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Abstract

Pedagogical discourse in Papua New Guinea (PNG) community schooling\textsuperscript{1} is mediated by a western styled education. The daily administration and organisation of school activity, graded teaching and learning, subject selection, content boundaries, teaching and assessment methods are all patterned after western schooling. This educational settlement is part of a legacy of German, British and Australian government and non-government colonialism that officially came to an end in 1975. Given the colonial heritage of schooling in PNG, this study is interested in exploring particular aspects of the degree of mutuality between local discourses and the discourses of a western styled pedagogy in post-colonial times, for the purpose of better informing community school teacher education practices.

This research takes place at and in the vicinity of Madang Teachers College, a preservice community school teachers college on the north coast of Papua New Guinea. The research was carried out in the context of the researcher’s employment as a contract lecturer in the English language Department between 1991-1993. As an in-situ study it was influenced by the roles of different participants and the circumstances in which data was gathered and constituted, data which was compatible with participants commitments to community school teacher education and community school teaching and learning.

In the exploration of specific pedagogic practices different qualitative research approaches and perspectives were brought to bear in ways best suited to the circumstances of the practice. In this way analytical foci were more dictated by circumstances rather by design. The analytical approach is both a hermeneutic one where participants' activities are 'read like texts', where what is said or written is interpreted against the background of other informing contexts and texts, to better understand how understandings and meanings are produced and circulated; and also a phenomenological one where participants' perspectives are sought to better understand how pedagogical discursive formations are assimilated with the 'self'. The effect of

\textsuperscript{1} Recent changes to the provision of community schooling have resulted in some community schools being designated 'Primary' schools. Primary schools are those schools that now cater for Grades 3-8, while community schools have not yet made this transition and still cater for Grades 1-6. Community School Teachers Colleges have been renamed Primary Teachers Colleges. For this purposes of this study the terms
shifting between these approaches throughout the study is to build up a sense of co-authorship between researcher and participants in relation to particular aspects of the research.

The research explores particular sites where pedagogic discourse is produced, reproduced, distributed, articulated, consumed and contested, and in doing so seeks to better understand what counts as pedagogical discourse. These are sites that are largely unexplored in these terms, in the academic literature on teacher education and community schooling in PNG. As such, they represent gaps in what is documented and understood about the nature of post-colonial pedagogy and teacher training.

The first site is a grade two community school class involved in the teaching and early learning of English as the 'official' language of instruction. Here local discourses of solidarity and agreement are seen to be mobilised to make meaningful, what are for the teacher and children moments in their construction as post-colonial subjects. What in instructional terms may be seen as an English language lesson becomes, in the light of the research perspectives used, an exercise in the structuring of new social identities, relations and knowings, problematising autonomous views of teaching and learning.

The second site explores this issue of autonomous (decontextualised) teaching and learning through an investigation of student teachers' epistemological contextualisations of knowledge, teaching and learning. What is examined is the way such orientations are constructed in terms of 'traditional' and 'modern' epistemological and pedagogical alignments, and, in terms of differently conceived notions of community, in a problematisation of the notion of community schooling.

The third and fourth sites examine reflective accounts of student teachers' pedagogic practices, understandings and subjectivities as they confront the moral and political economies and cultural politics of schooling in School Experience and Practicum contexts, and show how dominant behaviourist and 'rational/autonomous' conceptions of what counts as teaching and learning are problematised in the way some student teachers draw upon wider social discourses to construct a dialogue with learners.

The final site is a return to the community school where the discourse of school reports through which teachers, children and parents are constructed as particular subjects of schooling, are explored. Here teachers report children's progress over a four year period and parents write back in conforming, confronting and contesting ways, in the midst of

‘community school’, ‘community schooling’ and ‘community school teacher education’ will be retained.
the ongoing enculturation of their children. In this milieu, schooling is shown to be a provider of differentiated social qualifications rather than a socially just and relevant education.

Each of the above-mentioned studies form part of a research and pedagogic interest in understanding the ‘disciplining’ effects of schooling upon teacher education, the particular consequences of those effects, what is embraced, resisted and hidden. Each of the above sites is informed by various ‘intertexts’. The use of intertexts is designed to provide a multiplicity of views, actions and voices while enhancing the process of cross-cultural reading through contextualising the studies in ways that reveal knowledges and practices which are often excluded in more conventional accounts of teaching and learning.

This research represents a journey, but not an aimless one. It is one which reads the ideological messages of coherence, impartiality and moral soundness of western pedagogical discourse against the school experiences of student-teachers, teachers, children and parents, in post-colonial Papua New Guinea, and finds them lacking.
Summary

In the context of seeking to understand the way community school teaching and learning are constituted by teachers' college students, this research explores the way western-styled ideas, beliefs and practices of teaching and learning are understood, expressed and practiced in community school and teacher education environments in Papua New Guinea. It explores the ways teachers and children become subjects of schooling, how groups of student teachers, think and talk about knowledge, curriculum, teaching, learning and evaluation; how four student teachers experience and perform, teaching, in the context of School Experience and Practicum teaching, and how they are formed as teachers in the process. The research sets out to stimulate thinking and dialogue about the 'disciplinary' nature of teaching and learning by examining how student teachers, teachers, children and parents produce and are produced by schooling. In broader terms it argues for an approach to teacher education which goes beyond training for the teaching of skills and content, to include the way teaching and learning practices are situated, interpreted, understood and questioned by student teachers, teachers, children, parents and their communities.
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Introduction

Chapter 1

This introduction is organised into three broad areas, firstly a discussion and laying out of the issues and interests of this research; secondly, an overview of the theoretical perspectives which inform the positions argued; and thirdly, a review of the methodology used and related issues.

Research Issues and Interests

What counts as knowledge in Teacher Education research in Papua New Guinea (PNG)

There is at this point in the development of Teacher Education in PNG little knowledge about how student teachers construct their teaching practices and account for them, and what is available to them to make those constructions. This is due, principally, to a lack of research in these areas as well as the lack of epistemological perspective which values student teachers’ perspectives on what they think and do. Participant accounts are a minor part of the body of knowledge that informs the research quantum into teaching in PNG. While standardised questionnaires and structured interviews are commonly used to provide supplementary information to the observations of ‘trained observers’ and researchers, the understandings, practices, and voices of participants are often reduced to secondary codified accounts of pedagogical knowledge and practice. This fails to adequately inform such questions as, ‘How are student teaching practices and understandings constructed, what gives them structure?’; ‘How do student teachers make sense of their teaching practices?’; ‘How are school meanings taken up, assimilated and articulated?’; ‘What social and cultural orientations do student teachers draw upon to produce their practices?’; ‘How is their teaching accomplished?’. Research into Teacher Education has largely maintained a separation between practitioner knowledges and subjectivities, and the more ‘objectified’ knowledges and rationalities of the academy. This research, by contrast, has an interest in exploring the way each produces the other.
What counts as knowledge in Teacher Education and teaching in PNG

In many ways current teacher education practices reinforce the notion that training colleges are sites of knowledge reproduction and not production. Teacher education generally, lacks an inquiry and situated orientation to learning where students are encouraged to develop and test theoretical conceptions of teaching grounded in the culture of schooling. The reproductive/autonomous view of knowledge is an untroubled one, a view that separates the 'know-how' and 'know-that' of teaching from the complexity and situatedness of social interaction and relations in institutional settings. In teacher education this creates a problem when institutional accounts of teaching provide an inadequate framework for making sense of practical experiences and ultimately for managing them. This research aims to stimulate a review of this epistemological emphasis by giving 'voice' to researcher and student teachers' perceptions practices and subjectivities, and by highlighting some of the less visible tensions, resistances and contradictions which characterise community schooling and community school teacher education, constitutive of its discoursal foundations. This is done by shifting the research focus between the contexts of schooling, community and student teaching, exploring non-contiguous yet related sites and mapping their discoursal articulations.

Symes and Preston highlight the need to consider teaching practices and aspects of schooling which receive little attention though are pivotal in terms of their constitutive roles:

... the practices we have in mind are like timetabling, the organisation of school space, the procedures of assessment and examination, the writing of reports on pupils, classroom work and school rules. These practices are not often the focus of inquiry in educational theory; if they are, they tend to be treated in a decontextualised and technicist way. Yet they are absolutely central to the basic architecture of school life, to the maintenance of its disciplinary order and the processes of educational structuration, and their management provides clues on the kind of impact that schools have on the subjectivity of individuals. (1997:xiv)

As such this research aims to provide an understanding of how particular participants interpret and are interpreted, construct and are constructed, represent and are represented through different teaching experiences embedded in wider 'processes of
educational structuration’. Student teaching practices are particularly illuminated through processes of reflection, discussion and writing, in a constitutive pedagogical literacy. A process which implicates broader institutional, social and cultural discourses in the formation of student teacher identities.

Research Agenda
To research these matters, this study has the following broad agenda:

- To better understand and explore the roles of community schooling and community school teacher education in the production and distribution of social power and cultural meanings by providing representations and interpretations of selected pedagogical structures and practices grounded in the relations that operate between teachers, children, institutions, communities and the discourses of post-colonialism;

- To understand and explore the articulations between student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations and the discourses of post-colonialism by engaging students’ views on knowledge, community and schooling.

- To promote a reflexive mode of student teaching practice, to assist student teachers to rethink understandings of what teaching is, and to confront understandings of what it means to teach.

- To explore in this context the discursive production of students as teachers by making visible their accounts of teaching, and providing various readings of those accounts;

- To explore particular tensions between the ‘disciplinary’ and ‘emancipatory’ functions of community schooling and teacher education pedagogy through an investigation of performances and paradoxes;

- To develop a multi-focussed and multi-voiced study able to broaden understandings of the discourses which structure pedagogy, in a way which demonstrates regard for the circumstances, knowledges and agencies of those who are research participants, by preserving the integrity of their accounts and where possible their voices.
Discussion of the Issues: Backgrounds, Contexts and Related Literature

Introduction

Given the somewhat limited research that can be directly related to PNG student teachers' construction of pedagogical discourse the issue of what is to count as pedagogical knowledge and practice in teacher education and community schooling will be framed by the following largely chronological review of positions and perspectives seen to be important in contextualising this study.

Studying teaching and classroom interactions: different ways of looking

In seeking to ground this research in the academic literature the following two studies on teaching and classroom relations represent two different responses to questions of the nature of teaching and learning in PNG community schools. The first study by Smith (1975) is a critique of the social relations of community schooling at Wankung in the Eastern Highlands of PNG. It is a study that has been ambivalently received because of its critical perspective (for a ‘response’ see McNamara 1979). The second is what might be referred to as a process-product observational study of classroom interaction by Dunkin (1977) which focuses upon teacher/student behaviour in a community school in the Western Highlands of PNG. The studies are juxtaposed to show two different ways of looking at schooling in PNG.

Smith’s anthropological study is unique in that it seeks to explain classroom interactions in terms of identities, tensions and discontinuities, both within and outside the classroom. Discontinuities which are linked to the juxtaposition of modern world and local discourses in the classroom. It unveils tensions that emerge from insenstivity to community social structures and knowledges as in these statements by the Papua New Guinean teacher:

T: When you are educated you will all be the leaders. Who were your leaders before?
(One response of “garam tsera” (Adzera: big-man) which the teacher ignored.)


T: Just because your father is a big-man it does not mean he knows everything.
In Smith’s account classroom interactions are shown to have direct links to life beyond the school. He explores underlying tensions between the activities and purposes of a particular school and its community, arguing that

The activities of the school are perceived as “good” because schools are “like that”; and schooling fits people for the new ways in Papua New Guinea. Teacher behaviour is affected by the contradiction between the idealised model of education and the realities of Wankung. (1975:2-3)

Smith acknowledges the existence of an ongoing contested classroom life, as teachers’ and students’ notions of what counts as learning and knowing, collide.

Both teacher and students strive to impose their definitions on the stream of activities, each attempting to control the other. (p9)

It is a tension grounded in a hegemonic and colonising view of education where children are required to ‘suspend their own latent culture and accept the classroom situation as defined by the teacher’ (p9).

The cultural politics of schooling is an issue that emerges from Smith’s longitudinal study, one which leads to the questioning of idealised/autonomous notions of schooling as an agent of the community.

Dunkin’s study differs in its epistemological orientation in that it describes classroom interaction in terms of autonomous teaching/learning processes, ‘pedagogical moves’ (structuring, soliciting, responding and reacting), ‘types of thinking’ (logical operations and concreteness-abstractness) and not in terms of a social dialogue.

In the study, classroom interactions are coded and tallied in terms of behavioural variables and the data is validated against similar studies done in developed countries. The findings show that teachers were the dominant structurers, solicit-ers, and reactors, and pupils dominated the responding; though unlike the validating studies, some types of logical operations were not apparent. Dunkin reports that,

… teachers seldom had to make negative comments, such as criticising pupils or telling them they were wrong (p5)

… children ranked in the top half of their class were found to have interchanges with teachers in the first half of lessons … (and) … had more interchanges … than other children (p9).

The data Dunkin collects is treated numerically and forms part of a research corpus of generalisations about teaching and teacher behaviour. In this it differs from Smith’s
critically interpretive account of classroom culture. In conclusion, Dunkin claims that an important implication of the study is the need for the provision of

... specific training in the control of the types of behaviours explored in this study... Well established training techniques, such as microteaching (p10).

Interestingly Dunkin's recommendations were taken up and the 'micro-skills' approach to teacher training was adopted by teacher education institutions throughout Papua New Guinea and continues now in various forms (see Dunkin 1991). These studies interpret the milieu of classroom activity in ways that reflect aspects of the different research and epistemological perspectives of critical theory and positivism. While this research project is more closely allied with the critical perspective of Smith the incidental observations Dunkin makes about differential treatment of students and kinds of participation are issues that are engaged in this research as a result of similar observations. Exploring the construction of pedagogic discourse from a critical interpretive perspective, however, seeks to go beyond the mapping of 'pedagogical moves' to capture something of the less visible ideological tensions of classroom activity.

**Student teachers' views of western knowledge**

In seeking to understand something of the way student teachers construct pedagogy much of this research is interested in their accounts of teaching practices. This interest is grounded in a study conducted by Young (1977) and Young & Bartos (1977) concerned with student teachers' views of western knowledge in the context of social, cultural, political and economic change stemming from colonial and modern world influences. A central aspect of the study was a focus upon what is referred to as the study of 'changing images of knowledge' (p21). The study argued that PNG secondary and tertiary students and teacher trainees held a dualistic conception of knowledge what Young referred to as a 'traditional/modern distinction', a distinction which represented modern western knowledge as progressive and traditional knowledge as primitive. In this research this line of inquiry is continued as an exploration of student teachers' epistemological and pedagogical orientations. The work of Young and Bartos provides the basis for further investigation of student teachers' epistemic constructions and the ideological structures that produce them.
From a different epistemological perspective, the next study by Wohlberg, is not only notable for its use of student teachers' accounts and perspectives, but also for its interest in students' moral frames and the relationship between Christian discourses, colonial discourses and the motivations students have for choosing teaching in PNG.

**Why students choose teaching and the discourses of Christianity**

In 1979 Wohlberg's study entitled 'Teachers as missionaries' provided an account of student teachers' perceptions in relation to their occupational choice to become teachers. The research was a response to the notion that PNG teachers were poorly educated, lacked motivation and that selection processes for teachers needed to be re-examined. The study sought to uncover the reasons why students took up teaching. Wohlberg found in students' responses to his questionnaire a predominantly moral motivation for taking up teaching. This moral motivation was underpinned by a number of strongly held beliefs: that existing knowledge systems were inadequate; that new knowledge was desirable to bring about change; that teaching was a vocation involving serving others; that teaching was a calling from God; and that teachers were missionaries involved in spreading, among other things, the word of God. Wohlberg argued that for many students a 'religious' model of education which resembled teaching the commandments, liturgies and rituals of Christianity is what informed their conceptions of teaching. Wohlberg claimed that the predominantly Christian form of education students were experiencing was widely desired.

... in PNG the kind of change brought by foreign education, particularly by mission groups, is sought after and seen as good and proper by the very people who will continue the system - the student-teachers themselves (p134-5).

Wohlberg's study goes some way to showing the extent to which the discourses of Christianity were a part of practices of secular education. He does not, however, explore the sites of Christian practices, or make visible the cultural clashes and epistemic contestations which decided the moral ground on which these students would come to make their decisions.

Emerging from these studies are traces of tensions linked to the colonisation of PNG by western interests. Across these studies, a picture of school emerges, as a collection
of sites where old and new social and cultural practices, knowledges and ontologies are homogenised, hybridised, and contested.

Teaching and teacher education in Papua New Guinea: a review of qualitative educational research
There are relatively few significant studies of teaching and teacher education before the recent National Department of Education (NDOE) reviews of community school teaching and teacher education when a number of studies were undertaken (see McNamara 1989: 17-27). Two are notable for their focus upon beginning teaching and teaching practices (see Ross 1989; Avalos 1989).

Problems of Beginning Teachers
The first of these studies (Ross 1989) on ‘the problems of beginning teachers’ is wide ranging, involving classroom observations via a pre-determined observational checklist of teacher performances; a ‘basic skills’ test in English and Maths; a questionnaire and an interview. One of the points of focus of this study is beginning teachers’ pre-service needs. It is in this discussion that Ross raises pedagogical issues, rejecting the ‘teaching equals learning’ thesis and arguing that the main task of teaching is ‘to enable the student to perform the task of learning’, that it is important to take into account, ‘the learning environment which the teacher in part, creates and teaches within.’ (p56)
Ross further calls for change to the structure and content of pre-service teacher training programs emphasising the need for a closer relationship between Teachers College curriculum and community school classroom situations, and calls for a teacher training pedagogy involving more ‘experimentation’, study of ‘pupil-teacher interaction’, and the development of teachers’ abilities to critically evaluate their own performances. (p59)

The twin aims of improving participation and socialisation can be achieved through a less classroom-centred and more experimental teacher training course which encourages students to reflect more on their strengths and weaknesses. (p60)
Problems in Practice Teaching

The follow-up study (Avalos 1989) focuses primarily on the characteristics of teaching contexts and teacher performances and their effects upon pupil learning. Avalos provides a number of representative profiles of beginning teachers. There is in this research a strong implication that the quality of teaching impacts on the quality of learning, examples of lessons are scrutinised for weaknesses in content knowledge, application of teaching principles and teacher literacy skills.

Neither of these studies examined student teachers' own perceptions and thinking in action. The studies provided a basis for generalising across classrooms and teaching phenomena in support of a call for improvements in teacher knowledge and changed practices.

Avalos' (1991) follow up paper to the above research provides a wide ranging discussion of the 'practicalities' of student teachers' performance and competence, where student teachers are characterised as using 'formalist' teaching styles with reliance on a 'nominalist' type of teaching that emphasises 'names of things, events, or people in events rather then understanding the contents to which the names refer' (p172). Avalos argues that lesson planning is dominated by 'activity' objectives requiring pupils to 'do', rather than by 'learning objectives'. Individual learner differences appear to be ignored and questioning and answering sequences in lessons 'are entirely structured by teachers (p173); training and practicum supervision programs were noted to be predominantly structured around the development of teaching skills and 'resemble(d) the perspectives of behavioural theory'.

While the study's recommendations call for wide ranging changes to the ways prospective teachers are prepared, what is absent is any indication of student-teachers' own pedagogical understandings, 'beliefs, intentions, and meanings ... express(ed) in their actions', their 'subjective states' (Elliott 1980:310), or why, for example, lessons had strong 'activity' or 'do' objectives, and why individual differences might seemingly be ignored. Some light may be thrown upon these issues in the context of exploring documents that take a more global perspective on education in PNG.
The wider discursive context of schooling in PNG: competing discourses of subject formation

Symes and Preston observe that

The trouble with focusing upon pedagogy and pedagogy alone, is that it obscures contextual questions affecting classroom processes. Schooling ... does not happen in a vacuum. ... it is a social practice. (p15)

Education in Papua New Guinea has in the last decade been under close scrutiny with calls for a shift in its direction. Calls from community leaders (Matane 1986) for greater rates and different kinds of participation, equity and relevance in education are a recognition that the social role of schooling in the midst of a national transition from subsistence to market economies, old to new communities, is problematic. Particularly, that schooling has not provided young people and their communities with the knowledge and skills to manage the social, cultural and economic diversities they are currently facing.

The high degree of interdependency necessary to ensure community survival that once characterised the social economy of village communities, has been increasingly reconstructed as dependency upon institutions beyond local community control. Local and national governments, churches, schools and businesses now straddle old social, cultural, linguistic and geographical boundaries becoming the sites where old and new world meanings, and social, cultural and political economies, are hybridised and homogenised, embraced and resisted in the struggle to make new communities and manage the wider international forces. Western styled schooling and education play a central role in the construction of new interests and dispositions, and the provision of access to what are seen by many to be the social and economic rewards of a life in a capital economy.

Two documents have emerged in the recent past that are constitutive of processes of education structuration in PNG.1 The focal point of both documents is the nature and character of education in a transitional world. Both claim to be reformist. They seek to address the tensions and contradictions of the post-colonial present, expressed in

---

1 Both of these texts are linked to the aims of the National Department of Education and are unlike the studies mentioned above which are contributions from expatriate academics.
terms of a traditional-modern world dichotomy. Although not radical they are respectfully critical of the educational legacy of colonialism.

Integral Human Development

The first document, a Ministerial Committee Report titled ‘A Philosophy of Education for Papua New Guinea’, chaired by Paulius Matane, and presented in November 1986, is informed by 65 public submissions, interviews with members of the Department of Education and ‘other agencies’, and input from committee members. It is a document drawing upon various responses to the questions, “What kind of citizen should we now be educating?” “What kind of education is necessary to produce this citizen?” “How can we improve the Education System in order to provide this education?” (Ibid 1986: v). The following representations of traditional life and modern education presented in the Matane Report reflect somewhat the tensions that have existed between the two.

• Traditional education was the responsibility of the family and the local community; introduced schools ... took a large part of that responsibility away from the parents and the community...

• Traditional education satisfied the needs of the family and the community. The missions, the colonial administration and post-war development, introduced new needs...

• Traditional education was education for life. Mission education was for eternal life...

• Traditional education was integrated with the community and taught children to see the world through the eyes of the community. Through whose eyes do our children see the world now?...

• Traditional education was integrated with living: a child learned by observing and doing...

• Traditional education was integrated with times and seasons and extended over many years. How much can a child be expected to learn in six or ten years?...

• Traditional education was integrated with all of the child’s needs...

• Traditional education was very limited...

• Traditional education was based on obligation to the clan. In replacing this social emphasis with concern for the individual concern for the individual
child, has education lost sight of the importance of responsibility, justice and respect for others?

- Traditional education changed to satisfy needs. (pp3-4)

The report seeks to bring about a reconciliation of the ‘good’ in traditional society with what is perceived as the ‘political and economic’ benefits of the modern world, through education and the doctrine of integral human development. It continues,

Much of what is good in traditional Papua New Guinean society operates within a framework of spiritual, social, physical/economic and political needs, which are integrated and form the basis of life itself. For example in traditional society, even the simple task of building a house requires that an individual takes into account all human needs, and calls for questions like:

‘What do I need to build the house?’

‘What do the leaders, elders and other people in the village think?’

‘Will the ancestral spirits approve?’

‘What course of action should I now take?’

In other words thought must be given respectively to the physical/economic, social, spiritual and political needs for existence and this guides action. This is what is meant by integral human development (1986:7-8).

‘Integral Human Development’, (IHD) is an argument for a more coherent and integrated approach to social, intellectual, spiritual and economic development through the ‘agencies’ of home, school, church and community. It proposes a new integrated curriculum including the provision of education in social and spiritual issues. It is underpinned by a view which emphasises a social and moral role for these agencies in reversing the ‘fragmentation within the individual, society and the school’ believed to be brought about by the pace of social change and by a rejection of traditional values (Matane 1986:9).

IHD is the name given to the proposed development, through socialisation and education, of cognitive and practical skills, and ‘positive attitudes towards others for the purpose of becoming self-reliant and living useful lives in (their) society’ (ibid 1985:1). Each of the agencies referred to is seen to perform a reciprocal role in the education process:

The education of a child is a shared responsibility. It starts at home with the parents. If the parents are good then the child is off to a good start. Next comes the school. The teacher must have a good education and training and
must set a good example, be creative and have some visions of the purpose of education. The teacher transmits knowledge and integrates the teaching programme in order to interest and motivate the child. The teacher who cannot or does not do this should not be a teacher. The third influence on the child is the church that should place emphasis on the moral and ethical training of the child. The fourth is the community that promotes socialisation of the child. From the community the child learns the culture, traditions and can develop positive attitudes to life there. If the community is bad, then the child is also likely to become bad during adult life (ibid 1896:1).

The idealisations of IHD portrayed here miss to some degree the diverse socialising (naturalising), moralising and educative influences of each of these agencies, and while what is assumed is a unity, a coherence and a reciprocity of processes, there is only minor recognition of the way each confronts and contradicts each other in this post-colonial secular world.

For me, IHD is more deeply linked to Christian theology than to traditional life in PNG. In outlining their position on schooling, the PNG Catholic Education Authority make direct reference to it as a fundamental tenet.

A Catholic school or college is a means which the Catholic community uses for the purpose of giving students an academic vocational and religious education.

By means of the Catholic community school, vocational centres and high schools, parents are assisted to lead their children to full integral human development. This involves a knowledge of, and faith in the saving and redeeming work of Christ, and an expression of that faith in community worship and personal behaviour (PNG Education Gazette 9/1992).

IHD as a view of life, founded upon Christian teachings and catalysed by Dr. T Mathias in lectures given in 1973 on the identity of Christian schools.

---

2 IHD has been appropriated by some NGO’s in the interests of ‘liberating’ local communities, as Faracos (1997:158) puts it, ‘as a process of community members taking control over their lives’. I am ambivalent about this appropriacy of IHD and how it might be interpreted by NGO’s with a transformative interest. For another view see Faracos (1997) and a comment on the Summer Institute of Linguistics’ (SIL) transformative initiatives in Kulick and Stroud (1993).
From the very early times probably the 4th century onwards, one of the concerns of the church has been the total human formation of her children. This concern was given body and more or less institutionalised by the coming of the monastic orders. Each of the monasteries has a school attached to it, where the monks taught, not only sacred things, but also profane knowledge of the world, knowledge which would enable the young men to be more competent citizens of their own country.

When you look at this effort of the early Church, you see clearly that it was not something discussed and decided upon, not a conscious response to felt needs, but, rather the result of the inner working of the Holy Spirit. It came from an understanding of the Church’s mission, which is not merely to teach a doctrine, set up a moral code, present a set of religious practices, but to communicate a New Life. This is quite clear in St. Paul, St. John and in the words of our Lord Himself, who repeatedly said that He had come in order to give life, and to give it more abundantly. The doctrine, the moral code and the practices are things which are consequent upon the new life. They sustain and nourish it. Now a new life with its intellectual, moral and emotional fullness can be communicated effectively only through the normal processes of human formation, that is, through education (Mathias 1973: 47-48).

There are four groups of people actually busy in the education of a child: the Church, government, the family and the school. And we educators, whether Christian or otherwise, should not forget this fact. It is a serious mistake for us to believe that the entire task of education rests with us in the schools (ibid 1973:49-50).

IHD as an argument for a ‘new’ life makes its centre the individual and his/her ability to determine their own future.

First, man is the master of his own destiny ... Since a nation is composed of individual humans who can choose their own destiny, every nation is master of its own destiny. In the developing world in which we are, and in the future of Papua New Guinea, I think this is an extremely important point in education; i.e. to convince young people through every possible means that they can make or destroy their own lives; that they are not playthings of blind forces, physical or chemical or moral forces over which they have no control. They are not victims of magic or superstition or actions that have taken place
in an unremembered past. They hold their destiny in their own hands, under God.

A second consequence of the belief that man is the master of his destiny is that we must train young people in the use of freedom. If I am master of my destiny, that means that I am going to make my life a success or a failure (Mathias 1973:52-57).

In this view individuals have singular identities, choose their own destinies, are self-constructing, self-determining and freed from the influences of an ‘unremembered’ past. Embedded within a play of oppositions, ‘make or destroy’, ‘victim’ or ‘master’, ‘success’ or ‘failure’, ‘playthings of blind forces’ or ‘master of (my) destiny’, this view marginalises the primacy of community and the influences of social structures upon individual agencies, particularly those social structures it declares not to exist (magic, superstition), in order to portray the individual as freed, powerful and autonomous.

There is an assumption in these accounts that the community is there to serve the individual, and focus is upon the influence of community life upon the individual for the individual’s benefit.

In the work of Ennio Mantovani (1987) who explores PNG community life as a fused process of power (spiritual and temporal), authority, principles of reciprocity, clannic relations and loyalties, blended to sustain community order and life, the IHDP perspective on the formation of ‘traditional’ subjects is turned on its head. The focus shifts to the influence of community life upon the individual for the community’s benefit, a type of integral community development.

Community is next to life in value because it has been the only way to life for millennia... The community is not sought for its own sake, but fundamentally for its link with life (Mantovani1987:194).

Mantovani asserts that in Melanesian life the social, economic, spiritual and natural aspects of life are closely interconnected. A spiritual connection, for example, exists between the dead of the community and its living members. Within the living community a similar relation exists between family and clan members. Outside of the community, inter-community relations are established and maintained on the basis of mutual benefit. Relations with the natural world are maintained through acknowledging the spiritual powers of particular living and non-living things in bringing life or death to the community. The conclusion that community is highly
valued is easy to reach through observation of everyday social activities in PNG. Mantovani expresses this value as a set of ethical principles,

... what is good for the community is ethically good; what is bad for the community is ethically bad; what is indifferent for the community is ethically indifferent (p195).

And illustrates the point through a discussion of the way life and community are sustained through relationships and traditional practices of reciprocity and solidarity as lo, the Pidgin term primarily denoting ‘a proper relationship’. (p195)

An action takes its ethical value from its influence on the community: to steal from a brother is ethically wrong because it spoils a key relationship and endangers the community as a result, but to steal from an enemy is good if it does not harm the community... (1987:197).  

What often appears as injustice is ethically mediated through the value of community and its connection with life. What is ultimately valued is the contribution of those in the community to the maintenance of the community, expressed as an ethic of solidarity. In Mantovani’s hierarchy of Melanesian values, each value (life, community, relationships and exchange) finds expression in particular actions of the community (1987:196).

From this perspective the ideal of individualism is somewhat the antithesis of the life-giving, sustaining and inclusive values of traditional community life, individualism being associated with social separation and a discontinuity of community. How notions of ‘community’ and ‘subject formation’ are defined by student teachers is argued in this study to be of fundamental importance in understanding their pedagogic orientations and practices.

The question of autonomy

The second document, the Department of Education, Education Sector Review: Deliberations and Findings, presented July 1991, is a document of many voices. In the midst of educational reform, renewal and recovery it speaks out:

The transition from the traditional to the ‘modern’ society has also resulted in the rejection of traditional customs, languages, and values in favour of those

---

3 Such community-mediated conceptions of justice have the power to problematise western notions of a universal social justice.
which allow the person to enter this ‘modern’ world. In this ‘modern’ world values are often equated with profits. In PNG today our social, political and moral atmospheres are polluted by personal and group values based only on profit. The mentality expressed as ‘laik belong wan-wan’ (‘I’ll do what I want’, author’s trans.) typifies the revolt against the concepts of obligation, of respect, of authority, of love of country and even as right and wrong as absolutes. Individuals and society need some absolutes by which to judge between right and wrong, between good and bad. It is evil for children to grow up believing that all judgements are a free option, without consequence and without responsibility. This is an abuse of the concept of freedom.

(NDOE Education Sector Review 1991:172)

Coming five years after the Matane Report, this review raises some familiar issues: 20% of the population living inside the modern economy (Matane 1986), 70% of PNG children having access to primary schooling, 68% of primary school children being pushed out of school by the end of Year 6, and an attrition rate between years 1 and 6 of approximately 45%, (Education Sector Review 1991: 6,7).

In its juxtaposition of the economies of schooling with the economies of capital and national development the Review makes visible the extent to which powerful development discourses operating in the community and in education insert into the society new definitions of work (‘wage employment’), labour and resources. Despite some voices to the contrary, the ideals of national and individual independence and identity are here closely aligned with notions of modern economic progress. These interests are constructed in terms of PNG’s economic ‘growth and development potential’ assessed by significant economic interests in the region and articulated with PNG’s education framework.

The World Bank classifies Papua New Guinea as a “lower middle-income country”, with an estimated per capita GNP of US$700 in 1987. On the World Bank ranking, Papua New Guinea was the 50th poorest out of 120 countries listed. Thus Papua New Guinea is not among “the poorest of the poor.” Nevertheless, its educational status is actually worse then the average for the Low Income Countries.

Within the Papua New Guinean economy, the mining sector has played an increasingly significant role. Mining, particularly of copper but also of gold
and other minerals, generated an estimated 14.7 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1988. Planned growth in the sector is expected to generate what the World Bank has called a "mineral investment boom" during the 1990s and the first decade of the next century. ...

Formal wage employment is estimated to cover 14 per cent of the labour force. Another 35 per cent are engaged in formal commercial activities (mainly self-employed small holders producing some cash crops), whilst over 50% are either dependent on the subsistence economy or are unemployed...

The prospect of a mineral resources boom during the next decade holds little promise for employment because the mining sector has limited capacity to generate direct employment and has weak linkages with the rest of the economy. ...

Within its overall recommended strategy for the country's development, the World Bank places considerable stress on the need for human resources development. Increases in the allocation of resources on education and training are considered appropriate, though the bank feels that clearer definition of priorities is required (Education Sector Review 1991:2).

What is significant is how PNG is classified by whom and in what context. The identification of areas of growth and development by the World Bank is a significant presumption on behalf of many people in PNG. This text clearly establishes the World Bank as a dominant influence in the social and economic affairs of the country. A significant influence in fact since Independence in 1976 and a major ideological and material contributor to the state of PNG's of current educational settlement (see World Bank Report 1978, Papua New Guinea: its economic situation and prospects for development. World Bank, Washington).^4

The articulation of national economic and educational interests projects a particular view of the purpose of education in PNG and is a defining discourse constitutive of power, knowledge and institutional frameworks influencing the preparation of teachers in PNG.

^4 For a more recent and strident account of PNG's economic and social positioning at the hands of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank see Faruqul (1997).
What is captured in these texts is something of the ambivalence, ideological complexity and cultural politics that informs much of the educational settlement in PNG. The Matane Report I would argue is, as Rizvi (1997: 179) has recently argued with regard to the reconstitution of the ‘traditional’, a case of re-experiencing the past through the categories of the present. The Sector Review is as Faracelas (1997:146) has argued an example of education in PNG being ‘enclosed’ by the recolonising policies of international finance. In the gaps and spaces left by these monolithic positions, other means of managing these transformations are being explored.

Teaching: a metaphor for development

Gibson and Iamo (1991) have more recently referred to teachers as ‘brokers’, ‘mediators’ of community development in acknowledgment of the rising disillusionment (particularly in rural areas) of parents and communities with the role of schooling as a conduit to a new life. These labels imply that teachers occupy what is perceived to be a unique place between new and traditional worlds. In an awareness of the growing divisions between these worlds Gibson and Iamo focus upon schools as sites for intervention, as places where a sense of social healing and renewal might begin, and teachers might act as agents of change. In a veiled criticism of teacher education and training they argue that,

... community school teachers need to understand the social and cultural context of schooling. Teachers (should) learn about the anthropological techniques of participant observation, ethnographic interviewing, event analysis, and the collection of oral histories and then use these techniques in their communities to help them build stronger relations between community and school. (p183)

Teachers can then incorporate into their classrooms teaching examples of local ritual practices regarding such things as death and dying, or local taboos related to gardening and fishing, or information on ancestor worship. By drawing pupils’ attention to the wide array of belief systems that exist in their villages, rather than focusing entirely on Christian religious education, as in current practice, teachers can help children deepen their appreciation of their cultural heritage. (p184)

Without exploring the sensitivities which appear to be marginalised by positioning teachers outside of their cultures, what is represented are orientations to teaching
practice which focus upon the needs of local communities and cultures. Teaching practices which imply a criticism of current definitions of what counts as knowledge and how what counts as knowledge is constructed. Such sentiments are echoes of calls made a decade earlier by Apelis (1980) who proposed a closer link between anthropology and educational research in an effort to link school knowledge with students’ cultural knowledge. There are however, few voices of influence in PNG who look to grafting new knowledge to the stock of Melanesian knowledge in ways which compliment the social and cultural lives of local communities. Bernard Narakobi is one, however, who is critical of ‘expert’ anthropological classifications of knowledge which fail to ‘give any place or legitimacy to Melanesian thought’ (1991:23) Narakobi’s contributions to the issues of education and development are put in terms of the emancipatory potential of ideas or consciousness and knowledge creation.

The real challenge to institutions of learning ... is to give the possibility to teachers and scholars to explore knowledge in the same way that they would physically explore a mountain, a jungle or sea. I believe that if we can instil this idea we will be planting in people’s minds the possibility of creating knowledge, of creating thought which will assist in addressing human needs and problems ... The task of liberation and freedom is not a political task in the sense that you chase away the colonising power and take over political control of your country. The process ... is a process of liberation ... of thoughts which impede and obstruct our construction of a better society and a better people. (1991: 24,25)

While Narakobi calls for an interrogative/explorative/reflective orientation to teaching and the study of knowledge. His emancipatory position is illustrative of a call for a constructionist view of knowledge, and the valuing of knowledge that is not separate from the knower.

In a more recent text, an analysis of dominant discourses relating to literacy education in PNG is linked with the country’s goals for national development and with issues of social justice, a somewhat problematic term given the previous discussion of what counts as traditional justice. In their discussion of literacy in PNG Ahai and Faruclas (1993) deconstruct and interrogate contradictory social and economic ‘technicist’ discourses which are seen to be implicated in the crisis in literacy. Their analysis
provides a framework for understanding how ‘villagers and settlement dwellers’ are positioned as disenfranchised ‘objects’ of neocolonialist development policies. One of the principle tenets of the NDOE’s Literacy and Awareness Program they refer to is

...to help people understand the changes occurring in contemporary PNG society and to improve their ability to maintain and enhance their awareness of and their participation in development through the improvement of basic literacy and access to development information (1993:91).

Ahai and Faracles comment,

Just what this statement means is not clear until the social, economic, and political contexts of its production are understood. An initial observation is that the ‘people’ and the ‘changes’ are clearly separated in this discourse - the people are not discursively positioned as agents of these changes, in their own society, but rather as observers of the changes. (1993:91)

What is argued for in their paper is the removal of control of literacy programs from foreign development interests and agendas through localising and indigenising literacy. In the current climate of rational economics and ‘debt crisis’ Ahia and Faracles assert that

the inability of Technicist discourse to theorise the political, social, economic, and spiritual features of PNG society render all aspects of their work, including their carefully designed techniques for teaching the mechanics of reading and writing, ineffectual because of their substantive and methodological inappropriateness to the PNG context. (1993:98)

What Ahai and Faracles are arguing for is a form of social integration which involves the legitimisation of ‘marginal knowledges’, what Foucault refers to as ‘naive knowledges’,

... a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naive knowledges located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificty ... It is through the reappearance of this knowledge, of these local popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges, that criticism performs its work (in McHoul & Grace: 1993:16).
The observations of Narakobi and Ahai and Faracis provide a further justification for undertaking a re-examination of the way teaching practices are constructed in the context of modernist discourses operating in PNG.\(^5\)

What has been presented in this section is an attempt to contextualise the issues under investigation. Without some grounding beyond their immediate context, of matters related to the research focuses, the reader is less able to judge the adequacy of the researchers’ claims. This grounding is a feature of this study and contributes to its length. What might in other studies be isolated in an appendix as supporting material, is here, in many instances, pulled into the body of the text as a way of presenting the ‘narrative’ and discursive footings of this ethnography.

**Theoretical underpinnings and related literature**

**Introduction**

Doing research in cross-cultural settings is always problematic particularly when participants’ interests and perspectives are, at worst, ignored and misrepresented, and at best, only read and interpreted through the discursive lenses of the researcher. McTaggart argues that in cross-cultural research, the linguistic and cultural traditions of Western discourse ‘constitutes a blindfold … which can be removed, but only partially removed, by thoughtful deference to the linguistic and cultural traditions of others’ (1993:70). Coming to terms with this dilemma led to some consideration of how the research process, and the representation of its findings, might themselves be used to remove part of this ‘blindfold’. What follows is an outline of the theoretical

---

\(^5\) There are in addition to these studies, a number of small studies and articles which contribute to the debate surrounding the provision and practice of community school teacher education: Pickford’s (1991) article on Action Research as a basis for examining and improving teaching and learning practices; McLaughlin’s studies of teacher educators (1988) and teachers’ college curriculum (1990); Pearse et al’s (1990) study of community school teaching; O’Donoghue’s (1990) discussion of aspects of a three year teacher training course; O’Donoghue and Austin’s (1995) study of the professional development of teacher educators in PNG. Each of these studies have thematised in different ways the notion of ‘change’ in the practice of teaching and professional development, from the more critical interpretive perspectives of Pickford and McLaughlin to the more pragmatic orientations of Pearse, O’Donoghue and Austin.
positioning of this research in 'western' terms. This theoretical positioning is later moderated in the discussion of the methodology of the research practice. This section does not unpack a neatly packaged theoretical position, but identifies and defines conceptual tools that might be used to refine research perceptions and experiences, to work towards new awarenesses. In the following sections notions of 'theory', 'critique', 'discursivity', 'pedagogy', 'subjectivity', 'language', 'practice' and 'politics' are discussed.

**Theory, critique and discursivity**

Symes and Preston argue that

> The word 'theory' in connection with education is used somewhat loosely to cover a multitude of epistemological activities, including research and inquiry, thought, understanding, critique and ideas. (1997: 6)

What is represented is the part of that multitude in which 'theory' is defined in terms of 'critique'. In the interest of improving understandings and providing opportunities for student teachers to engage other perspectives than those they frequently confront, this research is informed by various theoretical perspectives 'critically appropriated' (Lather 1991) from interpretive, critical social science, post-structural/modernist theory and sociolinguistics. These informing positions are employed to make visible the researcher's more conscious theoretical orientations and practical interests, and provide a means of better understanding the diversity of conditions and practices that are described.

Among the most influential theoretical notions are those of 'discursive formation' and 'discursive practice'. 'Discursive formation' is a construct borrowed from Foucault referring to the articulated regularities which exist between objects and practices, between particular ways of speaking, thinking, acting and knowing. It is in the identification of these coordinations that Foucault suggests discursive formations become visible.

> Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations) we will say, for the sake of convenience that we are dealing with a discursive formation (in Barrett 1991:128).
Discursive practice is a related concept that refers to the mobilisation of discursive formations.
These notions are mobilised in pursuit of the researcher's aims to uncover 'coordinations' across different teaching and learning contexts that might ultimately be employed to inform student-teachers' pedagogical understandings.

Defining Pedagogical Discourse
The notion of 'pedagogy' is commonly understood as referring to the activity of teaching, more formerly, the science of instruction. As Smyth points out such conceptions gloss the dilemmas and 'lived contradictions of ... school and classroom practices' (1986c:31), and the way pedagogy is constitutive of relations of power. In this study pedagogy might broadly be cast as social practice, its politics, its rhetoric and contexts. In its lived sense it is about the production of knowledge and how that occurs, for as Lusted observes,

Pedagogy addresses the "how" questions involved not only in the transmission or reproduction of knowledge but also in its production. Indeed, it enables us to question the validity of separating these activities so easily by asking under what conditions and through what means we 'come to know'. How one teaches ... becomes inseparable from what is being taught and, crucially, how one learns (in Gore 1993:4).

Exploring the "how" of knowledge production requires a view and an understanding of the investments made by participants involved in the process and the discursive practices constitutive of those investments. As Gore surmises,

Much of the educational production of knowledge takes place at the very private, personal level of teacher and student ... It seems to me that there is something about the educational enterprise that leads to (the) local, partial, and multiple foci ... there is something about the lives of those in classrooms, as well as the lives of (social) "classes", about activities that deal with people as thinking, feeling individuals, that requires the phenomenological, personal accounts of multiplicity and contradiction ... (1993:49)

In this research, these 'local', 'partial' and 'multiple' investments are explored through the notion of pedagogical discourse, the 'constellations' of power/knowledge relationships constitutive of social practices through which school subjects are constructed. Here pedagogical discourse refers more directly to the way pedagogy is
authorised, structured (‘disciplined’) and articulated; it refers to the way student teachers, teachers, children and parents are constituted as particular subjects/objects of schooling through certain processes of knowledge production, distribution, consumption and resistance.

**The discursive formation of pedagogical subjectivities**

In this study the ‘constitutedness’ of participant subjectivities, their self-knowledge, self-understanding and self-discipline, are seen to be a manifestation of the discursive formations and practices they inhabit and recognise, taking Cock’s point, that,

> any individual always begins to think, desire, and act in terms specified for it by an established order of things, elaborated for it by past generations of individuals who began their thinking, desiring, and acting in the same way (in Gore 1993:132).

There is in this study a particular interest in understanding what constitutes student teacher’s subjectivity in relation to the teaching experiences explored in this research. Davies argues that

> Examining any individual’s subjectivity is … a way of gaining access to the constitutive effects of the discursive practices through which we are all constituted as subjects and through which the world we live in is made real (1994:3).

Davies defines ‘subjectivity’ as different kinds of struggle, focusing upon ‘the shifting, fragmented, multi-faceted and contradictory nature of our experiences’.

Subjectivity is constituted here in the ‘intersections of discourses, storylines and relations of power’, where Davies argues,

> While not negating the power of conscious and unconscious minds to store and use the multiple layers of knowing that accumulate in any one life, each person is, nevertheless, also in an important sense constituted afresh in each new context, each new set of relations and positionings within discourses and storylines (1994:4).

Henriques et al. also have argued, that the notion of the unified, rational individual is untenable given the unstable and contradictory nature of social experience (1984:11-25). Such a state of affairs is also described in Simon’s (1987) exploration of the production of student experiences in co-operative education programs where the
positioning effects of social and institutional practices were constitutive of multiple subjectivities. In a similar way Richardson has argued that

The individual is both site and subject of discursive struggles for identity.

Because the individual is subject to multiple and competing discourses in many realms, one’s subjectivity is shifting and contradictory, not stable, fixed, rigid. (1992:518)

As such, the notion of ‘identity’ becomes less fixed, more ‘mobile’ and contingent, a site of conflicting forms of subjectivity (Weedon 1987).

How student teachers, teachers, children and parents are constituted as subjects of pedagogic discourse requires a focus on how pedagogy is taken up by subjects as well as how subjectivities inscribe pedagogy.

**The linguistic and textual production of pedagogical discourse**

In this study the role of language in the production, distribution and consumption of subjectivities and pedagogical discourse is brought into focus through the study of spoken and written texts. Here it is argued that these texts speak and write various kinds of pedagogical discourse and subject positions into existence. Lee (1994) argues that texts are the ‘linguistic realisation of discourses …’ (p28). The spoken and written texts studied in this research therefore, represent the linguistic realisation

---

6 These notions are in opposition to what Easthope and McGowan (1992) assert are ‘common sense’ notions of the nature of individuality and identity stemming from Descartes proclamation, ‘I think, therefore I am’.

Common sense tells us that human nature determines identity, that as human beings we are the authors of all that we think and speak, and that as such we shape the world around us and the knowledges which structure the world.

Common sense, then, assumes that the nature of human being is given in some way - that it exists prior to language simply to label the world of its own experience. Within this framework, the human individual is conceived as a unified centre of control from which meaning emanates. (p67)

7 Easthope and McGowan note while drawing upon the work of Lacan and Foucault, that

Within any given social and historical moment a variety of discourses exist and complete for control of a discursive battle for the meaning of their identity; their interpellation as subjects within any single discourse can never be final... the contradictions brought about by the plurality of discursive fields ensures that the individual is constantly subjected to a range of possible meanings, and is therefore an unstable site of constructions and reconstructions which often overlap. (1980: 69)
of particular ‘disciplinary order(s)’ and processes of ‘structuration’ activated with the aim of constructing ‘educated’ subjects, knowledges and practices.

As Symes and Preston argue:

Education is a (if not the) disciplinary science, one concerned with the regulation of human subjects, with the incarceration and binding of the subject, with the production of identity, particularly as it relates to the areas of desire, physical dispositions and cognitive power. The organisation and practices of the school, even its architecture, all reflect this disciplinary function. (1997:32)

Such ‘disciplinary’ structures are here argued to be discursively mediated, constituted in the context of negotiations, tensions, silences, contradictions, oppositions, in what subjects bring to schooling, and how institutional discourses operate to claim them. The texts chosen for critique are both a product and derive from the process of this ethnographic inquiry, and relate to the teaching of English, the epistemological and pedagogical orientations of student teachers, student teachers’ accounts of school experiences and teaching practice, community school progress reports, student-teacher discussions.

**Engaging in textual hemeneutics and critique**

Spoken and written texts, as social and cultural registers, communicate and construct interests through choice of topic, content, example, argument, through choice of orientation to readers and listeners, and through their staging (Halliday 1985).

Exploring and critiquing textual choices and their management is a way of examining the ideological investments of texts, their discursively mediated interests and interpretations, and a way of opening them to critical negotiation. Furthermore, Belsey asserts that,

The object of textual critique is to seek not the unity of the work, but the multiplicity and diversity of its possible meanings, its incompleteness, the omissions which it displays but cannot describe, and above all its contradictions. In its absences, and in the collision between divergent meanings, the text implicitly criticises its own ideology; it contains within itself the critique of its own values, in the sense that it is available for a new process of production of meaning by the reader, and in this process it can provide a real knowledge of the limits of ideological representation ... To
deconstruct the text, ... is to open it, to release the possible positions of its intelligibility, including those which reveal the partiality of the ideology inscribed in the text. (1980:109)

This approach to the critical analysis of texts requires the identification of divergences and convergences, the opening of arguments and information used to construct positions of authority and 'truthfulness', an exploration of silences and what is essentialised alongside the marginal and non-essential. The socio-cultural identity of texts is not found within the text but in the relations that exist between texts, in its intertextuality. The notion of intertextuality serves to support the idea that all texts are constructed from other texts and that meanings are ultimately suspended in relations between texts.

How a reader/listener connects to ideological signals in a text is a matter of the way in which the reader/listener contextualises meanings and constructs a reading position within his/her own intertextuality. Multiple meanings are an inherent characteristic of texts. Some proponents of contemporary critical theory in the field of literary criticism have rejected the notion of 'meaning in text'. Culler through Barthe foregrounds the point that,

We now know that the text is not a line of words releasing a single theological meaning ... but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture ... there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not as was hitherto said, the author. The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up writing are inscribed... A text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. (Culler 1983: 32-33)

The reader/listener is ascribed the role of 'rewriter' and constructor of text, no longer a consumer but a co-creator of a text and its meaning. Culler argues that text interpretation is divided between the idea of meaning as a 'property of the text' and meaning as 'the experience of the reader'/listener. In summing up the implications of this claim Culler takes up the Derridean notion of deferred meaning.

