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Experience in working with pre-service teachers engaged in classroom practice indicates that they are primarily concerned with self-survival, content coverage and control of student behaviour. Preoccupation with these contextual realities often appears to distract pre-service teachers from attending effectively to the management of appropriate learning processes and episodes - the pedagogic discourse, and to the achievement of planned learning outcomes for their students.

This paper reports on the application of Basil Bernstein's theoretical framework on the structuring of educational knowledge and pedagogic discourse to the research question - How does a pre-service teacher plan, enact and reflect upon classroom teaching in order to achieve learning outcomes for students? This paper reports a pilot study that examines a case of the educational discourse constructed by a pre-service teacher with her secondary English class. The pilot study uses the concepts of classification and framing from Bernstein's theoretical framework to deconstruct the educational discourse constructed by the pre-service teacher, through the analysis of her lesson plan, the audio transcript of the lesson and the audio transcript of an interview conducted with the pre-service teacher immediately following the lesson.

It is argued that Bernstein's theoretical framework is useful in analysing secondary pre-service teacher classroom discourse for the purpose of improving learning outcomes for students through appropriate teacher preparation programs and intervention strategies.

The significance of the research question

The research question which forms the title of this paper can be reframed using the concepts and terminology of Lemke's (1993) theoretical perspective on the construction of classroom discourse and learning. Lemke's theoretical perspective, which underpins the theoretical stance advanced in this paper, will be defined and discussed in another section of this paper. The focus of the pilot study was then, to investigate the following questions,

• What happens in the classroom when a pre-service teacher transmits knowledge?

• What activity structures, semantic structures and thematic patterns does the pre-service teacher/intern use to transmit knowledge?
• How do the pre-service teacher and the students engage/interact in constructing a lesson and in transmitting/acquiring knowledge?

• Does the pre-service-teacher continue to focus on the transmission of knowledge or does s/he engage in behaviour control in order to manage student's off-task behaviour?

• Why? When? How do students engage in off-task behaviour during the construction of a lesson?

• How does the pre-service teacher account for what they do in the construction of a lesson, both in terms of the lesson plan and their post-lesson discussion of the lesson?

The investigation of the research question and the expected outcomes of this investigation are significant from three perspectives.

Firstly, from the practical perspective of informing teacher education policy and the curricula and pedagogy of tertiary pre-service teacher preparation courses, the expected outcomes of this study may describe and substantiate interventions in the following areas,

• teaching pre-service teachers how to construct and to manage classroom processes and classroom talk so that the focus of each lesson taught remains fixed on the achievement of planned learning outcomes for all students;

• skilling supervising teachers and teacher mentors in providing pre-service teachers and interns with appropriate and timely feedback on their teaching practice and in assisting pre-service teachers and interns to improve their skills in thinking about, talking about and improving the quality and effectiveness of their teaching practice;

• re-defining the curricula and pedagogy of school-based, supervised practice teaching and mentored internship programs so that the emphasis is placed on cooperative teaching of pre-service teachers and interns by university-based and school-based teachers and mentors.

Secondly, the study will provide a comprehensive review of the literatures of classroom talk and interaction in secondary English classes and of pre-service practice teaching in secondary settings in Australia and particularly in Queensland. A critical analysis of Lemke's (1993) theoretical framework of the lesson as a social construction that is built by the teacher and students using the mortar of classroom talk and the building blocks of activity structures and thematic patterns, will be undertaken. Lemke's framework, is concerned with the interplay that can occur between a range of possible classroom activity structures and the students' levels of understanding of and facility with the semantic relationships and thematic patterns of a subject. The ways that these interrelationships can be developed and how they can impact on learning outcomes for students will be discussed with reference to the teaching practice of secondary pre-service teachers. The teaching practice of these pre-service teachers will also be discussed with reference to Nystrand's (1997) notions of monologically and dialogically organised instruction and Cazden's (1988, 1995) theory of classroom discourse.

