possibilities of following on; projection for a term and weekly possibilities; record day to day diary what happened, emerged, review general intention and direction. But I have to leave it open enough to weave another web, if I need to, if I need to put another little ribbon through 7/31 |
| 08 | •  | •  |

| •    | • Practice analysis (34)/ Philosophical Comparison (27)  | • Practice Aims (33)   | • Other (3; 21; 19, 5)  |
|------|--|--|---|
| • 01 | • Own program too regimented, not flexible enough 1/7/34   | •  | • Interrupting play with scheduled activity 'this is wrong' (1/7/3)<br>• more time and discussion with chn r/t rigid teacher planning 1/6/21  |
| • 02 | •  | •  | •   |
| • 03 | •  | • I think the Piaget idea of having one objective for cutting scissors is fine but I don't know any forty year olds that can't cut with scissors so like I'm a little bit I would like to change that idea 3/20<br>• | •   |
| • 04 | • I'm probably doing the planning you know the planning is coming from my own planning at the moment and I probably need to ...4/8/<br>• Compares theme to integrating; superficiality to spiral effect; reflecting and acting on learning; thinking about big ideas: aspects of RE in Integrated Studies. 4/15&30 | •  | • I was interested to see in one of the rooms there was a, there was a planning chart there and so there was this, there was this three pronged approach to planning 4/9/19 (I liked) sitting down with the chn and planning the day. 4/8/19<br>• planning, with chn; not necessarily exclusively from chn's perspective (4/9/19)<br>• broad objectives (4/10/19) |
| • 05 | •  | •  | • planning as direction, going off the beaten track is OK 5/11/5  |
| • 06 | •  | •  | •   |
| • 07 | •  | •  |   |
| • 08 | • And even the centre's that have been influenced by Reggio are all doing the beach and the sea, right at this minute. And you think, 'is there a curriculum or isn't there a curriculum in kindergarten?' 8/20/   | • change planning format to accommodate project planning (8/22)  | • And I still think they're important but I think they should be relevant to what the chn are doing at the time, 8/23/12  |

## MEMO

Open planning is linked to both projects and a Stronger role for children. Eg 02: throwing it back to the children vs giving answers 2/4 (see projects)



## ***Appendix Q***

### **The Impact of Reggio Emilia**

#### **Themes x participants**

| <b>Theme</b>  | <b>Anna</b> | <b>Barbara</b> | <b>Cate</b> | <b>Diane</b> | <b>Emma</b> | <b>Frances</b> | <b>Grace</b> | <b>Helen</b> |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Confronting   | x           | x              |             | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| Confirming    | +           | x              | x           | x            |             |                | x            | x            |
|               |             |                |             |              |             |                |              |              |
| Consistency   |             |                | x           |              |             |                |              | x            |
| Confusion     |             |                |             |              | x           | x              |              |              |
| Consolidation | x           | x              |             | x            |             |                | x            | x            |

#### Legend:

X = inclusion in theme or sub-theme

+ = distinctive characteristics of inclusion within theme or sub-theme

## *Appendix R*

### The Influence of Reggio Emilia Themes and sub-themes x participants

| Theme                              | Anna | Barbara | Cate | Diane | Emma | Frances | Grace | Helen |
|------------------------------------|------|---------|------|-------|------|---------|-------|-------|
| <b>Aesthetics</b>                  | X    | X       | +    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
| <b>Capability of children</b>      | X    | X       | +    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
| -confirmation                      | X    | X       | +    |       |      |         | X     | X     |
| -change                            |      |         |      | X     | X    | X       |       |       |
| <b>Children as social learners</b> |      | X       | X    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
| -confirmation                      |      | X       |      |       |      |         |       | X     |
| -change                            |      |         | X    | X     | X    | +       | X     |       |
| -consolidation                     |      | X       |      |       |      |         |       | X     |
| <b>Projects</b>                    |      | X       | X    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
| -stories                           |      | X       | X    |       | X    |         | X     | X     |
| <b>Documenting</b>                 | X    | X       | X    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
| - of projects                      |      | X       | X    | X     | X    |         | X     | X     |
| -for parents                       | X    | X       | X    | X     | X    |         | X     | X     |
| - observations                     | X    | X       | X    | X     | X    |         | X     | X     |
| - link to 'teacher as researcher'  |      |         |      |       |      |         | X     |       |
| <b>Parents</b>                     |      |         |      |       |      |         |       |       |
| - involvement                      | X    | X       | X    | X     | X    | +       | X     | X     |
| -home-school                       | X    | X       | X    | X     | X    |         | X     | X     |
| <b>Environment</b>                 |      | X       | X    | X     | X    | X       | X     | X     |
|                                    |      |         |      |       |      |         |       |       |

#### Legend:

X = inclusion in theme or sub-theme

+ = distinctive characteristics of inclusion within theme or sub-theme



## ***Appendix S***

### **Participants' Workplaces**

**Anna** was the Director of a small (25 place) long day care centre, licensed for children aged 0-5 years. Located in a Sydney suburb, it was the sole service operated by an independent Management Committee.

**Barbara** was the Director of a pre-school for children aged 3-5 years located in a Sydney suburb. A single large indoor space accommodated two groups of children simultaneously. The service was operated by a large non-government organization.

**Cate** worked with 3-5 year olds in a long day care centre located on the perimeter of the greater Sydney metropolitan area. It was part of a larger independent organization which managed several centres.

**Diane** was a primary teacher working with Year 1 students in a large independent school in Melbourne. This was her first year with this school, having worked for several years for another independent school, located elsewhere in Victoria.

**Emma** was the Director of the pre-school section of an independent primary school located in Melbourne. Organizationally, she also has responsibility for the Prep class (first year of primary school).

**Frances** was the Director of the pre-school section of a large independent primary school in Melbourne.

**Grace** was the long-time Director of the pre-school section of an independent school. This school also includes a secondary section.

**Helen** was a pre-school teacher, who had recently joined the staff of the same preschool where Frances was Director.

## ***Appendix T***

### **Teaching in Context Themes x sub-themes x participants**

| <b>Themes &amp; sub-themes</b>     | <b>Anna</b> | <b>Barbara</b> | <b>Cate</b> | <b>Diane</b> | <b>Emma</b> | <b>Frances</b> | <b>Grace</b> | <b>Helen</b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Cultural Context</b>            |             |                |             |              |             |                |              |              |
| Culture as question                |             | x              |             |              |             |                | x            | x            |
| Cultural diversity                 | x           | x              | x           |              |             |                |              | x            |
| Influences and effects on children | x           |                |             | x            |             | x              |              | x            |
| Community                          | x           |                | x           |              | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| Outdoors                           | x           | x              | x           |              | x           | x              | x            |              |
| <b>Political Context</b>           |             |                |             |              |             |                |              |              |
| Resourcing                         | x           | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| Regulatory frameworks              | x           | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| <b>Social context</b>              |             |                |             |              |             |                |              |              |
| Working with staff                 | x           | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| Working collaboratively            | x           | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |
| - Isolation                        |             | x              | x           | x            |             | x              | x            |              |
| - Conflict                         |             | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            |              |
| <b>The Self</b>                    | x           | x              | x           | x            | x           | x              | x            | x            |