If we say that the meaning of a work is a reader's response, we nevertheless show, in our descriptions of response, that interpretation is an attempt to discover meaning in text. If we propose some other decisive determinant of meaning, we discover that the factors deemed crucial are subject to
interpretation in the same way as the text itself and thus defer the meaning they determine ... What deconstruction proposes is not an end to distinctions, not an indeterminacy that make meaning the invention of the reader. The play of meaning is the result of what Derrida calls “the play of the world”, in which the general text always provides further connections, correlations, and contexts. (Ibid p134)

In this sense the meanings of texts proliferate through the interpretations of multiple reader/listeners. Birch argues for a sense of textual interpretation that goes beyond what is ‘within’ the text.

... a true analysis does not remain within its object, paraphrasing what has already been said; analysis confronts the silences, the denials and the resistance in the object - not that compliant implied discourse which offers itself to discovery, but the condition which makes the work possible, which precedes the work so absolutely that it cannot be found in the work.

(Macherey in Birch 1989:17, see also Scholes 1985; and Giroux 1990)

These approaches to textual analysis provide a means to uncover social and institutional effects which situate subjects within a plurality of discourses. Such approaches acknowledge that subjects may ‘inhabit’ multiple positions in relation to particular ways of acting, talking and thinking within discourses. Understanding the existence of a multi-dimensional relation between subjectivity and intertextuality, that multiple ‘readings and writings, listenings and speakings’ of pedagogic practices are produced and reproduced through textual activity has important implications for the way post-colonial teacher education is conducted and understood.

Understanding the politics of practice: Appropriating the defining perspectives and categories of Action Research in the production of an emancipatory pedagogical discourse.

Pedagogical discourse in this research refers not only to practices, theories and subjective identifications associated with teaching and learning, but also to the social and cultural contestations constitutive of individual and institutional meanings which frame these practices, theories and identifications. In this regard, McTaggart (1993) draws attention to the way ‘individual identity’ and ‘institutional culture’ are mutually constituted.
Individual identity and institutional culture (and the forms of work made possible) come about by complex processes of contestation... The institutionalisation of particular kinds of social practices occurs through contestation. Some activities are chosen and reshaped ahead of others through an essentially political process (p69).

In seeking to uncover these ‘political’ processes the following constructs are drawn from critical social science discourse: ‘praxis’: a reflexive, educative and emancipatory enterprise concerned with acting and living in socially just ways (Carr and Kemmis 1983); ‘reflexivity’: using the self as an object of learning through deconstructing discourse, identifying contradiction, reaching imaginative illumination (Fulcher 1996), and forging critical thought in cross-cultural settings (McTaggart 1988; Giroux 1983, Lather 1991); ‘action’: interrupting and reconstructing social practice (Arendt 1958; Smyth 1986b); and ‘culture’ as webs of meanings and significations (McTaggart 1988, Geertz 1975), and Fiske’s view that

Culture is concerned with meanings and pleasures: our culture consists of the meanings we make of our social experience and of our social relations and therefore the sense we have of our ‘selves’. It also situates those meanings within the social system, for a social system can only be held in place by the meanings that people make of it. Culture is deeply inscribed in the differential distribution of power within a society, for power relations can only be stabilised or destabilised by the meanings that people make of them. Culture is a struggle for meanings as society is a struggle for power. (1987:25)

These constructs and this view of culture suggest that to explore pedagogy is to explore its ‘cultural politics’, ie what pedagogy means as a form of power/knowledge: the contests, movements and struggles which attend the production, legitimation and dispersion of meanings, and what comes to be seen as ‘true’ and ‘normal’ practice. McTaggart (1993) argues that the constructs outlined offer a means of confronting and articulating some of the contradictions of Western cultural imperialism in developing countries. That these constructs provide a conceptual framework for critically exploring the ‘political’ nature of pedagogical knowledge and action, its production and links to wider, institutional, social, political and cultural conditions that shape and coordinate schooling and classroom discourses. As Symes and Preston observe, making sense of the activities of education requires a knowledge of its
contexts and a theorising of the link between those activities and their wider social context and purpose.

Education as a field of understanding ... is concerned with making sense of teaching and learning, and with describing, among other matters, the contexts and conditions, in which they typically occur, as well as specifying the role education ought to play in a given social formation or arrangement. (1997:7) Young’s (1991; 1996) work is also underpinned by this position but also draws on the genealogical analytics of Foucault to draw attention to ‘(institutional) structural processes of cultural oppression’ (1996:200), and the way that discourse ideologies ‘inscribe’ subjects. Young argues that at every stage in the transmission of utterances and texts (the texts of pedagogic practice) opportunities present themselves for multiple readings and writings and provide spaces for challenging and constructing other readings. These spaces are opportunities for other knowledges and other ways of knowing to confront the imperialisms of western educational practices.

In the context of this research, critical post-structural/modern theories provide analytical frames for an uncovering of the contestations of the cultural politics of pedagogic discourse. Drawing from the work of Foucault (1980) and Derrida (see Norris 1987), such theories stimulate a greater awareness of the way language mediates social practices often represented as ‘either/or’ binaries, dualisms and dichotomies.

In practical terms drawing upon post-structural and critical theory in this research means identifying both discursive commonalities and contradictions in social and institutional discourse as a means of auditing the interests of western styled schooling in PNG. The search for commonalities across individual and institutional practices is an attempt to ‘discern regularit(ies): an order in their successive appearance, correlations in their simultaneity, assignable positions in a common space, a reciprocal functioning, linked and hierarchised transformations’, the naturalising and normalising powers of discourse (Foucault in Barrett 1991:128). The search for and an unravelling of, contradictions, an attempt to better understand and re-view social and institutional practices.
Towards a culturally sensitive reflective practice

One aim of this research is to nurture and enhance both researcher’s and students’ capacities as reflective practitioners where, as Habermas argues, ‘through self-reflection a subject becomes aware of the unconscious pre-suppositions of completed acts’ (Habermas in Bleicher 1987:186). Kemmis (1985) describes reflection as a socially transformative moment, ‘express(ing) and serv(ing) particular human, social, cultural and political interests’, ‘actively reproduc(ing) or transform(ing) ... ideological practices ...’ (p149). Underlying this definition are assumptions about the nature of action and moral judgement, assumptions which Grundy (1983) represents in terms of ‘practical’ and ‘emancipatory praxis’, as critical realisations of self and society (p12).

In a western context, Beyer and Zeichner (1987) argue that teacher education is dominated by a ‘technocratic rationality’ concerned with ‘the technical application of knowledge for the purpose of attaining given ends’, ends which are largely taken for granted. The effect, Beyer and Zeichner note, ‘has been to trivialise the relationship between teacher and learner by assigning teachers the role of technical, value-free behaviour manager’ (p315). It is argued here, however, that the activities of teaching and learning are

... far more than a set of technical tasks and vocational obligations, they are cultural frames in terms of which attitudes are formed and lives constructed.
(Geertz 1988:14)

In western pedagogical discourse, ‘reflection’ and ‘reflexivity’ have been the focus of much academic interest related to mediating the excesses of a technicist approach to pedagogy in an attempt to develop more dialectical-dialogical modes of classroom and institutional practice (see Dewey 1933; Elliott 1980; Zeichner 1982; Henry 1985; Smyth 1986 a,b,c; Gore 1987; Liston & Zeichner 1987; Boud, Keough & Walker 1985; Kemmis & Mc Taggart 1988; Fulcher 1996). In the third world such an approach potentially opens up the possibility for more culturally and socially relevant forms of theorising and knowledge production.  

---

8 Shumway argues that
Theorising is not the natural activity of unfettered reasoning; rather, it is a particular kind of discursive practice with its own cultural specificity.
Theorising is a particular kind of critical thinking ... a distinctive product of Western cultures. For example, the ideal of thinking critically assumes a
Conclusion
The theory framework for this study makes ‘critical appropriations’ in the areas outlined above for the purpose of understanding the confluence of interests, powers and knowledges constitutive of particular pedagogic structures and practices. Language is viewed as a social practice involved in the production, reproduction, distribution and consumption of local and ‘global meanings, its role has been given prominence in this study through the focus on texts. This research also draws upon the theoretical tradition of critical social science in order to better understand the political economies that operate in pedagogical discourse, to better understand schooling and to begin to ‘empower those involved to change as well as to understand the world’ (Lather 1991:4).

Methods of data collection: Ethnography and critical transformative research

Introduction
Developed in the era of European colonial expansion, ethnography has underpinned the anthropological study of culture and, as an orientation to research, has been informed through the notable works of Bronislaw Malinowski, Margaret Mead, and Clifford Geertz. Denzin (1997) argues that ethnography as ‘interpretive inquiry’ may be seen in terms of five ‘moments’: the traditional ‘realist works’ of the early 1900’s; ‘works’ with their foundations in postwar modernity; ‘works’ that employed the multiple theoretical paradigms of ‘positivism ... phenomenology, critical, semiotics, hermeneutics, psychoanalysis, structuralism, feminism ..’; ‘experimental works’ which reflect the current crisis in representation emerging from the blurring of genres of the previous moment; and the current emergence of ‘self-conscious’ accounts drawing upon post-structural perspectives and ‘anchored in the interactional experiences of the reflexive ethnographer' (p19) where Denzin observes, ‘(w)e are our own subjects’ (p27). This study is located somewhere in the latter part of these ethnographic ‘moments’. It is a hybrid work, that has involved extended periods of

competitive rather than cooperative use of language, and such a use is not typical of many non-Western cultures (Shumway 1994:102).
participant observation, living with the people being studied, learning the language, observing social and institutional life, distilling understandings and meanings researcher and subjects place upon events, representing behaviours and beliefs that constitute researcher and participants’ subjective realities, constructing textual accounts of cultural phenomena. Defining this ethnography, is a matter of defining social practices and their constitutive discourses, their purposes and what they ‘know’ at the point of intersection between participants. To define ethnography purely in terms of method and the reporting of data, is, according to Marcus, to embrace the ‘rhetoric of positivist sociologism’ (1986:184). To define it in relational and interactional terms is to acknowledge the unavoidable interpretative processes which operate in social engagement between researcher, field and participants. What is involved is an ongoing process of discoursally mediated, conscious and unconscious sense making, the situated layering of perspectives and interpretations. The researcher is here a close associate of the community, a participant, observing, doing, listening, conversing, asking, recording and collaborating, interpreting the actions of subjects in the context of their own interpretations of events. The researcher’s understandings of subjects’ realities is found in the nature of the dialogue between discourses of the ‘self’ and the ‘Other’ in the context of what Geertz (1975) has referred to as ‘the flow of social discourse’. Within the broad sweep of ethnographic work Geertz highlights a central concern, that of ‘trying to determine what this people or that take to be the point of what they are doing...’ (1983:4). The research undertaken here seeks also to interpret and construct participants’ perspectives, actions and sensitivities and their wider articulations. From this perspective James Clifford, argues that,

Ethnography is actively situated between powerful systems of meaning. It poses its questions at the boundaries of civilisations, cultures, classes, races, and genders. Ethnography decodes and recodes, telling the grounds of collective order and diversity, inclusion and exclusion. It describes processes of innovation and structuration, and is itself part of these processes.

(Clifford & Marcus 1986:2-3)

This ethnographic dimension is revealed not just through the revelation of the researcher in the study, but also through what the researcher’s presence in the field
represents in terms of a broader social and political economy of schooling, teacher education and community life. While acknowledging the influence of contexts and participants upon the meanings constructed, an accounting is also needed of the way this ethnography is situated in the context of the institutional life and pedagogic aims of the researcher.

**Coming to terms with criticisms of ethnography and critical transformative research.**

The criticisms that ethnographic thinking lacks objectivity (is subjective), lacks generality (is relative or relational), don’t necessarily miss making a point, but highlight other ways of understanding the world. Ways that argue against representing the social world in terms of facts and unifying generalities while backgrounding participants perceptions, intuitions and understandings. There are however, other more penetrating criticisms relevant to this field, which strike more directly at ethnography and anthropological research, at its moral and political dimensions. As Geertz (1988:132) points out, much anthropological research and writing has been rooted in a ‘colonialist’ settlement and based upon the assumption that the subjects and audiences of anthropological work were separate, both in a moral and political sense. Geertz documents how contemporary anthropology in the Third World is open to the criticism that it is neo-colonialist, that it perpetuates an asymmetrical moral and political relationship of economic and sociological domination and subordination (Fabian in Geertz 1988:131-135). Third World feminists, for example, have documented protests over the continuing absence in anthropological writing of women’s perspectives and voices, the continuing marginalisation of Third World women despite the rise of First World feminism in the West, and the undifferentiated categorisation of Third World women (Spivak 1990; Lather1991:121).

Deference towards local voices and cultural articulations needs to be supported by an awareness of the ‘Otherness’ of the researcher and the often discomforting sense of marginality that both researchers and participants can experience, the sense of lessening or exalting of one’s position in the moral and political economies of the Other. And so, to become aware that from within the boundaries of different cultural discourses and in the silences and embarrassments that attend ambiguities there is
much that can be appreciated as new ‘selves’ emerge, as defensive positions are discarded and participation becomes more truly informed and mutual.

Critical transformative research is often underpinned by the motivation to inform and improve social practices. In this it goes beyond description and analysis to address ideological and structural barriers to more democratic and empowered kinds of participation. Berlak & Berlak (1987) define empowerment as

... contributing to the shaping of society, rather then being subjected to the powers of others. It goes beyond critical thought and includes a readiness to act with others to bring about social conditions that one has chosen through a process of collaborative, critical inquiry. (p170)

Knoebel & Lankshear (1995) have argued that claims of ‘empowerment’, should be subject to rigorous and careful theoretical and conceptual attention involving the following clarifications:

- the subject of empowerment who it is that ... will be empowered;
- the discursive structures and mechanisms of production and distribution of power in relation to which, or in opposition to which, a person, group, or community is being empowered;
- the processes or ‘qualities’ through which or by which empowerment will occur;
- the sorts of ends or outcomes which can or do result from being thus empowered. (p18)

Avoiding excessive ‘transformative’ and ‘empowerment’ claims involves a consideration of a researcher’s own positions, a foregrounding of their limits. That is, how researchers are inscribed by dominant discourses and ideologies, how they understand their own complicity in the circumstances and inequities under consideration, how they are also bearers of power or injustice. It is to keep in mind Lather’s question, ‘How do our very efforts to liberate perpetuate the relations of dominance?’ (1991:16).

In this research, what is a recognised is that all researcher-participant relations are limited, mediated by and realised within particular social and institutional structures and frameworks. With this in mind careful consideration was given in this research to the kinds of didactic collaborations which might stimulate the development of student teachers’ critical capacities. The experientially based literacy teaching
approach, Do Talk Record (see Chapter Six), was used to scaffold student-teachers practice teaching experiences as a way of stimulating specific and meaningful dialogue and reflection on teaching actions which had real consequences, and, it is argued increasing the potential for a transformative educative effect.

**Why ethnography**

The use of ethnographic techniques is not the same as doing ethnography, nevertheless, at a pragmatic level, Geertz (1988) has argued that ethnographic thinking is about constructing informing contexts, through ‘trafficking in the symbolic forms available in one or another community’ (p153), and from an ideational perspective, ethnography is also represented as the study of local worlds, and the study of socio-cultural ideations as cultural artefacts expressed in terms of the activities that sustain them (Geertz p152). Ethnographic techniques are used in classroom and school-based studies, such as those reviewed by Osborne (1987). In addressing the problem of ‘knowing’ classrooms, practices and structures, participant observation and non-structured interview techniques are sometimes used within the cultural settings of classrooms and schools. Measurement instruments may also be used as they are generated in the field after initial observation and inquiry. The amount of time researchers spend in the field is believed to be crucial not only to the development of an awareness of ‘deep structures’ and related complexities, but also in the development of participant collaborations. Osborne refers to what he sees as the major limitations of the ethnographic paradigm as applied to schools-based research. Firstly, while seeking to describe and explain classroom phenomena, ethnography cannot offer solutions; ‘it can only tackle surface features and not the deep structure, symptoms but not the cause’ (p117). Secondly, as with quantitative studies, there are threats to external reliability (replicability), through variableness in researcher status, informant choice; social situations and conditions, analytical constructs and premises; methods of data collection and analysis; and internal reliability, the degree to which multiple observers/participants might agree on what is seen and heard; variation in the inference levels of descriptors; having only a single researcher; absence of scrutiny and mechanical data collection. Thirdly, Osborne outlines what are posed as threats to the validity of ethnographic research, whether or not ‘researchers actually observe and measure what they think they are observing and
measuring', and the extent to which 'abstract constructs and postulates generated, refined or tested ... (are) applicable across groups' (p118).

Osborne's problem-solving approach to ethnographic research fails to entertain the possibility that some problems may not be 'objectively' solvable or generalisable. Given that all research is theory laden, implicitly or explicitly, Lankshear and McLaren (1993) make the point that all theories are constituted by a 'problematic', i.e. the 'issues, questions, and topics framed within a theoretical stance and which the theorist seeks to explain', and that the problematic can serve a dual purpose. A first purpose being to provide a guide to solving problems where, '(e)xisting relations of power and their institutional organization provide the framework for problem-solving action', and the problem is broken down into manageable units, variables identified and acted upon. They include a second purpose, where the problematic promotes a 'reflective and introspective' consideration of the process of theorising, 'to become clearly aware of the perspective which gives rise to the theorising and its relation to other perspectives ... to open up the possibility of choosing a different valid perspective from which the problematic becomes now of creating an alternative world' (p32). While the first purpose is common in managerial discourses, the second promotes a consideration of the wider social, political and cultural economies within which a problem exists. It takes on the role of questioning both the power-knowledge relations within these economies and within the research design and process itself.

This critical approach takes on the role of investigating how problems are named and framed, how problems are posed, set and linked to wider social and historical circumstances. This form of critique when applied to Osborne's positivist preoccupations with reliability, universality, and generalisability in ethnographic research, reveal very different views of what counts as knowledge, as, in a very different way, do reflections upon notions of tentativeness, multivariability, difference and diversity.

Validity may be supported, it is claimed, in ethnography through processes of triangulation where multiple perspectives are gathered on a particular issue, and through member checks (Lather 1991:66). Yet triangulation is reductionist in its assumptions, for as Miller (1997:25) argues,

A major assumption of the triangulation strategy is that sociological research is a discovery process designed to get at an objective truth that may be systematised as a formal theory of social structure and process. Triangulation
assumes that looking at an object from more than one standpoint provides researchers and theorists with more comprehensive knowledge about the object.

Miller argues that different ways of looking construct different objects, and do not reveal 'indisputable facts about a single social reality' (p25). What Miller argues for is the possibility of a dialogue between perceptions, between accounts, methods and categories.

In this research, such a dialogue is attempted through the study's textuality, through the construction of 'discourse', the tracing out of the conditions of possibility for understanding and acting within the versions of social reality portrayed through the activities and circumstances researched.

Unlike research which aims to replace people's everyday practical theories with more rigorous, scientifically tested and generalisable theories, this ethnography aims to better understand local theories and their complexity by focussing upon specific instances as unique and important and not generalising widely from them. In respect of generalising, Schratz and Walker make the point that,

In conventional theory the central move is from particular observations to generalised statements ... we see the research task, not as that of generating and sustaining generalisation, but preventing it. We believe that human thinking too readily generalises and that a key function for research is to slow down or even block the process... (that it be) aimed at making us look twice at things we observe, listen carefully to what people say and re-read texts slowly... Our aim is to resist generalising, to scrutinise every statement for values, to search for blind spots in our own perceptions in order to understand both the espoused theories and theories-in-use of all those involved in a particular setting, event or process. We see theory as implicit in every social action, not simply the concern of academic theorists, and rather than seeking to replace these everyday theories with those we consider better, we seek to explicate them and understand them. (1995:105)

Valuing the perspectives and knowledge of participants is therefore central to this ethnographic research. This study is not concerned with the search for law-like regularities or causal relations to generalise to other contexts. It is concerned with describing and understanding, and encouraging further investigation of the effects of particular 'disciplinary' practices of pedagogy and schooling.
**Ethnography and interactional ethics**

Questions regarding the nature of the dialogue between researcher and participants and whose interests are being served are important in this study. The extent to which researcher and participants shared research interests and focuses, and the extent to which both voices are heard, shifts with each study as aspects of the dual purposes of gaining understanding and transforming understanding become more or less central. This is largely due to the situated nature of the research, to the different institutional relationships that mediated researcher and participants’ actions and positions.

As ‘educational’ or ‘applied’ research, it is an example of what Tax (1960) refers to as ‘action anthropology’ where the researcher ‘wants to help a group of people and wants to learn something in the process’ (p85). Walker (1986,1993) argues that best outcomes are reached through a collaborative ‘educational’ relationship between the researcher, subjects and audience:

> an interactive relationship between researcher and subjects ... in order to increase the responsiveness of the researcher to the problems, issues and work conditions of the subject (p183).

Such an orientation, addresses in part the criticism raised by Willis that ethnographic methods, unameliorated, ‘display a tendency towards naturalism and therefore to conservatism’ (1981:194).

Tyler refers to the implication of the prefix ‘ethno’ in the word ‘ethnography’ suggesting that it both privileges the voices and positions of research participants, and ‘makes its own contextual grounding part of the question’ (1986:139). What needs to be added in this ‘privileging’ is a consideration of the ethics of engagement which accounts for the effects that are generated through interactions characterised by differences in culture, institutional register and situation.

The following criteria outlined by Schwartz and Jacobs (in Watkins 1983) were used to inform the researcher’s cross-cultural behaviour.

- Each person is not a mere observer of the other but assumes that the other can affect and be affected by him/her in practical ways;
- One person has practical reasons to present himself (herself) to the other(s) as a kind of person with certain traits;
- Impressions are formed not through observations but during the course of an interaction between two persons, such as conversation;
• Impressions occur within a particular social setting ... with its own distinctive’
definition of the situation; this in its turn, affects the ‘definition of the people
within it’.

These criteria informed a dialectical-dialogic research practice which developed in
the course of numerous interactions and had the effect of increasing reflexivity
throughout the research process. With this orientation ethnography becomes a form of
social action, inquiry and analysis embedded in an understanding of local social and
political economies. Such research, as that of Anderson and Irvine (1993), aims to
critique the relationship between particular social sites and the wider ideological and
sociopolitical structures. Ethnographic research in this sense is an ideological
undertaking that goes beyond interpretivist self-disclosure. Anderson and Irvine argue
that,

Critical ethnographers attempt to ascertain why a particular meaning system
exists by examining the conditions that necessitate its social construction and
the advantages afforded certain interests. (p86)

Such research is characterised by a rejection of positivist notions of intelligibility; a
privileging of participant’s accounts; a concern for the distorting effects of ideology
in transcription and interpretation; a concern to expose social contradiction and
resistance; a grounding of research processes and products in the realities of
participants.

**Doing ethnography**

Watson-Gego in Allwright (1994:36) outlines a three phase research sequence which
provided an initial frame for orientating this study.

1. The comprehensive stage in which the ethnographer collects potentially
   pertinent data;

This process consisted of ongoing observations, conversations, interviews, and
thinking while working in the college, schools and surrounding communities. It
employed a variety of means to record what students, teachers, children and parents
said and wrote in different contexts. This data become a primary source of
information on teaching and learning and from which other focuses were derived.
2. The topic-oriented stage in which the research topic is narrowed via focused observations and appropriate interactions;

The decision regarding what to focus upon emerged in the context of emerging understandings regarding what might benefit student teachers in their preparations to become teachers, what aspects of schooling and pedagogy seemed to be excluded, and what things students might do to enhance their understandings of different pedagogical practices and their effects. Confirming that the area of investigation was relevant and appropriate involved consideration of students’ orientations to pedagogy, and a review of academic thinking in the area.

3. The hypothesis-oriented stage in which hypotheses are tested and research questions answered, through in-depth interviews, more focused observations, discourse analysis etc.

This stage involved collecting, analysing and theorising data aimed at gaining new understandings to inform the areas of investigation.

Allwright argues that a ‘data-first’ approach is important in developing ‘grounded theory’, ie ‘theory which stems from data rather than from logic alone’ (p36).

As a participant, my theories and beliefs were scrutinised, grounded in experience and read beside my own epistemological orientations.

Procedurally this study can be characterised as ‘hunt and peck ethnography’ (Watkins 1983). A way of working which focuses upon illuminating particular research issues through investigating different sites and circumstances that contribute to a better overall understanding of the issues. This research emerged as a parade of questions being asked and answered (in the form of experiences, explanations and theories) and gradually took shape through a process of what Stake (1995:9) refers to as ‘progressive focusing’. The following structured and unstructured approaches were employed in the context of engaging participants and circumstances.
Participant observation and participant engagement

The most common research activities might be labelled participant observation and participant engagement. The latter involved participating in the routine activities of the teachers’ college in which I was working, and more particularly in the preparation and teaching of courses in teaching English as a second language. This work took me into community schools and local communities, both as a contact person in language teaching and as a supervisor of student teaching and projects.

Participant observation and engagement, may be seen, Geertz (1988) suggests, not as methods but as ‘literary dilemmas’, that is, a problem of ‘participant description’ where the research process is represented as a product through the accounts of an ‘I-witness’. In this study, besides researcher accounts and commentary there are multiple ‘I-witnesses’. The participant accounts are more than diary-to-text constructions, the ‘being-there’ persona projected in these studies by the writer is a dialogic one where matters are reflexively explored. But ‘being-there’ is presented in this research as a problematic for in all the cases presented my presence is backgrounded in an attempt to foreground the unconscious knowing of participants. By foregrounding the accounts of participants, by making visible the means of data production, and the unfolding, diachronic approach to analysis, it was assumed that the reader would be better positioned to assess the validity of the research conclusions.9

Journals: gathering introspective information

One of the aims of this research has been to better understand the ways that teaching and learning are being interpreted and understood by student teachers in particular teaching contexts. During this study student teachers were engaged in pedagogic practices requiring the reflexive representation of their teaching through writing.

---

9 To paraphrase Geertz (1983: 8) this study puts Papua New Guinean students, teachers, parents and childrens’ representations of the world into interpretative tension with my own as a kind of commentary on both of them. My research theory becomes visible in the portrayal and analysis of data providing insights into the discourses of both researcher and participants. The setting aside of researcher impressions, in order to only see participants experiences within a framework of their own understandings and situations, or the taking up of an ‘all-knowing’ position is not upheld in these studies. The teaching/learning relation between the researcher and some of the participants has the effect of situating both as participants and researchers in a process of constructing educational discourse.
Through both extended teaching practicums, and regular school-based experiences where student teachers worked with small groups of children on literacy activities, student teachers recorded their experiences and practices. The journals had a dual purpose: Firstly, to encourage reflective teaching practices, and secondly, to provide lecturers with feedback on student teaching processes. Drawing on the work of Holly (1984), journals were used to bring together personal and professional dimensions of students' experiences in order to provide not just a record of their interpretations (and for some a record of their interpretations of those interpretations) of pedagogy and schooling, but as a point of reference for examining practices further. Students undertaking Practicums were asked to make ten Journal entries and were given the following prompt questions: ‘What happened today? What did I do? How did the class react to my teaching? How do I feel about my teaching?’ Students undertaking structured School Experience were asked to write up their experiences in Journal form and given guiding categories such as, descriptions, feelings, comments and plans. These categories broadly involved a description of the activities and events of a lesson from the student’s perspective; a recording of responses to what transpired; comments on particular ‘critical’ aspects or incidents which took the attention of the student; and plans for future action. The benefits of Journal writing to second language teacher training are outlined by Porter et al (1990), and as a research instrument by Nunan (1992). The four student teachers’ journals that are the focus of Chapters 6 and 7 were kept for a period of one Semester. The footnoted Journals are extracts from student teachers Journals kept over the period of their two Second year semesters.

The reasons for focusing upon students’ written accounts were that it was anticipated that they would provide subjective (insider) views of interactions with learners, and the management of teaching and learning strategies and classroom contexts, that would be more detailed, complex and recoverable than spoken accounts. It was hoped that they would be representations of pedagogy and schooling from the perspective of those not completely apprenticed to its disciplines and ideologies and reveal a range of purposes, motivations and interests. Furthermore, it was believed that they would ‘unmask’ dislocations and discontinuities in teacher training experiences in a way that would provide opportunities for critique and the development of improved understandings. The contribution of student journals to this research was by individual agreement. Students were asked to contribute their writing to the research
as a means of making it accessible to other students and the wider educational community.

**Discussing teaching fundamentals**

Complimentary to students’ journal writing, small discussion groups were organised to explore the ‘foundational’ categories students assumed in their writing. Discussions were semi-structured and consisted mainly of requests for clarification of journal entries in a debriefing process where they asked questions like, ‘What happened here?’ ‘How did you feel?’ and ‘What does this mean?’. This approach is similar to work done by Pearson & Smith (1985) on debriefing in reflective learning. In pedagogical terms, the dialogic nature of the group discussions and definings generated a range of student positions and negotiations, and a refining of understandings while providing a medium for student teachers to construct and realise their understandings.

Students were also asked to take the ideas of ‘teaching’, ‘learning’, ‘curriculum’, ‘evaluation’, ‘discipline’, and make them, both subjects and objects of their reflection in order to promote the development of their own internal knowledge. The process offered to them was one of joint construction of ideas, mediated by questions that were designed to guide their analysis of the idea.

To support this shaping process a number of questions were prepared for students to discuss as they wished. In preparing questions it was considered that the potential for ‘taken-for-granted’ theories to play a self-teaching role increased when the subject matter of expectations became problematic. Through the questions provided students were afforded opportunities to read the issue of curriculum in ways similar to Scholes (1985) notions of reading within, beside and against a text. That is, students were prompted to talk about ‘teaching’, ‘learning’, ‘curriculum’, ‘evaluation’, ‘discipline’ in terms of their ‘conventional’ meanings; to talk into being different interpretations; and to confront their ideologies. In all of these dialogues the researcher was not present. Students consented to have their discussions taped and they were played to other class groups for comment and discussion. Parts of those discussions are outlined in this research.

There were two broad objectives to these dialogic activities: to provide talked accounts of student thinking on the above concepts, and in the process, shape and deepen that thinking.
Questionnaire
In this research, a long answer questionnaire was used to generate data on student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations; to gain an understanding of the range and kind of categories which students used to structure their perceptions about schooling; and to gain an understanding of the ways students represented those understandings. (see Appendix One)

Field notes and descriptions
Another source of data comes from notes that were compiled on the basis of general observations in classrooms, schools, and communities. These notes were impressions and commentaries on impressions that arose in the midst of activity and observation. They often represented interrogations of my own thoughts, or strokes of insight, or links with other thoughts and happenings, or merely prompts to stimulate recall of moments which passed too quickly or were too complex to record or understand at the time, or were too interesting to leave or inappropriate to write.

Document search
A number of documents: minutes of meetings, school reports and notices, students reports and writing; departmental notices were searched and provided a broader expression of institutional meanings. Where possible some were collected. A record of staff and classroom noticeboard postings was made as important sources of action-structuring criteria.

Audio recordings
At different points of the research there was a need to capture the oral language of participants. This resulted in the audio recording of unstructured interviews, selected lessons and group discussions.

Conversing and listening
Much time was spent conversing, listening and ‘being there’ in the college, in schools and the wider community. In the context of everyday activity there was the social world of the campus to be negotiated, where students, staff and their families lived. In the context of earning a living there were colleagues and co-workers, students and
parents, there was liaison with school principals, governing councils and staff. In the wider community there were villagers, council and government workers, storekeepers, businessmen and women, police and 'raskals'. It was informing and engaging as the social and professional aspects of working and living merged and generated a powerful sense of inclusiveness.

A summary of college-based, community school and community based texts
This research also draws upon college-based texts including curriculum documents, staff meeting notes; NDOE texts, curriculum and policy documents; and field notes. Community school-based texts include, lesson transcripts, interviews with teachers and principals; notes from meetings; staff board notices, classroom tests, pupil reports, and children’s writing; Community-based texts include interview transcripts and field notes.

Multiple realities and multi-vocality: a juxtaposition of participant meanings
These documents and texts provide a mix of discursively mediated perspectives and positions from which this ethnography draws. Lutz is critical of studies that focus only on individual interactions and meanings and fail to account for broader influences. He argues that the narrow focus of micro-ethnography in education is limiting, and

exclude(s) studies of educational issues and questions in a broader and as least as important context - that of the school district-community, cultural perspective.

He further suggests that,

(a) narrow focus, while generating some important knowledge, fails to shed light on the more complex issues that account for much of what goes on (or doesn’t go on) in schooling. (1983:53)

The purpose of exploring a range of sites and ‘voices’ is to bring into view and print some of the often unrecognised, naturalised and invisible voices and discourses that sustain and give life and structure to pedagogy. It is to explore practices, circumstances and thinking that are assumed to be unproblematic in the process of teacher development, both in terms of their acceptance as ‘givens’ and in terms of their stereotypicality. It is also to pursue better understandings of pedagogic practice, by asking with Foucault, ‘What discourse has enabled this way of thinking?’
(McHoul & Grace 1993:15) and with McLaren and Lankshear, how is this discourse 'embedded in the prevailing economies of power?' (1993:403). It is to promote an approach to researching understandings that reflects an interest in a broadening rather than a narrowing of focus, enlarging rather than reducing research contexts.

**The problematics of interpretation and representation of texts.**

In exploring the problematics of ethnographic writing, interpretation and text-building, Geertz (1988) in *Works and Lives* considers a variety of ways ethnographic work has been textualised. What he reveals are a variety of text-forms arising from a range of authorial processes, purposes and writing contexts, from diary and biographical accounts, with linear and recursive text shapes, to academically distanced and contrastive accounts as series of co-occurring texts that compete and interfere with each other.

Clifford (1986) argues that as ethnographic writing is bounded and contextualised by textual strategies, its 'truths' are partial and incomplete. They are also incomplete to the extent that the process of portrayal is essentially a process interpretation and translation. In one sense Geertz's notion of 'thick description' (1975) and Lutz's holistic ethnography (1983) need to be mediated by an awareness of the problematics of interpretation and representation, in another however, it may be argued that 'completeness' is always illusive, that the 'textual' goal can legitimately be a mediated understanding. These problematics are discussed by Clifford and Marcus (1986), Geertz (1988), in an educational context by Lather (1994), in a discussion of intercultural learning and communication by Young (1996) and by Denzin (1997) who argues for a new form of ethnographic textuality one 'that is caught in the grip of a mobile consciousness recording its relationship to an ever-changing external world' (p46). It is this form of textuality that is closest to the macro structure of this thesis in
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10 Multivocality, as a feature of postmodern theory has been critiqued by Mascia-Lees et al (1989) for its potential to 'erase difference'. Mascia-Lees et al. caution that, if the postmodernist emphasis on multivocality leads to the denial of the continued existence of a hierarchy of discourse, the material and historical links between cultures can be ignored, with all voices becoming equal, each telling only an individualized story. The history of the colonial, for example, can be read as independent of the coloniser. Such readings ignore or obscure exploitation and power differentials and therefore offer no ground to fight oppression and effect change (in Lankshear & McLaren 1993:396).
its arrangement, in its juxtaposition of what appear to be unrelated cases. The relationship between cases is one underpinned by their purposes as pedagogic texts. Researched and used in classes these cases not only represent sites where the articulations of pedagogic discourse are found, but more particularly represent some of the researcher’s efforts to introduce student teachers, through ‘local’ cases, to the situated nature of teaching, learning and schooling.

As such, there is an interest that the texts and cases should, in part, speak for themselves. Marcus (1986) observes that different ethnographies situate ethnographic representations differently. In some, participant representations are ‘backgrounded, marginalised, or subordinated to a purpose’, a purpose which contributes to the understanding or explanation of a problem. In others, representations are the focus. Marcus observes that

in both cases ... ethnographic detail shares textual space with other varieties of writing, including historical narrative, literary exegesis, and autobiographical confession (p189).

Confronting the question of selection of sites and accounts for representation as well as the process of representing is as Marcus suggests, to engage in a process of ‘rhetorical self-consciousness’. But more than this, each major focus of this study also consists of a particular kind of staging of research moments generated through the medium of different research registers.

**Presenting and organising the study: cases and intertexts**

Each of the studies in this research is a ‘case’. In defining ‘case’, Walton (1992) suggests that on the one hand

... cases are situationally grounded, limited views of social life ... On the other hand they are something more - not simply glimpses of the world or random instances of social activity. When researchers speak of a ‘case’ rather than a circumstance, instance, or event, they invest the study of a particular social setting with some sense of generality... A ‘case’ implies a family; it alleges that the particular is a case of something else.

In this notion of ‘case’, Walton focuses upon links that make ‘case study’ a meaningful example of social life. Walker (1986, 1993) however, takes a less essentialist view, arguing that ‘case study’ is
... the examination of an instance in action. The study of particular incidents and events and the selective collection of information on biography, personality, intentions and values, allows the case study worker to capture and portray those elements of a situation that give it meaning. In educational evaluation or research the case study worker may attempt to study and portray the impact in a school of a particular innovation, the experience of a curriculum development team, the development of an idea through a number of social organisations, the influence of a social and professional network, or a day in the life of a teacher, administrator or pupil. These very different studies have in common some commitment to the study and portrayal of the idiosyncratic and the particular as legitimate in themselves. (pp189-190)

In this definition, Walker focuses less on the links cases may seem to have to wider social contexts and more on the intrinsic legitimacy of studying particularities. In this research both of these aspects of case study are embraced as particular cases are linked to the study to provide a larger study of aspects of pedagogic discourse.

**Intertexts**

Between the cases, and throughout the body of the thesis other texts have been inserted as a way of illustrating how pedagogic discourse in different forms is woven into the lives and life of schooling, its participants and communities. These texts act as counterpoints to the texts and practices of schooling, a reaction to their disciplinary regimes.

Some intertexts are provided for the purpose of more deeply contextualising the study, in order to make it more accessible to readers without a background in the contexts of schooling and teacher education in PNG. They are included to provide descriptions and commentary, to illustrate supporting and sometimes contradictory perspectives, to strip away some of the ‘certainties’ of this research. They are at times disruptive and representative of questions and issues that intruded continually upon the process of understanding the nature of pedagogic discourse. They reflect some of the difficulties of doing and writing ethnography, of using an ‘academic’ language to represent and interpret people, places and practices. They reflect some of the things I felt most hesitant to disturb. They, like the texts used within the different cases, carry intertextual meanings worthy of further consideration.
In his discussion of intertextuality Lemke (1995:257) argues for the importance of an understanding of how communities ‘construct relationships of meaning between texts’ by considering which texts are relevant for the interpretation of other texts. In this he considers two questions, ‘What kinds of meanings are made by constructing these relationships between texts?’ and ‘What kinds of meanings are not made because a community will not, or cannot, make these sorts of connections between other texts available to it?’. It is on the basis of this last question that I have tried to enrich the ethnographic tapestry of this research by placing these texts more in the foreground than as conventional appendages.

A chronology of inquiry
I have endeavoured to set out these studies in the order in which they were undertaken as a consequence of constructing a ‘transformative’ pedagogical discourse. Each has been revisited and refined in the light of new understandings and insights and the continual crossing of pedagogical boundaries.

Each study touches a variety of contexts and events, ideologies and discourses within community schooling, teacher education and community life. Each of them is linked to the other through a network of intersecting meanings, interactions, structural relations and practices that produce pedagogical understandings and practices.

The first case is situated in a community school classroom where I spent many hours observing and working with the teacher on projects aimed at providing student teachers with more empirically grounded views of language pedagogy. The study is of a Talking Drills lesson. Talking drills is seen by many teachers and students (and some parents, see Chapter 8) as the ‘core of learning’, it provides the foundation for teaching and learning English, the language of classroom instruction.

The second study is an exploration of student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations and reflects a concern to develop a more comprehensive picture of the kinds of discourses that guide their thinking and acting in the classroom.

The third study investigates student teachers’ perceptions of, and the ways they know their teaching experiences during the implementation of a literacy strategy referred to as Do Talk Record. This is followed by an investigation of students’ teaching and learning experiences and articulations in the wider context of their second year, four week Practicum.
The final study is located back in a community school and explores the social effects of an ideological thread present in each of the above cases, that of meritocratic schooling, through the instrument of teachers’ end of term reports to parents. The conclusion comments upon the systems of ideas and educational structures that are articulated across the above accounts, the consequences for community schooling and teacher preparation.

Conclusion

It is important to this study to explore what gives structure and agency to student teachers’ pedagogic discourse, the ways of thinking, acting, believing, talking, and feeling which pass as teaching and learning and its management, in the context of wider discursive structures and influences. On the one hand this study is concerned with tracing particular coordinating structures and practices which sustain and are sustained by pedagogy, and on the other, it is concerned with improving understandings to begin to show more clearly the pedagogical ‘order of things’.

Finally, this research aims to contribute to knowledge in the field of teacher education in Papua New Guinea by recognising the place of student teachers’ theorisings in the economy of teacher education pedagogy. Secondly, it aims to contribute to a broader and richer understanding of the way pedagogy produces and is produced by institutional and community discourses. Finally, it aims to represent a research orientation that reflects a heteroglossic framework, by demonstrating the epistemic value of multi-focussed, multi-layered, multi-voiced studies.
Situating the Studies
Chapter 2

Some beginnings
I was recruited in 1988 to work at Madang Teacher College as a contract lecturer in TESL/English for the Papua New Guinea Department of Education. This was the second time I lived and worked in Papua New Guinea (PNG) having previously worked for the Department of Education from 1982-84.

The campus of Madang Teachers College is approximately 8 kilometres north of the provincial town of Madang (population approx. 27000 including local villages) in Madang Province on the northern coast of PNG. There are over 250 language groups in the province making it the most linguistically diverse area in PNG. Madang is the provincial headquarters for government offices and services, coastal shipping, local businesses, various mission agencies, to a number of tertiary education institutions and more recently overseas commercial interests. It is situated adjacent a number of small coastal islands surrounded by pockets of tropical rainforest, cleared grasslands, coconut and cocoa plantations, villages and settlements, and is largely cut off from other provinces though an increasingly well travelled road connects the province to the highlands region. It is a place visited by tourists at different times of the year providing some income to local villagers and towns people, but more so to local resorts. It is referred to by locals as ‘beautiful Madang’ and has a reputation for being a ‘safe place’ this despite ongoing tensions between ‘settlers’ from other provinces and local villagers over land and entitlements. The climate is tropical with marked wet and dry seasons and high humidity. Most permanent buildings in Madang are of concrete block, painted timber or fibro construction and suffer extremely from weather, mildew and termites.

The villages around Madang practice customary subsistence agriculture with links to the ‘cash’ economy through local produce markets, cash cropping, and employment opportunities in town.

For many in Madang economic and social life revolve around ‘fortnight Friday’ when government workers are paid, higher education students receive their allowances and
villagers are bussed and trucked into town to buy and sell at the market and town trade stoas (stores). Many government offices and schools come to a stop midday Friday when most banking and shopping is done. Social activities vary from playing sport, going to clubs (village or town), ‘spinning’ (walking or driving around town), telling ‘stories’ (being with friends), or watching TV/video (where available).

Primary and high schools are either government administered, mission agency or international agency permitted schools, all but the latter use the National Department of Education curriculum and receive a measure of government funding. Government and mission schools are staffed by locally trained teachers and require the payment of fees despite government initiatives to provide ‘free’ education. The payment of school fees is a financial burden on many subsistence families and the cause of much tension between communities and their schools. Town schools are by comparison well resourced and serviced, marked by the provisions of running water, sewerage, electricity and a larger number of permanent buildings. Out of town schools are characterised by ‘bush materials’ classrooms, gardens, and generally none of the other services. The Department of Education provides teachers with basic housing in most areas. In rural areas teachers are dependent upon local communities for land for gardening, for transport, and for their safety. In return, where relations are good, teachers become valued members of the community, schooling local children and contributing their expertise in the management of relations between communities, and in matters relating to the worlds beyond the village. Schools start at 8:00am and conclude at around 2:30pm while government offices are open from 8.00am - 4:06pm.

The international primary school in Madang is made up of approximately equal numbers of local and expatriate children and is staffed entirely by expatriate staff teaching a curriculum that parallels that of Australian primary schools. School fees are usually paid by employers or in the case of some local parents from their own incomes. What was originally set up as a school for the children of contracted expatriates employed in PNG has become the equivalent of private schooling in Australia for more affluent Papua New Guineans, a situation that is duplicated throughout PNG.

Government sponsored tertiary education is well represented in Madang with the Madang University Centre (UPNG Department of External studies), Madang
Technical College, Marine College, Administrative College, and Divine Word (A catholic mission college now a university).

**Madang Teachers College**

Madang Teachers College (MTC) was established in 1964 and is the largest pre-service training college for community school teachers in the country and the only one of eight which is run by the national government. It is a boarding college and its student body is made up of predominantly Grade 10 school leavers with a small number of students from Grades 11 and 12 being drawn from throughout PNG’s 19 provinces. Up until 1991 it offered a two year Teaching Certificate which changed in 1991 to a three year Diploma of Teaching. With the three year program student numbers increased from around 250 students to about 360 students.

**Students**

For many students coming to MTC is the first time they have lived away from the security and the support of families, having not lived or travelled extensively outside their region. In most cases (but not all) students come from ‘educated’ families where one or both parents have received some formal primary or secondary schooling. At the time of this study, these students represent an elite group being part of the 32% of students chosen from primary school to go to provincial high school and then being among the 33% selected from the 66% who complete Grade 10, to go to some form of tertiary education (Department of Education Sector Review, 1991 pp6,7).

**Teachers**

MTC is administered and staffed by both ‘national’ and ‘expatriate’ lecturers under the authority of the PNG Department of Education and has an academic staffing complement of around 23 lecturers and an ancillary staffing complement of around 22. National staff are drawn from throughout PNG and have strong teaching and administrative backgrounds in Community School education, expatriate lecturers are drawn predominantly from Australia from disciplinary backgrounds which included at the time of my residence, Science, Social Science, English, TESL, Library studies with primary school, high school and TAFE (Technical and Further education) experience. Other countries represented amongst expatriate lecturers were Britain,
Philippines, Ireland, Canada, Sri Lanka, and Pakistan. At MTC there were a variety of institutional expectations for lecturers notably to teach subjects within nominated disciplinary frameworks guided by sets of National Objectives as set out in Department of Education curriculum documents; to contribute also to the development of curriculum and departmental initiatives; to participate in the supervision and evaluation of student teachers’ teaching practices; to perform extra-curricular duties as determined by the college Principal.

Throughout my period of employment, the English TESL department consisted for the most part of 3-4 expatriate lecturers and 1-2 national lecturers. From 1988-1990 I worked as a lecturer taking up the Head of Department position in 1991. In 1991 the introduction of the three year program saw significant upgrading of course content particularly in English and Maths to at least Matriculation level, and a shift from discrete subjects to ‘content’ areas (strands) saw the integration of various aspects of the curriculum of note for the purposes of this study Language Development (English, TESL, and Vernacular Literacy) and Professional Studies (Educational theory, Methods and Practice Teaching). The College curriculum subjects paralleled the community school curriculum consisting of TESL, Maths, Community Life, Health, Physical Education, Agriculture, Expressive Arts, Science, the exceptions being English and Educational Studies, the former being to improve students English and the latter to provide methods and skills in teaching.

**Daily routines**

Classes were organised into five 55 minute daily lecture periods from 7:15 am till 1:00pm and in year groups (1A-D; 2A-E; 3A-E). Afternoons were taken up with staff and student meetings, administrative activities, sports, grounds cleaning, student study, college-based research projects. In the evenings students have study time, regional group meetings, and Christian fellowship between 7pm - 9pm. Students (and staff) were involved in regular grounds cleaning activities (‘work parade’), usually cutting grass, trees, gardening, clearing around buildings, clearing rubbish and drains to lessen the incidence of mosquitoes, snakes, etc. The former particularly as Malaria

---

11 During the period of this study there were three volunteers on the staff, two teaching and one in the Finance office.
is widespread in the area. For most students and staff the climate of this coastal area
was particularly demanding and malaria, fevers, and skin infections were common.

The conditions of study
These studies were undertaken in the midst of my involvement in the daily life of
Madang Teachers College (MTC), and in the midst of the life of my wife and family
and the daily occupation of sustaining and schooling four children, attending to their
interests, desires and dispositions, and managing the re-shaping of our own.¹² We
lived with staff and students on campus, in a three bedroom weatherboard house
under what might be considered by some western standards to be extremely basic and
sometimes trying living conditions, and yet which were, in light of the deprivations of
some around us, to be fortunate circumstances. I was fortunate to work with
colleagues with whom I shared a deep sense of accountability for the actions and
decisions we took with regard to the programs we designed and taught. Not the least
of which being the concerns we shared at how our decisions and actions might
contribute to a more socially just education or how our work might be colonising or
excluding or self seeking, as we worked in a third world country that had first world
economic aspirations.

¹² I have thought that how I came to be here is because others had been here before
me, whatever legacies remained I was taking up residence within institutional and
social structures constituted by others whose knowledges and dispositions had been
traded as new cultural capital in PNG. I was literally inhabiting the spaces and the
buildings, breathing life into the structures and some of the practices, of the colonial
past becoming in some respects a colonial present. How I was able to speak and be
understood in the midst of people who looked and lived so unlike me, to have such
quick entry into an exotic world, to make sense of its more visible practices and
meanings, was a result of being apprenticed to the talk and the walk of a Western life,
and its presence here. When I first arrived at MTC it was nearing the end of the wet
season, I was struck by the run down condition of its buildings and classrooms. On
the left, just inside the front gate, for example, a large assembly hall, complete with
stage, performance alcoves, stage lights, switching desk, all run down and in need of
repair. Secured in the ‘cool room’ storerooms behind the assembly hall, rooms full of
obsolete equipment, video recorders, monitors, tape players, overhead text readers,
strip and slide projectors, record players, typewriters, the technological remains of a
previous civilisation. What was once considered sustainable was now no longer
tenable. What was once justifiable was clearly, in this age of third world ‘debt crisis’,
no longer defensible.
The boundaries of this field study, however, are blurred as my involvement, interests and investigations reach back before 1991-93 the period of my most directed research efforts, and beyond in terms of ongoing interests with teacher education in PNG. In the years since this study, some aspects of the circumstances and pedagogy I was involved in have changed, as such, this study provides insight into the historical construction of the assumptions and premises that inform the present state of teacher education in PNG.