Thirdly, Basil Bernstein's (1971, 1977, 1990, 1996, 1997) theoretical framework on the structuring of educational knowledge will be applied, for the first time, to the analysis of a Queensland, secondary English, pre-service teacher's classroom practice and development, in this study. Bernstein's theory of power and control, his framework of classification and
framing of instructional and regulative discourses, and the structuring of pedagogic
discourse, together with the work of Lemke, Nystrand and Cazden, will be used to sustain
the theoretical stance taken in this study. That is,

- if a pre-service teacher is to be successful in realising planned learning outcomes for
  his/her students then s/he must be proficient in planning, modelling and managing
  the interactive strategies and activity structures (Lemke, 1993) of the social activity
  that is the lesson;
- if the pre-service teacher is to be successful in realising planned learning outcomes
  for his/her students over a series of lessons or through a unit of work then s/he must
  also be proficient in thinking and talking back over his/her teaching practice and be
  committed to improving it; and
- the pre-service teacher's opportunities to practise and to develop these professional
  skills are directly and significantly affected by the quality of the changing
  relationships that exists between the pre-service teacher and the supervising teacher
  or mentor as s/he develops from pre-service teacher to practising classroom teacher.

In this section of the paper the research question has been stated and defined in terms of its
sub-questions and in terms of its significance for the preparation of pre-service teachers and
for the learning outcomes of their students. The evidence required to investigate the
research question is identified through an examination of classroom talk, learning and
teaching in terms of the theoretical perspectives of Lemke (1993), Nystrand (1997) and

Lemke's theoretical framework of learning and teaching

According to Lemke (1993: 2) a school or classroom lesson is a social activity. The teacher
and the students who participate in it create or construct it by choosing particular actions to
begin it; by engaging in one type of chosen action or another in a reasonably predictable
sequence as it progresses; and then by choosing particular actions to end it. A lesson is a
familiar social artefact through which students are expected to learn the content around
which it is constructed. As the lesson is being constructed, students are expected to learn to
think, to talk and to write according to the particular formats and genres of the subject being
studied. They are expected to master the interconnected use of particular terms and their
semantic relations of meaning by listening to and much less frequently by practising the
teacher's language of the subject being studied.

According to Lemke (1993: 170), students are very often left to make sense of the
vocabulary, semantics and grammar of the language of a subject by themselves by teachers
who are unaware that their students do not implicitly understand or relate to what the
teacher is saying and trying to do in a lesson. Students are expected to make sense of the
teacher's language of the subject which is very often far removed from their own
experiences with the subject and with the ways in which they think and talk about and value
the topics within the subject. Lemke (1993: 170) states that this is too much to expect of
students. He challenges teachers to become proficient in explaining to students, in clear and
systematic ways, the relationships in meaning among subject terms and language structures
and how they go about thinking and talking about the subject. Teachers need to become
proficient in and habitual users of this metadiscourse in teaching students in a subject. What
this means is, that for students to participate constructively rather than destructively in the
building of a lesson, they must be proficient users of the language patterns and language
devices of the subject at a level which is commensurate with their levels of interest in and
understanding of the subject topic being studied. Teachers must teach students how to do
this effectively if they and their students are to construct successful lessons.
This concept therefore gives rise to the following important questions. What are the cornerstones of successful lesson construction? What are the most fundamental ways in which the subject content of a lesson is taught and learned? How are students to tell, from all that is said and done in the construction of a lesson, which language patterns and language devices of the subject they must learn? How exactly do teachers effectively communicate subject-specific language patterns and devices to their students? According to Lemke (1993: 13), a lesson is constructed through a dialogue between teacher and students. As the dialogue develops and unfolds, two patterns or structures are constructed by the participants in the lesson.

Firstly, the teacher and students interact with one another, step by step, within an almost predictable pattern of moves, counter moves and activities as the lesson is constructed piece by piece. This organisational pattern of the lesson is referred to as the lesson's activity structure by Lemke (1993: 13). The activity structure of a lesson describes the particular sequence of actions that teachers and students learn to expect to happen in particular subject contexts and within different topics and processes of a subject. The organisational pattern or activity structure - the "how" of teaching and learning - is an important part of the form in which the particular subject content of a lesson is taught and learned. Different subjects are constructed through a combination of subject specific activity structures and activity structures that are common to most, if not all, subjects studied by students.

The first activity structure that Lemke (1993: 19), introduces is triadic dialogue. Teachers choose to use this structure - teacher question; student answer; teacher evaluation/elaboration - because it gives them a sense of control over the structuring and construction of the lesson. In this structure, the teacher sets the topic, initiates exchanges, controls the direction in which a topic develops, decides which students will answer which questions, and decides which answers are heard and which ones are correct. Within this structure, students contribute very little to the construction of the lesson because they are effectively prevented from controlling the direction of the discussion, from taking the initiative or from challenging the teacher's assumed prerogatives. If the teacher, and/or the students, were to choose a different activity structure, then the lesson would be constructed differently because power and control relations between teacher and students would be different and the form in which the content of the lesson was presented and learned would be different. For example, if the teacher and students chose to construct a part of a lesson using the student questioning dialogue activity structure (Lemke, 1993: 29) then the content of the lesson would be presented and learned through the form and language of student bid to ask a question; teacher nomination; student question; teacher answer; teacher check for understanding; and student response. The power and control differentials and the semantic relationships that characterise the student questioning dialogue activity structure are obviously different from those of the triadic dialogue structure.