**In the midst of structural change: an identity crisis at MTC**

These studies fall within the period of the development of the three year Diploma of Teaching program in which certain rationalisations of curriculum occurred under the influence of discourses of ‘integration’ and ‘integral human development’, where some of the boundaries between disciplinary practices were redrawn, resulting in a problematisation of existing notions of what counted as the theory and practice of teaching and teacher education. Attempts were made by some college departments and individuals to produce a single integrated approach to teacher education. Such efforts were met with uncertain and mixed reactions from staff. Some staff including myself, resisted homogenised notions of what was to count as ‘teaching’. The resultant tensions involved what might be referred to as a number of epistemic clashes, and disagreements, over what constituted what some were calling the ‘fundamentals’ of teaching. These debates were carried along in terms of various opposing positions: product/process, holistic/atomistic, theory/practice. Much of what some staff had to offer about processes, including myself, appeared to be interpreted by other staff in terms of a dilution of teaching skills, an erosion of teacher authority, and a rejection of teacher control over learning outcomes. Attempts to shift the debate beyond these oppositions to more mutually inclusive positions which recognised teaching in terms of its complexity, situatedness and ambiguity were often met with hostile rejection and seen as undermining the ‘national’ project of PNG’s development.

Similar debates, were occurring between the Department of Education and the Association of Teacher Education, an academic body (supported by the University of Papua New Guinea) with the responsibility to oversee the introduction of the three year program, which supported a proposal that Teachers Colleges be brought within a new institutional framework independent of the Department of Education, The
National Institute of Teacher Education (NITE) (McNamara 1989). The writing of McLaughlin (1990), O’Donohue (1990), Pickford (1991) and the research by Avalos (1989) & Ross (1989) supporting a shift from behaviourist dominated pedagogies, emerged at this time when the seal seemed to be lifting on aspects of the National Department of Education’s (NDOE) curriculum and management hegemony - a hegemony which maintained various ideological separations between teachers and their work, the most notable being a centralised approach to curriculum development, timetabling and assessment. A less noticeable but just as pervasive influence was the discourse of ‘management by objectives’. The discourse of behavioural objectives being used not just to define the boundaries of children’s classroom performances and behaviours, but also used by provincial inspectors to evaluate community and high school teachers’ performances, and in the college Practicum to define what counted as good teaching, and by NDOE to define what counted as legitimate knowledges, performances and attitudes of teachers’ college lecturers. 13 Some of the stitching of this hegemony of educational governance constitutive of a complex mix of powerful institutional and pedagogical practices, seemed to be coming apart.

In the midst of the introduction of the new three year program many meetings were held. Such meetings were often robust and illustrative of the tensions and displacement that redrawing the boundaries and problematising what counted as ‘knowledge’ and ‘teaching’, produced. The following extracts of meetings and incidents typifies some of the feelings of the time.

**Incident One**

*Field notes (gloss)*

In a college staff meeting a staff member made a presentation in support of performance objectives and in opposition to what was being referred to as ‘process’ approaches.

---

13 Each of these areas of surveillance was underpinned by a regime of objectives which aimed to specify performances in terms various conditions related to the behaviour of the individual. I noted on a number of occasions community school notices using the rubric, ‘By the end of the term/week/month etc...’ followed by various behavioural qualifications, to define the work of the school in fund raising,(BTEOTT Grade 6 will have raised K20 by ....) resource collection, extracurricular staff duties etc. Behaviourist discourse was implicated not only in the management of learning but also the management of schools.
Topic of the presentation: ‘Why we should emphasise behavioural objectives in students lesson planning?’

**Blackboard outline**

1. It helps the new teacher put more thoughts towards the lesson
   - it makes him/her mention/state how the chn participate
   - it makes him/her plan the lesson in more logical steps

2. Allows the teacher to observe and manipulate the children’s learning.
   - it helps to assess performance more accurately in order to work towards the learning of the next step
   - children need to know their success through more frequent reinforcements

**Comment:** ‘Non-behavioural objectives is like throwing mud on the wall and hoping some will stick. With behavioural objectives the mud sticks.’

**Responses from some expatriate staff**

- Behavioural objectives do not account for the uniqueness of individuals
- Behavioural objectives focus on changing behaviour rather than what causes behaviour.

**Responses from some local staff**

- ‘PNG does not have the time to dig into uniqueness and causes of behaviour. We are based on competition and examinations to measure success for the ticket to the next step.’
- ‘How can we keep teaching or get on to the next step if we haven’t found out how well they have learned?’

Some lecturers from departments that had moved away from using behavioural objectives wanted to go back to the community school as teachers to ‘practice what we have been teaching to see if it works’.

**Incident Two**

**Field notes (gloss)**

In the same semester 120 students refused to go on School Experience but were forced to after being addressed by the Deputy Principal administration who stated that it was a college requirement and implied that students could lose their place at MTC for not meeting this requirement. The students main concern was that a lecturer had
told them that there were 10 methods and skills of teaching and the students felt that they didn’t know them. Coupled to this was the concern that lesson planning was being taught differently by each department. One department had said, ‘plan how you feel’ but some school experience supervisors were requiring plans to be changed in accordance with their own disciplinary approaches - students were unsure, many felt that everyone should be taught one way of planning.

**Incident Three**

*Field notes (gloss)*

In the midst of the upheavals attending the introduction of the new three year course and new curriculum strands such as the Social and Spiritual Development strand with its focus on moral development, meetings were held to discuss the need for a moral ‘philosophy’ of Madang Teachers College. This was in response to both the unsettled atmosphere of MTC and a view circulated by the Secretary of Education (Secretary’s circular) that the greatest threat to the political stability of PNG was the breakdown in law and order, and the moral degeneration of the country’s youth (rascal problems; Pidgin: ‘raskal’).

At one such staff meeting I took the following notes:

- We do not want to create our own philosophy - we should obey philosophy in village they are a community. There is one general educational philosophy (reference to Matane) here we are all different we don’t do the same. *(Male national lecturer)*

- We all think we all relate to each other - we are all lecturers I don’t think that you can say that I can give my own ideas. We must have a common philosophy we can all work to. I don’t think we need a product but a process. *(Male national lecturer)*

- We are different people cultures and values we need a common philosophy so ‘in our differences we tread a common path’. There are many guiding documents however, we need to come up with one of our own - I personally feel we should have one - how will we have one that is really identical to ourselves - we should have one to guide us along. *(Expatriate female lecturer)*

- We have one common goal, one thing in common our National goals (PNG’s National Goals). It has more things to make MTC a better place than when I
joined it. We should contribute instead of hanging around getting fortnight pays - we can add this one thing (Holds up National Content guidelines: Social and Spiritual Development) they’ve got these things in other (Mission) colleges. *(Male national lecturer)*

- Unless I know my own philosophy I will not help and contribute - only me I know about my philosophy, how do *you* handle students depending upon *my* values, in my case I will handle students differently, for example, cultural differences, a student is involved in drinking, as a national I will handle it differently. *(Male national lecturer)*

- We should come up with a synthesis of national goals and (church) agency goals. The church representatives on the Governing Council will want to see (church) agency goals, including something belonging to Mabang. The community will want to see this for the college image in schools, something that we do. *(Male national lecturer)*

- Philosophy doesn’t need to be written down - it is us - it is destroyed when it is written down. *(Expatriate female lecturer)*

- Lets make ourselves aware of the college Governing Council goals and follow them. *(Male national lecturer)*

- Not agency, not Christians, not churches, we are MTC, let’s forget our individual values and work towards something general. *(Male national lecturer)*

- Perhaps we should have a college motto to represent a philosophy *(Male expatriate lecturer)*

- Do we have one? Yes I think we have one. *(Female national lecturer)*

The search for a common unified ‘philosophy’ was a struggle for a sense of coherence and community that was believed to have been lost through the disjunctions that were occurring as the new three year course was being written and implemented, and because of perceived social dislocations in PNG communities. It was in the midst of these uncertainties that these field studies take place.

**Entering the field: confronting ‘curriculum’**

My initial research interest was to develop a greater understanding of what was happening in community schools and how this might inform the TESL curriculum.
Over the next two years I was involved in brief teaching experiences in a number of community schools (Meiro, Sagalau, Bau, Amele). At Meiro Community school I worked with the Grade 6 teacher and class three times a week on children’s writing (including Grade 6 exam preparation on Saturday mornings). These visits were written up at the college as a study “Beginning the Writing Process at Meiro Community School” and incorporated into the college TESOL writing curriculum.

An interesting feature of the teachers college curriculum was that Educational Studies was the only ‘discipline’ which made explicit references to theory in support of its pedagogy. Almost all the curriculum was framed in terms of National Objectives (knowledge, skills, attitudes) and curriculum content guidelines produced for teachers’ college courses in curriculum workshops attended by college representatives and Department of Education officers. These guidelines formed the basis of what was to be taught in all teachers’ colleges. The absence of explicit theoretical justifications for the different knowledges and pedagogies or the basis upon which they were chosen, remains a feature of curriculum documents and reflects what I have called an ‘autonomous’ view of curriculum. This absence of explicit theory and theorising was reflected further in the way that community school teachers saw their work, as the implementation rather than the mediation of knowledge. 

14 This question of theory (meta-knowledge) and theorising came up in relation to community school teachers’ responses to the question: ‘What changes in ideas about teaching and learning have you had since you left college?’ which I put to many teachers. Most teachers interpreted the question in terms of the effects external influences had had on their role, and not in terms of their own ‘theories’, as such they did not interpret it as a question about the way they theorised aspects of their work. Such a perspective seemed to be missing. The following are a sample of responses:

‘I’ve learnt a lot of little games e.g. spelling games etc. from other field teachers through Inservice courses.

‘The curriculum changed e.g. I was trained to teach from the Pacific Series but after a few years in the field Melanesian Series was introduced. This confused some of us.’

‘New materials that had been printed and issued to schools for the teachers to follow. These do help me enjoy teaching younger leaders of this country.’

In response to this absence of explicit pedagogical theorising or intellectual engaging with the ideas and practices informing community school teaching I developed some situated cases of second language teaching and learning in the context of work I was doing at Mis village and Sagalau community school, which became the basis of the first year TESL course and supported the second and third year TESL courses which focused on thinking about and developing appropriate school-based TESL pedagogies. Students’ responses to and involvement in this second year course form part of this research.

**Student teachers and the notion of curriculum: a point of engagement**

There is little sense in the academic literature on teaching in Papua New Guinea of the ‘constructed’ nature of curriculum. In the following discussion designed to ascertain and broaden student teachers assumptions and understandings of curriculum, student teachers determine and discuss answers to specific questions and develop their observations on what they perceive ‘curriculum’ to mean.

---

What appeared as a general absence of theorising about their teaching in ways other than dominant institutional meanings, is manifest in other responses as a struggle over control of the materiality of their circumstances.

‘Today our (PNG) education system is growing so fast and creates lot of problems .. such as: poor classrooms and teacher’s housing, electric appliances, motor appliances, nutrition and agriculture.

and the hegemony of imposed curriculum changes,

‘English - Minenda - we had one booklet. We studied the booklet well & good in many ways as possible - BEFORE passing the whole idea across to the students in the classroom. Our background knowledge about the book was about 99% perfect.... Nowadays curriculum in Head Office in Moresby supply us with new booklet - minute after minute and we’re piled up with new colourful looking materials. As a teacher I look important and I feel high. The DIFFERENCE is that without knowing/special course about the materials I’m forced to use the booklet (teacher’s guide).

These questions to teachers produced these unanticipated responses. The responses provide insight into the nature of the ‘order of things’ which constitutes them as subjects of the curriculum, and their struggles to accept them. It might be argued that the lack of material (curriculum) diversity is complicit in sustaining a homogenised view of teaching and learning. What I found overwhelmingly absent in both community school curriculum and teachers college curriculum were the genealogies of ideas which informed the objectives, texts and practices that teachers were expected to engage with. The teaching and testing approaches used, the selection of content focuses appeared to only make sense in the context of institutional assessments like the Grade 6 exam.
The purpose of the discussion to this research is to ground it in some of the concerns and beliefs that student teachers hold, and to highlight issues arising, while noting some of the features which (and some which do not) inform their perceptions; and to demonstrate the pedagogic effects of these dialogic interactions as referred to in the previous section: 'Discussing teaching fundamentals' (p 44).

The following discussion took place in a small room between four Second Year student teachers preparing to teach in PNG community and primary schools. (A more complete transcript is available as Appendix Two). This discussion has been abbreviated and is divided into parts to facilitate a focus on its key processes and meanings.

Part 1

Key:  A – male; G – female; J – female; M – male
      (i/a) inaudible; (s/a) seeking agreement; (..) pause

A:  Okay our discussion is on what is a curriculum, talk about curriculum, what we each of us understand about curriculum. Now my understanding about curriculum, the curriculum is (..) what the school has to teach to the children which is either provided by the school itself or is given out by the Education Department.

G:  What I think about the curriculum is that its from the Secretary of Education its passed on to different provinces where they carry it out in schools.

J:  What I think of the curriculum is its some sort of guideline for a school, for a particular administration where teachers use to teach the children, its sort of a guideline for them.

M:  In other words what I think about the curriculum is its a fixed (i/a) its fixed for the teachers to follow to teach the children its (..) mostly written by headquarters its written in Moresby or (..) so that's what I think about curriculum, its a fixed content of lessons to be taught in community schools.

*Here students' give quite conventional and slightly varied views of curriculum. It is 'what the school has to teach'; it comes from the 'Education Department'; it needs to be carried out by schools; it is a 'sort of' guideline for schools; it is a 'fixed content' for lessons; it is 'written by headquarters'.*
This is of course a dominant view of curriculum, a delivery view. It is a view that provides answers to the question, ‘What will I teach?’, an important question to these student teachers whose main interest is having something to deliver to their classes. The dialogue at this point is characterised by a degree of consensus and agreement. The responses students have given provide various shadings of what is essentially a common understanding that curriculum is pre-scribed teaching material.

Part 2

A: ... are the classroom activities of the teacher part of the curriculum? (...) I think so because looking at the curriculum itself, activities that the teachers take, the ones that they take out from the curriculum, from the books that are issued out, they see that sometimes, I mean that most of the times teachers get see those things which are in the curriculum and they do the activities so teachers are part of the curriculum.

G: For my answer its similar to A’s, teachers are part of the curriculum (...) (i/a) to the classrooms (i/a) and sometimes they think about the community how the learning of the children will fit into the community (...) (i/a) and also suitable things related to the community which the children can understand

J: Okay my answer is also similar to G and A because most of the activities that a teacher carry out in the classroom they use the curriculum, the things that a teacher does are from the curriculum and yes er, I think most of the activities that a teacher does is part of the curriculum

M: Well ... in most of the cases all the teachers throughout PNG they use teachers guides at this stage, not us, but those Certificate ones or others, that came out long ago, they use Teachers Guides to guide them, they use most of the curriculum those things which are prepared (s/a), (...) but on the other hand I could say that some teachers are creative ah (s/a), maybe some of the activities they plan and they organise in the class might not be from the curriculum but they use their own creative talent to use in the classroom, so most of the cases we could say that the classroom activities are mostly a part of the curriculum but others they are just creative ones ah (s/a), teachers tend to develop.

In these moments students compare their responses, noting their agreement: “For my answer its similar to A’s”; “Okay my answer is also similar to G and A”. A broad
consensus emerges regarding the relationship between teaching activities and curriculum.

It is a consensus that turns on a shared definition of the word 'activity'. The reference to 'classroom activities of the teacher', is interpreted by the group as a specific reference to teachers' activities prescribed in a given curriculum document. Using this meaning, students go on to characterise teachers' activities as coming from the pre-scribed curriculum ('most of the activities'); as teacher initiated activities that aim to fit children to their communities (less common); and as activities prepared by 'creative' teachers, not seen to be part of the pre-scribed curriculum. This view of the relationship between teacher activities and curriculum, not only eliminates the possibility of seeing teachers' unplanned actions as contributing to the 'curriculum', but also questions the place of teaching practices which are innovative and responsive to local needs. It is of course not unusual for students to hold this view, for the dominant pre-service view of curriculum that it is pre-scribed subject matter to be taught in pre-scribed ways. But this view, as can be seen here, sits uncomfortably with orientations to curriculum that have as their starting points not pre-scribed content but learners and their needs.

Part 3

A: Any other things on this one or this point - classroom activities part of the curriculum?

G: Yes, so it looks like, you know, classroom itself, and the activities there, most of it is in the curriculum, what M is saying is teachers they try to make learning much more successful for the children, sought of try to fit in something else to do with the community and all that, where children can really understand the activities (...) for example, (...) (i/a) not very clear in the highlands if they are talking about er 'coconut', say 'coconut' then the highlands students ah (s/a), children, wouldn't understand ah (s/a), so the teacher would substitute the curriculum to 'coffee', where they are much more clear there.

...

A: Do children influence the curriculum in any way? (...) yes as what G says, influence the curriculum in anyway, what G said er (...) children up in the highlands they don't know what shark is or how the shark looks like, these
children will influence the curriculum to be changed to talk about a different thing because you cannot teach the children up in the highlands about sharks when they have no idea about sharks or anything that is to be done with

G: The coast
A: The coast so children influence the curriculum in so many ways this is one of the examples
G: Its very true that children play in influencing the curriculum as A has explained most of it is to do with the environment one of the (i/a) environment where the children (i/a), I think (. .) most come up with the same answer, children play a part in influencing the curriculum
A: Do teachers control the curriculum or does it control them?
J: What I think is sometimes the teacher er the curriculum controls them but in my opinion teachers also control the curriculum because as we um, as with some of the examples like ar
G: Substituting
J: Yea substituting crops or other things that does not grow or
A: Suit the environment
J: Suit the environment of the children in the place where your teaching, like teachers can control it and give the example of other things for example like coconut to coffee and after all curriculum is like a guideline as we have said so (. .) a guideline, once teachers got the concept 'what' er, like what they want to tell across to the children, they can substitute with other things close to their environment.

The dialogue, at this point, can be characterised as a process of negotiating positions, a sifting and shifting and transforming of meanings from the denotative unitary meanings characteristic of Part one to the generation of more associative meanings, marked by an increase in the number of references to what others are saying, "what M is saying is ... "; "yes as what G says ... "; "as A has explained". Confirming what Burbles and Rice (1991:409) have to say about dialogue, that,

The dialogic relation ... has in itself a strongly pedagogical element, in which participants seek to learn from one another ...

From G's tentative observations, springs a discussion of the way teachers do mediate the content of the curriculum, making word and topic substitutions in an effort to
increase the relevance and meaning of lessons. This may be interpreted as a means teachers use, albeit tacitly, to bring children to an engagement with the social practices and social literacies of their communities. The student teachers represent this as a matter of whether or not children have background knowledge related to the content of the curriculum, in the absence of which there is seen to be a need for school knowledge to be related to immediate local knowledge contexts.

What is in evidence in this part of the dialogue, is a shifting between meanings of 'curriculum', a subtle challenging of an instrumental view of curriculum with a practical one through the discussion of how teachers make curriculum relevant. In the next two parts of the dialogue students reach a 'critical' point in their discussion on the issue of curriculum control.

**Part 4**

**M:** Well then do teachers control the curriculum or does the curriculum control teachers? um what I think is a bit 'no', not really teachers controlling the curriculum, but its curriculum controls the teachers looking at this English ... we see that most of the lessons that are taught in the schools is mostly er, it controls the teachers ... in addition to that maybe those teachers who are first to the field, I'm not talking about those teachers who have been teaching in the field, maybe the first time to be teaching out in the field they've been controlled by the curriculum, that's concerning language, English, but in other areas subject areas also, after when they have experienced, they've got some understanding how to swap or substitute lesson topics like er what you say, but for the language what I think is most of the curriculum nowadays used in the community schools ... controls the teachers, not teachers controlling curriculum, but curriculum controlling teachers.

**G:** It's true, out on Practical day, I saw that even though class teacher she had experience (..) she had taught for almost seven years, now she still uses this OEM (Our English for Melanesia) material, she just lost her book and teaches the children, I see that she doesn't try to, you know, like I'll say change the way the lesson is prepared in the OEM book, there its the same procedure for every week ah(s/a)

**A:** Yes
G: Even the children are aware of it and they get bored and the teacher doesn't try to
A: Change
G: Change it to make the lesson more interesting for them, so it looks as M said, … curriculum controls the teachers, okay for the other subjects such as community life I felt that, um teacher er
A: The teacher is in charge
G: Yea, she sought of looked at the community and the, I mean, the environment of the school and she based the lesson on that so that the children can clearly understand what the teacher is trying to get across (..) so the way I look at this question is its both ways, like there are some subjects where the teacher controls the curriculum and there some subjects where the curriculum controls the teacher.

Calling up experiences, and juxtaposing them as M&G do in this part of the dialogue is the beginning of deconstructing the either/or binary that the question imposes.
There are after all, times when teachers are 'controlled' by a pre-scribed curriculum as M tell us, and even when the texts are missing the structures are maintained, as G illustrates. But there are also observable moments, when as A says, 'The teacher is in charge'. The student teachers engage in a layering of cases and examples, building reflexivity and refining as they go. M's example of teachers being controlled by the language curriculum, G's example of teacher control of curriculum where the teacher 'sought of' looked at the community and 'based the lesson on that' so that the children could understand. All of this adds texture to the ideas and theories the students each generate.

Part 5

M: Curriculum controlling teachers so what I would say is ... there is very little teachers controlling curriculum.
A: This will depend on the subject you are teaching, the subject you are trying to teach like what G said in OEM
G: English (i/a)
A: The English, trying to teach the English lessons the teachers you will see, will always look on the book there, they will always look in the books and (..) you
know like the curriculum, what I'm saying here is the curriculum, the books er, the subject itself, will make it like the curriculum is controlling you, there are some other subjects which you will control the curriculum, for example, in Expressive Arts sometimes you don't have any Expressive Arts books to look up what to teach for that term for that whole year in Grade 1 or Grade 2 er, whatsoever, it's you yourself who's going to take control of this curriculum and make a plan for what you're going to teach for that day, its depending on the subjects for example Maths, in Maths too its quite different in most of it the curriculum look after, control you, but looking at these subjects like Agriculture, Com (Community) life Social Science whatsoever, Ex Arts, Physical Education, it looks like those subjects which are not put into National Examinations, they are the ones that the curriculum is er, they do not control over you

G: Yea

A: But those which are based on examinations ... or whatsoever its a (...) er looks like the curriculum has a lot of control over you, example is in English and Maths, you have to follow what is written on the book to teach.

Dialogue does not always produce a consensus of thinking, but it can give rise to new perspectives that are important in broadening the assessment of issues. A's insightful remark, "the subject itself, will make it like the curriculum is controlling you", is another defining moment in the dialogue which broadens its scope. It prepares the way for the following matters identified by A: the controlling influence of texts (books), and curricula control associated with teaching to exams. These insights while not discussed in this transcript segment, represent a significant broadening of thinking on the issue of curriculum and its meaning in relation to teaching and teachers. It raises epistemological as well as issues of power. While students do not interpret their observations and insights in these terms, nevertheless they detect as relationship between knowledge and power.

The nature of student talk

These brief moments of structured dialogue that have been explored illustrate a pedagogic effect. An effect characterised as a process of social construction as
students negotiate the meanings they wish to make, accommodate the interests of others and manage the interaction.

The process of ‘talking into existence’ propositions, ideas, experiences, observations, coincidentally placed what was talked into both subject and object positions where what was said was both an act, and a deed, while at the same time being acted upon. Talking thoughts out provided the means to get some distance on thinking, to measure the thinking of self and others, to evaluate it and act to shape it.

There is evidence that student talk shifts between consensual talk and that aimed to add to understandings. There is talk that constructs associative meanings, and talk that shapes thinking. There is also evidence that these students have begun to address through talk, the play between institutional structure and individual agency as they bring into view some of the structural constraints which control the way teachers teach.

In general terms, it is of particular interest then to look at how ‘curriculum’ works as pedagogy, what meanings are made and not made; to see how student teachers understandings are part of the architecture of larger systems of ideas and smaller situated practices; to understand the social and cultural effects of the discourses which mediate their practices and experiences; to attend to the nature of the social power and cultural meanings generated at the sites of students’ teaching and training; to see that teaching is not just skills and content.

The case studies which follow, confront different manifestations of the observations made above by these student teachers, as teaching intersects with issues of English language literacy, student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations, the discoursal mediation of their teaching practices; and curriculum control. In large measure the studies and intertexts that follow also represent different aspects of my pedagogical dialogue with these and other students in the mediated construction of a pedagogy of teacher training.

In this next chapter there is an interest in exploring the messages of English language teaching pedagogy and literacy, its procedures, its content, its discursive links, in order to broaden the view of curriculum as an interaction of planned and unplanned moments, of meaning making and social power.

The study at Sagalau Community School looks at one of the most central lessons of the curriculum in terms of its frequency (six 15-20 minute periods a week), its
content, and its role in teaching the language of instruction, English. It provides both an example and a contradiction of recent criticisms of PNG community schooling. Here the previously discussed matters of teacher controlling the curriculum and curriculum controlling the teacher are placed under closer scrutiny.
Intertext One

Grade 3 classroom Sagalau Community School
Intertext One

Grade 3 classroom at Sagalau Community School

The Classroom
Approx. 13m x 6m, it is an extended storeroom, with the front half of the room a raised concrete slab and the back half of the room dirt floor. It has a pitched iron roof, no ceiling, with exposed joists and beams on the roof and walls. The left and right hand walls are concrete and iron and ventilated by a grill extending two feet from the roof on each side of the room, four large wooden shutters (about a metre square) held open by sticks open on the left side and there are two on the right.

On the concrete slab are 17 desks. Two desks have three children and the others (except one with one) have two. One desk is in the dirt at the back right of the concrete. The children’s desks are mostly cleared except when asked to take their books out. A few desks display empty plastic cups, hibiscus flowers in a cup, and tins.\(^{15}\)

The teacher’s table, chair and cupboard are in the back left half of the room. The teacher’s wooden table is cleared except for some Teaching Guides on the top right corner. The cupboard is a ten drawer dresser with only three drawers remaining. In the place of the missing drawers the teacher keeps his woven palm leaf bag, boxes of chalk, and assorted papers. On top of the cupboard is a carton of files, glue, assorted papers, class readers from Our English for Melanesia Series, a roll of toilet paper and a stapler.

On the wall beside the desk mounted on large sections of collapsed brown cardboard cartons are three colourful advertising posters: Trukai rice, Morobean bisks, and Paradise bakery cookies.

Across the back of the classroom lying on the floor is a box of coconut brooms for sweeping inside and outside the classroom; empty coconut shells, empty tins, small empty cartons, two small portable blackboards. On the other side of the door is a large table, underneath is an empty 20L mineral turps drum, a school bag and bottle of water. In the corner is a soccer ball, a small pile of covered boxes and more small tins. Nearby is a wooden work horse. Lengths of timber lie parallel to the right hand wall,

\(^{15}\) There are 22 boys and 15 girls present. The teacher and 5 students are wearing thongs, the rest of the class are barefooted. There are no school uniforms, some children wear remnants of old uniforms.
on top, two large mats woven from palm leaves. Slung at ceiling height across the room are three pieces of cane. Attached to the cane are coloured paper cut from magazines and woven decorations in coloured wool.

At the front of the room, above the blackboard are the **Classroom Rules** handwritten in black letters 2 cm high, with words underlined in red.

**Classroom Rules**

I must speak **English all time**
I must not **tear pages off or scratch books**
I must **not talk while Teacher is talking**
I must **ask before I get somebodys thing**
I must not **stand or walk on the desks**
I must keep my classroom **clean both inside and outside**
I must pay respect to my **teacher, visitors and friend**
I must play at **right time**
I must **always bring my tools every Thursday**

Inscribed and underlined below the rules is written: **If you obey rules you will be a good child.**

To the right are **School Rules** set out in the same way.

**School Rules**

A classroom is a **place where to learn**
Do **not play** in the classroom
Do not **eat or chew** in the classroom
You must not **left Rubbish inside or outside the classroom**
You must not **stealing fighting or swearing**

We must **bring our breakfast everyday**

To the left of “classroom rules” is a **Writing Marking Code.** On the far right is the **Class Timetable** and below it a subject **Time Allocation chart.** On the far left is a **Reading Organisation chart** and a list of children in three **Reading Groups,** below that more **School & Classroom Rules.**

There are three blackboards in the room. Across the top of the main blackboard at the front, the alphabet is written in modified cursive and below it, the date.

Below this the blackboard is divided into five sections each section separated by a patterned border. From the left are ‘Mathematics’; Talking/Handwriting; Spelling;
Written Sentences; and Reading Words. Below the blackboard a set of English
language charts is displayed. The other blackboards at the rear of the room display
Talking Drills and songs, one in Pidgin and one in English.

Talking Drills
The twelfth floor is very high, isn’t it?
It’s only a little way to the naval docks, isn’t it?
That’s our island, standing by the gate, isn’t it?
It’s a big city, isn’t it?

Gospel Song
Dispela de God makim yum
Ritim gutnius amamas na
Ritim yumi go long heven
long kingdom bilong em
Yu noken les namba bilong Jisas
I holim antap amamas em
Jisas Krais God Triwan

The Question song
This is a knife, isn’t it? it is oh yes it is
That’s a coconut tree, isn’t it? it is , oh yes it is
So climb up the tree
Throw the nut down to me
And we can both have a drink, can’t we?
On the right front wall is a section entitled Children’s Corner where children’s
drawings of islands, palm trees and paintings of houses are displayed.
On the left hand side at the back of the room is a section entitled Teacher’s Corner
where a number of notices dealing with the administration of the school are displayed.

SRC fund raising

Bottle Collection
• By the end of Term 1 each child will have collected 24 bottles as part of his/her
contribution to SRC.
Twenty toea collection
• By the end of Term 2 each child will have contributed 20t to his teacher.

Fund raising during Education week
• By the end of Term 3 each group will have sold items prepared for that day. e.g. food/drinks.

Cut lunch and Ice Block
• By the end of Term 4 Grade 6 children will have sold cut lunches and ice blocks to school children as part of their contribution to SRC.

Supervisory structure and levels
1 Headmaster Level 5
1 Deputy Level 3
3 Senior teachers Level 2
9 Assistant teachers Level 1

Duty Roster
Toilet cleaning; Supply and Stockroom; Library; Staffroom and tea; Sports; Work parade; Science kit; School council; Social science kit; Maintenance; Board of Management Representative.
Figure One: Grade 3 Classroom (external)
Post-colonial learning: classroom rituals as social and cultural practice

Chapter 3

Introduction

There is a privileging of western knowledge and teaching practices in the literature on schooling in Papua New Guinea. While there is an awareness that schooling as a legacy of colonialism has contributed to a new stratification of PNG society (see Bray 1985) what remains under-explored are the ways this is articulated with local discourses at the level of the classroom. There is an absence of understanding of how teaching practices collude with, resist and appropriate local social practices and cultural meanings in the pursuit of their own purposes. For such processes to be understood an awareness of the ways by which they are realised is needed. This chapter begins by looking at the point where community schooling has been often criticised. It is claimed, that problems experienced in PNG schooling are related to flawed teaching methods and modes of implementation which ignore the cultural and ‘intellectual’ differences of the indigenous (see McLaughlin 1996; O’Donoghue 1990). A common observation and criticism of community schooling in PNG is that children and teachers are immersed in ‘rote style’ teaching and ‘surface’ learning practices. What is suggested as an answer to these problems is a greater focus in teaching upon ‘analytic thinking and deep approaches to learning’ (McLaughlin 1996: 108).

McLaughlin draws from a body of classroom observers the conclusion that,

... a noticeable feature of PNG classrooms is the apparent industry of the teachers and students without either communicating with each other. The teachers are said to use teaching ‘recipe’ strategies and follow lock-step procedures, while the children respond ritually. (1996:110)(see also Pearse, 1990)

This ‘industry’ is further described in particular transactional terms.

The transcriptions of blocks of written exercises from teacher’s handbooks to blackboards by the teacher and from blackboards to exercise books by pupils is one such common ritual. Other rituals include an emphasis on procedural and mechanical processes, such as ‘correct’ headings and properly ruled pages, as
well as regular reminders for children to produce neat and tidy work.

(McLaughlin 1996:111)

Ritual teaching and learning as it is described here are ways of looking at teaching and learning which focus upon participants’ actions, their practices, but not their meanings. It is suggested in this study, however, that there are cultural meanings and sensibilities which mediate the activity structures of classroom practices, that also require acknowledgment if post-colonial teaching and learning and their effects are to be better understood. This chapter examines the classroom as a social and cultural space in which children’s knowledge and participation are disciplined by practices of solidarity and conformity.

**Situating the case**

The case explores aspects of three English language lessons from a community school in the Madang Province of Papua New Guinea involving the same class over a period of three years as they move from Grade 1 through to Grade 3. Particular attention has been focused upon the way children’s participations have been mediated by the structuring effects of teachers’ ‘contextualisation cues’ and the assumptions that underpin them. Gumperz (1982) refers to ‘contextualisation cues’ as particular signalling mechanisms … choice(s) among lexical, phonetic, and syntactic options…” (p99) which allow participants ‘to rely on direct inferences which build on background assumptions about context, interactive goals and frames of reference in terms of which they can interpret what is going on’ (cited in Schiffren 1994:101). Schiffren (1994) argues that interaction without the benefit of shared cues, without shared interpretive conventions results at the very least in misunderstanding, but more disturbingly in the disempowerment of those who are unable to effectively employ the contextualisation cues of others as a basis to infer their intended meanings. This approach to understanding pedagogy is concerned with the ways language is worked as a social practice to structure and inform classroom practices. (p101)

In this regard, Larcher (1993) notes,

... each individual’s personal use of language ... cannot help but mirror the sociocultural rules of his/her respective social system ... language seen as a social institution is the most important device for experiencing, defining, and
evaluating reality within the framework of a society’s culture. It stores in its 
structure and lexicon all the collective experience of a social group. (1993:127)

Such presuppositions that grammar and discourse structures, vocabulary, talk sequences 
and genres are socially and culturally organised and ‘carry information concerning 
social order’ as well as conveying local understandings and ‘theories of the world’, are 
well substantiated in the works of Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), Lemke (1985), 
Gumperz (1982), Gee (1990), Pennycook (1994) and in the literacy classroom by Baker 
(1991) and Baker and Freebody (1993). It is argued in this study that these lessons 
reflect not only the particular pedagogical and ideational interests of the school, but also 
broader sociocultural discourses of the community.

Talking Drills: developing oracy in English

My interest begins in the first term of schooling in Grade One the place and time 
formally marked as the beginning of schooling. The particular lesson fragment being 
considered is from a Talking Drills lesson providing practice in English language 
structures. Talking Drills is part of the English language curriculum in PNG 
community schools and is undertaken 15 -20 minutes/day, 5-6 times a week, through 
Grades 1-6. In these lessons, teachers present language patterns which are practiced 
and manipulated in various ways. Pattern manipulation involves substituting different 
words and expressions within a basic pattern framework to express different ideas 
while preserving the concept of the sentence or expression.

Situation:

The lesson observation is situated in the following scenario: 38 children are grouped on 
the floor in the front of the classroom around the chair of the teacher (female). Hanging 
behind the teacher is a picture chart of a mother holding a baby while cooking a fish 
over a fire. The picture scene is set outside. The teacher has the interest of the children 
as she points to the picture, and begins.

T: What’s this? ... listen .... what’s this? .... okay Delina want to answer, give me the 
answer
D: (hesitates)
T: Answer, you can stand up now *givim mi* answer (*Tok Pisin: ‘give me’)*
D: (stands up) This is a baby
T: Good try, good try, okay *bai mi* * answer... you listen (pointing and stressing)
   It's a baby it's a baby (*Tok Pisin: 'I will')
T: What's this? what's this? (teacher pointing to the fish on the fire) ^Janet
J: That is a fish
T: Very good try... you say its a fish its a fish
T: What's this what's this? (teacher points to a pawpaw tree in the background)
C: That is a pawpaw
T: Very good it's a pawpaw.

In the opening moments of this lesson what unfolds is the teacher's interest in a particular grammatical order, a linguistic prescription, as she implicitly encourages the children to 'say it this way'. The girls put together seemingly appropriate replies but the teacher's concern is with what counts as good or correct English, and sets aside the children's sense of meaning making. The children's language is 'disciplined', ie what is linguistically possible and not possible is in the process of being established in the context of the question, response, and feedback procedural frame the teacher employs. Her display is not only for these participating children but also for the others listening and observing. For the language to be learned limitations are placed upon both children's participations in the procedural framing of the exchange, and children's meanings. What is illustrated is something of the political economy of this classroom, children negotiating language, meanings and social positions at the same time, involved in a particular ordering of 'human multiplicities' (Foucault in Pennycook 1994:108). When the teacher attempts to correct and change, there is, however, little sense of support for change, the children are more focussed upon modelling the responses of significant peers than upon the teacher's corrections. Despite demonstrating a high degree of linguistic control and meaning their responses are not yet those valued by the teacher, as such there is no acknowledgment of the meaningfulness of their responses, only an acknowledgment of their efforts to produce approximations of the form the teacher holds to be correct. It is the reproduction of prescribed grammatical forms framed as what should be spoken, the replacement of 'ordinary' language as a valid way of knowing and organising the world which constitutes this teacher and these children as disciplined and schooled 'subjects'. Shapiro in Pennycook (1994:110) comments upon the altering effects of this kind of linguistic regulation,
Language purism is a move in the direction of narrowing legitimate forms of meaning and thereby declaring out-of-bounds, certain dimensions of otherness. It is not as dramatic and easily politicised as the extermination of an ethnic minority or even so easily made contentious as the proscription of various forms of social deviance. But the Other is located most fundamentally in language, the medium for representing selves and others. Therefore, any move that alters language by centralising and pruning or decentralising and diversifying alters the ecology of Self-Other relations and thereby the identities that contain and animate relations of power and authority.

In this typical lesson fragment, the teacher negotiates particular pedagogic interests in a situation where the participating children are not yet well socialised into the desired patterns of conformity. For them what is significant is claiming solidarity with the knowledge displays of their peers as they resist the teachers efforts to persuade them otherwise. Throughout the lesson most children do not make individual responses, their sense of a school identity constituted here by the teacher’s acceptance of their silence and the requirement that English be used. Exploring how these ‘negotiations’ continue to be played out with these children is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

Moving on: Grade Two

A year later, Grade Two, and the same class and teacher are involved in another Talking Drills lesson. The children are grouped across the classroom sitting on the floor and on the front desks close to the teacher.

The lesson is organised around three macro learning stages of pattern presentation, practice and production that theoretically aim to move children from a point of linguistic dependence to independent output.

In this lesson the main aim is to practice using uncountable nouns and the question stem ‘How much’. In the first stage (Presentation), the teacher uses a review to re-present the notion of uncountable nouns and to establish the appropriate question form, orientating children to the language forms. The second stage (Practice) can be broken into three, firstly, the teacher re-introduces the children to the procedure of using the forms in turn taking sequences through asking each other questions and answering them. After these orientations the teacher invites children to ask each other questions. At the end of the practice stage the teacher organises the children into a loose circle and the questions and
answers are passed around. In the final stage (Production) the children move into small
groups each with a group leader who initiates and monitors the group practice.
It is important to note that approximately 18 of the 36 children (half the class)
participated in the presentation and practice stages in various ways, while all of the class
participated in the final production stage and the chorused responses which occur
throughout the lesson.

Teaching and learning as ‘procedural display’
Within the broad staging of this lesson the teacher and the children engage in various
question and answer sequences as a means of establishing the preferred form and
content of the language pattern being practiced. These interactions are significant as
they constitute children’s notions of what is ideationally and procedurally appropriate.
They are a form of dialogue in which those involved develop meaningful
understandings and agreements. There is in these exchanges a direct sense in which the
teacher and particular children are involved in the joint construction of the lesson.
Throughout the lesson the teacher is involved in a complex process of ‘cueing’ the
class, and the children are concerned with ‘reading’ and responding to those cues.
For example, in the opening stage children are required to know when and how to
answer the teacher’s questions both individually and as a class, to nominate
uncountable nouns and to follow her logic by completing her sentences.

Key: T: Teacher; C: Child; Ch: Class chorused response; ^ a nomination

Stage 1a: presentation - appropriate lexis
T: Okay I want you to think of some nouns, some nouns, do you know what nouns are?
C: Yes.
T: Someone give me a noun
C: Stick
T: Yes, ‘stick’ is a noun, what is this word what.. (pointing to chart)
C: ‘Names’
T: ‘Names’ are naming words like
C: Stick
T: Stick
C: Mulap/ C: cup
C: Desk
T: Good girl, right these are things you can count, yesterday I told you a big word 'uncountable' nouns, nouns that cannot be counted or hard to count, you name some of them?
Ch: Yes
C: Meat
T: Alright
C: Sugar
C: Blackboard
T: Blackboard, can you count blackboard, how many?
C: One
T: Can you count the next blackboard?
C: One
T: That will be how many now? one...
Ch://T: Two
C: Sand
T: Right
C: Coffee

The teacher's cueing system characteristically provides a number of 'slots' which the children are expected to fill, in various ways.
By filling these slots, particular children are complicit in the procedural structuring of the lesson as well as engaging the pedagogical processes needed to successfully negotiate the grammar of the pattern.
In the second part of the presentation stage the teacher continues to rely upon question, answer and feedback structures to elicit understanding of the linguistic concepts. This common turn-taking sequence (QAF) is used to manage both social and propositional relations (see Mehan 1974).
In answering the teacher's question Delina gives an incorrect response, the teacher's response is not a direct evaluation but a repeat of Delina's answer with questioning intonation, here the class is cued to evaluate Delina's response and chorus their verdict. Delina is spared direct judgement by the teacher who maintains a sense of solidarity having distanced herself from a personal form of correction. (Later when Delina makes
another mistake the teacher again avoids direct correction by stating the correct form for her).

**Stage 1b: presentation - question frame**

T: Alright now, what was the word that we used to ask about nouns that it’s hard to count? ^ Delina
D: How many..
T: How many?
Ch: No
T: We used
Ch:/D: How much, ‘How much coffee have you got?’
T: Alright. very good how....... 
Ch:/T Much
T: What is the word?
Ch: Much
T: What is the word?
Ch: Much

What happens here is the invitation of a third party to fill a feedback slot ‘normally’ filled by the teacher. The explicit evaluation move is not directly taken up by the teacher, rather the class is invited to fill the evaluation slot. Instead of providing direct assistance to Delina the teacher reflects the problem to the class, who evaluate her attempt and following a further prompt from the teacher provide the correct answer.

In the first part of the Practice stage the teacher’s dominant moves again aim to establish interpersonal solidarity, firstly by asking Delina to recall something she had forgotten, next by responding good humouredly to Rod’s answer recontextualising his response to give it authenticity, and finally by seeking the class’s agreement on her observation that the final question had been asked, turning what could have been her point of closure over to the class.

**Stage 2a: pattern practice**

T: Alright. say your question again, ready someone to answer
D: How much coffee are there?
T: Jenny
J: (inaudible)
T: Yes that’s right ^ Eril
E: There are some
T: Okay the question. is she’s asking you or... (to Delina) what is the question again?
D: How much coffee are there?
T: Have you got.
D: How much coffee have you got?
T: Eril
E: I’ve got some
T: Good. next question. ^ Helen
H: How much water have you got?
R: I haven’t got any
T: Oh that’s no good. one more .. Rod
R: How much rice have you got?
T: Kanko
K: I’ve got a lot
T: Very good. that was the last question ah?..
Ch: Yes

As the children are drawn into an elaborated practice in the following section, the teacher invites them to use different pronominalisations. In this section the teacher continues to indirectly correct and work to maintain solidarity with her class.

**Stage 2b: elaborated practice**

T: Okay. ‘You’... three questions here were asking each other..... ‘You’ ‘You’ ‘You’, okay can we ask using ‘I’ ‘they’ ‘me’? Can I have some questions using those words?.. right er Phillip
P: How much.. how much coffee have they got?
Ch: They’ve got some
T: Right another question from Chimou
Ch: How much sugar have they got? ^ Dina
D: They got..they they’ve they’ve got some.
T: And we’ll have the last one from Marina
M: How much rice we have got
T: Have you
M: Have you got
T: Solen
S: We got any
T: Again
S: We’ve got any
T: We haven’t got any
S: We haven’t got any
T: That’s the last one (?)
Ch: Yes (class chorused response)
T: Okay. you are using ..I heard the questions asking about ‘we’, am I right?
Ch: Yes
T: You may use another word too, alright
C1: How much sand have you got?.. eh how much sand have they got?
C2: They got
T: They’ve
C2: They’ve got many
T: Ah?
C2: They’ve got some
T: Right .. eh Tidiwa
Ti: How much rice have you got .. how much rice have they got?
C3: They’ve got some

**Cueing: structuring conformity**

In the political economy of this lesson so far, different interactions are constituted through the teacher’s choices about how best to proceed, brought to life through her cueing system. Conformity is clearly one of the aims of the lesson, the teacher is concerned to encourage the class’s compliance to its procedures and the content that has been prescribed for her to teach. Conformity is realised as the teacher’s public attempts to harmonise children’s knowledge with curriculum knowledge. The encouragement of conformity is most visible during error management, where the teacher’s responses to error draw together the community discourse of solidarity and the pedagogic discourse of evaluation. The teacher’s moves to correct children’s mistakes are sometimes framed as rhetorical displays and indirect questions cueing not only for a class judgement but also for class consensus.
T: Alright now, what was the word that we used to ask about nouns that it’s hard to count? Delina
D: How many..
T: How many?
Ch: No

One effect of this cueing is to provide space for the teacher to avoid making direct confrontatory negative evaluations, to remove herself from the position of public critic. This is also accomplished through triadic interactions where the teacher asks the class to weigh up the response of an answering child, eg. the teacher asks ... ‘Is he/she right?’, the class choruses ‘yes’ or ‘no’. The effect on the responding child of a ‘no’ answer is often embarrassment, for the class a sense of unity, allowing the teacher to take up a position of mediation. In other situations where it is common for children to look to peers rather than the teacher for direction, the teacher’s move has the effect of disrupting these collaborations placing children in the position of judging and cooperating with the teacher, rather than cooperating with each other. The teacher’s error correction strategies vary in degrees of indirectness. In the following example, the teacher’s interpolation is understood by the child to be a correction to his question and is immediately taken up without any direct confrontation.

D: How much coffee are there?
T: Have you got.
D: How much coffee have you got?

In this next example the teacher calls for the repetition of the child’s utterance, a cue that some adjustment is needed to the utterance, and then models the correct response.

S: We got any
T: Again
S: We’ve got any
T: We haven’t got any
S: We haven’t got any

In each of these error correction strategies (repeating the utterance, interpolation, call for repetition and modelling) the teacher backgrounds all participant positions and does not take up the subject position ‘I’ or in the object position ‘you’ when correcting children. These positions are confrontary. To directly confront can result in children’s rejection of the teacher’s agenda, silence, lowered heads, uncooperative behaviour, non-responsiveness, running away from school and even hostility. This teacher’s
indirectness illustrates somewhat the care she takes in making a distinction between correcting a child’s response and the social position of the child. The teacher’s corrective practices are mediated by her interest in solidarity, while making positive evaluations, her corrections are indirect and formal enacted as face-saving moves which limit the social disruption of the pedagogical work she is engaged in.

**Stage 2b: Coda**

In what may be described as a coda to this stage, the teacher chooses two children who have not contributed, Dalpain and Riston, to conclude this stage of controlled practice. Riston and Dalpain are representative of those children who seldom participate individually. Those children who are seldom directly called upon to model responses without having first indicated their competence. They are hesitant, both are prompted by the teacher in ways different to other students. Riston is directed to ‘go and stand and answer’. Dalpain hesitates so the teacher gives her a start, ‘How much’; Riston is not certain what is expected procedurally, the teacher begins a prompt (‘I’ve’) but realises that Riston is not certain that it is he who is expected to answer: ‘T: She asking you ...’, Riston completes the sentence correctly. To be a teacher here is to see that not all children respond the same way. Riston (male) and Dalpain (female) are not ignored, but like others, inhabit background positions in the social structure of the pedagogy.

T: The last one, Riston go and stand and answer .. Dalpain

D: How .. how

T: How much

D: How much sugar have you got?

R: (no response)

T: I’ve .. she asking you

R: I’ve got some

T: Very good Riston . okay can you....say it in a circle (to the class)

In the final stage of controlled practice children form a question and answer circle and pass the pattern around. The teacher monitors the performances and acknowledges an answer that varies from the previous repeated response patterns. Children are also monitoring each other’s performances and when one child makes a mistake the class laughs as if the exercise were a game and this child has been caught out. The child is
embarrassed, the teacher asks a rhetorical question to bring about a refocussing on the concept of the language pattern and avoids confronting or shaming the child by giving the correct form.

*Stage 2c: circle practice*

T: Very good Riston okay can you.....say it in a circle
C4: How much rice have you got
C5: I’ve got some
C5: How much water have they got?
C6: They’ve got.....
C6: How much salt have they they got?
C7: They’ve got some
C7: How much rice have you got?
C8: I’ve got a lot
T: Very good answer
C8: How much water have you got?
C9: I haven’t got any
C9: How much how much water have you got?
T: Last time
C10: How much water have they got?
C11: They got
T: They’ve
C11: They’ve got a bucket..a bucket
T: A bucket full
C11: A bucket full
T: Right
C11: How many
Ch: (Laughter )
T: Can you count salt..how much
C11: How much salt have they got?
C12: They’ve got some
C12: How much sand have you got?
C13: We’ve got we’ve got we’ve got . we haven’t got some
T: Any
C13: Any
C13: How much coffee have you got?
C14: I’ve got a bucket full
T: A bottle full
C14: A bottle full
C14: How much water have I got?
C15: You’ve got some
T: Finished eh. move to your place leaders .......... boys and girls stand up and go to your group .. when you are in your place you start.

Stage 3: production
In this stage children are involved in small group practice answering and asking questions using the pattern. As this is a daily event, the children know what is expected and participate with more certainty than in the first two stages of the lesson. Their ‘production’ is under the supervision of a group leader. It is to be expected in this stage that children will benefit from the opportunity to produce their utterances in ways that more closely approximate the ‘natural’ use of the language. In actuality most of the authentic dialogic work has been done by a few children in the earlier stages of the lesson. As Burbules and Rice note

The dialogic relation ... has in itself a strongly pedagogical element, in which participants seek to teach and learn from one another; and the voluntary aspect of the participation is crucial, since a reluctant partner in dialogue is not likely to gain, or contribute, anything at all (1991:28).

In the group below, the leader takes up what he sees as the role of the teacher, to initiate and correct. As the pattern is passed around the leader takes up a number of positions opened up to him by virtue of his role and gender.

T: Finished eh. move to your place leaders....... boys and girls stand up and go to your group .. when you are in your place you start.
L: How much salt have you got?
C1: I’ve got some ^ How much sugar have they got?
C2: They haven’t got
L: They haven’t got any
C2: Any
L: How much how much how much rice have you got eh.. how much rice have we got. how much have we got?
Here, in this first sequence the leader after asking the first question and hearing its response, does not allow time for the second child to completely formulate a response and inserts himself into the question sequence crowding out the child’s turn.
C3: We got many ^ How much sand have we..they got?
C4: They got a lot ^ How much salt have we got?
C5: They’ve got some ^ How much sugar have I got?
C6: You got a lot ^ How how much coffee have you got?
C7: I’ve got some ^ How many
L: How much (hits girl on arm)
C7: How much salt have you got?
L: I haven’t got any ^ How much hair have you got?
In this sequence the leader corrects the girl next to him for making a mistake and hits her on the arm, his question, ‘How much hair have you got?’ brings laughter to the group.
C1: I haven’t got some . I haven’t got any ^ How much how much sugar have you got?
. How much sugar have they got?
C2: They got they got some ^ How how how much how much water have you got?
C3: I’ve got some ^ How much how much earth have you got?
L: I have some . eh I haven’t got any ^ How many
C3: How much
L: How much hair have you got?
C4: I’ve got some ^ How much water have you got?
C5: I’ve got a cup full ^ How much rice have you got?
C6 I haven’t got any
T: Each group ask a question go around this way
Towards the end of the final sequence some of the children drop out looking across to other groups and talking to each other. In this stage it is the leaders who have most opportunities to practice, in one group claiming seven opportunities to talk while others
in the group have three or less. The teacher intervenes to conclude the lesson with a final round of random practice.

**Cueing: structuring solidarity**

There are in this lesson, no examples of direct rebuttal of children’s responses or occasions that draw direct admonishment, rebuke or reprimand. There is a sense of an ongoing effort to sustain learning as a cooperative work through the construction of the ideology of solidarity. Solidarity is defined in terms of the teacher’s treatment of children as peers and intimates, for the most part marked by the use of more directly personal affirming language. The aim of solidarity is to cultivate relations of social sensibility and intersubjective agreement. It is often found following a child’s correct response as praise:

T: Good girl ... ; T: alright ..;

or as confirmation:

T: Someone give me a noun  
C: Stick  
T: Yes, ‘stick’ is a noun

At a more personal level it is found in statements that acknowledge the situations of individual children;

H: How much water have you got?  
C: I haven’t got any  
T: Oh that’s no good

And at the level of the class *;

T: Very good . that was the last question ah?..  
Ch: Yes  
...

T: Okay . you are using ..I heard the questions asking about ‘we’, am I right?  
Ch: Yes  
...

T: That’s the last one  
Ch: Yes  
...

T: Finished eh ...?
Each of these final utterances from the teacher is characterised by rising intonation marking them as attempts to seek intersubjective agreement. This questioning intonation is here used not as a way of requiring students to legitimate their knowledge, but as a means of legitimating the teacher’s position (see Baker and Freebody 1993).

These cues socialise children into a partnership with the teacher where the teacher is seen to seek children’s agreement on lesson procedures as well as lesson content. Here the children are apprenticed to the teacher’s consensual reasonings, practices and sensibilities of her pedagogy.

This emphasis on agreement, solidarity and consensus is a feature of oral community discourses (see Kulick & Stroud 1993). The teacher’s desire to maintain relations of reduced social distance is a dominant concern and overrides other pedagogical interests such as a focus on explicitness, explanation, analysis, criticism, public questioning of knowledge, expressing opinions and disagreements all of which potentially act to increase social distance. Much of what is often valued in western education is here subjugated by the cultural discourses of consensus and face.

This classroom is a place of intersection of institutional and community discourses, the planned curriculum and the primary system of dispositions of its participants defined by the communities in which they are embedded. In the process of learning, most children have come to identify with the teacher’s consensual mode of discourse as the means of traversing the known to the unknown.

As has been noted, chorused evaluations, position the children not the teacher, as ‘evaluators’ in the QAF instructional sequence. The cue the teacher gives for chorused evaluative responses is an explicit signal of control, a stimulus for the recall of previous learning, as well as an implicit backgrounder of her own voice in matters of judgement to promote solidarity with and within the class. A solidarity which reads against the ideological ‘authority’ of ‘teacher as expert’, as the only space for her to occupy.

Much of the teacher’s solidarity work is designed to win the consent of children and keep intact a sense of everyone’s social position. The following exchange between the teacher and class illustrates the way potential message problems are managed by negotiation where face is saved and solidarity is sustained.

T: Alright now, what was the word that we used to ask about nouns that its hard to count ^ Delina
D: How many.
T: How many?
Ch: No
T: We used
Ch:/D: How much, 'how much coffee have you got'
T: Alright. very good how........
Ch:/T Much

The teacher’s vigilance is not tuned only to the lesson content but equally and perhaps more so to sustain an atmosphere of agreeable circumstances under which this work might take place. Solidarity is also intimately linked with aspects of conformity when the teacher wishes to have children do things they don’t wish to do. There is some uncertainty assigned to these moments where conformity and solidarity are mutually expressed and children are required in these cases to be expert monitors of the teacher’s expectations, to follow the teacher’s logic and attend to both the context and the sequencing of the activity, as in this example,

T: Blackboard, can you count blackboard, how many?
C: One
T: Can you count the next blackboard?
C: One
T: That will be how many now? one...
Ch:/T: two

Here the unified voices of class and teacher are a powerful authority. Here, orderliness has the appearance of being maintained, and learning the appearance of occurring, through the practice and expectation of a shared response and purpose. ¹

¹ That this pattern of engagement is widespread and not just a situated response to the children’s lack of English is evidenced here where this kind of three-way interaction is found in other classes with other teachers.

For example, in this extract from a Grade 5 Community Life lesson:

T: What makes up the environment?
C: Birds
T: Birds
C: Forests
T: Forests ^ John
J: Soil
T: Is he right?
Ch: Yes
C: Fish
Cueing as subjectification: accessing social practices, which count

One way of addressing the complexity of this teaching and learning cueing system is to see it in terms of the expectations, which are constructed, and the positions, which are made available for participants to take up. To apply these notions to the lesson above, is to see more than language drills, it is to see a mix of social interactions, a flux of practices and meanings whereby teacher and children are constituted and positioned as different talking, acting, thinking and valuing individuals at different points in the lesson.

While it appears that children are positioned in these literacy events in similar ways with similar opportunities for participation, there exist different solidarities and different conformities, producing different learning experiences and identifications. Within the regime of lesson participation, there appears a hierarchy of ‘participant roles.’ High in the regime of acknowledged participation are ‘consensual’ roles characterised as working partnerships with the teacher, or as class chorused responses.

T: Fish ^ Kani
K:
T: Who can help him?
C: Water
T: Where does water come from?
C: Rain

Here the interaction involves not only a request from the teacher for the class to provide third party evaluation T: ‘Is he right?’ Ch; ‘Yes’, but also third party ideational support which when provided is indirectly confirmed by the teacher in the following initiation.

T: Fish ^ Kani
K: (no response)
T: Who can help him?
C: Water
T: Where does water come from?

A student teacher is observed constructing similar patterns of participation where direct forms of evaluation are replaced with implicit forms cueing agreement and solidarity with the class.

ST: What is weight? ^ Yes
C: Heavy
ST: The heaviness of something, am I right?
Ch: Yes!

These pedagogical procedures and cueing manoeuvres may be accounted for in terms of the discourses of institutional conformity and the wider discourses of social solidarity, each constitutive of what counts here as language pedagogy.
In both forms of participation intersubjective agreement with the teacher is reached but by different means. Individuals who identify with both the teacher’s solidarity and conformity cues, enter into a ‘consensual’ partnership with the teacher jointly working through the lesson content to ensure a correct outcome. In social terms, these children can be said to possess *save* a Tok Pisin term denoting knowledge and social ability. Kulick and Stroud (1993:44) provide an insightful reading of this construct applicable to the discourse communities of this area not far from their own fieldwork.

In its most basic sense, *save* signifies knowledge: the knowledge of facts and being able to learn from experience and through doing. But it also means more than that. *Save* is knowledge about appropriate behaviour and speech, awareness of social obligations and roles, cognisance of the consequences that one’s own or someone else’s actions or words can have. *Save* is a metaphor ... to mean social sensitivity and solidarity.

Individual children like Delina, who appropriate *save* in these various senses to skirt the regulatory ambience of the lesson are recognised by the teacher through their activity in the class. In a sense, rather than being chosen by the teacher, the teacher’s practice of not nominating children reveals how some children choose themselves. What is also the case is that non-initiating children appear not to be enabled to draw upon *save*, the appropriate cultural capital to fill the more valued participant roles made available in the orientation stages of the lesson. These children are often only involved in recreating, with the teacher, participations lower in value, such as imitating teacher initiations and engaging in class chorused responses. The sense of participation available in these positions is misleading, it is a participation that qualifies in terms of ‘face’ but is less rewarding in terms of apprenticing these children to the kinds of interactions that count.

The more authentically dialogic learning positions which the teacher makes available during the presentation stage privilege children who read the teachers questions as direct invitations to participate and not as a preamble to their participation at a later stage. Delina who features in both of these lessons is representative of that small group. In the staging of the lesson these children who interact with the teacher during the presentation and scaffolding stages, are apprenticed to different learning experiences, arguably more important knowledge constituting experiences. Those, however, who take up spaces in the mimetic stages of the lesson are involved in less ‘authentic’ social interactions and are apprenticed to different experiences, solidarities and conformities.
The relational and interactional differences between these different parts of the lesson, are important to note for as Gee argues,

... the way in which human minds are ‘peopled’ is by internalising’ the interactional semiotics of the social world - Any higher mental function was external (and) social before it was internal. It was once a social relationship between two people ...’ (Gee 1995:23).

From this perspective, the participations of Riston and Dalpain can be seen as secondary apprenticeships to those experienced, for example, by Delina. For Riston and Dalpain who remain quietly observant for most of the early stages of these lessons, the learning regime of the classroom extends to them limited subject positions with little access to ‘authentic’ social interactions and more genuinely dialogic, reflexive forms of learning. In the absence of such interactions Riston and Dalpain are less able to speak themselves into valued forms of participation. They are constrained by mimetic forms of involvement mediated by discourses of solidarity, compliance and conformity, where rote participation is what counts as learning. For children constituted at this level of participation, the unnegotiated rote stages of Talking Drills become their social and linguistic milieu, their dominant ‘operational frame of reference’. In broad terms, to be a successful student in this class is to inhabit key participant positions available at critical dialogic points in the lesson, positions which are discerning not only of the kinds of solidarity and conformity which the teacher is scaffolding, but also the discerning of opportunities to initiate dialogue, not just reproduce it. In short, those children who engaged the teacher in the orientation stages of the lesson experience a more genuinely dialogic and reflexive learning experience. The final production stage of the lesson where such experiences are expected to occur is dominated by conformity to the procedure of passing the language pattern around the small group and responding in rote ways.

**Lexical choices and the discourses of modernity**

To adopt Green’s rhetoric these accounts are about ‘what it means educationally to be living in a ‘time of transition’ (1993:10). The nature of transition is that it makes more visible the way discourses overlap and collide. Schooling in PNG is in this condition. Teachers voices are a blending and privileging of vernacular and ‘modern voices, unequally yoked. To look for coherence and unification between schooling and its communities is to ignore the ripple effects of colonisation, the unintended
consequences, dislocations and semiotic shockwaves being experienced from the ongoing collision of the traditional and the modern. Reid (1993) alerts us to the social effects of western-styled curriculum upon residual oral cultures, noting that ‘... once the members of that culture are coopted into the modern school system, the labels begin to exert their power’ (p23).

While this lesson is located in a transitional social and cultural context, the dominant ideational categories of its construction are drawn from the discourses of modernity. As a series of frames for ‘speaking the world and self into existence’ these categories interrupt and overwrite some of the knowledges and social practices which children bring to the classroom. To ground these notions in the practices of this classroom, is to see that the ‘appropriate’ lexical choices and definitions these children are expected to make come predominantly from modern social contexts. The dominant content words in this lesson, for example, pivot around particular commodities. The terms ‘rice’, ‘sugar’, ‘coffee’, ‘salt’, for example, make sense in the context of new market economies, and are symbolic of new definitions of economic well being and social privilege. These modern categories are talked into existence both ideationally and socially. The teacher’s reference to ‘coffee’, for example, illustrates how her way of speaking the world into existence displaces that of the child responding.

C: How much coffee have you got?
C: I’ve got a bucket full
T: A bottle full
C: A bottle full

The teacher’s correction, closes out an alternate reading of the child’s answer. For some local families (at Siar) harvesting coffee is a seasonal occupation, the teacher reads the question in terms of its reference to coffee as a supermarket or trade store commodity not as the product of manual labour counted in bucket fulls. What the responding child knows, however, makes sense in this context, but in the ‘social’ mind of the teacher, does not register.

The 23 references to these commodities when juxtaposed with 14 references to other categories (water 8, sand 3, hair 2, earth 1) show their dominance as categories. Some teacher’s responses, however, demonstrate a sensitive awareness of the conditions of the children’s lived experience.

T: Good. next question. Helen
H: How much water have you got?
C: I haven’t got any
T: Oh that’s no good ...

The child’s response is noted by the teacher because water shortages are a problem
many people are experiencing. By bringing their worlds into the classroom, these
children confront this ideological displacement, what Gee refers to as a process of
‘(a)bstracting concrete worlds - breaking down the moral and intellectual economy of
the ‘community’ (Gee 1990:51).3 Through the medium of modern schooling these
terms take up positions which occlude existing discourses, being privileged within a
new system of emergent binaries (modern/traditional) which marginalise the local
relevance of questions of water supply or land or earth, categories which are intimate to
the human experience of these school children and their communities. What emerges is
the extent to which this means of teaching English involves the disciplining of
children’s frames of reference and interpretive participations. That such practices are
enduring is the subject of the final part of this chapter.

Moving on: Grade Three

A year later, Grade Three, the same class with a different teacher (male) are involved in
an Oral Expression lesson where children are expected to ask and answer questions
based on a picture of ‘Things we need’. The children are seated in rows of desks in twos
and threes. This lesson extract focuses upon the orientation phase of the lesson where
the teacher is looking to stimulate a structured discussion of objects in the picture. At
the teacher’s request a child initiates a question:
C1: What do you need for play? (*said to the teacher*)

2 In the dry season, many villagers suffer through lack of water, schools are closed and
some communities rely almost entirely on the ‘milk’ of green coconuts. Water quality
and quantity is an issue for the many local people who rely on creeks and rivers as their
only supply for drinking, bathing, washing and growing crops. It is not so much a
concern for those whose link with the cash economy means that they are able to rely on
rainwater tanks, bores and in some cases piped water directed to households from local
creeks and rivers.

3 In a very real sense, this commodification represents a disruption to local subsistence
economies displacing social practices where the importance of food in bestowing
respect, prestige, and wealth, and sustaining, nurturing and mending social relations is
relocated. Families and communities positioned wholly or partially outside the cash
economy have little direct access to these goods representative of a new social order.
Even in lessons designed for a more communicative use of English, a process of ‘narrowing legitimate forms of meaning’, a silencing of meaning diversity, is evident. The teacher’s interest is in constructing a ‘schooled subject’ by emphasising conformity, over dialogue. The class’s interests are well aligned with those of the teacher. Unlike the Grade One and Two experiences where the discourses of solidarity and conformity appeared mutually sustaining, in the Grade three experience solidarity is here achieved through conformity, the affirmation ‘Good girl’ coming only after forced compliance.

It is in this appropriation of local discourses of solidarity by school discourses of conformity and governance that learning appears to suffer. Paradoxically while the discourse of solidarity sustains a sense of community and participation, it potentially increases teachers’ and children’s tolerance and acceptance of conformity to unnegotiated classroom practices and the construction of differently valued participations.

**Conclusion**

The discourse of English in its strong pedagogical framing, and in its standardisation, does not ‘speak’ to all children, nor in some moments to these teachers, providing only limited opportunities for genuine ‘talking back’. In the activity structures of Talking
Drills an illusion of learning and involvement is constructed in the midst of the uneven distribution of participations and meanings, problematising for many children the sense of what counts as learning.

In the thematic structures of these lessons there are traces of a displacement of local meanings and affinities in the relations between teachers, children and pedagogy, and in the unproblematic acceptance of ‘modern’ categories in the interests of schooling. Here in these lessons, teaching and learning, as curriculum’ are underpinned, and, I would argue, undermined, by the appropriation of discourses of community solidarity by discourses of pedagogical conformity in the broader interests of producing new hierarchies of cultural meaning and social practice. Paradoxically, however, it appears that in the spaces where some children draw upon community discourses, the regulatory nature of the pedagogy is undermined and learning is more successfully negotiated.

The way ahead
What is of interest in the context of this larger study of the construction of pedagogic discourse is the positions that student teachers take up in relation to these discourses. It is in this interest that the focus of the next chapter shifts to developing an understanding of the theories, perceptions, ‘solidarities’ and ‘conformities’, and epistemological constructions held by ‘beginning’ teachers as consumers, producers and distributors of pedagogical discourse mediated by the meanings of their cultural ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1990).
Intertext two

School
Oh school school you are very important
school is a place that helps people to learn
school is a place that all the people can learn many kinds of new things.
School is a place that people know English and also know education.
School help many people to read and write.
School must have clean areas. School must have toilets.
School school “oh” you are very good place to learn.

A student’s poem displayed on the wall of the Grade 5 classroom at Bugajim Community School
Student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations

Chapter 4

Introduction
This chapter aims to increase understandings of the ‘order of things’ which inform students’ perceptions of teaching, and to contribute critically to the meanings and practices informing those constructions. It uncovers a range of epistemological and pedagogical meanings, situated in a wider social system, which inform and discipline the ways student teachers learn to teach, and how those learnings are activated, reproduced and altered in practice. This study of epistemologies and pedagogical theories aims also to provide insight into the way meanings are positioned, settled and articulated within individual subjectivities as collections of perceptions, definitions and beliefs. Popkewitz quoted in Schratz and Walker (1995:135-6) asserts that

*Epistemology provides a context in which to consider the rules and standards by which knowledge about the world is formed, the distinctions and categorisations that organise perceptions, ways of responding to the world, and the conception of ‘self’.*

Unravelling students’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations may therefore provide some understanding of the way student teachers’ pedagogical perceptions are organised.

The study is premised on a series of informal observations of what students often referred to as a distinction between traditional and modern knowledge, and the way such distinctions appeared to influence their view of what counted as valid schooling and pedagogy. Coupled with this was an apparent strong belief in the pedagogical value of direct experience, in teacher dominated instruction, in self-directed practice, with little questioning of the ‘theoretical’ constituents of modern knowledge, its values and practices. I felt at the time, that these were distorting influences, that efforts to ground my teaching in what Bullivan (1975) referred to as ‘dialectical cultural exchange’ were undermined by practices and structures which dichotomised ‘theory and practice’, ‘teaching and learning’ and ‘the modern and the traditional’, practices and structures with which I was not reconciled. I noted at the time that Smith’s (1975) study of discontinuities between Wankung school and its community in the Eastern Highlands, Bullivan’s (1975) work on education in PNG as ‘a situated construction of cultural

---

4 This is an exploration of the intersections between students’ theories of knowledge, teaching and the world, for the purpose of developing an awareness of the assumptions students draw upon to interpret the questions they were asked to respond to.
reality’, and Young & Bartos’s (1977) study of the image of western knowledge among educated Papua New Guineans, all revealed in different ways the social consequences of the above mentioned polarisations. Their work provided a stimulus to an exploration of the nature of students’ tacit theories of knowledge, teaching and learning. Young (1981:200) suggests that,

... the image of knowledge acquisition in particular epistemologies - the image of primary knowledge acquisition we might call it - is likely to affect teachers’ images of secondary knowledge acquisition, the communication of previously discovered knowledge to others.

This notion is considered here, however, in a broader sense to mean the possible influences of primary or ‘first order’ discourses, socialisations, and ways of making meaning, upon secondary or ‘second order’ discourses, the ways they are articulated, acquired and practiced, and is not interpreted in terms of a direct correspondence. From these starting points students’ epistemological orientations, are viewed as potentially important constitutive aspects of their pedagogical practices. Young (1988) argues that teacher epistemologies may be manifest in three main ways,

It would be felt in the process of selecting, and justifying selection of, the knowledge that should be involved in the curriculum. It would affect the process of managing the presentation of this knowledge in the curriculum and, in particular the justification or otherwise of a teacher-managed pedagogy. And it would be felt in the process of assessment, including the social legitimation of assessment processes. (p495)

This study goes some way in exploring these areas in ideational terms, its purpose is to provide some categories to support further study and teaching while requiring students to examine their orientations to knowledge, teaching and learning in school and community contexts. Part of it involves written responses\(^5\) from students from across the three year course (n=167)\(^6\) to the following questions:

\(^5\) I noticed early in working with students and teachers that the cross-cultural of communication of ‘personal’ knowledge, eg opinions, feelings, points of view, about their work was not only better managed through writing, but also resulted in a greater sense of intimacy, than face to face questions and talks. Students in particular often felt keen embarrassment, particularly in the company of friends, when expected to respond orally (publicly), and preferred private and somewhat anonymous ways of communicating. Writing was seen as an indirect way of interacting in which embarrassment might be avoided, and solidarity might be maintained. As a way of communicating it allowed students the opportunity to take up contrary positions without the risks of ‘confrontation’. This enabled me to come to a quicker sense of what individual students’ positions were on a variety of matters. Face-face interactions nearly always involved a degree of formality and some deference to the researcher’s position as a lecturer and foreigner, and moves to establish an affinity with the researcher’s position, as such it was hoped that writing would work to reduce the distortions
1. What is knowledge?
2. What knowledge is most important?
3. What knowledge is least important?
4. How does knowledge come about?
5. How should the search for knowledge be carried out?
6. How is knowledge best taught?
7. What sort of knowledge should be included in a Teachers College curriculum?
8. What sort of knowledge should be included in a Community School curriculum?
9. How do you get knowledge?
10. How do school children get knowledge?
11. What is the difference between traditional knowledge and modern knowledge?
12. What is the difference between school knowledge and community knowledge?

Answers to the questions above are seen as representing situated responses mediated by the circumstances and contexts in which students participated as members of this pedagogical discourse community.

To explore the data synchronously in terms of its themes provides insight into the kinds of discourses students are informed by. In presenting the questions to students no specific expectations were communicated regarding the extent and nature of their responses, students worked individually with occasional moments of conversation.

**Interpreting the responses**

Three ways of making sense of this data have been used. The first is a limited cross-sectional analysis of students' responses to the question, 'What is knowledge?' and the construction of a frequency distribution of dominant themes. This was thought to be important in providing a view of the field, an idea of the range and complexity of responses that such a key question might generate. The second is a closer look at the 'epistemic profiles' of a number of complete responses. This was felt to be important in providing insight into the differing assumptions, beliefs, and perceptions students employ in articulating responses across questions. The third is a tabling and discussion associated with positional authority. As Florio notes in Cherryholmes (1988:91) 'In a social world that is unequal, you don’t get democratic or open conversation simply by saying everybody’s free to talk'.

6 In the analysis undertaken for this study 1st year students have not been included and a small number of students have been selected from years 2 & 3.

7 Questions 9 & 10 are grounded in broad knowledge distinctions students used when talking about schooling.
of ideological dichotomies or oppositions associated with questions 2&3. As the categories traditional/modern, school/community are in wide currency it was felt that exploring these responses would provide a view of how they are conventionally used.

**What is Knowledge?**

In quantitative terms, the following tabulation represents the distribution of dominant themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills/ Ways of doing Ideas</th>
<th>A state of understanding</th>
<th>The product of learning</th>
<th>What you know</th>
<th>Mental and thinking ability</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st yr: r=20</td>
<td>1st yr: r=7</td>
<td>1st yr: r=13</td>
<td>1st yr: r=14</td>
<td>1st yr: r=9</td>
<td>1st yr: r=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd yr: r=12</td>
<td>2nd yr: r=16</td>
<td>2nd yr: r=14</td>
<td>2nd yr: r=10</td>
<td>2nd yr: r=5</td>
<td>2nd yr: r=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd yr: r=22</td>
<td>3rd yr: r=21</td>
<td>3rd yr: r=6</td>
<td>3rd yr: r=8</td>
<td>3rd yr: r=5</td>
<td>3rd yr: r=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total r= 54</td>
<td>Total r= 44</td>
<td>Total r= 33</td>
<td>Total r= 32</td>
<td>Total r= 19</td>
<td>Total r= 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%r= 25.7</td>
<td>%r= 20.9</td>
<td>%r= 15.7</td>
<td>%r= 15.2</td>
<td>%r= 9.0</td>
<td>%r= 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%n= 32.7</td>
<td>%n= 26.6</td>
<td>%n= 20.0</td>
<td>%n= 19.3</td>
<td>%n= 11.5</td>
<td>%n= 5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st yr n=61; r=72, 2nd yr n=47; r=64, 3rd yr n=57; r=74
Total respondents = 165 Total responses = 210
%r represents the frequency of a particular category as a percentage of overall categories.
%n represents the percentage of students making responses in that category.
Dual responses were given in a number of cases the most common combinations being of the kind ‘skills and ideas’ and ‘skills and understanding’.

**Discussion**

The following statements are representative of the broad categories around which responses gathered.

*Knowledge is ...*

Category 1: ‘know-how’ of things’; ‘skills or the capability to do certain things’;
‘ways of doing things’

Category 2: ‘ideas we get from people or things to build up the way we think; ‘ideas in the brain’; ‘facts in the mind’; ‘ideas taught and remembered’; ‘ideas and concepts’.

Category 3: ‘understandings of things taught in school’; understanding that you acquire from learning things’; ‘understandings of things in the mind’.
Category 4: ‘something we acquire by learning in our everyday life; ‘what we gain through experiences, learning’; ‘the learning of new and old things’; what you have learned and know; learning from others’.

Category 5: ‘something you know and have to know about’; ‘what you know’; ‘knowing things that are known’.

Category 6: ‘mental ability someone has’; ‘the ability, which enables thinking and inventing’; the thinking abilities each person has’.

Category 7: ‘anything that has been taught in school and at home’; ‘something a person has to share with someone else’; ‘everything that has been stored in our heads’; ‘self-awareness’.

The dominant perception of knowledge nominated by a third of students is that it is a skill, a way of doing, a mode of action what might correspond to Young’s ‘practical-empirical’ orientation. Just over a quarter of responses defined knowledge in terms of ideas, notions in the mind, mental furniture, reflecting a strong rational perspective. One fifth considered knowledge to be a kind of understanding, a coherence about things. Another fifth, defined knowledge in terms of an outcome, an end, a product. Just over a tenth of students defined knowledge as an informed state, and another tenth as a mental ability or competency. Other responses were less conventional and more idiosyncratic in their expressions. What is noted here, however, is the predominance of both ‘practical-empirical’ and ‘rational’ perspectives.

The students’ linking of notions, such as ‘skills’, ‘ideas’, ‘mental ability’ in defining the culture of knowledge, mark their contact with various discourses which have conceptually carved up the world in both local practical ways and more abstract technicist logico-empirical ways (Young 1981; Kemmis 1985; Habermas 1979).

---

8 Young & Bartos (1977) argue that while face-face interviews provide a better means of gauging the strength of respondents opinions, ‘In data of this kind the mention of a particular kind of issue by more than 30%-40% of respondents is rare and indicates the likelihood that the issue mentioned is highly salient for a majority of respondents, some of whom failed to mention the point because of the saliency of other points, distractions, differences of interpretation, and the like.’ (p14)

9 Young (1981) suggests a tension in the work of Rorty (1964) where the categories ‘rationalism-thinking, empiricism-sensing’, intuition-feeling ‘authoritarianism-believing’ did not adequately reflect the hybridity of participant responses. Young however, in his study of teacher epistemologies of Australian teachers, did identify a broad division in teachers’ consciousness between a logical empiricist epitomisation of knowledge underpinned by a scientific view of the world, and a more ‘subjective’, intuitive’ or ‘personal’ (hermeneutic) epitomisation.

10 Young refers to the replacement in modern societies of traditional approaches to knowledge, ‘with a scientific image of knowledge and a technological image of
When the categories are collated a third of students seem to be indicating their epistemological moorings are more tied to variables which suggest that knowledge is situational: actions and experiences (ways of doing things) and mental and thinking abilities. For these students, it seems fair to say that knowing is either a physical or mental action and the consequences of that action, that it is situated in the context of some sort of activity, social or individual. The majority of the remaining students however, seemed to be indicating that knowledge is more autonomous, that it is ideas in the mind, ‘what you know’, and ‘what you understand’, a product, a state. In this conception of knowledge, the mind is seen to hold knowledge and disclose it independently of surrounding conditions. From this perspective, dialogic actions and circumstances are not consciously perceived to be critical to knowing. This is essentially an objectivist or autonomous view of knowledge.\footnote{Maxine Greene puts John Dewey’s position on the separation of mind and ‘environment’ that I feel is critical to the discussion here. ‘... mind is primarily a verb. It denotes all the ways in which we deal consciously and expressly with the situations in which we find ourselves. Unfortunately, an influential manner of thinking has changed modes of action into an underlying substance that performs the actions in question. It has created mind as an independent entity which attends, purposes, cares, notices and remembers. This change of ways of responding to the environment from which actions proceed is unfortunate, because it removes mind from necessary connection with the objects and events, past, present and future, of the environment with which responsive activities are inherently connected (1994:434).}

There is another pragmatic position that can be seen to be taken up by a smaller number of students who saw knowledge as a duality of both ‘skills and ideas’, such a position may accept that knowledge is both autonomous and situated. Though the above categorisations are useful, they tend to eliminate some differences and variations which are considered here to be important to understanding the order of things, for as Cazden has argued,

‘We need to see variation and/or attempted change in a system in order to understand its workings more fully’ (1989:286)

and further, Cherryholmes (1988:87) notes that

‘... discursive practices are not always highly integrated or tightly coupled’, as such, spaces exist which are filled by variant discourses. When discursive practices and speech communities bump into each other, as it were, meanings and rules for proceeding must be negotiated and established.

practice’, and calls the concomitant pedagogical ideology ‘technicist’. (1981:202) Here similar influences can be detected.
It is perhaps in the marginal area of Category 7 that some of these variants can be seen to provide alternatives to the dominant conceptions above. For example, the response that knowledge is ‘anything that has been taught in school and at home’, may be read as collapsing the school/community binary which privileges school knowledge over community knowledges. Similarly, knowledge as ‘self-awareness’ is disruptive of dominant categories, speaking to the profound sense in which knowledge can be the reflexive revelations of the conscious and unconscious. Here it is important to note Cherryholmes (1988:87) observation that, ‘(d)ifferences among discursive practices provide insights important to criticism’ The possible implications for teaching, of these different ways of looking at knowledge, are better served through a closer look at particular responses.

A selection of cases
To better uncover the way students perceive the relationship between knowledge and pedagogy, a ‘case’ view of individual student responses is adopted. In making the link to broader systems of ideas, students’ perceptions are viewed as ‘artefact(s) of the sign systems of the community’ (Butt 1985:1), where ‘(o)ne’s private self ultimately depends on the system of talk going on in the community’ (Butt 1985:67). Following from the work of Vygotsky (1953), Butt argues that knowledge is mediated through talk, that ‘our thinking is the present state of our conversations ... constructed out of all the meaning systems assimilated from the context of culture’ (pp 2,4). It is recognised, however, that any phenomenon, however, may have more than one value, be multivalent, thus generating a field of contending possibilities for action. Individuals may vary in their negotiation of these possibilities across circumstances. The approach here is to treat student responses as examples of texts reflecting the interests of particular discourse communities and discursive formations. Particular note is made of Kerr’s observation that

(w)hat constitutes proper “knowledge utilisation” depends upon one’s conception of knowledge and one’s theory of collective action, (1981:483)

Exploring responses by case resulted in the emergence of various pictures of how students’ epistemological and pedagogical ideologies were defined. The following cases consist of 7 males and 7 females all students between the ages of 18 and 20 from a various regions in PNG and selected on the basis of the variety of responses represented.

---

12 Text is defined here as ‘the social act of making meaning’, the same as ‘utterance’. (Lemke 1995) observes that, ‘It is as utterance, as text, that we make single words or clauses mean, and not as isolated lexical or grammatical units’ (p42).
1. *T is a 2nd year male student from the Highlands region*

T answers the question ‘what is knowledge?’ in pragmatic terms, in terms of one’s capacity to accomplish various labours

‘the abilities, ideas that you have to do things, when you have the ability you get the work done.’

He considers the most important knowledge to be ‘modern’,

‘the knowledge of knowing, understanding, observing (are vital) through experimenting and testing and inventing (Modern)’.

and the least important being ‘traditional’,

‘the knowledge of imitating or copying the idea from someone or something (Traditional)’.

For T knowledge (learning) comes about

‘by doing experiments, searching and observing from the environment’

and is searched out

‘by testing or practising and even observing. And also by imitating others.’

His own methods for getting knowledge are

‘By observing, experimenting and practising and even imitating’.

In these first responses T uses the notion of ‘imitation’ as a pivotal category in the explanation of how knowledge comes about. It is acknowledged as a strategy for researching knowledge but as a kind of knowledge/practice ‘imitation’ is not valued. The extent of T’s higher regard for the scientific discourses of ‘experimenting’ and ‘testing’ is clearly evident as is its standing in terms of what counts as modern knowledge.\(^\text{13}\)

In pedagogical terms, T states that knowledge is best taught

‘By clearly defining, explaining and knowing the advantages and disadvantages from text books’

and that school children get knowledge

‘by teaching them and observing from the text or curriculum’

His suggests that the teachers’ college curriculum should include

‘The knowledge of using technologies such as computers, typewriters and so on.’

And that community school curriculum should include

\(^{13}\) Scientific discourses appear in other accounts with different degrees of coherence, in terms of a valuing of ‘scientific knowledge’ and as a research construct, the work of ‘stimulus and response’, as ‘a way to accomplish, through the use of facts, concepts and principles of learning, something that can respond if it brought to a stimulus’.
'The knowledge of how to set up businesses like tradestores etc.'\textsuperscript{14}

In his developing pedagogical orientation, T draws from discourses which hold that knowledge can be clearly defined, explained and known, and that text books and curriculum provide valid determinations as to what is advantageous or disadvantageous in the communities of their use. The implied mode of transmission is one where the authority of the teacher and the text are central to the getting of knowledge.

In this account, there is a close alignment between traditional and 'community' knowledge, the latter being referred to as

'... the type of knowledge that you get everyday of your life by observing and imitating'.

T distinguishes between traditional and modern knowledge on the basis that traditional knowledge involves, 'using low level technologies' while modern knowledge refers to 'a more advanced way of life'.

Here the hierarchical relation between these two domains of knowledge is related to T’s consideration of what counts as important knowledge. Processes of 'experimenting', 'testing', and 'inventing' are juxtaposed with 'imitating or copying the idea from someone'. The knowing and understanding that comes through following procedures most commonly aligned with western scientific and technological development, are more highly valued than the kind of knowledge 'that you get everyday of your life'. Overall this account draws upon ideas and meanings which characterise progressive technicist pedagogical discourse with its emphasis on replacing the knowledges and learning practices of the past for a more modernist 'technological image of practice'.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} This purpose of such projects is as others have put it, to provide 'Grade 6 school dropouts' with some way of earning a living. Other often suggested overly ambitious projects include setting up small scale poultry businesses, piggeries etc.

\textsuperscript{15} Other students account for traditional and modern knowledge and pedagogical practices, similarly, though the emphasis is more on technical skills and the motivations utilitarian.

'Knowledge is the skills, tools and machineries that we use to achieve what we want. In traditional we use traditional skills to do something ... how to make garden, build house, fish and so forth and without knowing the outside world but except the community itself ... In modern we use skills, tools and machineries'.

In pedagogical terms, knowledge is gained by

'going to schools and by using our cognitive skills into practice, and by using skills and tools' and is best taught by 'teaching them what you’ve learnt (skills) and by putting into practice what you’ve learnt.'(P)
2. M is a second year female from Momase region

In answer to the question ‘What is knowledge?’, M writes,

‘Knowledge is what we gain from studies and we have clear idea of what is being said, not only studies but it also includes Informal learning by Observing.’

For M important knowledge is that knowledge which allows

‘human beings (to) go ahead and do things. Eg. you cannot build a house or fix cars without having a clear idea of how to go about the work.’

M does not define ‘least important knowledge’ but states in general terms that,

Knowledge is less important because we can go crazy in the head.’

For M knowledge comes about

‘... in many ways. That is by Observing (Informal Learning), Learning by Insight, (Formal Learning)

and that knowledge is gained ‘... by observing from others and then we imitate’.

The juxtaposition of formal and informal notions of knowledge suggests a view of knowledge built upon the idea of separate and distinct epistemological positions and practices. M’s responses are constituted in a separation between ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ learning, a distinction between learning from ‘observing’ and learning from ‘insight’.

In response to the question ‘How is knowledge best taught?’ M writes,

‘Knowledge is best taught by giving chn more exercises which they cannot catch up with quickly, having teaching aids (improvise) to illustrate.’

She continues,

‘School chn get knowledge by being taught different lessons and with the help of teachers use teaching aids.’

The pedagogical orientation here is one of keeping children busy with exercises, using aids and providing illustrations. In the following responses it can be seen that these notions are related to her reading of the way school and modern knowledge is constituted.

---

16 Some students claim that knowledge makes them go ‘crazy’. Students have suffered from stress and mental breakdowns which they attribute to too much study and the brain’s inability to cope with too much knowledge. In the absence of other discourses with which to understand these phenomenon such observations are understandable.

17 The notion of ‘improvisation’ is dominant throughout student teachers’ training. Though not formally taught it is invoked in the absence of teacher support materials, text books and resources eg where there are no ‘concrete materials for maths, science, and expressive arts, students are told to ‘improvise’, where there are no ‘Teachers’ Guides, language charts or classroom readers teachers are told to ‘improvise’. In resources distribution, The NDOE reports ‘a success rate of only 60% can be claimed nationally’ (NDOE Education Sector Review 1991:196)
‘School knowledge is when we have ideas of things in Text Bks...’
‘... modern knowledge is where we sit and listen carefully to instructions.’

School knowledge is linked to a view of knowledge mediated by text books and a predominantly monological pedagogy. In contrast community knowledge in the following response is perceived to be dialogical, socially constructed and collectively negotiated.

‘community knowledge is when we deal with things within the community and we discuss and do it together as suggested’.

Traditional knowledge, though, is believed to come about when
‘we observe and imitate (‘eg. a child imitating her mum coming back from the garden’)

This latter portrayal omits the extent to which such practices as the example given, are socially mediated. What are contrasted here in these responses, are not only different discourses of knowledge but different modes of knowledge as social practice or collective action, and different perceptions of authority representing different political economies.

What is also of interest is the distinction and separation of different kinds of learning as ‘observation’ and ‘insight’ as they relate to the role of the subject. Different images of pedagogical and social apprenticeships are stimulated. The former requiring the social engagement of the learner in practicing, repeating and rehearsing the activities of community life, the latter a more independent engagement of the learner, in sitting, studying, attending to and following carefully, sets of instructions. There is in this comparison little awareness of how these discourses might overlap, how community knowledge and learning also requires ‘insight’, how formal learning might have a place for more socially interactive pedagogies.

3. C is a 2nd year female student from the Highlands region

C’s definition of knowledge is
‘ideas, facts or anything new that we have been learning from observing, doing activities and taking part in something. It is our thinking ability to solve problems and do things’

The knowledge considered to be most/least important is
‘All kinds of knowledge ... Whatever you have learned ... that will benefit you.’

18 In this example what is visualised is the familiar scene of a child following her mother from the garden carrying a bilum across her forehead and on her back, laden with food, in imitation of her mother ahead.

19 See Intertext 3 on the knowledge practices of Mis Village.
and that
‘there is no knowledge which is least important because as we grow our learning
or knowledge is more reasonable’

Knowledge comes about
‘when we meet new people, visit new places, hear new things and so forth.
Knowledge is the day to day learning and perception of the working brain.’

In giving an account of her efforts to gain knowledge C writes,
‘I get knowledge from observing, doing things, reading, doing my extra research
in the library, asking questions and talking to people.’

In her comments on pedagogy C prefers ‘integrated’ lessons where children ‘learn
many subjects from different activities’. Activity based pedagogy across subject areas
where lessons are ‘planned with different activities’ and where
‘knowledge should be given in a real life situation where students will see the
importance’.

and
‘Whatever kind of knowledge that is taught should be planned with different
activities’.

There are a variety of other texts that inform the construction of these views, but
learning from activity and through experience is dominant. It is the basis of C’s
pragmatic view of knowledge, that experience can be turned into learning.

In this respect it is an epistemological/pedagogical discourse which seeks to transcend
dichotomies of school and community based upon views of the ‘knowing’ subject as a
listener/imitator. It is in a sense a ‘self-reflexive’ epistemological/pedagogical
orientation drawing on experience and awareness of the social world. There is
underpinning these responses a pedagogical discourse that has an interest in weakening
the traditional boundaries between curriculum subjects and integrating them through
activities.20

C’s account makes no unsolicited references to ‘community’. In comparing knowledges
she states,
‘Traditional knowledge are past ideas about customs, traditions and the village
lifestyle and modern knowledge is the ideas of how to adapt yourself to this
modern society.’

---

20 A question to be raised here is to what extent modern integrationist pedagogical
codes might disrupt the integration practices of ‘traditional’ societies? How what
Bullivant refers to as ‘building upon the roots’ of local practices might result in
pedagogical practices which overcome the roots by taking strength to themselves
(Bullivant 1975).
In subtle ways, this statement marks C’s position as being in ideological transition between a ‘traditional’ lifestyle and modern society. Her reference to traditional knowledge as ‘past ideas’ is a statement not generally made by those who have a strong investment in such ‘traditions’. While the reference to adapting oneself to ‘this modern society’ marks her position in the modern community as one into which she has not been seamlessly socialised. C inhabits hybrid spaces of traditional community discourses and discourses of modernity continuous with a pedagogical orientation, which eschews particular forms of ‘collectionist’ boundary maintenance. For C, school and community knowledges are marked by their degree of formality and diversity, not explicitly by their value.

‘School knowledge is more subject based and the teacher is there teaching and community knowledge is learning from different sources around the community’.

4. A is a 2nd year male from the highlands region
For A, knowledge is

‘... a type of skills and ways of doing things required by man to add on to what they already have.’

The most important knowledge is

‘Knowledge of learning new things to help us face the new world...’

The least important knowledge is

‘I personally believe knowledge of practising tradition and customary is least important to me.’

Knowledge comes about

‘... when new things are learnt or observed and put into practice and (one) possess that skill of doing other things.’

And is gained

‘By listening, observing, experimenting what teachers and parents and others tell us.’

The ‘skill of doing things’ is a dominant conception in this account. While customary discourses are devalued, the imagery of traditional masculinist practices of wealth accumulation are stimulated by the discourse that knowledge is a mode of action, of ‘doing things required by man to add on to what they already have’. As also, are images of various ‘manhood’ tests testing for ability and skill, stimulated by the statement that searching for knowledge involves, ‘testing to see whether that particular person has, possesses, that ability to do it’.

For A, knowledge is best taught
... by those who have experience so that he could correspond the person’s knowledge to his, and make corrections.’
His pedagogical orientation is influenced by his desire to learn
‘Knowledge of equipping students to teach at community schools, the skills and foundations of teaching.’
What is suggested here is a view of teachers as possessors of knowledge and learners as knowledge deficient and that knowledge acquisition is both a case of matching learners’ knowledge with that of the possessor of knowledge and correcting mistakes. Again images of customary knowledge acquisition practices experienced by male members of a community are stimulated.
For A,
‘School knowledge is skill of doing thing to respond to new world and community knowledge is the skill of doing things in the community’
Here the relationship between ‘community’ discourses and ‘new world’ discourses is mediated by a particularly gendered view of ‘skill’. The effect of this conflation along with the observations made above, suggests that for some, schooling practices embody the cultural ideologies of community life, ideologies which are linked to systems of ideas which operate socially and are carried on through the cultural habitus of the student.21 In this respect the traditional/modern dichotomy is unwittingly deconstructed through the re-production of masculinist discourses and its own sets of dichotomies.

5. V is a 2nd year female from the Papuan region
V’s sense of what counts as knowledge is
‘what one obtains when he learns new ideas or skills’
Knowledge that is most important
‘is that of reading, comprehending as well as writing’
Knowledge that is least important is
‘... the knowledge of enjoymnt’
Knowledge comes about

21 Similar overlapping of discourses can be found in other students’ accounts. One student writes in reference to how knowledge comes about, that,
‘In PNG society knowledge was passed down verbally from generation to generation. In modern societies knowledge was firstly passed down verbally, but later people wrote them in books for people to read and pass on to new generations.’
There is in this account no awareness of what Scholes refers to as ‘textual power’, the power of texts to ‘alter our way of interpreting things... to change the world’. Scholes (1985: 165)
‘... through inherited or taught’.

Knowledge is gained

‘... through schooling as well as through the environment around me’

What should be included in a teachers college curriculum is

‘the knowledge of understanding one another’.

and in a community school curriculum,

‘...the knowledge of practising traditional culture’

In these responses V’s epistemological orientations are linked to both the disciplined practices of schooling and what is gained from her environment.

V’s orientation to teaching is guided by notions of ‘theory’ and ‘practice’.

‘Knowledge is best taught through theory which is followed up by practical work.’

V’s account also differs in some respects from those above as it does not draw upon the discourses of observation and imitation but represents an interest in the discourses of literacy, ‘reading’ and ‘writing’, where

‘(t)he search for knowledge should be carried out by the encouragement of more reading of books’.

and active forms of participation, where

‘(s)chool children get their knowledge from doing school activities in which they are involved’.

In talking about traditional and modern knowledge V identifies the former as being ‘mainly based on culture’, while the latter, is based on the ‘new technology’.

Community knowledge for her is not skills but ‘socialisation’. There is a sense in these responses that ‘traditional culture’, community ‘socialisation’ practices, and practices which promote ‘understanding one another’ should become a valued part of school/modern knowledge, not seen as separate, belonging to another world. This view of revitalising schooling though introducing ‘traditional’ values and practices contrasts

---

22 The notion of inherited knowledge is also used by other students, one student expresses it this way, ‘Knowledge is inherited or is transferred from person to person’. Here ‘inheriting’ represents a social rather than biological process.

23 This sentiment is picked up by other students in other ways, eg Important knowledge is that which ‘enable you to know the world and keep you safe’; and ‘the least important knowledge ‘... is the knowledge of terrorism, violence that creates disruption in the lives of the humanities’.

24 ‘Theory’ is used by other students as synonymous with school knowledge. ‘School knowledge is the one you gain in formal education (Theory)’. 
with other student views that schooling should revitalise local communities through various forms of local development.

6. K is a 2nd year male from the New Guinea Islands region
For K, knowledge is defined as,
   ‘what we have been born with, it is innate, (it) helps us to understand things’
The most important knowledge is
   ‘Knowledge of God is more important. Because if we know God and believe in His word, that’s the Bible, we live a happy life’
For K, knowledge comes about
   ‘... from birth, as we are born we learn to develop our knowledge from the environment around us.’
and is gained
   ‘through reading books, watching TV, by studying more.’
K’s position is particularly heteroglossic. Outlined in these statements are links to four epistemological discourses; innatist, theological, environmental/cultural and mentalist. In the midst of these positions is a pedagogy, which draws upon the latter through the belief that knowledge is best, taught by
   ‘asking thinking questions and doing maths problems without much use of books’
and an approach to learning which
   ‘deals mainly with brain, not much work is done by writing in the book but only use of brain to work out things’.
K’s approach is also a shift from practical-empiricist discourses explicitly foregrounded in contextualised activities and experiences, to ‘rationalist-inspirational’ discourses where the context is somewhat backgrounded and the focus is on receiving, perceiving and contemplating,
   ‘In community school the children’s knowledge are not being fully developed but can be trained by encouraging to read.’

7. P is a 2nd year female from the Highlands region
For P, Knowledge is
   ‘the skills, tools and machineries that we use to achieve what we want’,
all knowledge is seen as important,
   ‘because human beings on this earth survive with the knowledges’.

---

25 Other students have noted that ‘reading’ and ‘being taught’ are ‘keys’ to modern knowledge.
Knowledge comes about
‘when you use your skills and tools to do something or when you implement what you learn’

For P, the search for knowledge should be carried out
‘... by investigations by going to schools, colleges, etc. and by practising what you know and by using the skills and tools.’

Knowledge is gained
‘... by going to schools and by using our cognitive skills to practice...’

School children get knowledge
‘... by listening and understanding of what is taught in class and later implementing them’

Best teaching involves the teaching of ‘skills’ and ‘putting into practice what you’ve learnt.’

For P, the difference between traditional and modern knowledge is that different skills are used. Traditional skills and modern skills, tools and machineries’.

School and community knowledge differ in that
‘...school knowledge is to learn how to read and write and knowing of outside world and community is learning of how to make garden, build house, fish and so forth and without knowing the outside world but except the community itself.’

It is tempting to see P’s definition of knowledge as privileging a ‘modern’ view, but she does not hierarchise knowledge in terms of least and most important. For P, ‘(e)very knowledge on this earth is very important to human life’, there is no unimportant knowledge.

The strong technological images throughout P’s responses, ‘skills, tools and machineries’ are on the one hand, images associated with modern infrastructure ‘development’ activities associated with the work roles of men, on the other they have links to the traditional work of women who are bearers of domestic skills and tools in the performance of community duties.

In employing these images, P crosses various epistemological and ideological boundaries. They represent for her, what is valued as knowledge in both traditional and modern worlds. While she claims that the ‘community’ world knows little of the ‘outside’ world, only ‘the community itself’, she does not devalue its knowledge but implies a continuity with modern practices.

In the midst of this, schooling is seen as a process of learning to develop and use skills and tools and ‘practicing what you know’, learning to read and write and ‘know(ing) (of) the outside world’. At school, children ‘listen(ing) and understand(ing) and later
implement(ing). P’s pedagogical orientation is strongly coupled to her theories of knowledge and the world.
In some respects, as in A’s account, the epistemological distinctions between traditional and modern worlds are dissolved through the notion of ‘skills’. What remains unexplored, however, are issues of work and gender inequality. Schooling, as a ‘development’ activity provides opportunities for young women like P, to participate in economic development through ‘modern’ labour market mechanisms. The entrance of young women into the world of ‘skills, tools and machineries’ opened up by ‘development’ discourses, on the one hand challenges traditional inequities associated with the roles of young women, on the other, masks the potential for the rise of new forms of exploitation of their productive capacities.26

8. W is a 3rd year male student from the highlands region
W defines knowledge in terms of
‘an unknown concept which is being acquired during an activity or while doing certain things’
For W, knowledge that is important is
‘Knowledge about life. The knowledge about doing certain things accurately and doing it to be productive (Agriculture).’
Unimportant knowledge is
‘The knowledge about knowing the outside world and non-essential knowledge which does not go with life.’
Knowledge comes about, in W’s terms, ‘because there’s a need by Human Race’, it is bound up in the activities of daily life and is a by-product of that activity. There is no distinction made here between ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ learning.
For W, the search for knowledge is principally a qualitative endeavour and
‘... should be carried out by interviewing, giving tests, asking questions and by observation and evaluation.’
In a teachers’ college curriculum, W writes that,
‘The knowledge should be about learning the children’s differences in acquiring knowledge, and how to help each one of the child’.
while the focus of the school curriculum should be,

'based on real life situation back in the villages, rather than teaching foreign knowledge'.