The second activity structure that Lemke (1993: 29) describes is teacher-student duolog. In this activity structure the teacher and one student engage in a prolonged series of exchanges in the presence of the remainder of the class. This type of activity structure can take place within the triadic dialogue structure or the student questioning dialogue structure. The power and control differentials that are constructed between the teacher, the involved student and the remainder of the class, and the semantic relationships that characterise the duologue activity structure combine to teach students a different way of thinking and talking and learning about the subject.

A further example of an activity structure available to teachers and students in the construction of a lesson is the teacher student debate (Lemke, 1993: 29) which contrasts strongly with the triadic dialogue structure. Within the teacher student debate activity structure, students challenge something that the teacher has said. Students and the teacher
share control of the direction of the dialogue and compete for control over which language patterns will be used and the ways in which these language patterns will be used to question, to discuss and to explain the content of the subject under study. On occasions, this struggle between teacher and students over which thematic patterns will be accepted in learning about the topic, can escalate into a student challenge to the teacher's authority to assert what is right and to determine the language that is used and the ways that it is used to discuss the topic. Such a challenge to the teacher’s authority may be sustained by the students over a series of exchanges with the teacher during the construction of the lesson.

This discussion of a small sample of the activity structures identified by Lemke (1993) serves to illustrate that students learn to behave, to think, and to talk differently about the content of a subject by learning to use the language of the subject differently in the different organisational patterns or activity structures that are either pre-determined by the teacher, selected by teacher and the students, or imposed by the students. But what is it that students learn about the content of a subject by engaging in or listening to the different dialogues of different activity structures that are chosen to construct lessons?

According to Lemke (1993: 13), the second pattern or structure that is constructed by the participants in the dialogue of a lesson is the thematic pattern, or the "what" of teaching and learning. For Lemke (1993), the "what" of teaching and learning is the complex web of meanings about a particular topic or subject that is constructed by the teacher and the students as they combine words and other symbols in particular and unique ways through their classroom talk. A thematic pattern then, is a way of picturing or imagining the network of relationships among the meanings of the key terms in the language of a particular subject (Lemke, 1993: 98). It is the common theme that emerges as the teacher and students say the same thing about a topic or subject but in many different ways. The grammar and rhetorical forms used by the teacher and the students in speaking or writing about a topic or subject provide the means of expressing the semantic relationships that exist among these items and ultimately the thematic pattern of the subject. Mastery of the thematic pattern of a topic or subject means being able to access and to use a system of semantic relationships at a level that affords meaningful and satisfying engagement in talk about the topic or subject. How do students develop mastery of the thematic patterns of a subject?

It is important to reiterate that teachers need to adopt a habit of engaging in a metadiscourse in their teaching practice. They need to, as a matter of course through the dialogue of the lesson, explain relations of meaning among the terms and concepts of a subject in clear and simple language to students. This practice of consciously and continuously making explicit the connections between the thematic structures and patterns of a subject and the ways that students currently talk about a topic or subject is fundamental to helping students to learn to talk the language of the subject with confidence, understanding and precision. If students are to become effective communicators in the language of a subject and simultaneously be empowered to engage with and to learn the content of the subject, then they must understand the precise relationships that subject specific symbols, terms, concepts and structures have to one another and how these relationships are assembled into the thematic patterns of the subject. While the work of assembling semantic relationships into thematic patterns is done through the practise and explanation of the vocabulary and of the grammatical and rhetorical structures of the language of a subject, it is also achieved through the various moves of the activity structures chosen in the construction of the lesson.

Following from Lemke (1993: 20), it can be claimed that the quality of student learning of the content of a subject is dependent upon the quality of the relationships, between subject thematic patterns and activity structures, that are developed and enacted by the teacher and the students as they construct a lesson. These two aspects of the dialogue of lesson construction are interdependent in the processes of teaching and learning. It is critical that
the teacher understands that the quality of student learning outcomes in a subject is equally dependant upon the activity structures and the semantic networks and thematic patterns that are developed and enacted, move by move, throughout a lesson. According to Lemke (1993: 19), any analysis of classroom dialogue that is intended to inform the understanding of classroom learning and teaching, must examine both the thematic structures - the "what" of teaching and learning - and the activity structures - the "how" of teaching and learning - of the talk, and how these structures relate to each other through each exchange, move and phase or episode of a lesson.