He is sceptical of 'outside world' knowledge, '... which does not go with life.'

His view of the way children get knowledge is recorded in identical terms to his own, by,

'... imitating, listening and also by doing certain things themselves'.

This is tied to a pedagogy where the curriculum is

'best taught by the teacher stressing more or putting a lot of emphasis on the unknown concept or doing things over and over.'

The ideological thrust of these responses is to reject the dominant position of 'modernist/scientistic' schooling practices. For W, what are valued are ideological positions which view knowledge interpretively/critically and which acknowledge local epistemologies and practices. W's emphasis is not only upon an indigenised curriculum but also on developing a productive awareness of children's differences. His pedagogical discourse is tied to 'traditional' modes of teaching and learning and is one of a small number which use the term 'foreign' to label what is referred to as 'modern' or 'European' knowledge. In resisting dominant discourses of what counts as knowledge W's capacity for critique is enhanced for as Cherryholmes observes, '... historical rules governing discourses can be challenged by those not fully socialised to them (1988:87).27

9. **B is a 2nd year female student from the highlands region**

For B,

'Knowledge is the skill of understanding or thinking or doing things.'

Knowledge that is most important is

'... the knowledge of thinking',

while the knowledge least important is

'... the knowledge of observing and doing'.

Knowledge comes about

'... when we actually are putting things into practice or actually when doing that particular thing.'

B gets knowledge,

---

27 Many students hold the view that they are involved in a national process of bringing about social and cultural change, not so much in terms of a revitalisation of 'village' societies, cultures and lifestyles, but more in terms of a radical restructuring of society in the development and modernisation of PNG. A few students hold what are perceived as radical views in putting the interests of local communities, cultures and economies before national interests.
‘from people like teachers, friends, parents ... reading bks, newspapers etc and watching TV or movies, news through NBC (national radio).’

School children get knowledge in similar ways

‘but mostly (from) parents and teachers and maybe through reading and doing.’

In pedagogical terms, teaching is best accomplished,

‘...through the involvement of all ... community school pupils learn best by involving themselves in the activities they do themselves.’

For B, a Teachers college curriculum should include

‘Knowledge of acquiring skills, critical thinking, being creative thoughtful ie.
the knowledge of training students to become creative teachers, thoughtful and helpful teachers to bring up smaller ones in community schools.’

while a Community school curriculum should include

‘The knowledge of teaching chn things that are in line with their level of learning ie. understanding, thinking and doing things.’

B distinguishes between traditional and modern knowledges

‘Traditional knowledge is the knowledge that we get through observing and doing/participation while modern is through teaching of others especially educated ones through reading, hearing etc.’

while the difference between school and community knowledge is that

‘School knowledge is to do with the wider knowledge while community is just based on the community itself. School knowledge is learning through reading, writing etc. while community is by observing and doing.’

There is great deal of overlap of the concept of ‘doing’ throughout B’s responses. Knowledge which is not valued involves ‘observing and doing’ (community knowledge). Yet the best teaching practices are those which involve children in activities, ‘they do themselves’. Where the distinction seems to lie is in what is coupled with ‘doing’. Where ‘thinking and understanding’ are linked to what is being done (put into practice), ‘doing’ appears to be valued. Where observing precedes ‘doing’, in the context of community life, and though it results in ‘participation’, it is not as highly valued. B’s epistemological orientation is linked to various social practices of sensing and acting in the world. Learning and knowing practices that are being identified as typical of traditional community living and modern schooling, remain separate.

Community knowledge as ‘doing’ is not seen to overlap with schooling as ‘doing’. B prioritises the latter on the basis that ‘school knowledge is to do with wider knowledge’. There is a sense here as with other accounts that there is something universal about ‘school’ (modern) knowledge, which is not the case with ‘community’ knowledge. Coupled to this is an assumption that school knowledge provides a more secure basis
for speculating about the world while community knowledge is geographically
confined, to a particular place, the ‘community’. A key difference in knowledges for B
is the further knowledge available to the ‘educated ones through reading, hearing etc.’
B’s perception of pedagogy is tutored by a nurturing disposition. What are needed are
‘creative teachers, thoughtful and helpful teachers to bring up the smaller ones’.
Schooling for B, is here, about ‘bringing up’. Interestingly in the course of student-
teachers’ learning about teaching and schooling, the social effects of the system of
which they have been apart, which has selected them for further learning and excluded
others, is not scrutinised. Notions of teaching as nurturing and ‘bringing up’ draw upon
powerful maternal/paternal protective instincts that are in opposition to divisive
institutional practices. There is a sense that teachers know that the system will segregate
children but seek to minimise the subjective damage, by being more ‘helpful’ and
‘thoughtful’.

10. N is a 3rd year male student from the Highlands region

N’s definition of knowledge is
‘...what is acquire through the process of learning taking place in any place.
Meaning the know-how.’

For N, important knowledge is
‘Knowledge that is useful for life, knowledge that help enable and strengthen
the lives of people in their living’

Unimportant knowledge is that which
‘... is acquire for references or just for the sake of knowing something’.

For N, knowledge comes about
‘When there is someone who knows about something gets that information
across to the person who doesn’t know.’

and knowledge is sought out by
‘Interviewing, testing, questioning, evaluating, experimenting, discovering,
involving, participating.’

His preference for a Teacher’s college curriculum is one that will provide
‘ The sort of knowledge that trainees will be equipped with to teach the
community school level rather than getting knowledge from the skies,
unnecessary ones.’

This position is similar to those expressed by other students who argue,
‘They should teach what we will give to the small children...’ and
‘Today’s lectures were good but I started to complain in maths lesson because
we were learning things which were too complicated for the children in
community school to understand. We were learning temperature but the words
we were taught were not the words I learnt in Community School’.
School curriculums should include
‘Knowledge that will mould/shape a child at that very early age to acquire more
difficult knowledge later in the years to come’
In responding to the question of how knowledge is learned in class, N writes,
‘Through learning by experiencing, participating, discovering, reasoning,
reading, writing, producing.’
For N, knowledge is best taught when
‘where there is all necessary information, material aids available, quiet
environment, with good relationship with chn and teacher’.
N’s responses to differences between traditional and modern knowledge are couched in
terms of different kinds of teaching,
‘Traditional knowledge is being transferred or acquired through informal
teaching while modern knowledge through formal teaching’.

N is in the third year of his training, within 6 months he will be teaching in a
community school his responses can be seen to reflect to some extent, the kind of
preparation he has participated in, the systems of ideas with which he has engaged. An
overview of N’s serial responses reveals a variety of influences pragmatically pulled
together to constitute a particular view of knowledge, teaching and learning. Within the
answer to the question, ‘How do school children get knowledge?’ for example, at least
three pedagogical discourses are traceable (though not exclusively) to different
disciplinary practices of the college curriculum each marked by particular key words:
‘experience’ and ‘participation’ are linked to activity-based, child-centred learning
strategies in Professional Studies; ‘discovering’ and ‘reasoning’ to discovery learning in
Maths and Science; and ‘reading’, ‘writing’ and ‘production’ to literacy in Language
Studies. Furthermore, N’s description of ‘how knowledge is best taught’ is typical of
versions of materiality (all necessary information, material aids available),
organisational certainty (quiet environment) and interpersonal stability (good
relationship with chn and teacher) which sustain dominant views of what counts as
good teaching and learning. Despite the presence of these discourses and their
theoretical diversity, a technical view of knowledge as ‘know-how’ dominates. One
significant contributing feature to this settlement may be found in understanding N’s
belief that trainees should only be prepared with the sort of knowledge that will equip
them to teach at the community school level, ‘rather than getting knowledge from the
skies’, (which I interpret to be a reference to theoretical knowledge often seen to be
irrelevant, knowledge not ‘grounded’ in practice or experience). Such a call assumes
that the boundaries are clearly marked, defined and operational whether in the presence
or absence of ‘theory’, and operates within the discursive boundaries of an uncritical pragmatic pedagogical ideology.

11. M is a 2nd year female student from the New Guinea Islands region
For M, Knowledge is

The ability to know how to do something, like reading, writing, speaking etc."

Knowledge comes about through

‘practis(ing) the skills that we had learnt at school up until now’
The knowledge that is most important is

‘The knowledge of reading, writing, understanding etc.’
The knowledge least important is

‘The knowledge of speaking eg. speaking tok ples, pidgin etc.’

These epistemological conceptions are clearly linked to discourses of schooling literacy with the emphasis on reading and writing, and speaking English as ‘keys’ to further education and access to the modern world. Community School language and literacy policies discourage the use of local languages (tok ples) and Pidgin with primacy given to English as the language of instruction. M’s devaluing of speaking local languages marks a discourse of linguistic imperialism, a boundary between speech communities, which are socially and economically divided.

In terms of an emergent pedagogical orientation, M sees that knowledge,

‘is best taught through the copying of work from the blackboard or books and also through reading books’

In a teachers college curriculum she is looking for

‘the steps of teaching and planning lessons and to control class’

In community schools M sees

‘(t)he knowledge of reading and writing and to understand what the teacher is talking about or even to understand the language being used by the teacher’
as fundamental to the curriculum. Here ironically, M highlights her awareness of the difficulties that come from schooling which is conducted in a ‘foreign’ language and which marginalises indigenous codes.

For M, school children get knowledge

‘... by doing what the teacher or parents (tell) them to do; and also they get it through seeing and copying what the teacher has done’

Much school work involves copying in terms of making a record, as a way of reinforcing and consolidating different kinds of knowledge.29 What is absent here,

---

29 On a more pragmatic level, I have watched children in reading lessons where there are not enough books, copy in to books, the ‘environmental print’ of the classroom, words and sentences from posters, notices, charts etc. In the absence of reading
among other things, are discourses of learning based upon an interrogation of knowledge, discourses of relevance and critical discourses to filter what is being copied.

12. *Y is a 2nd year male student from the Highlands region*

For Y, knowledge is

‘...the ability of thinking, how much a person knows to think and reason out things ...’

Here most important knowledge is

‘the knowledge that each one or individual has grown up with and later goes to school and develops it by learning new things they don’t know’

The least important knowledge is

‘... the knowledge that is inputed (input-ed) by our parents to us but is not well developed’

Y views knowledge as coming from a range of external sources

‘parent’s advices, by reading books, from a teacher teaching, new ideas, from our environments, and finally knowledge above all, comes from GOD’

In comparing traditional and modern knowledge, Y sees the difference as one between customary knowledge and knowledge

‘...dealing with reading, writing, counting and how you can out into practice what you have learnt in school to earn a living’.\(^{30}\)

Y’s view of children’s learning is that they get knowledge in direct and indirect ways

‘by reading, counting, writing, doing tests, playing and interacting with others’. His pedagogical orientation involves a concern for learner research on ‘the topic that has been taught’. This aligns very much with his view of what a teachers college curriculum should contain, what he refers to as ‘self learning knowledge’,

---

\(^{30}\)‘Earning a living’ is part of the discourse of survival in the modern world for the most part necessitating a separation from local communities. Students differ in their responses to how they will use their income. Extended family obligations are often considerable in the form of school fees and care given by relatives. Obligations may stretch back through all the years of schooling as a result some students elect not to return to home provinces and communities and take up teaching posts elsewhere away from ‘wantoks’ (relatives or literally a member of the same language group), until they have been able to satisfy their own needs.
where the lecture teaches the new topic and let the students find out or research more for themselves with the help of given references to develop more their knowledge, so that it helps them know more about the new idea. This orientation is further supported by his declaration that

'I get knowledge by asking, finding and proving what people or lecturers tell me is correct by carrying out my own research in the Library and reading more books.'

There is in these responses evidence of a discourse that claims that interrogative practices (research) are considered to be the basis of both good teaching and good learning. But without some consideration of the wider social effects of schooling, 'inquiry' pedagogy risks reproducing only the social relations of dominant ideologies and discourses.

13. H is a 3rd year female student from the Highlands region

For H, knowledge is

'... the process of learning new things through ideas and concepts taught, or experienced by oneself'

Important knowledge,

'deals with preparing man to live useful and better lives and to adapt to any kind of thing/changes'

While unimportant knowledge is that

'which is to do with one person alone who makes his own decision and doesn’t go by the majority'

In a teachers college curriculum H wishes to see knowledge for teachers

'which effects their everyday life in their environment and ... in the profession'

and community schools

'The sort of knowledge that best suits the children and the environment around them as well as the outside world'

The discourses traced here are linked to particular community practices and ‘environments’ and trace certain resistances and separations. The masculinist discourses of usefulness and adaptation to change, are, on the one hand seen as important, but on the other, are challenged by H’s preference for democratic discourse which resists authoritarian knowledge and behaviour. In responding to questions on curriculum, H notes various contexts that must be adequately informed. The 'everyday environment'

---

31 One difficulty faced by lecturers is the absence of 'accessible' texts. Most of the texts in the library are texts written for academic study in Australian or other international universities, in foreign social, cultural, political and economic contexts. Such texts proved to be impenetrable for many (though not all) students.
is different from that of ‘the profession’, and requires a different kind of knowing, the
environment around children is different from ‘the outside world’ and requires a
different kind of knowledge.
In line with her view of knowledge as a ‘process of learning’, H’s pedagogical
orientation is underpinned by a view of knowledge coming about
‘from the simplest form for doing things to the most complex, step by step.’
H states that she gets knowledge
‘through observing, imitating, participating and through own study at anytime’
and children gain knowledge
‘through participating, observing or imitating too.’
Knowledge is best taught
‘through observing, or researching a particular thing to find out its weaknesses’
The rubric of ‘observation, imitation and participation’ is a common frame used by
students’ to account for the way community knowledge and practices are acquired and
transmitted. In this frame it is not always easy to determine students precise meanings
for these processes. When questioned, students talk about forms of social learning such
as making bilums (string bags), building houses, making gardens, which they claim do
not call for direct explicit instruction, only requiring occasional supportive suggestions
to stimulate increased self-awareness and ableness. This rubric is generally not used to
describe the way students themselves learn but variations are used to refer to the way
children learn at school. Studies by Heath (1983) Gee (1995) and others point to the
way community valued ways of learning mediate children’s participation in and
engagement with the cultural codes of schooling. Observations made in conjunction
with this study (see Chapter 2) reveal that children who do not engage directly with the
teacher through dialogic modes of classroom participation (for example, self-initiated
questioning and responding) tend to build their sense of learning through observation
and group chorus practices which occur predominantly during imitative stages or
controlled practice stages of a lesson. These stages are not stages of primary knowledge
construction, but knowledge rehearsal and reproduction. In the event that H, and the
children she has in mind, gain knowledge through observing, imitating and
participating, it is likely their classroom experiences have been dominated by activities
of knowledge rehearsal and reproduction. H’s response regarding her own position,
however, is not that clear cut. Linked to her ‘traditional’ orientation to knowledge
acquisition is the comment, ‘and through own study at anytime’, an acknowledgment of
her links with privatised knowledge which schools and other ‘modern’ institutions of
learning provide. The epistemological orientation of H’s account is located in the midst
of shifting ideological boundaries of what counts as public and private knowledge, in
the disruption and realignment of traditional perceptions of knowledge as
predominantly a public/community trust. Threads of this epistemological disruption can be found in other student responses where community knowledge and processes of knowledge acquisition are juxtaposed with the ‘privatised’ learning practices of modern educational institutions (Y, for example, wishes to see a curriculum of ‘self-learning knowledge’).

In pedagogical terms, H finds that teaching is best served through ‘researching a particular thing to find its weaknesses’. The search for contradictions in knowledge and practice through confronting their claims characterises an orientation to teaching and learning which opens the way to challenging the authority of pedagogical orthodoxy. H adopts a view of pedagogy that recognises its instability even in the context of what might be initially defined as the reproductive pedagogy of observation, imitation and participation.

H concludes her responses by commenting on the difference between school and community knowledge

‘School knowledge is to prepare you for more learning through formal education and community is to prepare you for living in a big group to learn to cooperate and work with others more closely ...’

The separation of what could be referred to as school-based and community-based learning is a familiar one. In this case the separation is made on the basis that schooling provides learning while community learning is about the cooperative use of knowledge. This distinction is also made by a small number of other students, that community knowledge is about disciplining school knowledge.

14. O is a 2nd year male student from the Papuan region

For O knowledge is

‘... new skills, ideas and beliefs of a particular thing.’

The knowledge that is most important is

‘The western knowledge or modern knowledge. By natives it is the least important; by educators it is the most important.’

The knowledge considered to be of least importance is

The traditional knowledge. By expatriates, it is the least important, by the natives it is their most important.

For O, knowledge comes about

‘... because people (interested) were trying to find out the works of nature or the creation of the Lord and its works.’

Knowledge is gained
... by learning from a lecturer, doing my own research about things around me, discuss with others about matters (eg. maths problem) and doing my own readings.

While school children

'... get knowledge by learning from their teacher'.

For O, Knowledge is best taught

'through ... demonstration, excursions, trips, films, using concrete materials, discovering new things by oneself and asking questions.'

In a teacher college curriculum he suggests

'A more modernised knowledge. That in all or most of our courses should be upgraded or lifted to those of overseas countries like Australia or Japan.'

In a community school curriculum he suggests,

'A more traditional knowledge. This it to bring their minds more into real life situation. For example, we use a canoe to fish, then eventually they will find out that people use bigger ships to fish than ... small canoes.'

In comparing traditional and modern knowledge the former is seen as

'...learning from our culture by our old men using traditional equipment'

while the latter consists of

'... ideas and skills gained from western culture, is passed to us through modern education of which expatriates are our teachers.'

In what is in many respects an unproblematised (but not unproblematic) spectator commentary on knowledge and interests, O presents his perceptions of knowledge in terms of the relative value different kinds of knowledge have for 'native(s)', 'expatriate(s)', and 'educator(s)'. Threaded through his responses is a distinction between insider and outsider knowledge, between indigenous and western cultures, 'traditional' and 'modern' learning. O, however, is not critical of these distinctions, of traditional or community knowledges, societies or practices, nor of modern developments, nor does he take a strong 'developmental' or progressive position (except to say that Teachers College curriculums need to be 'upgraded or lifted to those of overseas countries like Australia or Japan'). Rather the world appears to be accepted for what it is, a place where the 'traditional and the 'modern' interact and coexist: 'we use a canoe to fish', 'old men use traditional equipment', 'expatriates are our teachers', that 'ideas and skills gained from western culture, (are) passed to us through modern education'. Different knowledges require different learning, '(a) more modernised knowledge' requires a more modern approach, '(a) more traditional knowledge' will bring into the minds of children a knowledge of their 'real life situation', and both will eventually lead them to find out that 'people use bigger ships to fish than .. small canoes'. In the midst of these generalities are complexities, insight into which O
provides only brief reference though the following insightful account of the ‘passing’ of
'school' knowledge 'onto a child’. In this account he provides insight into the shift in
social behaviour and order that is expected of children when they first come to school,
and the central role of the teacher in facilitating this shift into a new social order, from
one in which O perceives there was '(n)o need to be taught'

'School knowledge is what is passed onto a child from a new and different point
of view eg. a child goes to school and plays and talks around the school
unnecessary even inside the classroom as well, then the teacher calls the child in
and says to the child. "You have come to a different place as now where you
have to stay quietly and do your work". (Behave Properly) This way the child
adapts to a new school knowledge. Whereas community knowledge, are the
skills, ideas, behaviours are learned by children themselves through observing
their family members. No need to be taught.'

It may be argued that it is the questions that students were asked to respond to which
constitute the 'order of things'. I would argue that they are indeed constitutive of that
order as they were recognisable to students, in addition, however, it is clear that
students appropriated their experiences and moral frames to answer them extending
beyond the boundaries of the question.

**Ideological dichotomies**

Across this survey, students drew upon various frames of reference in responding to
‘ideological dichotomies' (Poynton 1985:18) explicitly marked in questions of what
knowledge is most/least important, and the binary modern/traditional. Students
accommodated these questions easily, they were familiar with these binaries. The
modern/traditional binary in many respects, acted as a ‘transcendental’ dichotomy, a
fundamental dualism upon which other responses appeared to rest. The following
dichotomies are illustrative of foundational categories around which student
epistemological and pedagogical responses were organised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important knowledge</th>
<th>Least important knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modern</td>
<td>traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>home/community/village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>theoretical/mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new world</td>
<td>customary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological/scientific</td>
<td>religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morality</td>
<td>terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td>interpretation/understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brain</td>
<td>mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>english</td>
<td>tok ples/pidgin/motu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading/writing</td>
<td>speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researching</td>
<td>imitating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventing</td>
<td>copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimenting</td>
<td>observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>rascalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career</td>
<td>everyday life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educators/expatriates</td>
<td>natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers/others</td>
<td>self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>businessman/businesswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our country</td>
<td>other cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The patterns identified here are evidence of considerable social change brought about by western technological, social, educational and religious practice of which schooling is a fundamental institution. Poynton argues that 'ideological meanings emerge out of particular power-configurations' that 'they constitute the reality and the theory of reality of a society', that they become visible when power-configurations begin to shift as a result of contestation or external causes (p18). These oppositional binaries are
constitutive of particular ‘theories of reality’ which student teachers hold and which reflect wider social and cultural discourses which privilege the colonial legacy. The ‘invention/copying’ dichotomy, for example, reflects a view of modern societies as creative and achieving and traditional societies as ‘derivative’. What is apparent is the way ‘notions’ of modernity have currency against a frozen or static view of the ‘traditional’. As Crush notes,

‘Deeply embedded within development discourse (is) a set of recurrent images of ‘the traditional’ which (are) fundamentally ahistorical and space-insensitive. Collectivities (groups, societies, territories, tribes, classes, communities) were assigned a set of characteristics which suggested not only a low place in the hierarchy of achievement but a terminal condition of stasis\(^{32}\), forever becalmed until the healing winds of modernity and development began to blow.’ (Crush paraphrasing Watts, 1995:9)

In a similar way, however, students’ images of modernity and western living are homogenised into the essentially economic.\(^{33}\)

**Conclusion**

The broader epistemological orientations of these responses reflect the place of students in a society in uncertain transition, characterised by interrupted cultural practices, new economies of knowledge, shifting definitions of what constitutes public and private interests, and the rise of the ideology of ‘modernism’.

At the edges of these compressed images of students’ epistemological and pedagogical interests are fragmentary, sometimes contradictory and incomplete perceptions. Transitory networks of understandings constitutive of a level of uncertainty and

\(^{32}\) Such images are sustained in ‘terminal’ accounts I have heard from missionaries who report ‘the grey monotony of village life’, but which bare little resemblance to the descriptions that students give of their homes and lives.

\(^{33}\) What is ignored or absent from critical discussion are the hybrid spaces and the hybrid cultures that have emerged in the last 20 years. These are most obvious as populated settlements that have grown up around the urban centres of PNG. These hybrid spaces are not geographically or socially recognised in the modern/traditional (town/village) distinction. They consist of houses, for example, which are constructed from both ‘bush’ materials and ‘permanent’ materials, inhabited by people who live on market food or small gardens and food bought from the store, many of whom have had only partial education in both worlds. These are spaces where traditional forms of governance have no power to maintain order, where police are afraid to go, where school dropouts join ‘raskal’ groups whose activities disrupt and destabilise discourses of ‘development’. In the case of PNG the responses above reflect the extent to which discourses of development are operative in the aftermath of colonisation.
tentativeness tacitly posing the question of ‘what self-image our society should have of itself’ (Rorty in Cherryholmes 1988:143).

In the midst of these heteroglossic tensions traditional practices and knowledges have been given some standing by those students who have argued for their inclusion in the school curriculum as a means of negotiating ‘real life situations’ and maintaining links with local communities. While some students tacitly reject the objectification and abstraction of knowledge, particularly community-based knowledges, these notions have been dismissed by others who see them as ‘not well developed’ and having little relevance in a ‘new world’. And yet for others, the issue appears not to be clearly visible.

What shimmers faintly in the background of these responses, is not a picture of a new multiculturalism, but a new social plurality marked by a realignment of community power with new segregations of knowledge, community and gender. In pedagogical terms schooling is implicated in the ideological and material constitution of this realignment and segregation through the disbursement into the community of new foundational categories of knowledge and its management, constitutive of post-colonial ‘modernist’ attitudes, values, practices and structures.

At a micro-level, one thing that remains to be seen is the way students’ idealisations are worked out in practice, to explore how these discourses are reproduced enacted, maintained, strengthened, challenged, resisted and altered as they bump and collide with local and institutional discourses.
Intertext three

A Papua New Guinean community and its knowledge practices
Madang Teachers College is built on land traditionally owned by the Wagi people of Mis Village who live around its borders. They are proud to have the college on their land as it symbolises a contribution they have made to the national development of PNG. It is also a source of employment for some men and women from the village. This account is reliably informed by Ben Uril (a village elder) and Alice Batari (a resident of Mis and secretary at MTC) and others with whom I enjoyed a close association.

Wagi conceptions of knowledge and its acquisition
The Wagi people of Mis village report two conceptions of knowledge, *duak* and *dafmak*. *Duak* the dominant conception, is knowledge which is received from those who have it through telling and/or showing. *Dafmak* is knowledge not possessed in the same amount by all and which is untaught, parents observing their children growing up may say, ‘he is growing up with dafmak’, the child is able to do things without being shown or instructed, they demonstrate insight or understanding not transmitted to them by others but individually gleaned from the world around them. *Dafmak* is related to ideas of intelligence, intuitiveness and initiative. *Duak* is more common and is knowledge of the things one learns from others, eg how to make a bilum, build a house, prepare a garden, hunt, tell a story, etc. *Duak* is also seen to be the knowledge a person gets from school. In the context of getting *duak*, the Wagi verb ‘due’ is used to mean both ‘to listen and ‘to know’. ‘Anwe due’, literally means, ‘Tell know/listen’, or glossed, ‘Tell me so that I will know’ or ‘Tell me, I will listen’.

‘Ismir we due’, literally means, ‘Show know’, glossed, ‘Show me so that I will know’. In these common expressions what is significant is that the request for knowledge comes from the learner. Such requests are expected to be made to those who have particular knowledge. These requests mark and open a particular mentoring relation between the teacher and the learner.
What constitutes proper pedagogy however is dependent as well upon the nature of the
nenor knowledge sought. Some knowledge and discursive practices that were once firmly
integrated into the ideology and practices of the community are now not so tightly
coupled. As Ben (in his seventies) tells me, unlike when he was young, no young men
have come to him for his knowledge, and as Alice tells me, her mother laments when
making bilums and grassskirts:

    Da keke seina ge ag pi pesi.
    (I things do (but) you don’t watch)
    Da mausui ge aun is mardig
    (I die who show (to you)?)

**Gendered knowledge acquisition**
The acquisition of traditional knowledge is predominantly described in terms of
observation, imitation and participation. This is somewhat of an oversimplification, as
it ignores the different ways boys and girls are socialised into their communities.
In Mis village, as with many other Melanesian villages, boys have a less structured
childhood in terms of the domestic duties they are required to perform than girls. For
many boys the village peer group is the dominant social institution. Girls socialise with
their village peers less and are expected to assist in many more ways, in sustaining and
nurturing the family.

In Mis village young males are expected to pursue, at the right time, ‘intergenerational
knowledge’. Intergenerational knowledge is not public knowledge, it is learned by
young men who ‘go into the bush’ for six weeks with village elders to participate in
particular rites of passage to adulthood. In the process young men undergo a
transformative experience which involves being tutored in ‘traditional’ law, gender
roles, spiritual knowledge, cosmology (the significance of particular stars), and told
stories of their ancestral homes and descendants, stories which explain the
interrelationship between their people and the plants, rivers, mountains and valleys of
their area, moral and historical stories of their origins, all of which build an identity and
an understanding of their environment and how to act within it. Despite the wide and
varied nature of the knowledge taught, understanding is often tested in terms of the
performance of physical skills, eg by shooting arrows at objects where a miss denotes a
lack of understanding and the need for further tutoring and mentoring. After the isolation the young men are to build a home and manage on their own to prove that they are adults - no more sleeping at parents' places or eating their food.

In this ‘schooling’ young men are introduced to various epistemologies, ‘technical’ knowledge, ways to build houses, canoes, etc; ‘legal’ knowledge as ancestral laws and practices; ‘spiritual’ knowledge of their relationships and obligations to the dead (tumbunas) and spirits (masalais); ‘historical/critical/moral’ knowledge, the story of the ‘mythical’ brothers Manub and Kilibob, for example\(^{34}\); ‘social’ knowledge their relationships to women, kin and strangers.

**Women's knowledge**

Women’s knowledge involves longer and less intense periods of socialisation. For the most part revolving around domestic activities and knowledge associated with the shift into young adulthood and adulthood that the onset of menstruation and child bearing brings. Knowledge of home-making, gardens, magic, ceremonies, gender roles is contextualised in the evolving life of the community.

The dominant pedagogical orientations of these experiences are not mimetic they are social and transformative to prepare young men and women to act wisely, cooperatively and independently within the community.

**Community knowledges: beyond observation and imitation**

Most community knowledges are learned in the course of subsistence labour and community survival.

When preparing a yam garden, for example, the men cut down the trees and burn the bush. The women prepare the garden beds. When planting yam a fire is made to get rid of birds and pigs (crows especially will dig up the seed yams and eat them). Yam sticks (poles) are cut from the bush and left for two days, the time of planting is accompanied by a strong wind which dries the sticks this makes them easier to carry to the garden site. Mounds are dug with special sticks, this takes a day. The growing yam plants climb the sticks and do not remain on the ground. For weeding and tending the garden,

\(^{34}\) If you go to Mis Village ask for Sawi Ben, who will take you to his father, who may on polite request tell you a version of the story of Manub and Kilibob. You should take some betelnut, tea or rice for him to show respect and friendship.
everyone works, though small children stay at the garden house; parents work in the
garden and older school aged children help by following the actions of their parents.
Children are not taught directly how to make gardens, their imitative activities are
observed by parents and if they are incorrect then a correction is made or it is done for
them eg. during harvest children may assist the cutting of yam stalks, planting or seed
yam stalks must be cut a certain way - if the stalk is cut straight then the parents will
correct the child as a diagonal cut is needed to encourage shooting. At the time of
harvest assistance is given from relatives. The yams are piled into a corner of the
garden in the shade and the stalks are cut according to the future purpose of the yam.
The yams are sorted into groups: planting yams (thick stems and longer yams); big
yams - are stored in the yam house for special occasions - for big kaikai (feast); small
yams are eaten with daily meals. The yam sticks are then gathered and used for
firewood. (Yams are planted in August and harvested in September the following year).

Not all that is done and learned can be accounted for in terms of observation and
imitation. There is knowledge which emerges from thoughtful reasoning and making
connections between things, where sensory information is reflected upon, insights
gained and distilled as ‘commonsense’ knowledge. Some of this knowledge is
apparent in the account of yam planting which deconstructs purely mimetic views of
knowledge acquisition, for example, the following observations require greater sensory
perception than just imitative practice.

- yam leaves must not touch the ground or they will not grow well;
- cuts to planting yams need to be oblique or shooting will not occur; and
- freshly cut poles are left for 2 days (drying) or they will be too heavy to carry to the
garden.

What however, is more critical is the relationship of this knowledge to its social
environment, its embedded meaning in the wider context of the ebb and flow off
community social and material life. What is glossed is the sociality of these occasions
of knowledge acquisition, how they depend so much on particular kinds of interaction.

You can read a comparison of versions of the story in Manub and Kilibob by Rufus
Pech (1991), The Melanesian Institute, Kristen Press, Madang, PNG.
and participation for their existence, and how social identities are constituted through these situated interactions.

**Conclusion**

The preceding accounts point to the way knowledge and knowledge acquisitions are variously contextualised in the social and material environments of Mis community life. For the people of Mis, knowledge is seamlessly interconnected with the material activities of life, embedded in kinship networks, social obligations and responsibilities, community ontologies, individual desires, beliefs and attitudes, where situated knowing rather than ideas is an enabling source of power.
Towards reflexive subjects

Chapter 5

Introduction
In the last chapter it was possible to identify particular discursive structures which disciplined student teachers’ epistemological and pedagogical orientations. It was apparent that students individually employed quite definite, though diverse, ideologies and assumptions about knowledge and teaching drawn from both within and beyond the boundaries of their local communities. In these accounts, there was a sense that students were developing a dual membership, belonging to both old and new worlds, that they were preparing to be ambassadors for the new. Attention is now turned to particular aspects of the nature of this apprenticeship to teaching.

At MTC one of the things which interested me most was the predominantly ‘skills and content’ approach to ‘teacher training’ in which students were introduced to regimes of teaching skills and bodies of knowledge sustained by assumptions that what was to count as teaching was the sum of these skills and the passing on of the knowledge. Another thing that struck me was the separation of skills from the content to be taught. Bodies of knowledge separated from the processes that constructed them. The link between a discipline and its reproduction (its literacy) was here mediated by focusing on student teacher performances of ‘generic’ teaching skills. (See Appendix Three for the list of skills and subskills)

Apart from classroom rehearsals, School Experience sessions and Semester Practicums provided opportunities to ‘authentically’ contextualise these skills.

Absent from this learning procedure were structured opportunities for students to be reflexive about what they were doing. Much of this teaching system was endowed with presuppositions of certainty, generalisability and predictability, an interest in reflexive interrogation of situated accounts, could be seen to run the risk of casting a shadow over the validity of these assumptions.

Discourses of pedagogical certainty

There is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. But this does not mean that it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject ... (Foucault in Cherryholmes 1988:130).

Teacher training at Madang Teachers College is bounded by systems of ideas not entirely of its own making. The core curriculum underpinning teacher training is framed by sets of National Objectives written in behavioural terms and numbering some 1134 objectives across nine subject areas (McLaughlin 1990).
McLaughlin traces the introduction of this approach to teacher training to work done using Tyler’s ‘rational model’ (1949) in 1971 by individuals at St Beneditcs Teachers’ College (Wewak) in the early 1970’s. The model came to be adopted nationally as a means of identifying and establishing minimum standards of teacher preparation. This was coupled at a later date to a ‘micro’ skills approach to teacher education emanating from Sydney University in Australia.

In its schematic form in the core curriculum it is represented as a series of structures: Objectives, Content, Strategies, Assessment underpinned by a behavioural emphasis. In the construction of lesson objectives, for example, student teachers are required to write objectives in behavioural terms which must include, the behaviour performed; who performs the behaviour; the result or product of that behaviour; the conditions needed for performing the behaviour; the standard or criterion used to judge or evaluate the performance. Students are also required to avoid the use of words (verbs) which are not observable behaviours, words like: feel, enjoy, learn, understand, know, appreciate, discover, and think. (Teaching Skills mimeo, Madang Teacher College, from Sydney Micro Skills Handbooks, Sydney University Press, Turney, C et al 1973). This curriculum model forms the basis of not only Teachers’ College curriculum but is a dominant influence upon the way Community School curriculum is organised. and managed. Lesson objectives, for example, are commonly prefaced by the acronym BTEOTL (By the end of the lesson...) followed by Condition + Who + What + Result + Criterion.

In a wider discussion of what is referred to as Tyler’s rational curriculum model, Cherryholmes links it to broader ideological discourses of structuralism.

    Tyler applied principles of scientific management to education that showed educators how to think systematically: decide upon objectives, list learning experiences, organise learning experiences, and evaluate outcomes (1988:137).

Learning was constituted as happening via processes of systematic instruction, its effect Cherryholmes notes, was to centre the system and fix meanings in education (1988:138).

In Papua New Guinea McLaughlin argues pragmatically that the ‘Tyler model’ was appropriate in a period of post-colonialisation (1970’s-1980’s) where expatriate lecturers were obligated to ‘provide a curriculum, which new national lecturers could implement’ (1990:2) and justifies its ‘recipe-type approach’ on the basis that it provided a ‘simplified’, ‘straight forward, time efficient approach’. Cherryholmes asserts that the attractiveness of Tyler’s rationale was that it ‘promised order, organisation, rationality, error correction, political neutrality, expertise and progress’ (p26), but notes that
The structural basis for the Tyler rationale produces programs that are unwitting captives of their times. They are objects of history intentionally produced by educational experts ... silent on issues such as feminism, racism, poverty, and social injustice and inequality... (p41) The absence of these discourses derives in part from the sense of certainty and social and political neutrality delivered in the autonomous management structure of both the Tyler model and the micro-skills approach. In these approaches failure is ultimately interpreted as a weakness in the learner and not the inflexibility of their structures and rules. Student teachers were both recipients and users of these models. In the following exchange third year student teachers talk briefly about some of the effects of these structures, and some of the barriers they confront in the face of objectifying their teaching and teaching environments.

Key:  
Nu – male; E – female; T – female; N – male
(i/a) inaudible; (s/a) seeking agreement; (..) pause (;) overlap

Nu: So one of the difficulties, learning difficulties that I’m facing here is when lecturers are going very fast we don’t stop them

E: Yea ; T: Yea

Nu: Yea we don’t catch up with what they are doing we should stop them and say you are going very fast could you go back and explain that thing, for example, in Maths Mr B that’s the way he teach, he just teach very fast, and some of the things he don’t work it out step by step he just work it out in his mind and he just write the answer on the board, we are still confused how he got that answer

T: We have difficulties with lecturers

Nu: We don’t ask, we don’t ask work out the problem in steps we just copy and when I myself, when I go back to the dorm and try to work out the answer the same ones I find it difficult, I don’t know how he got the answer

E: Another one is er, what teachers, I mean maybe lecturers, ah(s/a), some of them they just stand in front and talk and talk and talk, and we just sit down and listen and they don’t give us chance to talk ah (s/a)

Nu: Yea K’s a good example

T: K (laughter) Yea he just talk and talk and he won’t let us give our point of view

T: Like Mr G
E: To show that we are learning something ah(s/a), but they just talk talk and won’t give us chance to talk so in that way we lose interest and you see all of us just lying around
T: Yea the way the lecturers teach they make it difficult
E: Yea
Nu: That’s one thing, they er these people, they ask us they tell us to give chance to children to ask question and they should show the example by giving us chance to ask a question they go ahead and teach teach teach, and talk talk talk, bell goes they go away and we go to our next er lesson
N: Adding to what E said er, some lecturers are not motivated
E: Yea
N: And that’s where they make learning really difficult for us because if they’re not motivated then we continue sleeping away, that fellow will waste their time teaching, wasting their time, wasting our time, we should be somewhere else in the dorm sleeping or something
T: That’s true
Nu: Some of the difficulties are that some of the things we are learning are very new ah(s/a), so that’s why sometimes we have difficulties and then as we go through (i/a)
T:N: Yea
Nu: It’s hard to catch up with it
N: Like lesson plans especially Mr L he’s talking about these three things, what are they for writing objective
E: Er, the knowledge
N: Knowledge
T: Skills?
N: Effective er
E: Effective
T: Yea
E: Yea those ones
N: Yea those ones he used to make it (...) that’s one of the difficulties I am having one of the problems
E: Yes
N: That’s why I crack my head trying to write objectives

**Constructing reflexive subjects in the discourses of teaching**

Developing reflexivity in teaching as an educative practice requires teachers and students to engage in moments of strategic inquiry and critique. What was encouraged
in the curriculum intervention to be outlined in Chapter 6, was not just student inquiry but the cultivating of an awareness that teaching is not an autonomous activity, that inherent in the work of teaching is the struggle to realise particular kinds of joint intellectual, social and cultural transformations. In theoretical and practical terms, this amounts to the encouragement of a disposition to question, and to critique, to explore the complexities and effects of pedagogic interaction of schooling, and to interrogate the processes of identity formation and to see oneself both as enabling and disabling pedagogical structures and agencies, as well an object of them. One way of getting to this point is to go to the margins and boundaries of teaching experiences to get a better view of the field, and avoiding what Richardson refers to as

... turning the notion of the reflective teacher into a technical approach ... (and) resist(ing) pressure for research and evaluation approaches that examine reflective teacher education processes in a positivistic manner... (rather) concern(ing) ourselves with the content of teacher’s reflections - with what teachers will view as problematic (in Grimmett & MacKinnon 1992:339).

This study is interested therefore, in the positions students take up and are taken up by, and the content of their reflections, what is done, felt, thought and experienced. In the accounts below, it is not only against the positivist/structuralist ideologies of certainty, fixity and objectivism that students experiences can be read, but also against the ideological structures of post-colonial education which have informed the pedagogical positions that have evoked their responses.

Personal/Professional Reflective Journals: writing as praxis

It is here argued that both the mode and medium for this work, Reflective Journals, constitute a writing genre with the potential to make more explicit the heteroglossic nature of social experience and stimulate an awareness by students of the different social, cultural and institutional ‘voices’\(^{35}\) that contribute to their daily teaching experiences. But, it might be asked, ‘How are the actions reflected in students’ writing and the act of writing itself, to be understood?’ In answer to this, Arendt argues that

For in every action what is primarily intended by the doer, whether he (sic) acts from natural necessity or out of free will, is the disclosure of his own image ...

---

\(^{35}\) The notion of ‘voice’ is a problematic one, Gilbert argues that in prevailing discourses on writing pedagogy, for example, ‘voice’ is used as a metaphor for personal authorship, a metaphor which, ‘... ties the meaning of text to one individual consciousness’, emphasising ‘personal creation, inspiration and imagination (which are presumably ‘natural’) ... by obscuring textuality’ (1991:30,31). What has been forsaken, Gilbert argues, are ‘claims on the social, cultural and the ideological’ (p44).
nothing acts unless (by acting) it makes patent its latent self (Dante in Arendt 1953:175).

Further to seeing action as form of revelation of the self, action is a revelation of ‘membership’ in a discourse community, ‘the way in which members of a given social group view the world’ (Roberts in Morris 1994:249).

In the texts which follow various interactions or rapport emerge which shift along a continuum between what Grundy (1992) refers to as states of poiesis and praxis. The first, is defined as a technical orientation to educational practice, where educational activities result in tangible products, where unpredictable outcomes are seen as anomalies in teaching or learning requiring either correction or dismissal, where practices are aimed at reducing complexity and increasing manageable. To pursue such an agenda uncritically is to promote what Dews (in Grundy 1992:162) refers to as the transformation of

... human subjects into objects of manipulation, screening out their ability to reflect upon, to transform and collectively to define their own situation.

On the other hand, the idea of praxis suggests that human interaction is characterised by, among other things, different kinds of uncertainty, unpredictability, non-attributability and irreversibility. Each of these characteristics reflecting what Lemke refers to as the, ‘unstable, creative meta-practices of a community’ (1995:158).

It is in the way student teachers negotiate this inherent instability and discontinuity and the discourses that mediate those negotiations, that the next two cases are interested. Journal writing is one way of realising what Arendt refers to as ‘the disclosure of the agent in the act’ (1953:180) while moving the actor towards a more profound pedagogical ‘meta-knowledge’. For as Gee asserts,

When we come across a situation where we are unable to accommodate or adapt ... we become consciously aware of what we are trying to do, or being called upon to do, and often gain deep insight into the matter. This insight (‘meta-knowledge’) can make one better able to manipulate the society in which the Discourse is dominant, provided it is coupled with the right sort of liberating literacy ... (Gee 1990:159).

Ultimately, the study of praxis is the study of questions and responses arising when ‘we are unable to accommodate or adapt’. Questions that arise in the midst of deliberate and deliberative action, which Appel argues also calls the individual forth into subjectification, for as he observes,

\[\text{36 Smyth, J (1993) refers to such an orientation in Frieran terms as the ‘pedagogy of the question’}.\]
The function of language is not to inform but to evoke. What I seek in speech (and in writing) is the response of the other. What constitutes me as a subject is my question ... (Appel quoting Lacan, 1995: 171).

If we are constituted as subjects of discourse through questions, it might be argued that we are constituted as objects of discourse when we are unquestioning, when we surrender to its categories or collude in the denial of agency. In this sense to be a subject of discourse is to act within, upon, and, as discourses are constantly confronting each other, against discourse. As well as considering the questions students ask, confront and resist there is also a need to locate them within orders of discourse, sets of ‘discursive practices associated with an institution of social domain’ (Fairclough 1995:27), located as Fairclough argues, not only in

... the classroom but also in the playground and the staffroom and other key ‘sites’, (specifying) the relationships, the boundaries, the barriers and slippages between these practices ... and identifying particular directions and tendencies of shift (ibid).

Positioning the learner

Journals were a way of building a sense of trust and dialogue between student teachers and their lecturers in a way that seemed mutually informing and comfortable. Direct observation and talk generated different kinds of relations and dialogue often mediated by differential student/lecturer institutional positions and authorities.

This study of teaching practices drawn from the field experiences of student- teachers is portrayed here as a joint production. It is joint in the sense that student-teachers’ accounts as ‘reflective’ texts were situated in a curriculum framework initiated in response to a perceived need for an educative process that took students beyond a ‘skills’ only focus to stimulate other accounts of what counted as student teaching. The writing of School Experience and Practicum Journals was initiated by Language Studies staff in the context of curriculum development and renewal. The purposes behind their introduction was to begin a process of student inquiry into the milieu of practices, beliefs and values associated with ‘beginning teaching’; to provide students with the opportunity to articulate observations and experiences as they were negotiated within the contexts of their field work; to provide lecturers with a means of engaging students’ pedagogical orientations and practices as they were textually represented, and a basis for exploring how ‘beginning teaching’ in general was being ‘read’ and ‘written’ by students and how they were being inscribed in turn by its ideologies. Unlike other work done in this area (Avalos 1989), ‘beginning teaching’ is here argued to going beyond, classroom practices, to acknowledge other discoursal influences as traced in student
teachers accounts, influences often unacknowledged as constitutive of teaching ‘subjects’, influences other than those formally associated with teacher training.

Towards a theorising of pedagogy
As was discussed earlier, the dominant conception of ‘theory’ is a kind of objectively validated ‘scientific’ knowledge, constitutive of sets of truths about aspects of reality which are generalisable across people, circumstances and practices. In teaching, theory is often used as the basis for prescribing fundamental practices and methods and commonly rests upon the assumption that what is to be taught is knowable in an objective sense, and that such knowledge can be taught and ‘mastered’. The position taken in this study is that theories are always present as ideas, beliefs, dispositions, ways of talking and doing in particular circumstances, that they are socially constituted (for similar recent positions see Fulcher 1995; Schratz and Walker 1995), that all theories are meanings people make about the nature of reality and their positions within it, that they are ‘claims about truth and reality are meanings … according to the patterns they have learned’ (Lemke 1995:156). Making these ‘learnings’ and their interests visible to oneself, requires a critical level of thought and reflection (Kemmis 1985), and a knowledge of the particular social formations by which they are constituted.³⁷ Friere refers to this process as ‘conscientization’ the development of a consciousness about consciousness,

...a process in which people, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the sociohistorical reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform reality (Friere in Kemmis 1985).

To the extent that such transforming is possible, questions arise as to its stability in the face of the hegemonic influences of powerful social and institutional discourses. What becomes important in Lemke words is ‘not to make a theory of how things are, but to develop a praxis, a critical way of analysing, doing, creating’ (p158) that allows the

³⁷ Fulcher argues that,

In our teaching, we may contrast the ideas of ‘truth’ with not truth, and realism with representation, but we do not have to resolve these discussions since, in part, our task is to awaken the imagination. We assume education matters and that teachers matter, even if we are not especially sure where ... ideology ends and education begins. In our teaching, we can juxtapose opposing claims and thus invite reflection. (p186)

And further suggests that,

... developing the ability to think critically-theoretically about ... ‘practice’ requires ... a knowledge of different social political frameworks; ... an awareness of language; ... an ability to decode various discourses; ... a lively imagination. (p188)
gaps and disjunctions in dominant meaning systems to be exploited for the purposes of ‘making a rival set of meanings’.

Personal/Professional Reflective Journals: the subjective and the social
It is important to note that this study is being written in a time of multiple transitions in the post-colonial socio-political setting of teacher education in PNG, a time of reconceptualisation of understandings of the relationship between the individual and society, the private and the public.

Walker (1993) suggests that qualitative research/ers concerned with the question of subjectivity(ies) look for ways of not ‘objectifying the voices of their subjects’, and should pursue ways to quieten (‘silence’) the intrusiveness of the research/er voice. In doing so he suggests that photographs (pictures) provide a means for researchers to momentarily ‘stand outside of (their) own use of language’, a way of providing ‘complex information’ as a stimulus to educative engagement and reflection. While not taking a visual ‘turn’ this study draws upon Walker’s observations. In a similar way personal/professional journals also provide portraits, portrayals, images and voicings that capture and narrate complexity and subjectivity in ways that more structured and intrusive forms of research might not be able to do. As with the photographic aspect, the researcher’s subjectivities and ideologiya are momentarily revealed both in the selection and representation of accounts, and in the theorising of their messages. Like Walker’s argument that photographs are ‘keys to memories’ so also where the researcher is a participant, student journals provide the means for activating memories and images and bringing again to conscious awareness, circumstances, interactions and feelings, in the process making the private, public, closing ‘the spaces between what is personal and what is social ... what is agency and what is structure’ (Walker 1993:81). Personal/professional/reflective journals became a means of generating ‘insider’ knowledge, of revealing the publicness of private meanings.

Accompanying the presentation of these portrayals is a stream of theorising\textsuperscript{38} and commentary that varies in distance, focus and intensity. This is governed to a large degree by what catches my mind, what I recall, and the intertexts I am aware of which inform the events and circumstances being portrayed. The students’ experiences portrayed in most detail are the experiences of those whom for one reason or another I

\textsuperscript{38} Theorising is defined in this study, as drawing conclusions, turning descriptions into theories of teaching and learning, in this case by using the heuristic of different ‘readings’. What this process reveals is the intertextuality of theorising, the ways in which the research text derives its meaning ‘against the background of other texts and the discourses of other occasions’ (Lemke 1995:57).
knew well. There are elements in their accounts that tutored my understanding and awareness of what it meant to be a co-teacher trainee’ in PNG, elements that are not easily forgotten, and some elements that have only made sense in this writing. There are many other students whose work is referred to in footnotes and appendices with whom I also worked closely, whose testimonies are organised around particular themes. I have drawn upon their work to illustrate the diversity and richness of their responses and characterisations, and the depth of complexity and diversity constitutive of pre-service teaching experiences and discourses. My commentary shifts between these texts. It is a commentary that in one sense shows the contradiction between what Walker refers to as ‘public’ and ‘private’ domains, the emic and the etic. For though I was not present on many of the occasions referred to by students, it was not my purpose to be there, and being there would have produced a different portrayal. In all of this I was not far away, my role as their supervisor brought me closer to these students than others, for different reasons. In a different way and in a role less determined by the institution, I was able to develop less formal relations in weekly School Experience sessions than in Practicum experiences.

In the next chapter I continue what has been begun by adopting a position of interpreting student significations and accounts not only as individual responses, but also collectively as voicings of various systems of ideas through and within which individual pedagogical practices are constituted and the wider order of teaching sustained. 39

Students’ novice accounts are in a sense naive texts, in that they are situated local texts and somewhat resistant to and unsullied by official definitions of what schooling means – they provide various lenses through which to view the school, its participants and activities which are particular and define what is relevant. In many ways they speak against the monological constituted accounts of what counts as teaching and learning offered by the academy.

39 Lemke suggests,

The social meaning of texts and discourses cannot be usefully isolated from their social contexts of production and use ...Ultimately we may concern ourselves with individual speakers, addressees and sequences of social events, but we can usefully do so only in relation to the typical patterns of such things in our communities. What kinds of persons speak these discourses? What subcommunities do they belong to? What are the interests of those communities? What discourses do these other communities speak and on what occasions, with what typical effects? How are larger scale sociological relations between communities, including relations of power and domination, enacted, maintained, strengthened, challenged, resisted and changed through these kinds of social events, these kinds of discourses? (1995:57)
Intertext four

Student teacher discussion – On Teaching

Key:  M – female; P – female; L – male; D – male
     (i/a) inaudible; (s/a) seeking agreement; (...) pause

L:  What do you think about teaching P?
P:  Oh well, what I think is er, what I, this what I personally think, teaching is actually sort of like showing, showing somebody what to do or say um, in this case we are training to be teachers ah (s/a), so actually its like you are showing or guiding that person along - different learning experiences or that’s in classroom situation where you teach different subjects and all that or different subject matters and another (...) when we are talking about in traditional um side, its meaning showing them how to do gardening or handcraft or things like that its what I personally think.
L:  Yes um teaching I think the general idea is a what you are saying, teaching means to transmit knowledge to other people
D:  Yea, a showing as she said
P:  Yes
L:  That is the general idea that is how we understand ah (s/a), teaching might be defined in a different way in a dictionary but that is how we understand teaching, teaching is first to transmit knowledge to show something to other people, can we teach ourselves?
P:  (laughs)
D:  We, we cannot teach ourselves somebody has to teach us, we cannot teach ourselves
L:  Mm right.
D:  First think about children in the classroom they couldn’t teach themselves right you will have to teach them because they don’t have the knowledge ah (s/a), and how can they teach themselves if they don’t have the knowledge.
P:  Okay you’re saying, you’re saying, that we cannot teach ourselves so what I’m thinking is like I think there are some ways that we can teach ourselves like say
for example you don’t know about a particular thing and you want to know about it like ... say you can read through books or like looking at pictures or like that, in that case like you are getting something out of it ah (s/a)

L: Yea yea,

P: So that means you are actually teaching yourself about what is really, like say there is something say drawing ah (s/a), if its like stylistic drawing or something like that and its, through their designs it represent um say fish, like draw fish but its sort of like that and when you look at the design very carefully you can see that its a shape of a fish or something like that, drawing of a fish and it will tell you that its a fish, you see what I mean?

D: Yea

L: Yea

P: Or say like if you don’t understand something say a concept or say (...) a given explanation or something like that and you want to find out about it, the books, books give you ideas and topics about the particular thing where you can read through and get you know like ideas and that’s like you are broadening your knowledge and you are teaching yourself through reading.

L: Yea P when you are talking about teaching yourself (...) we’ve got to get these concepts clear, teaching, learning and, preaching, teaching, learning and preaching, when you are saying we can teach ourselves well we can learn by ourselves on our own, but when we are looking at teaching and answering this question what is teaching I think it means somebody has got to teach somebody else, one is going to teach, one is going to teach and the other is going to learn from him, that is teaching that is what I think if we are if we are going to teach ourselves, I mean we are learning, the term we could use is learning because we are going to do studies ourselves, on our own times, but when teaching, somebody giving advice, ideas, knowledge to other people that is what I think about teaching

D: Yea

L: I think when were saying we can teach ourselves, what do you think about it, can we teach ourselves? I don’t think we can teach ourselves, we can learn things, new things on our, by ourselves.

M: So how do you mean, you mean teaching is really, er, its not learning ourselves but something we convey to others, you see

L: No teaching is the word used, one person er

P: Shows
L: Shows things to another person, when learning
P: Like sort of transmits ah (s/a)
L: Yea transmitting
P: Ideas or concepts or something like that, skills to another person.
L: At the first place I said preaching ah can you teach yourself? You can find out things from the Bible by yourself that is learning ah (s/a), learning on your own but when you're preaching, preaching actually the word, the term, preaching is used when you are delivering the w.. message.
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Chapter 6

Introduction
In TESL School Experience held weekly for one hour over 13 weeks, the aim was not to ‘canonise’ or ‘essentialise’ theory in a way that it became practice, but to provide interactive teaching/learning opportunities that might inform student’s theoretical discourses and their understandings of them. Weekly school experiences became an integral contributing experience to the development of understandings about language teaching and a structure was provided to help student teachers turn their teaching into learning. TESL School Experiences aimed to develop dialogic and experiential English language teaching and learning based on the teaching/learning sequence of Do Talk Record41 (Cazden 1977; Gray1985) Shared Book reading, and Issues-based Oral language development.

In making this shift from recitative forms of language teaching and learning, (see Chapter Three) much thought and discussion was given and had over the nature of the ‘dialogue’ which was to be constructed between lecturers, student teachers, teachers and children. Collegial concerns were expressed regarding the extent of the colonising influences of English language teaching; the nature of students’ expectations in terms of what counted as language teaching and teaching more generally and institutional demands and expectations. In response the TESL program maintained a ‘structure’ strand, which ran alongside and from time to time was crossed into by the ‘integrated/reflective’ strand. The purpose of the structure strand was to provide

40 The common interpretation of the hybrid expression ‘student-teacher’ is to read it as a binary term, the first word qualifying the second. The readings presented here, however, are where the second qualifies the first.

41 Do Talk Record is a teaching frame built around Cazden’s notion of ‘concentrated language encounters’ where literacy is developed as a social practice based on activities and experiences which provide greater scope for the inclusion of children’s and teachers’ community meanings. Based on shared experiences teacher and children ‘language’ different situations, and record their experiences in a variety of ways. Apart from using books and children’s experiences as ways of engaging children’s meanings, student teachers prepared a variety of community based activities relevant to children: making animal and bird traps, classroom decorations, cooking western and local food, weaving, carving, painting, etc, as the basis for generating more functional texts.
students with a view of the ‘conventions’ of language teaching as they were prescribed in community schools curriculum, texts and syllabuses. This was done using the existing curriculum areas of Oral language (speaking/listening), Writing and Reading, and covered topic areas such as Talking Drills, Oral language, Written Sentences, Written Expression, Handwriting, Spelling, Vocabulary development, Reading. It was hoped at the time, that the practices that were often associated with these curriculum areas might be mediated by the work done in the ‘reflective’ strand. In a sense, however, what became a pluralistic approach to TESL teacher education failed to explore adequately the points of difference that existed between the two orientations and why they existed, particularly in terms of their wider social implications. Much of this was discussed in departmental meetings never reaching the classroom, the administration or other departments in order to maintain a level of collegial solidarity. As these shifts in pedagogic focus required structural shifts in the way school experience was implemented, a larger number of participating schools was required, so that each week each student was able to work with the same group of children for an extended period. Previously students worked in groups of two and three alternating the teaching and working with a different group of children each week. Five schools outside of those designated as ‘demonstration’ schools were approached and were extremely willing to participate. Demonstration lessons often only focused on the display of teaching skills, and were heavily focused upon teachers’ performances with little direct consideration of what children were doing in response to the performance, how those performances were being turned into learning.

---

42 Added to Jomba and Sagalau Demonstration schools were Meiro, Baitabag, Gum, Lutheran Day and Tusab community schools.

43 While classroom teachers gave skilled and polished demonstrations, my observation was of little teaching other than a series of ‘banking’ procedures with little feeling of children as participants, just a sense of bodies in spaces. The nature of ‘demonstration’ was that there was always some pressure that the lesson must be seen to be a success, generalisable, predictable, reproducible, by student teachers. To ensure this and to safeguard the ‘credibility’ of the teacher, demonstrations were carefully choreographed, lessons had often been taught previously, particularly responsive children were chosen to answer questions, with prior warning and under the gaze of 40-50 visitors class control was ensured, lessons were neatly trimmed to fit the time though there was an understanding that when time was lost, lessons might need to be brought to an abrupt closure. At the end of demonstrations with the class dismissed, there was an opportunity for students to ask questions. Questions were often display from lecturers and only rarely asked by students. Students often lowered their eyes and heads not wishing to question what the teacher had done. Those questions which were asked were usually fielded well by teachers. On one occasion, what I refer to as the ontogenesis of some of this work, near the end of a written sentences lesson when the children were writing and the teacher was supervising, I arose to look and talk to nearby children about what they were doing, in doing so a number of student-teachers took up positions around
Recording and reflecting

As a guide and a means of helping students to capture and identify different aspects of their teaching experiences, a journal structure of description, feelings, comments and planning was suggested. In describing the events of their practice students were being taught to 'learn to look' closely at what happened, and write up individual observations. Asking students to reflect, and reflect upon, their feelings, was an acknowledgment that experiences are felt, that emotional responses are legitimate. Asking students to comment on their experiences was a suggestion that upon reflection some things might be confronted and viewed differently. The planning part of the entry was an opportunity for students to make adjustments based upon their assessment of where they and their learners were at and where they wanted to be.

children's tables observing what they wrote. Mr T who was taking the lesson that day allowed us that space. When I sat down the visiting school inspector seated beside me asked what we were doing. I told him that we were not so much concerned with the teacher's skills as with what sense the children were making of the lesson. At the end of the session students talked about various things they had seen and Mr T provided some history and insight into the way different children worked and aspects of the lesson/planned curriculum that he felt didn't work. This session and others like it, proved to be so impressive to everyone involved that it became the basis of developing a reformed school experience where students came to work with teachers and children rather than to test their own performances. Instead of weekly TESL demonstration lessons, students went to 'normal' classrooms and observed 'normal' teachers teaching in their everyday contexts, and afterwards worked with the same group of children on extended projects. These changes however, were not without some unforeseen effects. With the widening of the number of schools and teachers involved, some demonstration teachers, even though still involved, felt marginalised. The college approved payments to these teachers for their extra work. These payments were under threat as notions of specialist teaching' and 'demonstration' were being redefined. In negotiation with the schools the college wanted to pay the schools instead of the teachers and the schools could disperse some money to those teachers involved, though I don't know how this was resolved. In putting up and implementing these changes support was forthcoming from sections of the Professional Studies department and the college administration as well as the schools asked to participate who were keen to benefit from curriculum and pedagogical changes which were seen to coincide with the new three year course. (There being some insecurity amongst school teachers linked to the belief that three year trained teachers would be better qualified, more knowledgeable of new pedagogies).
Student teachers' accounts

The following accounts are drawn from students work in teaching writing in the lower grades, in particular the genres of recount, narrative and exposition (report) using the writing ‘process’ as a heuristic frame.44

In regard to students’ texts, the concern is to both contextualise them and untangle them, to highlight where possible, their ‘hybridity’ as well as what Fairclough refers to as ‘the tension between ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ pressure in texts - pressures towards convention and normativity, and pressures towards difference and change’ (1995:28). This will be undertaken after setting the cases within a descriptive/interpretive commentary, by exploring discursive practices across the cases.

A note on the reading of these accounts

Students accounts have been recorded here in full and not been included as appendices. I felt that this would better contextualise my analytical responses, while cutting down the need to continually visit the relevant appendices. This does however, create a larger than normal reading load.

---

44 The focus of this work was upon students’ language teaching practices and learner writing processes, which on these occasions were contextualised in the teaching of children’s writing. I am acutely aware that more critical aspects of writing were not engaged, particularly the content of texts, the field, the topics, ideologies and themes to which more careful consideration should have been given. (As for example, in a visit to one classroom (not connected with this exercise) I was surprised to see that in children’s writing, pictures and displays on Anzac Day and World War 2, there were no indigenous representations, no recognition of their historical presence in the events of World War 2, only the activities of American and Australian soldiers were portrayed).
Kathy School Experience Grade 2

Kathy is from the highlands, she is confident in her outlook and expresses a keenness in becoming a teacher. She enjoys class discussions and is an energetic student. Each week when she arrives for School Experience she assists with the class's morning activities before working with her children. She monitors the group of student teachers she is with to see that everyone is there and all the children have a teacher. She is a student who is concerned that the things she and others do, go well. She is working with a Grade two class at Jomba Demonstration school about 10 minutes drive from MTC in Madang town. The children at the school are from surrounding suburbs and local villages and settlements on the edge of town.

Visit 1:
This morning at Jomba Demonstration Community School at quarter past eight we were met by a senior male teacher and he welcomed us. He showed our allocated classroom and there we went with our supervisors. Ms W took one group to the class which we will carry out the language activity. I was given three children from Grade 2B. Two of them were boys and one was a girl. I took them to a shady tree and we all sat down on the grass.
First of all I introduced myself calling my name and where I came from then I asked them to introduce themselves as well. They were shy at first but I encouraged them to talk but one of them stood up and called his name and quickly sat down. He was Walter from ENB province, the other boy was Ibo and he’s from Yabob village from Madang Province, the girl is Erin from ENB province. After this I told them what I did during the weekend then I asked them what they did during the weekend. Walter said he played with his two friends and went to the market with his mother, Ibo said he went with his father and helped him chop firewood, Erin helped her mother cook food for their dinner. Then I asked them to write about what they told me but nobody could write exactly what they said. They had two or three words on the paper. Erin drew pictures of herself cooking instead of writing, this is what I did with the children this morning.

Feelings
When talking to the children and they did not respond well to me I felt stupid and useless. I was discouraged when nobody wrote a sentence on the paper. I thought these children should be in grade one instead of grade two. However, I think being a teacher means a lot than just teaching. I feel it is important that I have to put my time and be patient in helping them to become a good citizen of my country.
Comments
This lesson was not satisfactory taught because of these points, the children did not respond quickly and they looked confused. There was silence for about 5 minutes before I asked them to speak in Pidgin. The other thing was noise, the other group was close to us and the children were disturbed and were looking around. Next time I will speak simple english, make my instructions clear and make sure I'm far away from the other groups of children.

Planning
I will prepare a good story or a true life experience, and I will get the children to do it. I will provide papers and pencil and have a mat for them to sit down and do their work. I'll get the children to write their story and help them with spelling the words correctly and doing the example of my own story I will get them to improve their story and ask questions so they can write more sentence.

Kathy introduces herself to the children and receives shy introductory responses in return. She leads the session by telling the children what she did on the weekend and asks the children to share what they did. After some encouragement each child tells what they did on the weekend and Kathy asks them to write what about they have done.

... I asked them to write about what they told me but nobody could write exactly what they said. They had two or three words on the paper. Erin drew pictures of herself cooking instead of writing, this is what I did with the children this morning.

Kathy records her feelings of the mornings session
When talking to the children and they did not respond well to me I felt stupid and useless I was discouraged when nobody wrote a sentence on the paper, I thought these children should be in grade one instead of grade two, however, I think being a teacher means I have to put my time and be patient in helping them to become a good citizen of my country.

Feelings of disorientation and discouragement crowd into Kathy's mind as she tries to account for how little the children have written. She recalls the thoughts she had about which class the children should be in, and sustains her motivation by constructing the work she is doing, 'teaching', as the patient work of helping children to become good citizens.

For Kathy this is a not a satisfactory beginning.

...the children did not respond quickly and they looked confused, there was silence for about 5 minutes before I asked them to speak in Pidgin. The other thing was noise, the other group was close to us and the children were disturbed
and were looking around. Next time I will speak simple English, make my
instructions clear and make sure I'm far away from the other groups of children.
This is a new moment for both Kathy and the children. There are uncertainties that need
patient monitoring. Kathy is concerned with the children's performances and writing
outcomes. Under the influence of her expectations she misses the need to build up an
awareness of what is possible in the circumstances, to acknowledge what the children
have been able to do, to take smaller steps. She is also concerned with the lack of a
interaction. At first, Kathy finds it difficult to put aside English, and to find an
appropriate voice and language to establish a dialogue. The children, who bring with
them desires to learn, to listen, to please, to participate, begin from where they are
placed, they begin in silence, disciplined by the expectation to respond in English. It is
only when Pidgin is used that they are able to freely speak.45

In the outside environment the children look around, the openness of being outside
allows noise from other groups to reach them, they appear to be monitoring what others
are doing. Kathy's direction to write what they have done on the weekend seems to me,
as I look on, premature, the children have been brought to the 'end' with little
orientation to a 'means'.46 I sense that Kathy is keen to gain early control over her role
as a teacher, a role that she ends up confronting instead of controlling.

Visit 2:
During the first hour of school experience we are to do the language activity. Right after
the teachers warm up activities in the morning we were given the children who we

45 For these children English was the source of tension. It disrupted the teaching context
and stripped it of opportunities for dialogue. Teaching and learning was reduced to the
limits of what these children are capable of understanding and saying in a foreign
language. In the children's silence other instructions were being answered, being
followed, 'you must only speak English' overrode the educative dimension of the
lesson.

46 Most students I observed appeared to make similar assumptions to Kathy, that
children were capable of speaking, reading and writing, almost as well as themselves.
The revelation that this was not the case sometimes resulted in students attributing a
cause to the child and/or the teacher. The lack of familiarity with what children were
able and not able to do was difficult to prepare students for. As I look back on these
experiences and the milieu of activity which constituted them I think of how this
problematic 'instinctiveness' might be have been addressed. That more could have been
done to make understandable the tensions that this new set of macro-categories (Do
Talk Record) might stimulate. How more use could have been made of student teachers
weekly accounts to jointly access and work through some of these matters, to see how
decisions are directed, and teachers and children positioned by circumstances.
worked with last week Wednesday. I got Erin, Walter and Ibo and we went and sat on the desks in the classroom.

Firstly I greeted them and asked them if they remembered my name they said they forgot so I told them my name. Then I got into what I planned to do with them. I asked questions for revision about what they did on the weekends from their reactions I could see that they could not remember the story they told me before. They were whispering among themselves then I got their paper out and gave it to them. I told them their story that they wrote on the paper with nodding heads they said that they remember their stories now. From there I asked to write their stories in complete sentences as I helped them to spell words. From observation, Erin was writing on her own, I think she was shy in the first place so she didn’t write instead she drew pictures. While Walter and Ibo were asking me to spell the words for them. The interesting thing I found out was that Walter could not differentiate between the letters ‘p’, ‘b’ and ‘d’. I had to point to the letters on the board so he could see and write it down. Asking questions, help spell words and giving them ideas to write their stories was what I did with them. I am pleased with what they did, however, they need a lot of help yet to write a good story.

Feelings
I feel that I should be responsible in helping the children, I can complain about what the children are doing. I do have thoughts like not bothering about those who can’t spell words or make up a sentence after all I am a little bit happy about what I did today. I tried my best to overcome the laziness or the thought of giving up very easily.

Comments
From the three children Erin can write words without me spelling it for her. Walter and Ibo would sit down and ask each other to ask me to spell words for them. They ask for words like, bush, firewood, yesterday and some more. I think these children need to be introduced to reading books and be encouraged to speak English. They can’t speak English and write stories, I had to guide them with questions to make them talk. I am willing to help the children so I will put in the best that I could give.

Planning
For me as the teacher, I will prepare questions to help the children think and answer in two or more sentences. And correct spelling errors, and get them to draw about what they drew. I will provide aids like pencil, colour pencils and papers. For the children, I will make sure they listen to my instructions carefully and improve their stories. After this lesson then I could think of other things after improving from this lesson. And the most important thing is to expand the story and correct spelling errors.

This week Kathy moves her group inside where she remains for the remaining sessions. They sit around two desks. There are other groups working in the classroom.
Erin sits apart from the boys. Kathy is opposite. I am across the room, between us is another group. The children are reminded of what took place the week before and what is required today, they sit closely over their papers and begin to write.

I told them their story which they wrote on the paper with nodding heads they said that they remembered their stories now.

Kathy helps with spelling, ideas and words and observes the writing difficulties they have transposing letters.

Asking questions, help spell words and giving them ideas to write their stories was what I did with them. I am pleased with what they did, however, they need a lot of help yet to write a good story.

Her feelings reflect a growing tolerance of children's differences and a consideration of what level of responsibility she should have towards them.

I feel that I should be responsible in helping the children, I can't complain about what the children are doing I do have thoughts like not bothering about those who can't spell words or make up a sentence after all I am a little bit happy about what I did today. I tried my best to overcome the laziness or the thought of giving up very easily.

Her comments reveal her ongoing concern over the children's English. In the midst of this tension, however, Kathy continues to 'guide them with questions' and subdues impulses to give up.

I think these children need to be introduced to reading books and be encouraged to speak English. They can't speak English and write stories, I had to guide them with questions to make them talk. I am willing to help the children so I will put in the best that I can give.\(^{47}\)

Feelings of 'giving up' and 'not bothering' are put down by thoughts of what is needed to help these children, and that she must be 'responsible'. Somehow what Kathy and the children accomplish does not at this moment count as learning. She is busy conquering her disappointments with her desires,

I am willing to help the children so I will put in the best that I could give.

Visit 3:

At quarter to eight this morning we 2D's were dropped off at Jomba for school experience. The other 2D's went to meet their class teachers and so do I. The class

\(^{47}\) The children's focus on spelling is a common one in community school classrooms. There is an over preoccupation with correct spelling which can disrupt writing as the flow of ideas. This is another example where children have been 'disciplined by language' where correctness overrules content. Kathy finds herself an object of competency discourses.
teacher came and told me that she was sick and she won’t be in school so I can take care of them. After explaining these we were given our children to work with for the Language activity. There was Erin and Ibo only. Walter was sick so I got them to do what I planned for. Firstly, I greeted them and then I asked them what we did last week. None of them could remember. So I got out their work and showed to them. Since there were no picture drawn so they could not remember from looking at their writing. I asked them to read and they remembered what we did last week. We all worked together correcting spelling mistakes and word tenses, then I asked questions to get them to talk it was still the same, I heard one answer word only, I kept on asking related questions until there were few words mentioned. The thing which I was not pleased is when I asked to write what they said on the paper, they would write only one word and say the sentence for them. How will I get them to write their own instead of being a guide? This is a question I must answer or seek help. However I tried my best to help them and they wrote some more words and did corrections to their work. For the behaviour towards this lesson that I observed was that the children expect me to be a guide and are not doing much. So far, this is what I did.

Feelings
Honestly speaking I do feel discouraged when children don’t do what I say or answer my questions when they don’t talk I try my best to speak simple english. When I do that and no response comes back I feel really bad. For example I asked the two children Erin and Ibo about what we did last week there was no answer and they were staring at me I called them by name but there was no answer. This is the third visit but still there is no change with the children. I’m feeling that I was useless for that one hour. I think being a teacher is not a simple job.

Comments
Comparing last week’s work and today seems to be confusing last week they were working very well today they are too lazy to talk and think maybe the lesson was boring or the instructions were not clear I’ll have to look into this and do my best next week.

Planning
What I’m going to do with the children next week is to get them rewrite their stories neatly and draw pictures to illustrate it and we will make a book. I will bring chart, colour pencils, papers and pencils for them to do their last touches to complete the book. The children will write their stories neatly and draw pictures and I will help them correct spelling errors, put full stops or any thing that need to be change. In addition I will start my lesson by telling a joke or a story for motivation.

For Kathy the third session brings no relief to previous tensions. They are real and disconcerting and to some extent not fully revealed here. As I watch her work with
these children I sense that she feels that to provide children with direct support by
doing and jointly producing the writing is to fail as a teacher. Is to construct
dependence. I am tempted to intervene, but I'm not sure how. Kathy is in many respects
more intensely focused and internally directed than her peers. I feel to have some
confidence in her determinations to work through these difficulties. She likes to share
what she is doing but is usually not one to ask for assistance.

The thing which I was not pleased is when I asked to write what they said on
the paper, they would write only one word and I had to say the sentence for
them. How will I get them to write their own instead of being a guide? This is a
question I must answer or seek help.

Back at college other students make similar observations about their children's 'lack of
ability'.

It is an interesting and uncertain situation. Some students are not facing
difficulties, others, (like me), are not sure of the boundaries of their intervention. As
students talk about what they are experiencing, they use terms like 'bright' and 'dull',
'fast' and 'slow' to describe the different children they work with. I am uncomfortable
with these terms. I try to relativise them: 'Some children might be bright at one thing
but dull at another', students don't feel that this is the case, they suggest that most dull
children are dull at everything. I suggest social factors: 'Some children have not had
the opportunities to learn that others have'; some students find a point of agreement
here, in their experience 'dullness' runs in families. I am not comfortable with this idea
either though I have heard it from teachers. I am faced with 32 students about half of
whom feel aspects of the pedagogy are too demanding. I feel uncomfortably positioned,
unable to provide for my student community the certainty and assurances that they wish
to hear. Teacher trust is often built on these assumptions, particularly when you're an
expatriate and expertise is what you are believed to trade in. I am trading on the

---

48 Some students display similar tensions,
So I asked them, 'What did you people do over the weekend?' Then they told me what
they were doing and I asked them to write them down. The children did not write
anything. They were just writing and scribbling on the paper which made me felt upset
because they did not write anything for me to help them. I was feeling bored because
the children were writing slowly and also I was feeling uneasy with what they were
doing.' (Areda, female)

'Then I told them to write their stories down, but I was very surprised to see that their
stories were long when talking, but it turned out to be one sentence when writing it
down' (Bima, male)

49 I am reminded of how I was written into one student's account:
The way I capture the children's attention in writing was through praising them where I
told them ... that our lecturer who is a european, too was very happy to read your
stories. The children smiled and laughed.' (Toniki)
students’ willingness to explore these tensions, that in their own reflections and writing they might find some unexplored spaces that reduce the sense of alienation that they feel. I assure them that I will visit their groups, as they wish, to work with them.  
Kathy continues to feel disheartened

Honestly speaking I do feel discouraged when children don’t do what I say or answer my questions when they don’t talk I try my best to speak simple English. When I do that and no response comes back I feel really bad. I’m feeling that I was useless for that one hour, I think being a teacher is not a simple job.

Kathy is trying to find herself in the work but is having difficulty, I feel some concern because after trying her best, she still feels useless, and I don’t see any easy way out. In the midst of this discomfort I sense that these moments of questioning and struggle have the potential to write themselves into the identities of students like Kathy, to provide learning which may otherwise be unrealised, particularly that learning involves more than teacher telling and children doing.

Children’s draft recounts

Erin
On Tuesday my mother and I went to the hospital. My mother was sick and the nurse gave her some medicine and we went to the house.

Ibo
In the morning I went to the bush to look for firewood with my father Then we went to the House.

Walter
On Saturday I was playing bees witH my two friend

Visit 4:
When I got off the college bus, I walked straight to the classroom of the Grade 2A. I went inside and Mrs L came and told us that the class teacher is on maternity leave. So we told the child to go with the trainee teachers. I got Ibo, Walter and Erin and we sat on one of the desks in the classroom.

I told everybody that we were going to make a book so they must write neatly on the papers I provide and draw pictures Walter was sick last week so I was close with him to rewrite his story neatly while Ibo and Erin drew their pictures and colour them. Ibo could really draw a human being representing his father and himself. Erin and Walter were drawing pictures which I can describe as children in Pre-schools this was

---

50I am tempted to politicise the matter of labelling children, to suggest that schooling segregates children on the basis of narrow definitions of what counts as learning. I sense that this would be undermining to many students and resist.
interesting because of individual differences and the influence of the environment the child was living in. However, Erin could write and read well but cannot draw good pictures but like children in pre-school I help Walter by asking questions. For example, what did you do after playing with your friends? What did your friend do after playing with you etc.? And also I helped him spell words like ‘market’, ‘After’ ‘went’ and many more. When everybody was colouring their pictures it was time to stop so I collected their papers together to make a book looking at their faces they were smiling and I know that they liked the idea of making a book.

Feelings
Today’s activities run smoothly for me. I’m happy with all the children and the effort they put in to finish their work. But I’m sad to see that the children are taking this exercise as a new thing for them. I feel that teachers need to help children speak and write good english.

Comments
Looking at the children’s work over the four visits to the school I would like to make my comments here. The children need the guidance of us teachers to progress well in their learning. Giving them assistance and helping them make them feel somebody then they learn well. When I got to know the children very well, that helped them and myself. This improves their stories and their talking to me orally from time to time I would say that this type of activity needs patient commitment and a kind willing hand. It takes time for children to learn something new and same as doing things after all being a teacher means giving your heart to somebody who really wants to learn.

Teaching is a living job and not a working job.

Planning
Do - Teacher read a story to the children
Talk - Exploring the text - Recall events, setting (place) characters
teacher ask questions. Connect text with children
Record - Teacher will get the children to write a similar story about animals who were friends and become enemies.

In the process of helping the children to make their book, there is a narrowing of the distance between Kathy and the children. She uses the notions of ‘individual differences’ and ‘environment’ to help her understandings of the way children draw.

I told everybody that we were going to make a book so they must write neatly on the papers I provide and draw pictures. Walter was sick last week so I was close with him to rewrite his story neatly while Ibo and Erin drew their pictures and colour them. Ibo could really draw a human being representing his father and himself Erin and Walter were drawing pictures which I can describe as children
in pre-school this was interesting because of individual differences and the influence of the environment the child was living in.

Kathy summarises her first four weeks as she has done along the way in foundational terms. Framing her beliefs (existing knowledge) and the realisations (new knowledge) that have distilled throughout these sessions as platforms from which she launches further action, thought and investigation.

The children need the guidance of us teachers to progress well in their learning. Giving them assistance and helping them make them feel somebody then they learn well.

When I got to know the children very well that helped them and myself this improves their stories and their talking to me orally from time to time I would say that this type of activity needs patient commitment and a kind willing hand. It takes time for children to learn something new and same as doing things after all being a teacher means giving your heart to somebody who really wants to learn. Teaching is a living job and not a working job.

Teaching is ‘a living job’ by Kathy’s definition this means guiding, assisting, helping and knowing children. Demonstrating a ‘patient commitment and a kind willing hand’, taking time, ‘giving you heart to somebody who really wants to learn’. To her view of children’s learning, as the accomplishment of particular skills and performances, Kathy adds a view of teaching and learning described in relational terms, in terms of various attitudes, dispositions and commitments needed for teaching and learning to occur, partially derived from these experiences.

Visit 5:
As soon as we arrived at the school this morning I went to the classroom because I know that I got lots to do. After the morning prayer and the singing the children went with the student teachers. Ibo came to me and I greet him. When all the children had gone with their student teachers I noticed that Walter and Erin were not there. I felt sad and felt that it would be a bad start for the new activity. I asked Ibo for Erin and Walter he told me that Walter was sick but didn’t know whether Erin would come to school or not. It was Ibo alone. I got out the complete story book and let him read it to me while he was reading Erin came into the classroom. She was late. Now I was happy. I let Erin read the book as well. While she was reading I realised that one interesting thing when she came to the new words or the words she asked me to help her she stopped then I would call it to her. This was interesting but what would it do to help her? Its a question for me to ask Mr P to help me. Ibo was just reading well because most of the words were his own the words that Erin found difficult was nurse, because, hospital’ and some more.
After reading the story book I read another story book entitled ‘Animal stories’ and I picked only one which was “The end of the friendship”. This was what I planned to do with them. The story was about the tiger and the elephant who became enemies after paying tricks on each other by the monkeys. While reading I noticed this from Erin and Ibo. They both were moving closer to the book which I was reading from. After reading the story I asked the questions which I planned some of the questions like ‘who were the animals involved in the story?’ ‘what happened to the monkey when the deer sat on the elephants back?’ When I reflect these questions on them, the response was really poor, when I reflect the questions on them they did not even answer. Looking at them they know the answer but they can’t talk anyhow I had better think of ways that I will make them talk. As for their writing it is interesting as well. After asking questions I asked them to write any stories about animals who were good friends before and one day became enemies I gave my example as the cuscus and the dog Erin and Ibo followed me by writing about the cuscus as well. This is what they wrote, Erin ‘The cuscus and pig bay are good pat and bay are bad friends. Ibo ‘long time a gale cuscus are god friends.’ Seeing what they have wrote and their weaknesses to answer the question I will plan my lesson very carefully to help them, especially my questioning.

Feelings
I’m not really happy with the effort the children put in today especially answering questions I feel bored when children don’t participate in talking. I think I did a lot of talking and there was no response. I do feel discouraged at times.

Comments
Getting the children to do something new or a different activity you need to make yourself clear. This well help the children’s understanding. I think the questions or words I used to ask Erin and Ibo were too difficult or new words. But I did try my best to help them but I don’t know how I can help them the best thing is to seek help from Mr P.

That was about talking and writing is a little bit all right. They wrote something on the paper I gave. Erin and Ibo wrote the animals I gave in my story as examples for them to write. I did not stop them to think of another animal or so because it was already time. But for the next visit I make sure they think of different animal and write about. After all I did teach what I planned for so I will plan to improve it and make the story interested to do a good story.

Planning
For the next visit this is what I’m going to do.

Do - I will revise the story I read by asking questions

Talk - I will ask the children to talk about any animals that they were friends before and become great enemies.
Record - After doing these I will give their papers and ask them to write their stories. I will assist them by spelling words, correcting word tenses and put full stops at the right place and generally walk around and see them work.

In this next phase of school experience students prepare to write narratives with the same children. At the end of this session Kathy fights off some discouragement after what she feels was a boring lesson in which the children were unable to answer her questions about the story she read and spoke little. I note how Kathy’s observations and determinations intensify.

When I reflect these questions on them, the response was really poor, when I reflect the questions on them they did not even answer. Looking at them they know the answer but they can’t talk anyhow I had better think of ways that I will make them talk.

Kathy’s pedagogy is continually modified by what the children are able to accomplish. She monitors their movements, their responses to questions, their writing as well as her own input.

I think the questions or words I used to ask Erin and I were too difficult or new words but I did try my best to help them but I don’t know how I can help them. The best thing is to seek help from Mr P.

There is a sense in Kathy’s concerns that there are short cuts to learning things that can be literally handed out. The situated nature of teaching and learning is often difficult to accept when knowledge is seen to be contained in texts and minds and not in interactions. Kathy notes but doesn’t see the value of the support/model she is giving.

I gave my example as the cuscus and the dog Erin and Ibo followed me by writing about the cuscus as well.

Despite her reference to ‘Mr P’ she does not ask for assistance and despite my visits she does not call my attention to any difficulties.

Visit 6:
As a normal routine for every morning on Wednesday’s was to do the language activity. As soon as I entered the classroom I saw the children playing in the classroom. The time was 7:50am. I told M and T to take the class for the morning activity because they were taking that class for other lessons. When the morning activity was over, I took Erin, Walter and Ibo and we all sat on the desks. First of all I greet them and I asked them if they are ready for another day of learning. They all said yes. The I asked questions on the story I told last week. These were some of the questions.
- Can you remember the story I told you last week?
- What is the story about?
- Can you name the animals etc?
Then I notice that Walter did not answer questions with Ibo and Erin. This is because he was sick and did not come for class last week. For his sake, I retold the story to them again. Walter was interested and he moved closer to the book which I was holding. While Erin and Ibo sat back and listened and called out some of the things that happened in the story. After reading the story, I asked them to write a similar story about animals who were friends before and for some kind of reason they became enemies. Erin and Ibo have started writing last week so I gave their paper and they started writing their stories. As they were doing that, I help Walter by questioning him and helping him spell words and he wrote down something on his paper. One thing that I realise from Walter is that he waits for me to spell words for him. This is something which I’m not too sure. What will I do? I need help from Mr P. I did try my best to help Is and Erin to get them write something on their paper.

**Feelings**
To be a teacher you must stand all kinds of things, I as a teacher must stand up with the changes, I must learn to control my mood and feelings. As for me today was not a good day because I have my own personal problem which is really affecting me, I’m not really upset but I’m just trying my best to overcome my problem and put the best into my children’s work. Really there are times you’ll be effected most with your own problems.

**Comments**
Though I had my own problems I did put my best and help my children. Today was not wasted but the children did something. Erin and Ibo understood the story because I read it twice. For Walter he’s trying his best. Generally they are all doing fine, the problem is they know the words or can think of it but cannot spell it. I did not correct their spelling or change their words, I will do all these things next week. To add to my comments, I would like to write something to think about which will encourage me to do my best. Doing the work with a willing heart is self giving your whole life, teaching is a living job so teach to the best of your ability search to find more knowledge to convey, plan what to teach to guide you to your goal, set your priorities right and run towards.

**Planning**
*Do - I will let the children read their own stories to me. I will let others to continue writing their story while I go around and get them to read their story to me. (I plan to do this to avoid copying from each other). And I will make spelling corrections.*

*Talk - After going around all the three children’s story I will ask them to talk about the things which can cause a good friendship to end.*

*Record - After talking about these I will ask the children to look at their stories and put the cause of the end of the friendship of the animals they are writing about. Need to*
improve a lot with the children's writing helping in spelling words and doing corrections.

There is a sense today that Kathy feels only a fragile hold over what she is doing. Yet she is doing much more than co-producing a story. She faces again the consequences of a linguistic imperialism that imperialises her position as teacher, through whom all 'meaning making' in English comes. Walter waits. Kathy is not sure how this waiting should be negotiated.

One thing that I realise from Walter is that he waits for me to spell words for him. This is something which I'm not too sure. What will I do?

Walter's learning is here mediated by Kathy's determination of how much or how little support she should give.

In this session Kathy works under the weight of a personal problem. As with other accounts, the shift from description to feelings to comments, provides different views of her experience. Kathy begins by recounting her teaching steps, questions about last week's story, retelling the story, getting Erin and Ibo started, helping Walter with his sentences and worrying over his spelling.

... I help Walter by questioning him and helping him spell words and he wrote down something on his paper. One thing that I realise from Walter is that he waits for me to spell words for him. This is something which I'm not too sure. What will I do?

In 'feelings' Kathy reveals that she has a personal problem that is distracting her but which she is trying to overcome. She theorises the relationship between teaching and emotional disturbances

To be a teacher you must stand all kinds of things, I as a teacher must stand up with the changes, I must learn to control my mood and feelings ... Really there are times you'll be effected most with your own problems.

In commenting she is more distanced, reasoning through her worries and concerns to find some good in the midst of these problems.

Though I had my own problems I did put my best and help my children. Today was not wasted but the children did something. Erin and Ibo understood the story because I read it twice, for Walter he's trying his best. Generally they are all doing fine, the problem is they know the words or can think of it but cannot spell it.

To conclude Kathy writes to herself.

I'd like to write something to think about which will encourage me to do my best. Doing the work with a willing heart is self giving your whole life, teaching is a living job so teach to the best of your ability search to find more knowledge
to convey, plan what to teach to guide you to your goal, set your priorities right and run towards them.

Kathy's initial description details what she does, her feelings reflect the state of her personal internal world, her comments mediate these external and internal realities. The thoughts she writes to herself are a way of overwriting what she sees as failures in both worlds.

In my own mind I ask how it is that her comments mediate her feelings, and how often this happens. Whether these categories represent contending discourses, rationalised objectified responses overwriting other subjectivities.

Visit 7:
What a new day will bring. I have planned to do my best to improve the children's stories and extend them. And this is what happened today. Walking into the classroom full of noise, I felt that it was part of my responsibility as a trainee teacher to control the class if the teacher is not there. After the morning activities the children went with their trainee teachers. I got Ibo and Walter and got them to set on the desk and I start off with my planned activities. After five minutes Erin came late. What I did with Ibo and Walter was getting them to read their stories. Is read his story well. There are some words which I saw which he spelled wrongly but it made sense when he was reading. For instance vil-will, varey-very, set-said, these are the words that I picked when he was reading so I corrected him on his paper.

For Walter, he can't even read his own writing. His story was about the dog and the rat and he said the pig for dog and cat for rat. I told him that the words he said was wrong and told him the right words. It took him long time to recognise the words. I had to help him read his story. When the writing part, he can't write words or spell them so I ask him to tell me and I wrote it for him. As for Erin she came late and I told her to read her story to us. She read her story well. But looking at her story it was not really in logical order so I helped her put ideas in order. For Erin and Ibo is alright but Walter needs a lot of assistance from me. The other interesting thing was Erin and Ibo brought their own written stories. It was still on animals which is our topic. But I think someone has given them ideas to write or wrote them for the two children. I have put their stories in my journal folder and hope Mr P to have a look at it. I don't know what to do with these stories. What I did to see whether it was their own writing, I ask them to read but they had some difficulties in reading it. However, I make Erin and Ibo to keep working on their stories we worked together the last two visits.

Feelings
I feel that things you planned will never work out right for you unless the children perform their part as the teachers expected. I feel tired, upset and I loose interest when my lesson plans don’t work out for me.

Comments
Today seems to be a confusing day for me. Erin and Ibo came with their own stories. Walter had to extend his story because he came late and was absent last week. I had to re-explain the things we were doing. That was a lot of work. They all need my assistance in spelling words. However, the stories had a beginning, middle and ending. As for Walter he needs a lot of assistance from me.

Planning
Do - Read the story with the children again their written stories
Talk - Discuss individually to extend their stories.
Record - Keep on helping the children write more sentences or words in their story.

This session is a good example of what involves Kathy,

Walking in the classroom full of noise, I felt that it was part of my responsibility as a trainee teacher to control the class if the teacher is not there. After the morning activities the children went with their trainee teachers.

(I look in and Kathy is leading the morning song and prayer and divides the class for the writing session) Settling her group, getting Ibo and Walter to read their stories, monitoring their reading, correcting B’s paper, helping Walter to read his paper, writing W’s story for him where he can’t make the letters, listening to Erin read, helping her to put her story into a logical order, detecting disparity between what Erin and Ibo write and what they are capable of, getting Erin and Ibo to continue to work on their original stories, struggling over the dilemma of the ‘already’ written stories.

(Kathy talks to me about what happened with Erin and Ibo bringing completed stories to class. We talk about how it may have been their desire to please Kathy, to provide her with what they assumed was wanted. I told her that working closely with Walter would probably help him to keep up with others. We talk about his absence and the effect that is having on his work and schooling. I told her that I will visit her group next week.)

One of the difficulties Kathy is having is implementing her plans. She has high expectations for her group.

I feel that things that you planned for will never work out right for you unless the children perform their part as the teacher expected. I feel tired, upset and I lose interest when my lesson plans don’t work out for me.

Her plans reflect a reality that she has not yet been able to capture. When she puts her plans into action they fragment. Each child does things differently, there are unexpected
events, Erin coming late, Walter absent, Ibo bringing a story from home. In the midst of these disruptions, however, she manages all that was noted above, not to plan, or by design.

Kathy is not the only student experiencing a sense of frustration and disorientation as notions of teaching and learning, planning and implementing fragment. Back at college we talk about the need to adjust expectations. I suggest that children's performances should reflect their efforts and abilities but also that students should see in the writing and thinking about writing, their influence. I find this exercise a stretching one, I don't feel to provide answers, but to support their observations with what I am seeing and provide some of my own insights.⁵¹

Drafts of children's stories

Ibo

Long time ago the Kangaroo and the pig live in a village. the pig is said Kangaroo you go to the garden and get dome food. too the Kangaroo said. Im very tired. the pig is said I will kill your now. the pig is said Kangaroo ran I ran away.

Erin

The CusCus and Cat are good friends The CusCus is eating pawpaw The cat was angry and The Cat run to the bush. The CusCus wants to eat the Cat.

⁵¹ These experiences had the effect of refining some of the students primary experiences of teaching and learning, particularly its perceived qualities of self-sufficiency, completeness and giveness. For me, teaching to specific objectives became problematic for Kathy within her discursive disposition, their was an assumption in the first case that she could create/control a beginning, that by constructing a beginning, a pre-determined end could be reached. In the process of preparing this subject, one of my considerations was that there would be many 'beginnings' and many 'endings', (and lots of decisions along the way) however, the effect of framing the school experience sessions as projects with specific outcomes (children's written work) wrongly implied that pre-determined homogenous beginnings/ends were possible. These thoughts were influenced by my reading of Dewey (1925; 1994:119) after these experiences, particularly his statement that,

Control of beginnings and ends by means is possible only when the individual, unique, is treated as a composite of parts, made by sequential differentiations and integrations.

My reading of his notion of 'control' is more in terms of its meaning as 'direction' rather than as 'discipline'.

It is in this latter sense that I feel Kathy interprets her teaching role for the moment. And yet I find myself somewhat complicit in the way Kathy interprets the activities, they do form part of her 'training' and in the sense that dominant educational views of assessment are 'ends' dominated, they are still interpreted within that powerful discursive framework. To imply that there is a beginning to the end is to tacitly suggest no prior system of ideas, knowledges, understandings, learnings.
Walter
The Dog and The rat in lived two good friends. They dre The Dog an The rat.

Visit 8:
The activity planned for TESOL this morning was to write the stories neatly, do illustrations, drawings and make corrections to spelling errors. I was prepared to do all I can to publish their story book. What a disappointment it was! Erin and Ibo did not come to school. Walter only came to school. In fact Walter was away for two Wednesdays. There was not much work done with him. I was worried that I could not publish the book today but to help Walter. It was only Walter which I will work closely with him. This is what I did with him. I got him to read his story first. He read his story but he could not go any further when it came to the words which I spell in his story. He stopped. I did not know what to do. Because when I call the word, he would say but when I ask him to read again he would forget the word. The I ask Mr P for help. He came and helped me read the story with Walter. Mr P read each line as Walter followed after him. Mr P ask him questions as he answered which made his understanding clear. Mr P helped him arranged his sentences properly which made his story had a beginning, middle and ending. I was happy then and I was told by Mr P that the story must be written neatly again by Walter because this could be one of the reason why Walter did not read the story properly. I made Walter to write his story and did his illustration or drawing. The I made him to read his story aloud.

Feelings
I was disappointed because I could not complete the activity that I planned to do with the children. I was really discouraged. I felt like giving up the whole thing. I feel it is one of the contributing factor towards child’s learning. If a child does not attend classes regularly then the teacher will never teach what he or she has planned to teach. Such things are sad and annoying.

Comments
Though I had problems and difficulties on how to get Walter to read his story, Mr P was kind enough to help me. He showed me how to make a child read his own story by reading the story line by line as the child follow. The child can read on his own while the teacher look on. Walter could not read the words that he asked me to spell. That is interesting. Because he was thinking of that word and he can’t spell it. So why can’t he remember the word when I spell it. However I can’t blame his mind I have to observe his behaviour very carefully. After all, it was good that I had more time to work with Walter and help. Really I do feel satisfied when I did all I can to help Walter.
Planning
I will complete all the children’s stories plus illustrations and publish them. I won’t do the DO activity for the Expository writing.

There is a sense in which Kathy’s pedagogical disposition is being built upon the issue of personal control over what is happening about her. When her expectations are disrupted she feels a loss of control.

I was worried that I could not publish the book today but to help Walter. It was only Walter which I will work closely with him. This is what I did with him. I got him to read his story first. He read his story but he could not go any further when it came to the words which I spell in his story. He stopped I did not know what to do because when I call the word he would say but when I ask him to read again he would forget the words.

Kathy asked for help. I sat down with Walter and helped build into his mind the sentences that he had written. To help Walter recognise what the words meant because of the sense that they made as part of an idea. With Walter I worked at the level of the clause to help him to change the order of his words to fit with his idea, what he wanted to say (there are no meaning in words, only utterances). By reviewing chunks of his writing we built up the text and read it slowly through. Kathy looked on and followed what we were doing. There was a sense in which this experience brought some new

52 I attempted to build up the meaning, the coherence of the story first and did little with the spelling. Error correction is a dominant language teaching discourse. The point I was trying to model was not to ignore errors but make them a secondary focus. I noticed in Kathy’s accounts that she had done this from time to time but that the children kept directing her attention back to their spelling. I saw also how painstakingly she had laboured with W in earlier writing, and that his absence had disrupted his sense of what was going on. I talked with her about the good work she was doing with him and how I wouldn’t be surprised if he forgot the sentences we had just worked on. I reflected upon the different learning environments we had constructed with W and considered how other students managed these moments. Later in the work of Toniki (male) with Grade 3 on imaginary writing, I found the following account:

I issued the children papers and told them to begin their story writing. When I finished, I saw that the children were talking amongst themselves to define the word ‘imaginary’ and what they said was ‘false story’, so I ask them are you having problem, no one respond, instead they all smiled at the end of the discussion. P who was the only boy amongst the 3 girls went away from the girls and sat some distance away and write his story. This child came regularly to me to spell him words, he cannot spell and write. One very interesting thing I discover from a child named G was that whenever I questioned her do you know what to do, she hide her paper and denied herself that she knew what to do and at the end of the lesson I collect their papers and glance through her story and found that she did not even wrote a story. Instead she copied the words from a magazine which was not even a story. The words used were too complex for her to understand. I failed to check G’s work where she wrote totally a wrong thing; not
understandings for me as I sensed how much the children desired to give to Kathy something that the she wanted even though much of it wasn't really theirs. As I worked back through the text with Walter it seemed to me that for the story to become more a part of his discourse some re-vision was needed through his eyes.

**Visit 9:**
Having my fingers crossed I hope that all the three children would come to school today. When I walked into the classroom, I saw Walter, Ibo and Erin there. I was happy. I walked over with a smiling face and greeted them. I told them that they have to finish their story with their illustration so we all could make a book. I also told them if they finish quickly, I will show them how to make a star with wool and sticks. These motivated them and they all got to work. Walter completed his story and he was drawing his pictures and was colouring them. Ibo was drawing his pictures while I notice that he could really draw properly. While Erin was still writing her story. I had to help her complete her story because there was no proper ending to the story. They all were working on their story till the time was up. We didn’t have any time to make the star with the wool and the sticks. So told them to bring two wool of different colours with sticks, so we could go straight into our activity next week. Looking at the three of them Ibo is working very well Erin and Walter need a lot of assistance from me. From recount writing and literary writing I have found the weaknesses of these children. Therefore I will try my best to do a good activity for the children.

**Feelings**
I’m happy today because Erin, Ibo and Walter all came to school. This made it possible for me to get all their stories written and illustrations done. It makes me happy and I feel more relaxed than last week. As for the last week, I was worried and I thought that I’ll

---
even a story. It was my duty but I fail to do. By looking through other children’s work they did it fine but for this girl, she understood the concept imaginary wrongly. She thought it is just any writing on any thing.
The following week
   After talking I gave their stories and told them to read while I work with G first. I call the girl to come and sit close to me then I explained her that imaginary story is not copying any writing on anything. I also asked her can you understand what you wrote and she said no. To help her I told her an imaginary story to clarify her understand then I told her to tell me a story and now she did it fine. I praised her and said very good and told her to go and rewrite the story she told me, at the end of the lesson I got her paper and found out that now she did it fine.'
Toniki showed in his case that when prior learning was assumed he needed to fall back to constructing a position of shared understanding, a level of intersubjective interaction and agreement for learning to take place.
never get a book publish for the child. However, today was fine and I’m ready to go on to the activity for Expository writing.