Behavior management in lesson construction

Lemke (1993: 170) indicates that for students to be constructive participants in lesson building rather than engaging in obstructive or destructive behaviours, they must be taught and must learn how to be proficient and interested users of the thematic structures and patterns and of the activity structures of the subject being studied. If this is the premise, then how is student behaviour during a lesson influenced by the interrelationship of the activity structures and subject thematic patterns that are combined to construct the lesson?

Lemke (1993: 49), says that classroom behaviour is described by the activity structures that tell participants what sequences of actions are expected to happen in a particular lesson and by the functions that these patterns of actions perform in the classroom in the construction of the lesson. Typically, a lesson is made up of sequences of single but related events or activities of varying lengths involving the study of one or more topics. Usually these related events or exchanges can be logically grouped together into lesson phases or episodes of varying lengths. That is, a lesson is typically episodic and is constructed of a number of distinct phases or episodes which are linked together by shifts or moves in the structure or function of the activity structure of the lesson or by a change in topic within the lesson. A successful lesson, according to Lemke (1993: 51) is one in which the teacher and the students choose particular actions to begin it; sustain a common focus of attention in it over an extended period of time through engagement in one or more activity structures and interrelated thematic structures ; and then choose particular actions to end it. Within this lesson construct, teachers do not usually control student behaviour by telling them what to do. Rather, student behaviour is managed and controlled by the expectations that are built into the various activity structures that are typical of particular subjects and/or of particular teaching and learning contexts and that have been learned by the students. This does not mean that the teacher or the students cannot influence participant behaviour or the construction of the lesson. The teacher can influence the level of student participation in or engagement with the lesson by varying the pace of the lesson, the activity structures, the subject-matter content and the quality of metadiscourse of the lesson. Students can either cooperate in or resist the activity structures being employed by the teacher in each phase of the lesson.

Lemke (1993: 66), emphasises that pacing is a critical variable in the construction of successful lessons and in the management of student behaviour. This is so because pacing is concerned with both the time limits placed on exchanges and phases within a lesson and with the number of thematic items introduced in a lesson. The teacher can control the pacing by deciding how much time students will be allowed to complete each task and how long s/he will spend on an exchange or task or episode before raising a new issue or introducing a different activity structure. The teacher can also control the pacing through the number of thematic patterns and relationships that s/he introduces during a lesson. Students can control the pacing by deciding how long they will remain engaged in a lesson activity or task before switching their attentions and energies to unrelated interests and activities.
Nystrand's monologically and dialogically organised instruction

Nystrand (1997), has also theorised that the fundamental issue for classroom learning and teaching is that the quality of classroom learning is inextricably linked to the quality of classroom talk. Classroom talk or discourse shapes and defines the limits of student thinking and subsequently their learning. This presupposes that the way the teacher responds to students’ questions, declarations and responses establishes and defines the context for learning in a lesson. The teacher's responses define the organisational pattern, or activity structures - the "how" - of the lesson and also the content, or thematic patterns - the "what" - of the lesson. Nystrand (1997) further states that the specific ways in which the lesson is conducted, combined with the type and quality of classroom discourse that is engaged in by the teacher and the students, establish particular knowledge roles for the teacher and the students. These established epistemic roles either encourage, constrain or empower their collective and individual thinking. If we are to understand the structure of classroom discourse and its relationship to learning outcomes for students, then we must analyse and evaluate the classroom exchanges that constitute "the language of learning" (Cazden, 1988).

Nystrand (1997: 19) has used the constructions of monologically organised instruction (i.e. recitation), and dialogically organised instruction (i.e. discussion), to investigate the language of classroom learning and teaching and the potential effects of each construct on learning outcomes for students. Table 1. illustrates the key features of these constructions.

Table 1. Key features of monologically and dialogically organised instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monologically organised instruction</th>
<th>Dialogically organised instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
<td>Recitation</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication model</td>
<td>Transmission of knowledge</td>
<td>Transformation of understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Objectivism: Knowledge is given</td>
<td>Dialogism: Knowledge emerges from the interaction of voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of valued knowledge</td>
<td>Teacher, textbook authorities:</td>
<td>Includes students' interpretations and personal experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excludes students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Choppy</td>
<td>Coherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nystrand, 1997: 19)

Gutierrez (Nystrand, 1997), elaborates by stating that recitation or monologically organised instruction is characterised by the following activity structures.