Comments
The daily attendance of children coming to school is very important. Looking at my situation, should be completed last week, but due to the two children - Erin and Ibo who did not come to school the stories were not complete then. I would like to comment that, for effective learning to take place children need to be healthy and free of physical disabilities. That enables them to come to school regularly and that helps the teacher and the children to be up to date.

Planning
Do - make a star for decorating the classroom or the house. using wool, sticks, scissor.
Talk - What to do? The steps of how to go about the star making.
Record - Write the steps on a piece of paper.

Kathy achieves a level of satisfaction through the children finishing their stories, and having them published. She credits the children’s attendance with enabling her to complete their work and notes the need for continuity of attendance for children to keep up with their learning.

I would like to comment that, for effective learning to take place children need to be healthy and free of physical disabilities. That enables them to come to school regularly and that helps the teacher and the children to be up to date.

But it is not always poor health that keeps children away. Some families require the help of their children work at home, in the gardens or markets. At times children are cared for by other relatives or travel to other villages. There is no provision for these children to make up what they miss, no other form of schooling that is considerate of the seasonal needs of subsistence families.

Visit 10:
Thinking about teaching something or doing something before you actually do it is easy but it is the other way around. I thought making a star with the wool and the broomstick would be easy for the three children namely, Erin, Ibo and Walter. I prepared all the materials like broomstick, coloured wool, scissor and I went to school. I was happy that I had all my materials and I was going to do something good and interesting with the children. First of all, I went in and got the three of them and we all sat on the desk. I greet them good morning and told them that we are going to do something good this morning. But before that I ask them to read their story book. They all had turn to read their own story to the group members and myself. It was interesting that they had to stop think of the new words that they learnt and wrote in the story. There I call the word
for them and they continue reading. After reading, I got the broomsticks, coloured wool and the scissor out. I did one model for them to see and so I showed it to them. I ask them questions about the star wool. For example, what did I use to make this star wool. Do you like this? Is it good to hang it in your house for decoration?

Anyway these were some of my questions which I used to ask. Then I went into the demonstration part. I used the words like, ‘over’, ‘under’, ‘around the broomstick’ and ‘tie’ it. These were new words and I try to use it several times for them to hear and use it as well. After the demonstration they got the broomstick together. I gave another longer piece about 50cm and they used it to go around the broomstick. Ibo did not have any problems, he understood what I said and he went ahead doing it without my help.

Where as for Walter and Erin I had to demonstrate over and over again. Finally Erin caught up and she went ahead doing it while I concentrate with Walter. They all did it - going over, under and around the broomstick until the wool was short, I joined it again. However I managed to do something with Erin Ibo and Walter. I was frustrated that I had to show it over an over again but there was a voice saying - YOU NEED TO TEACH TO HELP.

Feelings
As I have said in my description, I was frustrated, angry and felt useless because I did not put myself down to what the children can do. I felt happy and excited at first that I was going to do something good but it turned out to be a boiling lesson for me. children had to make so many mistakes and I had to correct and show the right thing. Anyhow its always the case for teachers. I need patience.

Comments
I think writing from a doing activity is good because children know what they did and were using. They use the words meaning talking about it. Therefore I would like to say that teachers should be encourage to teach this to help and improve the children in speaking, reading and writing English. I for one will take this out into the field to teach it to the children. because there are lots of good things about it.

Planning
This is what I will do for the next lesson. For the first few minutes I will ask questions and tell them to show me how they will go about doing the star wool.

Do - Continue from where they left you make themselves familiarise the new words.

Talk - As they are doing it ask questions on where the wool (rope) is going.

Record - I will give them papers and ask them to write what they did.

In the remaining visits the group is involved in making stars from coloured wool and coconut leaf spines ('broomstick') and writing a report on the activity. Kathy is again besieged with frustration as the children have a hard time following her weaving
instructions. Her description is memorable as she builds a field of language through the movements of the activity.

In spite of her frustrations (the 'children had to make so many mistakes'), she finds value in the activity in that the language used is demonstrated.

Kathy engages her own frustrations with some rigour. She does this in various ways: by interrogating them and altering her perceptions, sometimes turning them on their heads,

‘Thinking about teaching something or doing something before you actually do it is easy, but it is the other way around’; by monitoring voices other than those most dominant and immediate,

‘there was a voice saying - YOU NEED TO TEACH TO HELP’;

and by leaving, as it were, notes for herself,

‘I need patience.’

Kathy draws the conclusions that teaching is unpredictable, yet both necessary and in need of a patient approach in order to help children. She seems to be sustained by these messages, which represent compressed emotional reactions to her teaching experiences. There is an ongoing sense however, that teaching for Kathy in a reduced form, is both a social obligation and a moral action, that it is against these standards that she measures the effectiveness of her teaching.

Visit 11:

‘Good morning Ms B’, was the response from Erin, Ibo and Walter. I was happy and I started off with my lesson. I got out the stars and gave it to them. Then I ask them some questions on how we did it. ? What did we do first with the wool and broomstick? How did we do it? Then what did we do next? And I went on, helping them to used the new words when I was demonstrating and making the star. I let them to do it for 10 minutes as I walked around talking to them and asking them the steps they took to do. I wanted to make them talk to use the new words. When I have seen everybody I asked them to put the star away. Then I gave a paper each and I ask them to write the steps of how make a star out of wool. This came the hardest part for the children. From my observation. They looked confused and did not know what to do. I talked to them and explain what I want them to do.

Ibo went ahead and wrote something on his paper. As for Walter and Erin was different. Erin was biting her finger while Walter was thinking hard. I broke the silence by asking these three questions. What did we do last week Wednesday? They answered star. What are the things that we used to make the star? They answered wool and broomstick. Then I ask them how they started making the star. Ibo explained it to us and I asked Walter to
demonstrate it and he did it correctly. However, these are some of the hard times I had with my three children, Ibo, Erin and Walter to write a good story.

**Feelings**

I do feel discourage at times but I do feel that it is very important to feel I am RESPONSIBLE for a well being of a child. That is to help him or her. The child needs my help and I must give him or her willingly. I feel bad and worried when I don’t put much effort to help the children during these sessions. But I feel happy and satisfied when I have done my best.

**Comments**

I would like to comment about the three children that I have. These three children have different stages of learning abilities. As a student teacher don’t know which area of learning they are good in. It has happen that, from the three different writings, at least someone is good at it while the other two are not and vice versa. For Ibo is good at imaginary stories and expository story while Erin is good at writing from experience while Walter is good at imaginary stories.

**Planning**

*Do* - Children complete their star only for 10 minutes.

*Talk* - Get the children to talk about the steps they took to make the star. Let them use the new words.

*Record* - Get them to write the steps to make a wool star.

*What I have referred to as a discourse of social obligation recurs in various forms with Kathy as its subject and the children as its objects with little agency to act. Kathy’s own observations reveal that the children are hesitant and confused about what they are required to do, and probably more worrying for them, their capacity to do it.*

I gave a paper each and I ask them to write the steps of how make a star out of wool. This came the hardest part for the children. From my observation. They looked confused and did not know what to do. I talked to them and explain what I want them to do.

*Ibo went ahead and wrote something on his paper. As for Walter and Erin was different. Erin was biting her finger while Walter was thinking hard. I broke the silence by asking these three questions...*

Unable to proceed as they have been asked to, the children are again kept at a distance from Kathy by her expectations.

*Kathy’s voice of moral responsibility is a form of social regulation defining what counts as acceptable or ‘best’ teacher behaviour and in some circumstances what counts as acceptable pupil performance. There is a sense that Kathy’s happiness derives from a feeling of being faithful to this particular code of conduct.*
I do feel discourage at times but I do feel that it is very important to feel that I'm RESPONSIBLE for a well being of a child. That is to help him or her willingly. I feel bad and worried when I don’t put much effort to help the children during these sessions. But I feel happy and satisfied when I have done my best. A question that emerges for me is to what extent this voice enables or constrains Kathy in engaging a critical exploration of the social consequences of her pedagogy.

Visit 12:
This morning was another bright day but things just didn’t work out for me. I planned to get the children to write their report on the doing activity. I was not happy because I had Ibo only for this morning’s activity. While Erin and Walter did not come to school. These two will be a lesson behind Ibo and its very hard to help them when we are going to the school for only half a day. It was sad and frustrating at the same time. Anyhow, I got Ibo to write his story again under the following headings: What we did? How we did it? What we learnt?.

What I learnt from this is that he got what he wrote as a story and did not know what to write under each headings. I realised that and I showed him what to do. I asked him questions about what they did first then he answered. I told him that this will go into this first heading I did it for the other heading. His work was becoming better bit by bit. I told him to rewrite his report neatly next week. However, Erin and Walter will need a lot of help from me. I’m sure I won’t be able to publish their book because Erin and Walter will be late for this. But I only hope for improvements for this last coming visit.

Feelings
When your expectations are not fulfilled, really you become worried and upset. And this is the situation I was in today when Erin and Walter did not turn up for class. I was not happy because, there won’t be any time left to get all of their work published. This is how I feel for today’s school experience.

Comments
From my own observations, I would like to make a comment here on class teachers. I wonder if the class teachers are co-operating with the trainees. As for our 2C class teacher she does nothing. Not even talking to us or asking us about what we are doing. I think this is one of the downfall of teachers. They should help us to identify the children in the class to say which children are bright or fast learners and others are slow learners. From this it can help us to provide much help on certain children and less on the bright one. This is a comment of concern.

Planning
I will get Ibo to rewrite his report and get Erin and Walter to catch up in their report writing. I will get the paper chart ready for publishing.
Kathy's concerns about class teachers are interesting. She has taken much responsibility for the early morning activities of her class in the teacher's absence. Usually during School Experience teachers are released to prepare, mark or attend to other duties. Kathy's concern over the lack of input from teachers reflects both the difficulties she has faced and also the need she feels for a greater cooperative effort. For me greater teacher involvement is an important issue. There has been little formal involvement of classroom teachers in the organisation or direction of these sessions though most teachers have been keen observers but not intervened and rarely talked about their children.

Kathy's concern is to have children identified according to whether they are 'bright or fast learners' or 'slow learners'. Her aim being to 'provide much help on certain children and less on the bright one.' It is difficult to see how this knowledge might change things as Kathy has already recognised that some children are good at some things while others are good at other things.

I would like to comment about the three children that I have. These three children have different stages of learning abilities. As a student teacher don't know which area of learning they are good in. It has happen that, from the three different writings, at least someone is good at it while the other two are not and vice versa. For Ibo is good at imaginary stories and expository story while Erin is good at writing from experience while Walter is good at imaginary stories.

(Visit 11)

There is also the matter of providing 'bright' children with less help that could be further explored. Yet in all of this Kathy legitimately senses that greater awareness of children's needs and capabilities, and more opportunities to assist children having difficulties would improve her teaching.

Visit 13:
This morning was our last visit to Jomba for our school experience. I was worried and only hope that everybody turn up for my language activity. When I walked into the classroom, Ibo, Walter, and Erin were all there waiting for me. I gave their paper back and started by telling Ibo to rewrite his report story while I see Walter and Erin. There was no time to waste. I tried my best to help them. When Ibo was finished, I told him to continue and draw his star that he made. Erin finished writing and she did the same. Now it was Walter that I had a hard time with. Anyhow I tried my best and he at least got something on his paper. Looking at their overall work on different writing, Ibo was doing fine followed by Erin. While Walter needs a lot of assistance from me. It was sad for me to see that Walter was like this and he needs a lot of such activity to improve his
writing (talking) speaking and reading skills. I think the teacher needs to look closely and help those kind of children.

Feelings
I’m not feeling happy today because it was the end of our visits and also the children did not really complete the story writing properly. Needs more time to improve it.

Comments
Hopefully I have done my part well to teach the children. From my weaknesses and the way I conduct the language activity. I believe I have learnt a lot and I hope to improve in when I’m in my practical teaching and also when I’m a field teacher. I shall smile for the strength that I have put into helping the children. I think that this language activity has helped me alot and I have learned alot as well.

Planning
None!

Kathy summarises her impressions of the final visit. Though not happy that the writing was not completed, she is encouraged by her efforts and feels that in general, she has learned from ‘... my weaknesses and the way I conduct the language activity’. Kathy is positive about her teaching, ‘I shall smile for the strength that I have put into helping the children’, though I sense some ambivalence. This moral support is drawn from the way Kathy’s teaching is shaped in terms of a discourse of personal accountability. A discourse in which teaching is constructed as ‘helping’, difficulties are privately dealt with, anomalous circumstances transcended and the work is ‘personally’ rewarding. It is these latter qualities, where circumstances don’t appear to count but participants’ personal efforts do, which opens to Kathy a ‘performance’ view of herself and the children.

Looking at their overall work on different writing, Ibo was doing fine followed by Erin. While Walter needs a lot of assistance from me. It was sad for me to see that Walter was like this and he needs a lot of such activity to improve his writing (talking) speaking and reading skills. I think the teacher needs to look closely and help those kind of children.

Children ‘like’ Walter, for example, are a ‘kind’ of schooled child needing close attention, Ibo is fine, but Erin not so fine. The wider tensions inherent in these observations are only glimpsed here where Kathy’s observations are less focused upon her interactions with the children and more defined by a sense of teaching as developing skills and knowledge through tasks.
Discussion
Kathy lives her teaching, the children’s failures are her failures, their ‘successes’ her successes. She lives teaching through their performances and their capacity to deliver expected outcomes.

... (c)hildren should do what teachers plan and expect, when they don’t I feel like giving up.

In the midst of the situational demands of the writing sessions, Kathy’s senses of national, moral and social obligation mediates both her actions and the children’s actions. Kathy is both a seeker and a provider of knowledge. Throughout, she contends with images of children’s inabilitys by constructing a discourse of reinforcing maxims, defining the complexity of her experiences in law-like statements and generalising them to her teaching. Her primary source of support appears to be the extent to which what occurs in the classroom agrees with particular pedagogical standards and outcomes. Where these standards are not met, there is despair repaired by processes of justification. It may be read that despite her vigilant position in the classroom her ideals lead her to overlook some of the complexities of what is in front of her. I sense at times she is caught between the impulse to stand apart from the children as their teacher and an impulse to join with them and develop a different kind of dialogue.
Marcus School Experience Grade 2

Marcus is from the highlands and is in his second year of teacher training. He came to Madang Teacher College after completing Grade 10 through the College of Distance Education. He is slightly older than other students and is an independent and engaging student who socialises widely and likes to express his ideas. Marcus liked to talk about his work in a strategic sort of way, I often felt incomplete in his presence, not being able to read everything he meant, misreading some things. Throughout School Experience he observed and explored as much as he could in an effort to learn everything possible. He is here recording his observations of School Experience at Sagalau Community School, about ten minutes walk from MTC. The children at the school are from surrounding villages and settlements. The visit begins with Marcus and fellow students observing the class teacher go through various morning activities.

Visit 1:
We the student-teachers watched with observation mood as the grade 2 class proceeded with Wednesday’s normal teaching program. According to my observation, the objective of the first 15 minutes class was to enable the children to know the day, date, week, term and the year. As I pondered deeply to see how english language applies in the lesson, I observed that children learned much of the tenses. Example: The teacher asked, when was yesterday? When is today? and when will be tomorrow? (days of the week given as answers) The children answered with correct tenses.

The first lesson ended, and the children were asked to gather together to the front. I as the student’s leader distributed two each, a boy and a girl to each student-teacher. I took the remaining boys outside to the shade of a tree. We sat together, and I started introducing myself. The three boys did the same, and then went onto the short stories based on our experiences. I then asked them to write me the same story in pidgin as the language they used. The peculiar thing I discovered among all my three children, was that they could not write into words or structure up a short sentence. So I helped them out with spelling of words, and structure of sentences.

Comments
My general comments in experiencing the situation I would like to comment that collaborating with children of such lower grades earns less learning. Most of our time
budgeted for learning through observation, less assistance and reporting spent on spelling words, putting words together, and correct placing of punctuations. For instance, of three children I had to help them write three sentences at a time. That weakens my energy and I recommend that we should be given one of the upper grades, so that we can collaborate and learn more at this given time. According to my personal assessment of the hour class with grade 2 children, I would say it was a waste of time. The young children were not interested in any of the activities that were programmed for us to use during our class. Even further they could not write. With me taking three children, I had to spend most of the time spelling words, structuring sentences and accurately place punctuation.

Marcus was visibly disturbed by the prospect of taking a lower grades class. Outside the classroom before we were introduced to the Grade 2 class, he asked me to change his group to an upper grades class. He could not see that he could learn much about teaching by working with children who could not read and write. Smothering my concern, I told him that in the future he might be given a lower grades class and then what would he do, that he would be required to be able to teach across all the grades. His record reflects these concerns. I sensed his discomfort, and sensed that he felt some embarrassment that he was to work with small children, that it wasn’t a male domain and not mentally challenging. I made a mental note to observe his group. I noted that in his dividing of the children he divided to himself all boys and went outside and sat with them under a tree, facing away from the classroom.

His entry reveals an intense reflective orientation characteristic of his disposition.

‘We the student-teachers watched with observation mood’ ... ‘As I pondered deeply’ ... ‘I observed ... ‘

He outlines a concern for how he and other students' might benefit from the experience, a worry about what children were capable of doing, how well they were able to ‘write into words or structure up short sentences’ and how much ‘energy’ would be expended by him in the exercise. I sensed that he did not want to become a subject of this discourse; that he was concerned with how he would be constituted as a teacher in the context of this activity. When reading his account, I noted how he asked the boys without hesitation to write their stories ‘in Pidgin as the language they used’.

Marcus’ concerns reflect his interest in learning about children and teaching through collaborative observation of older children (where lecturers and teachers together
observe lessons). It is a position that I do not reject, but retain the view that engaging
directly with children results in different kinds of knowledge and different kinds of
inquiries. I see this as a new experience for Marcus one that I hope will be educative,
which will increase his ability to negotiate the situation-specific complexities of
teaching.

Visit 2:
My children were not fearful as of last week. When I greeted them they responded
confidently. Their reactions indicated willingness to cooperate and work on their story.
They kicked off straight away but at times asked me to help them with spelling words.
That was their second draft.

Among my group was a new child, who was absent during the first week. The child is
David aged 8 transferred from Manam island. He wrote a very peculiar story. His
peculiar style or feature of ‘word-structure’ can be termed as only ‘pronounceable’
words structure to real English words.

Example: “eesttedi” means “yesterday”. Sample of a sentence: “ieesttedi ai wet tu the
maket en bai sam fihs.” Translation - “Yesterday I went to the market and buy some
fish.”

The child was interviewed by Mr P and he confidently answered his questions. Mr P
then took the paper away for further investigation of how he develops such features of
words structure. Further than that I observed that children lacked spelling words, but
they are good at structuring words according to their pronunciation. At this time its
important that children should be closely coached on sentence structures and logical
thinking pattern. As time runs on the children can correct their spelling words. I also
noted that children learn quickly through repeated chanting of word, words, numbers
sentences etc. They can not do individual study, exercises etc.

    This week Marcus moved into the classroom. Despite last week’s concerns he
took up the task of teaching the Grade Two boys. When I came to his group he showed
me David’s story. As Marcus noted,

    His peculiar style or feature of ‘word-structure’ can be termed as only
‘pronounceable’ words structure(d) (like) real English words.
The story was interesting because it was unlike any that the other children were writing
or I had seen written before. It had a particular structure and coherence, and involved a
number of lexical and orthographical contrasts with both English and Pidgin. In
essence it was a phonetic rendering of English. Marcus had difficulty breaking the
code as the story was not readable in either language. I noted how my interest aroused
his curiosity and he began to look closely at what the boys were doing.
At this point Marcus conceptualises more specifically what he considers needs to be
done. ‘At this time its important that children should be closely coached on sentence
structures and logical thinking pattern’, in doing so he begins to define for himself a
pedagogy of children’s writing. He notes that these children learn through group
chorusing and lack the ability for ‘individual’ study. Within this view of learning it
seems the idea that study can and should be ‘individual’ is an important end. This is an
important observation it places Marcus in the position of having to provide not only
lesson structure but also meaning.

Visit 3:
Our usual sitting place was already occupied. The three children looked curiously at me
for the next place that I can choose. When I once more looked around in the classroom I
could not locate any big vacant space for us to sit, so I asked the three children, “where
shall we sit?”. One child, by the name of David, said, “why not go outside?” The other
children supported him and said, “yes teacher lets go outside”. I said, “yes”, and I saw
the faces of the children were brightened with smile.
We came out and sat under the shade of the mango tree. The children so excitedly
exchanged their own words as communication proceeded with their story writing. One
peculiar thing I noticed from the young boy David. David used his manner for

---

When I spoke with David, I asked him if he had been to school at Manam Island. He
said he had attended a ‘tok ples’ mission school where they were taught Pidgin (as the
local language (tok ples)) and English. He gave me permission to make a copy of his
story. David had learned the spelling conventions for Pidgin words and was applying
them to English words.

**David's story with English and Pidgin translations**
leesttedi ai wet tu the maket en (Yesterday I went to the market and/Asde mi go long
maket na)
bai sam fihs (buy some fish/bai sampela pis)
ai si the fren (I see the friend/mi lukim pren)
ai tok wit him (I talk with him/mi tok long em)
ai wet to owm (I went to home/mi go long haus)
ai si mada is tokin (I see mother is talking/mi lukim mama em toktok)
si gib mi wota (she give me water/em givim mi wara)
borrowing a fellow pupils rubber or cleaner. He said, ‘Mate, may I borrow your rubber?’ The word amazed me was ‘mate’. He should have called the owner by name, or other names but he sensitively used a good word to borrow the item, which most children of his age never use. Most grabbed the item that they want before they excused the owner.

Also I observed that the three children helped each other materially and with words. They cooperated to get their stories completed. Example, when a child does not know a word, and so reluctant to ask me, he asked his fellow child to help spell the word. We started conferencing for the third draft, but it was time, so we put it off and we will complete it during the next class.

There is nowhere to sit, Marcus asks the boys. David suggests outside and he agrees. He reads the faces of these boys and notes their approval of his decision. He notes the enthusiasm with which they do their work. He notes their cooperative and collaborative interactions. Marcus records his observations, but little of his feelings. What I note is the developing relation between Marcus and these boys, marked by increasing familiarity and the extent to which the boys appear unencumbered. Marcus’ attention is captured by the unexpected. He notes David’s unusual expression and ‘manner’ and deepens his reading of how children interact cooperatively, how they share ‘materially and with words’. I note how David stimulates cooperative social relations in the group. How the children establish a collective social identity. Marcus notes how others beside the teacher (peers in particular) are sources of learning. I note how the boys are teaching Marcus and me. I note also that teaching, at this point, is more a product of the boys’ responses to the situation and what they bring to the task, than what Marcus is doing for them.

Visit 4:

One amazing or fascinating thing I use to notice is about the way or methods of how children learn. Each wednesday’s morning lesson that I observed the children of lower grades adopted different techniques of learning and remembering. They adopted ‘repeated chanting learning’. I believe this must be different from upper grades methods of learning. They learned through individual study, writing, drawing, reasoning etc. Individual learning is good, but it depends on each child’s initiatives, talents, gifted talents etc.
I observed that ‘repeated chanting learning’ is good and very effective. They chanted each phrase, stanza, or a whole paragraph as a song, and so they continually chanted the whole paragraph recorded in their minds. Also they helped each other. Eg. A child read three words only, but can continue because his or her classmates helped him or her complete the sentence.

We conferenced to draft the final story I asked them to see if they can see any difference of words and punctuation between my drafted story and theirs. Their body language of nodding indicated yes. I asked again and they said ‘yes’ They said ‘O yes teacher, our words are wrong’ I asked them further ‘have you seen any words like this before?’ and they replied ‘yes’ I asked again why not you write these words? and they said, ‘we can’t remember it.’

In reading Marcus’ account I note his continued interest in making observations during the morning activities and an absence of directly interrogating his own thoughts and feelings.

In the observation period before the class is divided Marcus distinguishes what he calls ‘repeated chanting learning’ from ‘individual learning’, or public from private kinds of learning. In drawing the distinction, he acknowledges that each has a place. Marcus sees the effectiveness of ‘repeated chanting learning’ in terms of how it benefits children, ‘who read three words only, but can continue because his or her classmates helped him or her complete the sentence’. This common practice, I read as a kind of indirect collaborative dialogue where children ‘speak’ and ‘listen’ to each other in the midst of chorused recitation, a moment when children are both learners and teachers. What appears as a homogenised class response is in reality a different performance for/from each child, a moment of pedagogic heteroglossia where children are taught by and teach, multiple others. Children’s collaborations are underpinned by community discourses of reciprocity and are manifest in these instances as the ‘giving of words’.

Immersed in collaborative culture, Marcus picks up on this as a kind of social learning and draws a parallel with learning a song.

They chanted each phrase, stanza, or a whole paragraph as a song, and so they continually chanted the whole paragraph recorded in their minds.

I note that Marcus’ writing pedagogy comes more into focus. He shows the boys his model of a recount. I note his conference focus on comparing words and punctuation. I read that the boys consider their words to be wrong, that even though they are known to
them they cannot remember them. I consider that the boys have engaged in writing as a collective act but that writing is most often viewed as an 'individual' act of articulation, that at school it is often expected to be 'individual' work. I see how such ideologies might be destructive to practices that value and require collective memory. In the absence of a literate tradition, these boys draw upon the cultural capital they possess, their writing is a situational product of their collective minds. I reflect how schooling can cut off access to the collective mind/memory of the community and disrupt indigenous expectations of collective support.

There is something about Marcus' sense of meaning (what he's not saying, to me) which confronts my backroom efforts to shape his practice. What is he doing/not doing? And yet when I make the effort to tune in, I find that I am being informed in unanticipated ways.

Visit 5:

I asked them whether they satisfy with their final draft and they said 'yes'.

'We looked at your written words and compared with ours and where we see difference we made change of our words'.

I asked them again whether they learned these new words and they responded with soft smile, which indicated, "no". I then let them finish their illustration. After some minutes, I asked them to read their own story. Each one did but with slowness. Some can not even pronounce their own words. So I helped them pronounce the words. One child by the name of David asked me to pronounce his own word, "ieestedi" - which he meant to write, "yesterday". That gives me a reflection, how can a child write a word that he or she can't pronounce? But that means its a difference of time before a child catches everything. So its clear that a child has to lack some areas and be good in other areas until full education flourishes in him. And also the child can learn more from his mistake.

To commence the lesson Marcus questions the boys about how they feel about their final drafts,

I asked them whether they satisfy with their final draft and they said 'yes'.

Continuing to probe, he asks if they have learned the new words.

I asked them again whether they learned these new words and they responded with soft smile, which indicated, "no".
What defines this moment goes beyond a situational construction to the mediating presence of community-based discourses.

It is the nature of the dialogue that reveals their positions. Marcus, as teacher, asks for their report, the boys speak directly that they are satisfied.

'We looked at your written words and compared with ours and where we see difference we made change of our words.'

In response to the second question, they respond indirectly, their smile marking their membership in community discourses. Marcus reads the 'smile' in terms of discourse with which he is also accustomed. In these small exchanges community-based discourses mediate teaching and learning.

In turning his attention to the boys' writing, Marcus sees David in a moment of confusion in the midst of a learning moment and is confused himself.

...how can a child write a word that he or she can't pronounce?

He reflects that 'lack' and educational 'fullness are mutually informing conditions of learning which are mediated by time. That a child can learn 'more' from mistakes than from certainties. I see Marcus in a transforming moment, distilling a view of learning as uncertain, variable, and unpredictable brought about by not excluding the confusions he confronts from a reflective gaze.

Visit 6:

A good healthy program for the children to develop their speaking skills is the daily program of children reporting to fellow children what they've done. Each child is rostered to report any actual events he or she has done or witnessed. Time allocation is good for it depends on the length of the story, which means there is no limitation or given time. I see it as a healthy program for it helps the child in so many ways. The child develops speech skills, confident in him or herself and utilising learned words, and can structure sentences.

One child's presentation draws my special attention. It indicates that the child lacks wordings. Each time, when the child wants to structure her sentences she has to come closer to Mr K's ear for his words. She used Mr K as an informant machine. She herself cannot structure sentences using her own words. So whatever the child gets from Mr K she presents to the class.
In my group I’ve noticed that the children are so sensitive with the words. Whatever words the other children asked me to spell it for them, they just wrote it down, even though it doesn’t make any sense to the sentence.

*In the 15 minutes before the writing session Marcus observes morning talks. What he sees are children sharing experiences, developing ‘speech skills’, ‘utilising learned words’, and ‘structur(ing) sentences. What most interests Marcus is a girl who ‘lacks wordings’, who uses her teacher as a translator, an ‘informant’ like his own children who ask for words to write down, ‘even though it doesn’t make any sense to the sentence’.*

I look at these circumstances and see the discourses of schooling reproducing themselves as primary discourses, the girl dependent upon the teacher for words to speak herself into existence. Children collecting words (or words collecting children). One reading is to view this girl’s participation as one of dependence, and while this characterises parts of her performance, this single reading risks ignoring the dialogical nature of the interaction between herself and the experience she is recalling where her experiences inform the words, captures them and makes them work for her. There are too many examples of the way English and its literacy have been appropriated for local purposes to suggest that subject positions/locations are not inherently heteroglossic or interdiscoursal, or that ‘to speak’, is to assume only one subject position within one discourse. (See Kulick & Stroud 1993; Pennycook 1994)

> Words, expressions, propositions, etc. change their meaning according to the positions held by those who use them, which signifies that they find their meanings by reference to those positions, ie by reference to the ideological formations ... in which those positions are inscribed. (Pecheux in Pennycook (1994:31)

What Marcus sees on this occasion I would suggest are the ‘conditions of possibility for engaging in the social practice of using ‘English’ ... and the conditions and possibility for taking up positions in the discourses created by knowing English.’ (Pennycook (1994:31) What is to be seen is the extent to which the schooling she engages is able to deliver her to the point where those possibilities are present, recognisable and realisable, the point where the uncertainties of the world collide with the certainties of the mind, for as Marcus once remarked,
It's always the case where we the silent majority will be at the edge of the receiving line. (Class discussion)

Visit 7:
Each one hour time I spend with my four child, I observe that the children are progressing in recount story and imaginative story writing. At the very beginning, a child spent four to five minutes writing sentence comprised of five to seven words eg. 'One day a boy got a doll.' Seven words sentence. But as we conferenced together and helped each other with words, spellings, punctuation, grammars etc. they made a great improvement. They must take less time to write a complete sentence comprising more than 6-7 words. Most of the children I worked with tend to learn from their previous mistakes. They learn little by little.

A good example that I can write about my observation, especially in relation to children's improvement. Like a tank containing a lot of water, where it cannot find a hole to run out, so are the children who compiled in their minds the words they picked up from reading, speaking, and listening. As the water blocked, so are these words blocked in the mind. When providing such opportunities to write, it is like creating a hole for the water to run out, and then can only be released by the people, the content of the water in the tank. So as related, children realise their own capacity of words, and it further reflects the amount of knowledge especially the child's knowledge of words, grammar and punctuation etc. Its good to give such writing projects to children at these lower grades.

In reading this account I find it informative to read it alongside earlier entries, in the context of the observations Marcus has been theorising. I read Marcus' observation, 'As we conferenced together ... they made a great improvement', as an acknowledgment of the intersubjective dimension of his teaching. His statement that, 'They learn little by little' as an example of the clarity through which he is coming to view these experiences. His analogy that writing is like a blocked tank of water waiting to be holed (that it provides opportunities for children to come to know what they know), is an opposition to the notion that children's heads are empty and waiting to be filled. And that '(i)t is good to give such writing projects to children at these lower grades' as a re-vision of an earlier disposition.
I see what amounts to a shift in aspects of Marcus' thinking to be an effect of the way these teaching experiences have been transformed into learning. He has confronted various circumstances and degrees of epistemic complexity and has qualitatively altered his judgement. There are no absolute ways of accounting for these shifts, as Milner suggests.

Discourses become self-consciously theoretical, which is another way of saying that they become self-reflexive, as a general rule only when their subject matters become in some sense problematic. ' (Milner in Fulcher 1996)

These moments of insight Marcus experiences, represent to me a layering of new meanings after a stirring of sediments. While the settling may be momentary, however, they are meanings that differ in their logic from either/or binary statements possessing deeper metaphorical complexity.

Entry 8:

Some of the very effective educational attitudes children demonstrated in their learning are the cooperativeness and sharing. I have observed this at the commencement of our observation till the latest day - dated 21st April 199-. I believe their spirit of togetherness, in sharing material wealth, knowledge and peering qualities is coincided with their stage of development. This is very interesting because apart from teacher teaching the children during official hours, the children learnt a lot themselves. I proved this from the group of four children that I observed. Each day we met, I observed closely that the four of them helped each other in one way or another. Most times I observed that the children helped each other with the words they know. Especially, spell the words for their fellow students who does not know. Eg. One time David said, 'Teacher can you spell me garden? Just before I spell the first letter, Arike, a fellow child rushed in and said g-a-r-d-e-n, 'garden'. Then the next time, Sangai said, 'Teacher can you spell me home?' and again Arike rushed in and said h-o-m-e. They even helped each other with words, sentences, dates etc. They also helped each other materially like pencil, rubber etc. I think this is a very healthy method of normal education. Children helping children should be encouraged by their teacher, so that as they help each other they can learn more.

Marcus notes how the boys interact and support their learning through their social network.
This is very interesting because apart from teacher teaching the children during official hours, the children learnt a lot themselves. I proved this from the group of four children that I observed. Each day we met, I observed closely that the four of them helped each other in one way or another. Most times I observed that the children helped each other with the words they know.

Here the boys demonstrate again an independence of activity that Marcus approves of, particularly the disposition to share knowledge and things. The ‘academic’ expression ‘stage of development’ usually applied to individuals is used to help explain the sociality of what he observes. There is, however, no direct recognition of the influence of community practices or the regime of social expectations that the underpin the boys interactions. Nor does Marcus explore his own feelings of why he feels the way he does about the boys behaving as ‘teachers’, only to say,

I think this is a very healthy method of normal education. Children helping children should be encouraged by their teacher, so that as they help each other they can learn more.

This, however, is an important observation that Marcus makes, for these kinds of participations can be found in other places to disrupt notions of ‘doing own work’, ‘copying’ and some of schoolings more segregatory practices.

Visit 9:

As I’ve observed and participated in the Expository writing activity visit 9. I’ve detected great differences of learning between literary writing and recount writing. The children as centre of our concern have demonstrated different attitudes of better understanding, memorising, word usage and sentence structure. It proved to me during our activity of ‘Naming Parts of Plants’ that child seemed to visualise things and thus learned with inner joy. It was really a joyful and open learning. Children answered and described the plant parts freely. When I asked a question like, ‘What is this?’ holding a bread fruit shell, both children raised their hands. Then I asked them again to tell me anything that they can tell me, and they said ‘it is hard, it has a cover inside, it is brown’ etc. When I asked them the same question after some minutes, they still respond with the same answers. This indicates a great difference of learning attitudes. Children learn better and memorise better with inner joy when using concrete materials. To further prove this, their attitude during recount writing and literary writing activities were different. They were tensed, frustrated, short of words, takes long to write and think of a
sentence. Most times they asked teacher to help them. But with objects in hand, they
can write and name it quickly. Even to draw, they drew quickly and accurately.
Therefore we can undoubtedly believe in the Piaget’s theory of ‘Concrete Operational
Stage’ (for) the children at the age of seven (7) to eleven (11). So we as teachers of
tomorrow should closely apply Piaget’s theory in coinciding with lesson programs.

In shifting between writing activities, Marcus notes a difference in the boys’
responses. In expository writing involving ‘concrete materials’ the boys respond
enthusiastically they are able to ‘visualise’ and answer questions based on their
observations. They respond with ‘inner joy’, with great interest. What breaks through
in this shift between activities is an awareness of other more empirical discourses,
which inform the way the boys learn. What Marcus describes is the way situational
meaning is constructed through strong contextualisation of knowledge.

Children answered and described the plant parts freely. When I asked a
question like, ‘What is this?’ holding a bread fruit shell, both children raised
their hands. Then I asked them again to tell me anything that they can tell me,
and they said ‘it is hard, it has a cover inside, it is brown’ etc. When I asked
them the same question after some minutes, they still respond with the same
answers.

I note the way these exchanges constitute transcendent states in both the teacher and
the children and their relationship to discourses of ‘play’ being juxtaposed with the
tensions and frustrations accompanying other kinds of writing, ‘short of words’,
‘tak(ing) long time to write and think of a sentence’, ‘ask(ing) teacher for help’. I note
Marcus’ observations that ‘children learn better and memorise (remember) better with
inner joy when using concrete materials’, and his momentary confirming of the work of
Piaget. I see this as a theorising of children’s inner states and interactions in terms of
development theory, as part of a heteroglossic mix of training pedagogy, as part of the
role of theory to engage experience.

Visit 10:
I asked my 4 children about the activities that we have done during visit 9. Their
responses drew my special attention. The peculiar thing is the other two boys can
answer my questions where as the other two can not answer any of my questions.
Seeing the two boy’s curiosity I asked the four children to spell me the word ‘shell’ and
the two boys who were with me spell accurately the word, and the other boys cannot. I pretended looking away and while doing that one of the absentees whispered to Arike, ‘How did you spell the word shell?’ When I looked at them, Arike turned around and spelled the word s-h-e-l-l. From this, I just picked up several things. First thing that comes to my mind is that the word is not useful to any context at that moment, but that the child just want to know so that the absentee can be in line with the other children. And so from this point I could say that the child is self motivated to learn. Second thing that I’ve noticed, the child are cooperate learners. They helped each other in learning and that means they are teachers to each other. Through this the children learned a lot themselves. The child’s curiosity also mean a lot to us teachers. It means they don’t know, so we can help them. I finally do recommend this type of learning, children helping children should be emphasised so that upon hearing each other they learned a lot.

Marcus revisits the activities of the previous week and notes that not all the boys can answer his questions. The two absent boys are ‘curious’ to find out more. Marcus’ charade demonstrates his great interest in the motivations and behaviours of the boys. I note that Marcus recognises the informing and constituting influence of ‘context’ in making the lesson meaningful and memorable, that without a supporting situation the new words the boys are learning are ‘not useful to any context at that moment’. Marcus furthers the interests the boys have in being ‘in line’ with each other, that they know what the others know,

... the child just want to know so that the absentee can be in line with the other children

Coupled to these observations, is Marcus’ continuing observation regarding the cooperativeness of the children,

... that means they are teachers to each other ... that upon hearing each other they learned a lot.

I note how this observation might be broadened, children as teachers. What is thrown into critical relief here are the conventional roles of teachers and learners through the recognition that all social interaction is didactic (informing), including the interactions we have with our ‘selves’. Marcus himself being immersed in these circumstances, and what in these accounts appears as an unmarked classroom genre. In conclusion, Marcus perhaps misses the extent to which he is also responsible for the boys’ curiosity in jointly constructing learning contexts in which they feel comfortable to express it.
Entry 11:
From visit 1 to visit 11 I’ve closely observed that children learnt English in so many ways. They learned through speaking, writing, listening and reading. One good method that I’ve observed during visit 11 was telling stories and questioning. A child had his or her turn to the front and told his or her story to the class. When the child finished the story, the rest of the children asked good and proper questions and the storyteller mindfully answered the questions. One example, a child by the name of Arike told a good story about ‘went fishing’, to the class. Then when he finished, a child questioned him, ‘Did you catch any fish?’ another child asked him another lead up question, ‘how many fish did you catch? and Arike said, ‘many fish’. Many children asked him many different questions, he carefully answered all questions. The lesson as of this type should be recommended for it is a lesson with so many children participating in the lesson, and even so, they learned a lot in such class learning. Also practice using the words learned is important than just learning vocabulary after vocabulary. Also children at this stage must know how to ask proper questions at proper times and questions related to the content of the story.

*Marcus summarises his visits with some general observations about learning English and makes particular mention of the learning that occurs when children engage in ‘telling stories’ to the rest of the class and answering follow-up questions. On the one hand, it is the level of participation, practice, learning and questioning which attracts Marcus attention of not just competent individuals like Arike. The lesson as of this type should be recommended for it is a lesson with so many children participating in the lesson, and even so, they learned a lot in such class learning. Also practice using the words learned is important than just learning vocabulary after vocabulary.*

There are those like David and Arike who speak and understand more English, they possess the cultural capital which marks their participation as exemplary, there are others noted by Marcus who are not named whose performances are struggling and in need of support. These observations, however, are sufficient for Marcus to suggest the benefits that come from children talking to and with each other.

Discussion
During the period of School Experience Marcus’ focus was shared between the boys in the group and the early morning activities of their class. His observational interests (outwardly, as opposed to inwardly introspective) are divided between the two. Both are dominant intertexts in defining in these circumstances, Marcus’ views of teaching and learning, as well as helping him to resolve wider related questions. For example, through his observations and reflections, Marcus is able to go some way towards theorising the difference between working with lower and upper grades children.

Each wednesday’s morning lesson that I observed the children of lower grades adopted different techniques of learning and remembering. They adopted ‘repeated chanting learning’. I believe this must be different from upper grades methods of learning. They learned through individual study, writing, drawing, reasoning etc. Individual learning is good, but it depends on each child’s initiatives, talents, gifted talents etc. (Visit 4)

With respect to the boys and their writing tasks, his most common observation is their cooperative group behaviour and how that behaviour influences their learning. Woven into his comments are strands of the discourses Marcus confronts and those that he has brought with him. These are ‘socialising’ influences, what Marcus ‘discovers’ and accepts. The boys’ behaviour, for example, is a defining feature of Marcus’ school experience, particular the way they organise their work.

Some of the very effective educational attitudes children demonstrated in their learning are the cooperativeness and sharing ... I believe their spirit of togetherness, in sharing material wealth, knowledge and peering qualities is coincided with their stage of development. (Visit 8)

Marcus brings with him a pedagogical orientation which values independent work, his initial experience,

I had to spend most of the time spelling words, structuring sentences and accurately place punctuation. (Visit 1)

is transformed (initially through David’s influence) to a situation where the boys work less dependently on him and more dependently on one another. For Marcus cooperative learning is ‘normal’ education, learning which is linked to the ‘norms’ of the wider community.
They even helped each other with words, sentences, dates etc. They also helped each other materially like pencil, rubber etc. I think this is a very healthy method of normal education.

What is less noticed are the ways that he and the boys are engaged in masculinist discourse through the bonds they develop and the recognition of ‘independence’ and self-reliance. Marcus’ use of the word ‘children’ instead of ‘boys’ throughout his accounts marks a blindness to the qualifying influences of gender and the attendant worlds of gender socialisation. Perhaps it is instructive that Marcus’ only account of girl’s learning is where the girl is almost totally reliant on the teacher.

Each time, when the child wants to structure her sentences she has to come closer to Mr K’s ear for his words. She used Mr K as an informant machine. She herself cannot structure sentences using her own words. So whatever the child gets from Mr K she presents to the class. (Visit 6)

Theorising may bring with it a sense of understanding, which may also have a hegemonic effect, temporarily blocking out discourses and contradictions and the need to scrutinise further. What amounts to seeing the world for a moment in terms of an answer to a question, is held up at the expense of failing to see answers as also determinate of more questions, more uncertainty. There is always the question that asks to what extent we are captives of our questions, theories and experiences. For me Marcus’ accounts have provided a clearer awareness of some of my own horizons. Despite his lack of articulated introspection I read his accounts as reflecting an indigenous sensitivity that is not so apparent in other students accounts, particularly in his departure from the focus of reflections that was proposed and his pursuit of interests which to him were more relevant.

Teachers work in the midst of a stream of students, practices and circumstances, every now and then something or someone disrupts the flow more than usual. They bring to the stream some turbulence that makes things a little clearer. This has been as much the case for me as it has been for Marcus.
Mona School Experience Grade 2

Mona is from both Momase and Highlands regions. She is a quiet, reserved and friendly student who does not socialise widely. I see Mona each week, twice in class and once at School Experience. Each Wednesday at around 7:30am we travel on the college bus to Metro community school. On arrival the students separate themselves to their classes to look for their children. It is near the end of the wet season, the school has been built in a low lying area and some of the classrooms have flooded. The Grade Two classrooms are at the back of the school, unlike most of the other classrooms they are small and made from bush materials with rough dirt floors, the desks sit unevenly, there is no lighting and on these grey wet mornings the rooms are dark and damp. Some of the student teachers take their children outside and work under the eaves of other classrooms where it is drier and lighter. Mona sits close to another group on a small dry concrete slab at the back of the grade six classroom. I see her working closely with her group seated in a circle the children only turning away when leaning on the cement to write. The conditions are uncomfortable and distracting it is sometimes difficult to keep focussed, but Mona seems to make every effort to hold the interest of her group in the hours she is with them.

Visit 1:

There were three grade two children involved their names were Elijah Dana and Nancy. I took behind a classroom and found a good place to sit down then I introduced myself to them, later they introduced themselves to me. Then I explained the little activity to them I started by telling the children a short story about the weekend, after that I asked them to tell me their stories. The three of them told me their stories of what they did after school. When they finished I gave them papers to write their stories on. At the end I found that only Elijah wrote a short story but the girls only wrote words that they thought of.

Feelings

I felt that only Elijah understood what to do whereas the two girls didn’t understand anything. I even made myself clear by explaining in both English and Pidgin but the two girls just couldn’t do the right thing. Although it was only my first practice I was already upset and angry when they kept on doing the wrong thing I felt very bad about
myself because it looked as if I was wasting my time explaining over and over again. When they couldn’t catch up I felt as if I wouldn’t make a good teacher.  

**Comments**

I think this experience is a good start for us it is good to start working with children at this time so we can understand how children learn, so when we go out the job may be easy for us, especially in trying to write short stories using simple words.

**Plans**

During my next visit I’ve decided to work very closely with the three children. For Elijah I will help him to extend his story by asking some questions. As for Nancy and Dana I will work closely with them and help them to spell difficult words. I will also help them to pronounce words properly for them. This will probably help them to write better sentences.

---

**Other student-teachers beginning experiences and responses**

*For the teaching I’d say that it was a helpful one because the children came up with what I expected them to do and for the children’s learning I’m sure they’ve learnt something because they managed to do their work. (Garoni, female)*

I did enjoy the part at the beginning that’s when we were telling stories but it when came to the second part where they were going to write the story I was abit angry because they can’t spell simple words and write them correctly. Anyway its not their fault, but its the way they are learning according to individual differences, some of them learn faster and some learn very slowly but I think its not a problem because its just the beginning of their schooling to be in grade two. I think these children need more time to write down alphabetical words and spelling, they also need more time so they can practice writing stories so they can get more ideas. They must also follow the school rule which states that children must speak english at all times so that they can improve their work. Also teachers must encourage them on that rule. (Alis, female)

*On that Wednesday when we went into that TESOL period I had two kids, I took them to a shade tree where we sat down. Under the shade tree I told them about myself and where I come from. They to introduced themselves to me and I told them write what they did during the weekend and they wrote what they thought of. These kids started off their sentences with ‘One day’ and they never wrote many things. When looking through their work I was sad and worried because I will not do my TESOL task well because I see nothing from them. They wrote less and they also said nothing. I feel nothing from them, they looked away as I was talking, anyway nothing went well. I thought my teaching went well but because they did not concentrate nothing went well. The children learned nothing. I tried my very best to get them to concentrate but they kept looking away, so I decided to try my best to work close with these two kids and I’ll also make sure that they get to know me by next week, I’ll also try my best that they learn something next time. As far as I’m concerned these two kids need to have more assistance from teachers and I’m there to try and help out. (Tobo, male)*
In Mona’s efforts to stimulate a good learning environment she is frustrated by the two girls who ‘just couldn’t do the right thing’ and subsequently feels a lessening of confidence and ‘anger’ that she will not ‘make a good teacher’. In these first few moments, Mona’s sense of self is challenged by what she sees as the inadequate performances of these children. Such thoughts are countered by her comments that ‘this experience is a good start for us’, that it is a time to ‘understand how children learn’. It is within the construction of these tensions, particularly between the children’s performances and the construction of her credibility as a teacher, that Mona plays out and reflects upon these first teaching moments. In her plans, it is questions and extension for Elijah and pronunciation and spelling for the girls.

At the time, I do not have any immediate concerns when these frustrations are expressed but acknowledge the emotional investment that Mona has in this work and how important it must be to her. I see her thinking through what are important elements of her relationship with these children, how a particular teaching disposition is being constituted and how these are mediated by the pedagogy employed. I notice also how she feels that ‘explaining over and over again ‘looked as if I was wasting time’; and wonder did she feel under observation? Perhaps I am missing something early in the experience. I have an interest in what I see as a separation between Elijah on the one hand and Dana and Nancy on the other. I also have an interest in the effects of the pedagogy (the learning procedures and ideologies), and the extent to which it is complicit in constructing positions of acceptance of or resistance to her observed differences among these children. I see Mona negotiating a way ahead with her interest in working closely and individually with these children. My interest is in how she is constituted by these moments, what subject positions she takes up, in what is resisted, confirmed or changed. I note her being unexpectedly and uncomfortably positioned by the contradictions inherent in her own expectations of children’s performances, a fracturing of the ideological determinism that teaching equals learning, feeling like she’s teaching at the wrong end of the ‘Bell’ curve.

Visit 2:

Elijah, Nancy Dana and I went to or favourite place there I said good morning to them and then I asked if they still remembered what they wrote the week before. Elijah raised his hand and told me exactly what he had written on his paper, but Dana and Nancy didn’t say a word. Later I gave back their papers and told them to continue from
where they'd stopped but before I did so I asked them to read to me what was on the paper from the previous activity. Without hesitating Elijah read his story. His was very good so I told him to read it to himself again and try to shorten the sentences by putting fullstops where necessary. Next I asked Nancy to read her story on her paper she only had the beginning, "yesterday I went" and nothing else but when she was reading she added some words which were not on the paper. When she had finished I told her to write what she said by helping her to spell some words. With Dana it was very difficult because different words were written on her paper and the words didn't make a sentence. She even didn't know what the words were although she asked me to spell the words for her in the previous lesson. So I helped her by rearranging the words to form a sentence and finally she had a sentence written.

Feelings

Although I felt like giving up this time I tried my best to help Nancy and Dana because I knew it was my job to help them learn. This time I communicated mainly in pidgin and I felt that Dana and Nancy understood very well what I expected them to do the only problem with them was spelling they expected me to spell every word for them which I think wasn't very good.

Comments

As far as I'm concerned I reckon this is a very good start for people like me to get involved with young school children and find out where they find most difficulties so that I can try to help them. But one question which I would like to know the answer to is 'how can I stop the slow learners from asking me to spell every word for them?'

Plan

In my next visit I've decided not to spell as many words as I can for the children, instead I've decided to just help them along by pronouncing the words or making the sound of the letters to them, so that they write the words by themselves. I think this would be much better, instead of spoonfeeding them.

Mona is constituted in and by her questions 'how can I stop the slow learners from asking me to spell every word for them?'. In her plans she suggests deciding to help them 'by pronouncing the words or making the sound of the letters to them, so that they write the words by themselves'. Mona draws upon the commonly used expression 'spoonfeeding' to mark an antithetical position to her preferred teaching orientation. The notion of 'spoonfeeding is left unexplored. It is a term that is commonly used to
refer to a particular pedagogical relationship between teachers and children where the
teacher provides knowledge on demand from the child with little apparent effort on the
child’s part. The wide uncritical rejection of this pedagogical position among student-
teachers and lecturers leaves little room for reclassifying some of the ambiguities that
arise when working with children for whom the lesson content and language of
instruction are new. What is not often seen is the role of ‘spoonfeeding’ in moving into
a position of joint construction, rather than into total dependence upon the teacher.
Mona does not totally discount ‘spoonfeeding’, she is aware of the children’s need for
such support as exemplified in her use of Pidgin and assistance with spelling. Her
concern is to find something ‘much better’.

Visit 3:
This time Elijah was absent so I took Nancy and Dana and went behind a classroom. I
gave them their papers and asked them to read their stories to me. Nancy read her story
properly but still missed out some words as for Dana she still had difficulties. Dana
wasn’t able to read her story so I asked Nancy to read her story once more, then Dana
probably knew what her first word was because she realised that her first word
‘yesterday’ was the same as Nancy’s so when I asked to read her story she started off
by saying ‘yesterday’ but then stopped and looked away. I knew she was confused so I
asked ‘what did you do yesterday?’ and she said, ‘I go store’ but actually the sentence
‘Yesterday I went to the store’ was written on her paper but the difficulty she had was
that she didn’t know what the words were so I pointed to the two words ‘went’ and
‘store’ and told her what the words were and how they were pronounced and this time
she read it a bit better, so I went on asking questions, like, what did you do next?, what
did you buy? or what did you do with it?’ They gave me answers in pidgin so I asked
them to tell me in english they had difficulty so I repeated sentence in english and told
them to write it down. Finally Nancy and Dana were able to write a bit longer sentence.

Feelings
I feel that Dana and Nancy really need a lot of help in spelling they seem to be relying
on me for most of the words even simple words like ‘cook, go play and many more. I
know I shouldn’t blame them because its not their fault I should blame the class teacher
and myself therefore in the short time I spend with them I feel that its part of my job to
help them in their difficulties especially in spelling grammar and pronouncing words.

Comments
One thing which I realised about Dana was she seemed to stare into space while I’m talking she usually has this confusion look on her face and doesn’t look at me when I ask her questions in English she doesn’t answer but when I ask her in pidgin she answers me but the both of them still forget to write in capital letters for the beginning of a sentence.

**Plans**

Nancy and Dana were able to write a few words well without asking me to spell them so I’m sure they’ve learned to write these words already. Also, their story is getting longer so I think they should be finishing it off in the next visit. Therefore on the next visit I’ve decided to have the children read their stories to the group and also read their peers stories as well.

The teaching relation between Mona and the girls is quite involved. Mona sees Dana’s confusion and shifts from having Dana read to having her tell what she did. The follow up questioning, having the children try to translate their answers into English, the provision of words and grammar are Mona’s responses to the positions these children occupy in relation not just to her teaching, but also to the institutional orders schooling, its protocols, conventions and disciplines surrounding the use of English. In looking for a cause for the children’s difficulties she determines that it lies with herself and the class teacher, dominant subject positions within the discourses of schooling. The institutional assumptions that what is achievable for some children is achievable for all, is not considered. Nor are the wider social and cultural dislocations

55 inherent in Mona’s observation of Dana, in which

... she seemed to stare into space while I’m talking she usually has this confusion look on her face and doesn’t look at me when I ask her questions in English she doesn’t answer but when I ask her in pidgin she answers me, directly acknowledged.

In all this Elijah’s absence provides Mona with some space to work closely with these children, space that may not have been used in the same way had Elijah been there or had she been teaching an entire class.

---

55 There is a sense in which English may be viewed as both relocating and dislocating. Dana’s confusion and embarrassment signals more than a lack of knowledge of the code, but the marginalising of her linguistic and cultural inheritance.
Visit 4:
This morning I gave the children’s papers back and before I gave them clean papers to transfer their story I asked them to read their stories to me. Elijah read his story without much difficulties but Dana was unable to pronounce a few words like went, buy, rice and home. I helped Dana by pronouncing the words for her and then I asked her to read the story again. This time she was able to say the words correctly. As for Nancy, she read her story well but missed out some words. I asked her to look carefully at her paper and read her story again. This time she read well so I told them to exchange their stories with each other. After they changed their paper I asked them to read their friends story to me. Elijah read Nancy’s story very well but when it came to the two girls, they looked confused, especially Dana. She was holding onto Elijah’s story and looking a bit worried, maybe because Elijah’s story was long. So I told her to look carefully at her own story which was with Nancy. I asked her if she could see some words on her paper and Elijah’s paper which had the same spelling, she nodded her head so I asked her to tell me what they were. She slowly said “yesterday I went” and stopped. She couldn’t read the rest so I asked Elijah to tell us where he went to but without looking at his story. Elijah told us exactly where he went to and what he did which were written on his paper. Then I asked Dana to read the story again. She was trying very slowly until she finally read the story to us. With Nancy there wasn’t any of the difficulties because Dana’s story was short and Nancy could read all the words correctly. After they had read their peers stories to the group I gave them clean papers and told them to transfer their story onto it. I also provided them with some texture pens to draw pictures related to their stories. In the end Dana Elijah and Nancy had 3 short stories written.

Feelings
I felt a lot better today when the children gave me their finished work (stories). I was glad especially with Dana and Nancy because in the beginning I thought they wouldn’t have anything done. Now I think they’ve really understood and have learnt how to write short stories. I also feel that I’ve been a great help to the children and hope they will be able to write as many short stories as they can on their own.

Comments
After working with these children I’ve found out that they have learned some new things like spelling new words, pronouncing them and writing them. But one problem
which I’m still concerned about is the mixing of small and capital letters. Elijah, Dana and Nancy seem to mix the letters up. Although I’ve spoken to them and even corrected them the mistakes they seem to forget and still do the same mistakes.

**Plans**

During the next visit with the new activity I’ve decided to help the children in writing the letters. This is how I’ve planned to do it. I will write the letters of the alphabet from A to Z in capital letters then under or beside each letter I will write the small letters. I will also tell them that capital letters should be written to begin the sentence and after that rest of the words or letters should be in small letters, unless you want to begin a new sentence again.

*Mona records the way she scaffolds Dana’s reading, saying essentially, ‘do it like I do it’ (‘I helped Dana by pronouncing the words for her and then I asked her to read the story again. This time she was able to say the words correctly.’). When Dana’s efforts need further refinement Mona asks her to ‘look carefully’ and ‘read ... again’, saying essentially ‘do it like this’ (‘This time she read well ... ’). In her request for children to exchange stories to read out, she displays a tacit recognition that children’s stories be valued as heteroglossic, different voices and different readings. These appear to me as transforming aspects of Mona’s unfolding pedagogy. In the concluding activities I note what Mona considers to be needed to bring these children to a point of closure of this writing experience. I sense that some of the emotional investment has been rewarded when the children are able to bring to completion the writing they have been doing but note that Mona sees that there are aspects of the children’s writing which still require attention, difficulties they will bring with them into the writing sessions which are to follow.*

Elijah, Dana and Nancy seem to mix the letters up. Although I’ve spoken to them and even corrected them the mistakes they seem to forget and still do the same mistakes. During the next visit with the new activity I’ve decided to help the children in writing the letters.

---

56 The most obvious difficulty with the act of closure is that it can only be invoked artificially. Closure is ultimately an authoritative act that marginalises continuity, variation and uncertainty, artificially unifying disparities for the purposes of managing the curriculum and its clients.
Mona has interacted closely with her group, but does not classify this as 'spoonfeeding' despite the small steps she has taken with Dana. Mona's interests have become more immediately focussed as she plans to tackle the children's problem of 'mixing small and capital letters'.

Children's draft recounts

Elijah

Yesterday I went to the garden.
I broke my stick at the garden.
I went home.
I plant my flowers.
I went to the bed and I sleep.

Nancy

Yesterday I went home and play middle blo (ball) and wash nd eat rice Afte I sleep
no the bed

Dana

Yesterday i went to the store and i buy rice and i go home
i cook rice.

Visit 5:

I asked the children if they liked listening to stories and they all said yes. Then I showed the reading book and asked them to tell me the title of the book. The book was titled 'The Talking Pig'. Elijah and Nancy both said 'the' and didn't know what the next word was. Elijah mentioned the word 'pig' but still couldn't figure out the second word. They kept on trying so I gave them a clue. The clue was a question. I asked 'what am I doing?' And suddenly Elijah said "you talk". Then I corrected him by saying 'talking'. I told them to repeat the title of the book after me.

Then I opened the book and read to them. As I was reading I could tell from their faces that they were very interested in the story. When I finished they told me that the story was very nice. I didn't need to explain the story again because the story was short and simple and was written in simple English which I think the children really understood. I
also asked some questions and they answered me very well. Then I asked them to think up a make-up story and tell us. Elijah told us a story about the hunting boy. He couldn’t speak very well in English so he mixed the both languages (Pidgin and English) together. When he finished, Nancy told us a story about the hunting dog. Her story was mainly in Pidgin. When they finished, it was time so I told them to come back next week with their same stories in their minds.

Feelings
I was very happy with the children because they seemed to have understood the story very well. They were able to answer the questions which followed after the story. Another thing which I was very happy and pleased with was the way they told their stories. Although they were not able to say the story in English, they were able to answer some questions which I asked in English related to their own story.

Comments
One interesting thing about these children is that, although they don’t speak English very much, they seem to understand the questions I ask. I ask questions in English and they reply in Pidgin. I find this very interesting because if they can’t even speak English, how do they understand the questions and answer me back in Pidgin.

Plans
In my next visit I’ve planned to work closely with the children to start on a story. Since they all have different stories I will be there to guide them along as they write. If they ask me to spell words for them, I will but not spelling all the words for them.

Mona’s use of questions, stimulates interest, requires the children to solve the problem of telling the title of book, and draws them into a teaching/learning relation built upon what they know but need to find out (Do you like listening to stories?/Can you tell me the title of this book?). She appears to consciously avoid ‘telling’ and likes to give ‘clues’ which commit the children to trying to find out more. Through her closeness to these children, she sees that they are able to understand English though not use it, wondering how ‘they understand the questions and answer me back in Pidgin’. Here for the moment, Mona stops, contained at this point, I suspect, by strong institutional assumptions that children’s abilities and performances are individually motivated and determined. I am contained also, suppressing the promptings of second language acquisition theory that suggest language learning be considered
predominantly as a mental phenomena, though I am interested in the way that Mona's continually invites communication (looking through the language) and her ongoing interest in monitoring the responses (looking at the language).

I ask questions in English and they reply in Pidgin.

In a way I see this 'hidden' linguistic interest contradicting her communicative pedagogy but perhaps she is drawing upon deeper assumptions that are not plain to me. What is also interesting is how her reflective concerns are raised with her children. Her commentary often revealing pedagogical concerns (for example, the children's understanding in English but speaking in Pidgin) which are not reported as being directly raised with the children. Why are these matters not explored with them? Why are they privatised?

Perhaps it is the absence of such a dialogue which sustains the tension between herself and in particular, Dana. With Nancy and particularly Elijah there is greater solidarity linked to their capacity to do what she (and I, and the educational policy-makers) are asking. How is it that Elijah goes first when telling 'make-up' stories, why Nancy second and how is that Dana misses out?

Visit 6:

This morning Nancy was absent so Elijah, Dana and I went to our usual place. Before I asked them to write their imaginary stories, I asked questions about the story I read to them last week. I asked them if they could still remember the title of the story. Elijah raised his hand and said "The talking Pig". I said "very good" and then asked another question, "Do pigs talk?" and Elijah said "No" but Dana said "yes". I asked Dana if she has seen a talking pig somewhere. She said "No". The I asked her again "Do pigs talk like us?" and she answered "No". Then I gave them papers and asked them to write their imaginary stories. I explained to them about how they could write their stories. I told them to make and write a similar story to the one I read.

57 While the phenomenon is common, her question is not easily answered. Some parallels can be drawn with children learning their first language who in the early stages of language development can understand more than they can say. There are social aspects to this question also to do with the amount and type of exposure that these children have had to English outside of the classroom, and the fact that Elijah appears to know more and is more confident to try and use English.
Before they started I asked them to write the title of their imaginary stories. Elijah told me that his title would be “The Hunting boy and his dog”. I told him to write it at the top of the paper and begin on the story. He started off immediately without asking me to spell words for him. The only words he asked me to spell were away, hunting, flew, snake, spear and flying but the rest of the words were written by himself. As for Dana, she had a lot of difficulties. She couldn’t even spell a single word. I asked her to tell me the title of her story and she said in Pidgin “Tupela Pikinini” (two children). Then I told her how she should say it in English. After that I wrote the title on a paper and asked her to copy it down. She wrote down “The two children”. When she finished writing the title, I asked her to start with her story. She held the pencil in her hand and stared in the sky. I knew she was confused so I asked her to tell me her story. She told the story in Pidgin. Then I translated the Pidgin words to English and then told her to repeat after me. The beginning of her story was “wanpela taim” so I told her how it was said in English “One day.” Without writing or spelling it for her I opened the story book which I read to them in the beginning of the activity and told her that the words “One day” are at the beginning of the story so she must see from the book and begin with her story. She still didn’t know what to do so I pointed to it and told her to write it down. By the time she finished writing the two words “One day” it was time so I had to leave them.

**Feelings**

I feel that making up and writing imaginary stories is interesting especially to the bigger people but to the little grade two children, it is very difficult. It is difficult because they can’t spell words that they want to write in their stories. Although they can say them its hard for them to write them down. I was very angry and upset when Dana couldn’t even write a simple word like “one” which she had already learned.

**Comments**

It looks as if though I will have to spell every word for Dana because she can’t even write a single word. She can tell me her imaginary story in Pidgin but then I will have to translate everything in Pidgin and maybe write them down for her just to copy. I think this isn’t very good but since she is one of those very slow learners in the class, I feel I just have to do it in order to help her learn.⁵⁸

---

⁵⁸ Mona is continually confronted by the children’s use of Tok Pisin as an intertext. Confronted also by the difference in children’s performances. Her teaching is shaped in the realisation of these ambiguities. I pick up similar concerns from other students, a couple of them intensified due to their lack of ability and confidence in using Pidgin.
Plans

In my next visit I've decided to write Dana's story on a paper and tell her to see the letters and words carefully and write them down. As for Elijah, I'll try to make him extend the story by asking him questions.

At the beginning of the lesson, Mona confronts Dana, quizzing her answers to her questions,

...(I) then asked another question, "Do pigs talk?" and Elijah said "No" but Dana said "yes". I asked Dana if she has seen a talking pig somewhere. She said "No". The I asked her again "Do pigs talk like us?" and she answered "No". Then I gave them papers and asked them to write their imaginary stories.

That Mona is antagonised is evident from her demolition of Dana's answer and the staging of the follow-up. Having brought Dana sharply back to the 'real' world she then asks her to write an imaginary story. I am confronted by the depth of feeling that Mona displays. Working against the grain of her expectations is demanding and frustrating. Mona feels obliged to persist with Dana,

... I will have to translate everything in Pidgin and maybe write them down for her just to copy. I think this isn't very good but since she is one of those very slow learners in the class, I feel I just have to do it in order to help her learn.

Her work is bounded by internal desires and external pressures to teach, in English, and 'on task' (within the parameters set down for the school experience sessions). Such conditions shape the relationships she forms with each of the children. At different points tensions arise from the need to satisfy what appear as the competing demands of these requirements. In response Mona shifts across one or more of these boundaries by speaking in Pidgin, spelling words, writing the story for Dana, 'spoonfeeding'. I confront the awful view that Dana is constituted as 'one of those very slow learners' in the midst of these pedagogical events, not apart from them, that her staring into the sky and not knowing what to do and Mona's own feelings of anger and reluctance ('I was angry and upset when Dana couldn't even write a simple word ...'); It looks as if I will

For my part this was unanticipated, I unexpectedly find myself in attempting to manage the consequences of what unfolds, encouraging students in the use of both Pidgin and English. But many are reluctant to, they are committed to the ideology of English only at school, for them it is linked to the national development of PNG (the 'community at the expense of the individual' argument).
have to ... then I will have to... I feel I just have to ... ’) are constituted in the difficulty that both Dana face in undertaking this task. I note Mona’s feelings.

I feel that making up and writing imaginary stories is interesting especially to the bigger people but to the little grade two children, it is very difficult.

I am confronted in my reading by my absence. Many of these moments pass without my knowing though I am aware that some students are experiencing frustrations, but not so much aware of the children’s difficulties. 59

Visit 7:

This time the 3 children were present so we went to our favourite spot and sat down. I gave Elijah and Dana’s papers back and told them to continue from where they had stopped. Without wasting time Elijah started straight away. But Dana sat quietly and stared at her paper which only had the beginning “One day”. I asked her to think about her story while I gave Nancy a paper and explain what she should do. Before she started I asked her to tell me a make up story. When she finished I asked her to tell me

59 In introducing student-teachers to children’s writing, genre, content and code/structure are treated somewhat discretely, so that children are not initially hindered by their lack of code knowledge and can focus on putting ideas down. Use of Pidgin and code-mixing is an acceptable feature of children’s speaking (as with Ezekiel in Visit 5) and some writing but there are influential pedagogical traditions and policies upheld by schools which expect that children’s writing should be entirely in English and that quality of expression and correctness (accuracy) is the main criteria for measuring a successful piece of writing. In this tradition, both writing and reading are viewed as decontextualised cognitive (memory) skills. How well these skills are learned is held to depend upon the extent of a child’s intellectual gifts and talents (see Marcus Visit 4) with little recognition of the social constructedness of learning. The initial stages of learning to write in English are often greeted by children with great enthusiasm as they take up pencils and books or chalk and boards, sticks and ground, tracing letters, marking their papers, boards, the earth, copying strokes and letters. Beyond this initial stage children learn to write by copying words and sentences from the board, from writing cards, charts, books and from friends (Copying words and sentences is also a way that many children appear to learn to read). The more demanding work of writing brief personalised accounts begins in Grade Two and relies largely upon children’s oral facility with English. Most student teachers in learning to write, have been subject to the disciplining policy of English only, with its great emphasis on accuracy. At this time, however, this policy has been liberalised to counter claims that children’s writing is often contrived, meaningless and rote. The legacy however, remains as student teachers’ tacit orientations to what constitutes appropriate written expression. In the pedagogy suggested in the subject she is doing, one of the tasks for her is to locate and manage places where structural and communicative orientations appropriately overlap and diverge.
what title she would like to give to her story. She said “The hunting dog” so I asked her to write the title down and begin the story. I went back to Dana and found out that she hadn’t written anything yet so I wrote her story on a piece of paper and told her to copy it down. As for Nancy she only wrote “The” and was still trying to write the word “hunting” so I spelled it for her. After she had written “I”, she was able to spell and write “dogZ” herself. When I looked over to Elijah, he was busy with his story so I left him on his own and concentrated on Nancy. As for Dana she was busy copying. Nancy wasn’t able to spell most of the words like mother, afternoon, garden, crocodile, walked, tree, under and left, so I had to spell all these words for her. She was able to spell the words like baby, and dog, the, one, eat, and big, so I didn’t spell them. Towards the end I collected a completed but continuous story from Elijah and a half completed story from the two girls.

Feelings
I have a strong feeling that Elijah is a clever little boy and I believe he’ll be able to make up and write good stories in the future. But Dana still needs a lot of help, especially in spelling. As for Nancy, I think she has learned to make the sounds of words which she can’t spell and is beginning to write the first letters of the words so soon she should be able to write the words herself. I believe more practice will help Nancy.

Comments
I wasn’t very happy with Dana because she couldn’t even write a word I don’t think she is learning when she is copying everything that I write. I tried to make her write the easy words herself but still she couldn’t I wonder if she’ll be able to know all the words she writes or copies.

Plans
In my plans for the next visit I’ve decided to work closely with the three of them to publish their stories and make a small book for their class. I will read Elijah’s story with him and together we’ll shorten it. As for Dana I have to listen very carefully to her story and then write it down for her to copy. With Nancy I reckon she’s doing a bit fine so I will help her with the spelling and then she can finish it off.

Mona distinguishes between the children on the basis of their ability to undertake the tasks being set and the way they respond to her requests and directions. Such rankings are manifestations of the institutional orders that constitute the macro
ideologies of community schooling. What is experienced as a ‘personal’ response to a set of teaching/learning experiences is also a socially/institutionally mediated way of looking: Uptake times to the task are discursively juxtaposed, constitutive of performance benchmarks, ‘Without wasting time Elijah started straight away. But Dana sat quietly and stared at her paper’; Children’s different task activities are compared, ‘When I looked over to Elijah, he was busy with his story so I left him on his own and concentrated on Nancy. As for Dana she was busy copying’; Completion rates are monitored, ‘Towards the end I collected a completed but continuous story from Elijah and a half completed story from the two girls’. These performance variables are ultimately constitutive of particular pedagogical identities ‘I have a strong feeling that Elijah is a clever little boy ... Dana still needs a lot of help... I believe more practice will help Nancy’.

I note however, how Mona has shifted in relation to her work with Dana,

As for Dana I have to listen very carefully to her story and then write it down for her to copy.

despite her view that,

I don’t think she is learning when she is copying everything that I write.

I note how there is less tension when Mona acknowledges Dana’s position.

Visit 8:

I handed back their papers and asked them to read their stories to me. Elijah read his story but when it was Dana’s turn, she was confused. She couldn’t even say a word. Probably forgot everything over the holiday. I told her to listen to me while I read her the story. When I finished, I asked her to read the story back to me. Her story had only two sentences. She read the first sentence but couldn’t read the second one, so I asked her a question.

“What did the two children see in the bush”? “Tupela lukim wampela baby karai istap long diawai”, she answered. Since her answer was in Pidgin, I translated it to English. I said, “They saw a baby crying in the tree”. Then I asked her to repeat after me. Later I told her that what she had just said was the next sentence. I asked her to read the story again and this time she read it correctly. As for Nancy, she didn’t have a lot of difficulties reading her story. She was able to read her story to me. I went back to Dana and found out that she had finished copying her story which I wrote on a piece of paper. Elijah was busy reading his story over again and putting fullstops where
necessary. His story was long and interesting but there weren’t many fullstops. His story was a continuous one. In the end I collected three completed stories.

Feelings
I was very glad indeed to collect the children’s finished stories. At the beginning of the activity last term I thought Dana and Nancy wouldn’t write an imaginary story but I was happy when they had their stories written in the end. I think Elijah is a smart small boy. He can work without much supervision.

Comments
I am still in doubt about Dana’s learning. Especially reading sentences or words and saying words. Since the beginning I’ve been spelling most of the words for her. I wonder if she will still be able to read the books that have been published because the stories inside were all written by her and her other peers.

Plans
Next week I go around, I have planned to help them write their report. But before they do so we are going to do an activity together. As we are doing the activity I will ask the children to observe carefully on what we’ll be doing so that after the activity, they can write short reports. I will help them to spell the difficult words but not the easy ones.

In her emerging sense of how to help Dana to read her story, Mona avoids collaborative use of the text.

I told her to listen to me while I read her the story... I asked her to read the story back to me... She read the first sentence but couldn’t read the second one, so I asked her a question... Since her answer was in Pidgin, I translated it to English... Then I asked her to repeat after me... I asked her to read the story again and this time she read it correctly.

This pedagogy requires Dana to listen, remember and repeat, the practice of jointly looking at the words of the story, decoding and following is not employed, rather Mona requires Dana to read the story more from her mind than the text. Here reading is constructed as a mnemonic activity, a memory prompt, the ambiguities associated with interpreting the code are secondary. It should be noted that little work has yet been done in the course on reading pedagogy. Mona’s learning emphasis here is less about decoding English words and more about sustaining the link between Dana and her story, re-encoding and preserving Dana’s thoughts in English.
She read the first sentence but couldn’t read the second one, so I asked her a question. “What did the two children see in the bush”? “Tupela lukim wanpela baby karai istap long diawai”, she answered. Since her answer was in Pidgin, I translated it to English. I said, “They saw a baby crying in the tree”. Then I asked her to repeat after me. Later I told her that what she had just said was the next sentence. I asked her to read the story again and this time she read it correctly.

In the midst of these small exchanges Mona and Dana’s sensibilities shift between constitutive and constituted pedagogical moments, in a play of agencies and linguistic structures. For a moment they are woven together, concealing the subversive character of the final version of the text, its colonisation of primary intertexts and the discourse community of which they are a part. And yet what Mona unwittingly creates and asserts here, is the potential for Dana to ‘write back’ as it were, to bring these her utterances at some point in time, into wider circulation, to read and write the world she is a part of.

Children’s draft ‘make-up’ stories

Elijah

The hunting boy and his dog

One day the boy and his dog went to the bush. They went hunting. They so are very big snake flying to the tree. Then the boy and his dog went home. And they want to got the spear. Then they went to the bush to kill the snake. And they went home. They went playing with the ball. They play basketball, after they went to the bush to see the snake, the snake so them and flew away and the boy and his dog went home to sleep. Next morning they wake up and they went to so the snake, the snake went to another tree and sleep. The boy and his dog look for the sanke. They didn’t see the sanke. Then they went home to sleep. Next morning they woke up and ate the food and they got ready to go nwo they walked half to see the sanke the sanke didn’t stay they went sitting under the tree the sanke see they and want to eat then they see the sanke and run wake and sit and Talk about a sanke then they went to see the sanke the sake see and flew away.

Nancy

The hunting dog
One afternoon mother baby and the dog went to the garden. Mother left the baby under one big tree. The baby walked down to the river one big crocodile eat the baby and the dog pull the baby’s leg the dog pulled the baby to the garden. Mother was very happy with the dog. Mother carried the baby and they walked home

_Dana_

_The Two children_

One day the two children went to the bush. They saw a baby crying in the tree. They went to the house to tell their mother. Then they all walked to the bush to see the baby. The baby saw them and ran away. They went back to the village.

**Visit 9:**

This morning I took my two children Elijah and Dana and went to our usual place. I asked them where Nancy was and they told me she was sick. Without further questions I went on to explain the new activity. Before they could begin on the first step of the activity I took out the materials that were needed and placed them in front of them. I asked them to tell me the names of the materials as I pointed to them. The materials that were needed for the activity were blank pieces of paper, glue, chalk, scissors, and a bottle of water. They were both able to name all the materials. Then I told them to watch as I demonstrate step one. They both watched carefully and when I finished, I gave them the papers and chalks and told them to do what I demonstrated. They did it very well and when they were finished, I told them dry their paper in the sun. After that I demonstrated the next few steps. When I finished I asked them to get the materials and do what I did. They picked up the materials and started straight away. While they were working, I asked them a question. I asked them if they think this activity was hard. They both said ‘no’. Then I stopped talking and watched them. I found out that while Elijah was doing the activity he kept on looking at me and asking me to see his work. I knew he was doing fine so I just gave him a smile and told him to continue to the end. As for Dana, she was very busy. She was doing the activity properly. While they were both busy, I asked them another question. I asked them if they had made such things before. They both answered ‘no’ and Elijah went on to say that it was a new thing that he was learning. He also told me that he was enjoying the activity. When they completed the activity I asked them to tell me the steps. Elijah was able to say all the steps but they were not in the right order. As for Dana she said a little and stopped. She didn’t say much. Then I thanked them for doing the activity very well and asked
them to think about the steps when they go home because they were required to write a short report in the next visit the following week.

**Feelings**

I felt very happy with Elijah and Dana because they were both able to complete the activity. After they finished it they asked me if they could do some more but time didn’t allow us so I had to say no. I asked if they really liked it and they both said that they enjoyed it. I think I have taught them something new so they might teach their friends in the future.

**Comments**

While Elijah and Dana were cutting the folded paper with the scissors I observed very closely and found out an interesting thing. Everytime Elijah would cut an edge or side of his folded paper, Dana would slowly look up at the sides he was cutting, then would cut hers exactly the same as Elijah’s. I saw this going on so I told Dana to concentrate on her work and not to look at Elijah’s. Later they unfolded their papers, the patterns on their papers were almost similar to each other.

**Plans**

Since they will begin writing the report next week, I’ve decided to firstly ask them to tell me the steps which they went through in making the activity. When they finish telling me the steps, I will write it in a sentence form (report). I will help them by asking some questions and also spell words if they ask me to.

* Mona monitors the interests of the children, what they find easy what is difficult, she invites them to comment on how they find the task, she keeps quiet and provides them with uninterrupted space to go about what they are doing. The subtleties of her pragmatic classroom politics is noted in the way she reins in Elijah’s bids for her recognition of his achievements

  I found out that while Elijah was doing the activity he kept on looking at me and asking me to see his work. I knew he was doing fine so I just gave him a smile and told him to continue to the end. As for Dana, she was very busy. She was doing the activity properly.

She is observant, occupied with watching how each proceeds through the activity, noting how Dana follows Elijah in the way she cuts her paper, cautioning her not to look. In essence, disrupting the subtle social dependencies and gender identities that are constituted in following along and being followed.
Visit 10:
I went through the steps of the activity with the children. When I finished I asked them to write the date and begin on their report writing. Elijah wrote the date and started straight away. Dana sat still and looked worried so I asked her what her problem was. She told me she couldn’t spell Wednesday, so I helped to spell the word for her. Then I asked her to start writing her report. I explained everything to her and told her to ask if she needed some help. As for Nancy I had to demonstrate the activity again because she was absent on the day we started on the activity. I collected the materials and firstly demonstrated every step. When I finished I handed her the materials and asked her to do the things I did. Since the activity was not too difficult, she was able to complete the activity quickly. Then I explained the report writing to her and asked her to write the date and begin as soon as possible. She wrote the date and didn’t know how to begin, so I helped her by asking a question “What did you do first?” ‘I put water on chalk and write on the paper’, she answered. So I told her to write that down. She was able to write it down with a little help from me. While she was thinking of what she did next, I looked at Dana’s work and saw that she had only written ‘This’, so I asked her some questions about what she did first, second and so on. She told me everything in Pidgin so I wrote them all in English and asked her to copy them. In the end I collected a finished work from Elijah and half completed work each from Nancy and Dana.

Feelings
I seem to be enjoying myself with these children but at the same time I feel very sorry for the two girls Dana and Nancy. Although I have spent most of the time trying to help them to say the words to themselves and try to guess the spelling, they still find it very hard. Nancy seems to be improving a bit but Dana is still trying. As for Elijah, he doesn’t worry me a lot because he understands things properly and works on his own most of the time. He only asks me to spell words that are difficult for him to spell but I think he is doing fine compared to Dana and Nancy.

Comments
When the children were asked to write their reports, Elijah went ahead and started off with ‘this morning’ as his beginning, but Dana and Nancy sat still for awhile. Then Dana probably saw Elijah’s first two words so she copied it down. Some minutes later, Nancy copied the two same words from Dana. Later when I looked at their work I saw
that they all had the same beginning. I knew very well that they copied each other but I just told them to continue writing the report and not to look at each other’s work.

**Plans**

Next week Wednesday, I’ve planned to give a new paper to Elijah so that he can transfer his work onto it. But before I do that, I will help him correct the grammar in his report. As for Dana I will still have to ask her more questions on the activity so that when she gives me the answer, then I will write them down in English and ask her to copy them down. With Nancy, I’ll have to spell words or even write some sentences which are difficult for her to write so that she can copy them.

*I sense a shift in Mona’s position that she is being shaped more by the children’s needs than by their performances, that what she undertakes to accomplish is driven more by an interest in teaching the children than teaching the ‘subject’.*

Elijah wrote the date and started straight away. Dana sat still and looked worried so I asked her what her problem was. She told me she couldn’t spell Wednesday, so I helped to spell the word for her.

*For Nancy who has returned from absence, the activity is taught and*

...I explained the report writing to her and asked her to write the date and begin as soon as possible. She wrote the date and didn’t know how to begin, so I helped her by asking a question “What did you do first?”

Mona acknowledges both a sense of enjoyment that she feels in working with the children and also a sense of sorrow for Dana and Nancy who ‘still find it very hard’.

She plans definite strategies for working with Elijah, Dana and Nancy according to her experience of how they are managing the task. She anticipates that Elijah will require help with grammar, that Dana will need to be questioned about the activity to generate language to be written into sentences, that Nancy will need help with spelling and sentences. These plans are followed seemingly unproblematically in the next visit, but in all of this she expresses reservations and concerns about Nancy’s and Dana’s reliance on copying. (For discussion see commentary on Visit 11)

**Visit 11:**

This morning I handed back their papers and asked them to read back to me. Firstly, I went through the steps of the activity, then I asked Nancy to read her report. Her report was not finished. She only wrote about five sentences so she was able to read to me. As
for Dana she was only copying what I wrote last week, that’s why she found it hard to read some words. I helped her say the words, then I asked her to read it back to me. She read it back correctly. With Elijah his report was completed so when I asked him to read, he read it back to me. The only problem with him was his grammar so I corrected his grammar and gave him a new paper to transfer his work. While he was transferring his work I helped Dana and Nancy by asking questions spelling words and helping them to write the steps of the activity in the right order. Towards the end of the lesson, Elijah gave me his completed report. Nancy also gave me hers. As for Dana she was still copying so I got her paper and asked her to come next week and try to complete it.

**Feelings**

I was trying my best to help the children write good reports i.e. writing all the steps in the right order but when I asked them to tell me the steps, they were able to give me all the steps but the problem was that they couldn’t say them in the correct order. Although they gave me the steps, they couldn’t say them in order of what was done first and so on. I tried my best to make them give me the correct orders by asking questions. Finally, I came to understand that they were beginning to realise the steps that should come first and so on.

**Comments**

The children, especially the two girls seem to wait for Elijah to ask questions and get something done on his paper before they copy. I saw Dana doing this so many times and I stopped her but she still continues I don’t think it is right but I feel I can’t do anything because I think she’s used to copying. Most of the time she tries to copy Elijah’s work so I always keep a close watch on her.

**Plans**

During my visit next week, I have planned to keep a close watch on Dana and make sure she concentrates on her own work and not to copy Elijah’s work. I will make sure she copies the sentences that I write for her correctly because she still can’t write sentences or spell words. With Nancy I will correct her mistakes, like the spelling, tenses and grammar and then give her a new paper to transfer her work.

*For Mona, her early teaching experiences were demoralising, somehow beyond her control she is constituted as a teacher of ‘slow learners’. In ensuing visits her concerns become less self focussed as she categorises the efforts of the children she works with.*
... I feel very sorry for the two girls Dana and Nancy. Although I have spent most of the time trying to help them to say the words to themselves and try to guess the spelling, they still find it very hard. Nancy seems to be improving a bit but Dana is still trying.

In contrast,

As for Elijah, he doesn’t worry me a lot because he understands things properly and works on his own most of the time. He only asks me to spell words that are difficult for him to spell but I think he is doing fine compared to Dana and Nancy.

Elijah is portrayed as an understanding, independent and discriminating learner. Dana and Nancy, who are both observed by Mona to copy from Elijah, and to communicate predominantly in Pidgin, are unwittingly portrayed as floundering in the wake of his success. ‘Copying’, for Mona, and in the mainstream educational discourse to which she has been apprenticed, is not a learning strategy it is something to be guarded against. To be a ‘copier’ is to be at the borders of appropriate learning behaviour where the distinction between appropriate and inappropriate learning conduct is greatest, though somewhat ambiguous in the face of children’s resistance to other forms of pedagogy.

I knew very well that they copied each other but I just told them to continue writing the report and not to look at each others work...

The children, especially the two girls seem to wait for Elijah to ask questions and get something done on his paper before they copy. I saw Dana doing this so many times and I stopped her but she still continues I don’t think it is right but I feel I can’t do anything because I think she’s used to copying. Most of the time she tries to copy Elijah’s work so I always keep a close watch on her.

It is clear that Dana and Nancy are aware of the significant position and advantage that Elijah occupies. They seek to keep up through their copying strategy, to also be seen as valued participants, even at the expense of being censored (for the student teacher is not the only one who looks upon their work, there are their peers, the class teacher and the student-teacher’s supervisor).

Copying as a learning strategy is an effective way of accessing and transmitting valued knowledge and ‘know how’ in communities which depend upon strong networks of cooperation for their survival and prosperity. Western styled schooling significantly devalues the notion of copying by teaching the ideology of the private ownership of
knowledge and thought. Through the privatisation of the individual the distribution of shared values, practices, knowledges and materialities is disrupted, brought into subjugation. The discourses of western rationality (logico-deductive reasoning) and morality (fundamental Christianity) exalt individual effort and accountability. Under the colonising influence of these discourses, local practices are represented as hypocrisies, portrayed as unworthy, monotonous, uncreative, complicit in their own subjugation, shown to be destructive in a time of social and spiritual renewal. Schooling as much as it is a servant of the post-colonial ideologies of change and development, ironically devalues copying while casting itself in the image of western modernity. In the teaching/learning circumstances under consideration, these dynamics are in play.

In the account above, the circumstances surrounding the acts of copying are also constitutive of subtle gendered positionings. Dana's deeply socialised expectations of social cooperativeness are fulfilled in Elijah's generosity in allowing his work to be copied, (see Visit 9) but disrupted by Mona's insistence that her work be individually defined and practiced. Elijah who seems content to have the girls look on, does not however, seek their cooperation but brings to class a way of working which meets with the teacher's immediate approval, a way that is privileged in the dominant discourses of western styled schooling, and which also sustains local community expectations of male preeminence. Elijah behaves in ways that reinforce cultural expectations of female dependency and male independence, the latter more highly valued by Mona whose subjection to both community and institutional discourses reveals no incongruency.

In addition, the distinction between copying one's own words and those of someone else is not made by Mona who remains uncomfortably complicit in sustaining the practice by writing out Dana's oral stories for her to copy.

During my visit next week, I have planned to keep a close watch on Dana and make sure she concentrates on her own work and not to copy Elijah's work. I will make sure she copies the sentences that I write for her correctly because she still can't write sentences or spell words.
I sense that Mona feels caught in a double bind, even though the ‘stories’ are dictated by Dana, they are told in Pidgin, ultimately Mona rewrites them in English which are her words which Dana then copies.  

What emerges here is a need to provide space for Pidgin to operate as a legitimate vehicle and resource in defining what counts as meaningful to these children.

I looked at Dana’s work and saw that she had only written ‘This’, so I asked her some questions about what she did first, second and so on. She told me everything in Pidgin so I wrote them all in English and asked her to copy them.

The shift from Pidgin to English sentences is not bridged by a learning procedure that includes any acknowledgment of social, cultural, discoursal and strategic correspondences, differences and purposes. English simply replaces Pidgin.

Mona is led less by her observations, and more by her evaluations. Her preoccupation with ‘copying’ misses the point that Dana is there every week, never absent, that there is some evidence that Dana’s is learning, particularly in the final session where Mona enriches her approach by having Dana follow the words she reads.

This morning Elijah and Nancy were absent so I took Dana to our usual place. We sat down and I gave back her report which was completed during recess. I asked her to read her report and she started off well but looked confused in the middle. She couldn’t read any further so I told her to listen carefully and see the words as I read through. She listened and watched while I read the report. When I finished I asked her to read the report back to me. Although it took her a while to say each word, she was able to read till the end.

Visit 12:
This morning I gathered my children together and without giving their papers, I asked them to tell me the steps of the activity. They were all able to say everything that they did. Then I gave back Dana’s paper together with what I wrote on another paper and

---

60 After all what does it mean in common teaching practice to have students copy from the board or from a book, to copy a pattern or sound. In the commercial and ultimately political (and not unproblematic) constructed distinction between what is private and what is public (see Walker 1994) copying is a regulated practice, it is granted by ‘right’. In PNG where there are no actively enforced copyright laws copying is a way of collapsing knowledge hierarchies, of disrupting notions of the commodification of knowledge, of accessing the colonising discourses of western learning without being totally economically and socially disenfranchised in the process.
asked her to copy them down. While she was busy copying I handed back Elijah and Nancy’s reports and asked to read to each other. I also told them to exchange their reports and read each others work. While they were reading to each other I found some interesting things. I saw that Elijah could read Nancy’s report without any difficulties, although most of their wordings were the same. As for Nancy, she could read a bit and then stop. Then she would start again. Most of the words they wrote were the same words but I saw that Elijah could read properly, whereas, Nancy would stop for a while and try to miss out some words that she couldn’t pronounce. When I saw this happening, I helped them to say the words. I tried my best to help them pronounce the words correctly because some of the words which they wrote were difficult for them. When I went back to Dana, I found out that she had finished copying everything so I gave her a new paper and asked her to transfer her work neatly onto the new paper. Soon it was time so I asked her to come to my classroom at recess to have it completed.

Feelings
I feel that what the TESOL department is doing with the children is very good and I’m sure the children and the trainees teachers are learning a lot of good things out of it so I would like to encourage the department to provide more of these activities with children in future.

Comments
I have a comment which I would like to bring across to the TESOL department. I think that the grade two children are too small to write their ideas down in a form of a story, report, etc. My main concern here is that although they can think up words and say them, the problem is that they cannot get it down on paper because they find it very hard. My suggestion here is that, why can’t we do these activities with the middle grades rather than the lower grades. Sometimes we trainee teachers find it very hard to explain to them because they don’t really understand us well and soon we start to spoonfeed them.

Plans
Since Nancy and Elijah have already completed their reports, there’s nothing much to be done so just to keep them busy, I’ve planned to have a little spelling lesson with them. I will firstly give back their reports and let them read it to themselves. Then I will collect them back and call out some words from their reports and ask them to write the words down. As for Dana I’ll give her time to transfer her work onto the clean paper.
I take seriously Mona's comments about the program, it is the first time something like this has been done. For me one question is how might the expectations of the program be better portrayed without diminishing what I see as important learning processes and opportunities to explore 'real life' dilemmas in teaching and learning, to provide significant opportunities for students to exercise and develop their capacity to 'learn to look', to hold back immediate judgements, to capture moments of ideology in action.

Like Mona, I also have concerns about the capacity of some of the grade two children to keep up with the demands of such a structured program. A concomitant concern is with helping students to modify their expectations, demands and evaluations of children where difficulties and dislocations are evident, to help them manage the diversities, uncertainties, contradictions and sensitivities of teaching in different languages, to learn to speak the language of teaching children who 'don't really understand us well', and to better see themselves as agents of structure and change in the construction of a learning context with its attendant ideologies and discourses. I am particularly interested in influencing the way student teachers portray and position children experiencing difficulties, and the social and pedagogic consequences of these representations. When I look at the writing many children are doing I am not disheartened but cautious in my assessment in contemplation of the tensions between their social and pedagogical significations.

Children's draft reports

Elijah

This morning me and my teacher and Dana we make our activities. We colour some papers. Then we put the papers on the sun. Then they get dry. And we get the papers. Then we got some alers and make some diamonds. and cut shapes with scissors. After we stick them on the papers that we coloured. When we cut the papers we find the papers we find some shapes on the paper that we cut. Then we put them on the sun to dry. This things that we make is to make our classroom look nice and beautiful.

Nancy who has been absent from time to time who shares similar English literacy difficulties to Dana, ranked by Mona between Elijah and Dana, writes the following assisted report,
This morning teacher give me a chalk and paper. I put the chalk in water and colour on the paper. I put the paper under the sun. Teacher get one paper and cut it. She made box and diamond. Teacher give me paper and scissors and I cut the paper. I make circles and boxes. I put the paper on the coloured paper. I put it with glue. After I put it in the sun. I get it and see coloured shapes. I liked it. I put it my class room. My class room look nice.

There is a strong oral resonance in this text as Nancy takes the reader through the activity she and Mona have accomplished. There is in the text no other hint of the challenges Mona has faced in helping Nancy to write, only a strong sense of Nancy’s activity and accomplishment thematised throughout the text (‘I put’, ‘I cut’, ‘I make’, ‘I get’, ‘I liked’). What for Nancy has been a significant event, is somehow overlooked by Mona in her concern for structural certainty and I suspect in the wake of Elijah’s more visible success.

Dana

This morning I get a bottle of water for teacher. Teacher put chalk in water. She coloured the white paper then she put it in the sun. I followed the teacher. I put the chalk in water and coloured my paper. Then I put it in the sun. Teacher give one paper again and I folded it. i get scissors and cut shapes on the paper. I stick the paper onto the coloured paper. I put it in the sun to dry. It looked very nice. I put it in my house.

Visit 13:

This morning Elijah and Nancy were absent so I took Dana to our usual place. We sat down and I gave back her report which was completed during recess. I asked her to read her report and she started off well but looked confused in the middle. She couldn’t read any further so I told her to listen carefully and see the words as I read through. She listened and watched while I read the report. When I finished I asked her to read the report back to me. Although it took her a while to say each word, she was able to read till the end. When she finished reading I asked to look through her report again and study the spellings of the different words properly. I explained to her that we would be having a little spelling activity. I gave her some time to do that. When she was ready I got the report from her and handed her a piece of paper. Then I looked at her report and called out some words for her to write down. I only asked her to spell 5 words. In the end I found out that she had only one word correct and the rest were wrong. The words
were (teacher, house, look, water, white). The only word she spelled correct was ‘look’. I knew that the words were a bit difficult for her but I decided to give her these words because she wrote them and was able to say them. Finally I showed her the words and their correct spelling and we spelled them together. After this, I said goodbye and thanked her for her time and effort and left.

**Feelings**

I feel that these children still need more of the activities that we were doing with them because the time we spent with them is too short and I don’t think they have grasped all the ideas yet. I know that they have learnt some good things from us already but I strongly feel that they need more of us. I enjoyed myself very much with my children although there were times when I felt like giving up. I learnt a lot from them and I’m sure they learnt a lot from me too. I feel that teaching or being a teacher is a hard task but being with different children is great fun.

**Comments**

I don’t have much to comment on this time but there’s one thing which I’ve been observing and it has come to my attention that Elijah, cannot pronounce some words properly. He can spell and write the words properly but he cannot pronounce them correctly. The words which I’ve heard him using are (after, flowers, beautiful and flying). These words are written in his previous story and also in his report. Instead of pronouncing them in the correct way, this is how he pronounces them. For the word ‘after’, he says ‘aptcha’ beautiful - bitipul, flower - plawa, flying - plying. He pronounces these words that way but he spells and writes them correctly.

**Plans**

Since this morning was the last visit, I don’t have anything to do with the children anymore but if I have the chance to see them again, I will help Elijah to pronounce the words correctly.

*On this final visit Mona decides to test Dana’s spelling.*

> When she finished reading I asked to look through her report again and study the spellings of the different words properly. I explained to her that we would be having a little spelling activity. I gave her some time to do that. When she was ready I got the report from her and handed her a piece of paper. Then I looked at her report and called out some words for her to write down. I only
asked her to spell 5 words. In the end I found out that she had only one word correct and the rest were wrong. The words were (teacher, house, look, water, white). The only word she spelled correct was ‘look’. I knew that the words were a bit difficult for her but I decided to give her these words because she wrote them and was able to say them. Finally I showed her the words and their correct spelling and we spelled them together.

In the admonition to ‘study the spellings’ there is no evidence that Dana knows how to study the words or that Mona provides suggestions for doing so. For Mona the test appears to be a check, a revisiting of her earlier concerns:

‘I wonder if she’ll be able to know all the words she writes or copies’ (Visit 7)
I wonder if she will still be able to read the books that have been published because the stories inside were all written by her and her other peers’. (Visit 8)

For the enduring Dana, who never misses a week, the test like many of the tasks required of her, has contained her, and too conveniently confirms the view that copying does not mean learning. Throughout these sessions, however, little recognition of what Dana can do, her mastery of the lesson content, her understanding and following of the teacher’s instructions, her courage in asking questions and for words to be spelled, her ability to give coherent answers, her grasp of the different genres, the focus has been reduced to her management of the code.

Within Mona’s concluding comments, however, that

... these children still need more of the activities that we were doing with them because the time we spent with them is too short and I don’t think they have grasped all the ideas yet. I know that they have learnt some good things from us already but I strongly feel that they need more of us,

lies a trace of a more refined sensibility of what teaching means and perhaps what it means to learn something (always incompleteness). Over the 13 visits, I see a series of small shifts in Mona’s disposition, from the ‘anger’ and ‘upset’, expressed in the first visit towards the two girls who ‘just couldn’t do the right thing’, who made it look ‘as if I was wasting my time’. To a recognition, that ‘I seem to be enjoying myself with these children’ though, ‘they still find it very hard. N seems to be improving’ and ‘D is still trying’. To a feeling that,

I enjoyed myself very much with my children although there were times when I felt like giving up. I learnt a lot from them and I’m sure they learnt a lot from
me too. I feel that teaching or being a teacher is a hard task but being with
different children is great fun,
a recognition of the extremities that are reached in the course of teaching. There is a
sense in these comments that Mona does not want these children to be lost in a system
that has in her view already overlooked some of their basic literacy needs, ('I know I
shouldn't blame them because it's not their fault...') (Visit 3); '... they need more of us.'
Hers is not a 'heroic' account as in the discourse of 'I met my objective'). The irony
here is that Mona finds she is needed more as she goes on, not less (Dana's spelling
difficulties and Elijah's pronunciation difficulties are cases in point), for me these are
vital signs of a healthy pedagogical relation, but perhaps Mona does not see this yet,
the way ahead for her is not yet diagnosed in these terms.
Mona's parting reference to Elijah is read, on the one hand by me, as a concern for
things she has not been in a position to attend to, but would have, given future
opportunity. On the other I am left with a nagging concern which touches on what I
have tried to set in motion, what I see as the problematics of impartiality, ultimately the
politics of agency.61 Despite Mona's level of goodwill towards Dana and Nancy it is
difficult for me to escape the view that her sense of partiality for the clever, the
'-independent' and able as represented in her accounts of Elijah obscures a view of the
social effects of schooling's systematic sorting and consignment of children to futures
over which they have little control. Mona's account highlights for me a problem in my
preparation of these student teachers where the difficulties they face are interpreted as
either 'technical' problems of method, or problems of competence or social
background. I am confronted with the question of how each of these pedagogical
orientations and responses conceals its politics and how these matters might be
represented to students in insightful ways. How the partial taken-for-grantedness in
Mona's relationship between herself and the children, and those similarly manifest in
other student accounts, might be identified and remedied.

61 I found myself appreciating Mona's commitment and sense of responsibility defined
in her general concern for the group. I note, however, that such concerns can also
legitimate potentially destructive practices, particularly when coupled with institutional
policies, like 'English only' or competency based perceptions that lead to labelling
students as 'slow learners'.