- Classroom talk follows a strict initiation (question), student response and teacher evaluation construct or pattern of discourse. This "IRE" structure is similar to Lemke's (1993) "triadic dialogue" activity structure.
- Teacher always selects which students will speak, when and for how long.
- Teacher shows little if any acknowledgment of students' self-selections.
• Topics and sub-topics for discussion are always selected by the teacher.
• Student responses tend to be limited to single words or short phrases. The teacher does not encourage students to elaborate in the oral contributions and the teacher's commentary or elaboration on student responses is minimal.
• Teacher initiates test-like questions for which there is generally only one correct answer, throughout the construction of the lesson. The aim is to progress the lesson by students providing specific "right" answers to the teacher's predominantly "knowledge" questions.

While the oral interactions that constitute a secondary classroom lesson are rarely completely monological (i.e. a teacher soliloquy), Nystrand (1997) correctly reminds us that recitation is the predominant mode of classroom discourse in secondary classrooms. Teachers in these classrooms frequently appear to try to construct lessons as thought they were monological or univocal structures. Teachers typically use monological structures to "fill students up with all the essential points and all the right answers" (Freire, 1970 in Nystrand, 1997); to control the content and pedagogy of the lesson; to control student participation by manipulating the pace of activities; and to control the behaviour of the students. Paradoxically, the outcomes of this approach to teaching and learning are very often missed "teachable moments" because students are not afforded the opportunity to "talk to learn" (Britton, 1969 in Nystrand, 1997). Students who are frustrated by the teacher's authoritarian control strategies that effectively gag their participation and temper their interest, resist or react by engaging in off-task behaviour. Student thinking is replaced by remembering and guessing for those who remain engaged in the construction of the lesson. What is the alternative to this construct in which the teacher talks and students supposedly listen to learn?

Following from Table 1, Gutierrez (Nystrand, 1997), describes dialogically organised instruction (i.e. discussion) as having the following activity structure characteristics which are similar in many respects to Lemke's (1993) modified triadic dialogue; student questioning dialogue; cross discussion and teacher-student duolog activity structures.

• The strict "question - response - evaluation" activity construct or pattern of discourse that characterises monologically organised instruction is relaxed to allow for more student responses and for the construction of shared content knowledge.
• While the teacher frames and facilities the learning activities of the lesson, teacher talk is minimal in comparison with the virtual teacher soliloquy that characterises the discourse of monologically organised instruction.

• Students tend to self-select or select peers to speak and determine when they will speak and for how long.
• Teacher and students negotiate which sub-topics will be discussed and in what depth.
• While the aim of the discourse is the development of shared knowledge, the teacher places an emphasis on students' learning of correct, factual knowledge.
• Teacher and students ask questions of which neither knows the complete answer and questions that build on students' previous responses.
• Teacher recognises "teachable moments" that occur during the construction of the lesson by engaging with students' contributions that expand particular sub-topics.

This very brief review of Lemke's (1993) theoretical framework of learning and teaching and of Nystrand's (1997) complementary instructional framework, indicates that the evidence required for an investigation of the research question must include the activity structures used by a pre-service teacher in teaching his/her students; the semantic structures and
thematic patterns that constitute the classroom discourse constructed by the pre-service teacher and the students; and the power and control relationships that describe the learning context in which the pre-service teacher and the students interact.

The following brief discussion of Bernstein's (1971 - 1997) theoretical framework of the structuring of educational knowledge is used to further define the evidence required to investigate the research question.

**Bernstein's theoretical framework of the structuring of educational knowledge**

Typically in the classrooms of pre-service teachers, classroom talk or discourse is dominated by the pre-service teacher who is trying to complete a planned sequence of learning activities within a given timeframe while simultaneously trying to manage or control the behaviour the students. Frequently, the pre-service teacher is unsuccessful in one or more of these endeavours with the result that neither the students nor the pre-service teacher can identify which, if any of the planned learning outcomes have been achieved by which students by the close of the lesson. Basil Bernstein (1971 - 1997) has developed a theoretical framework on the structuring of educational knowledge and a language of description and analysis that allows analysis of the pedagogic episodes of a lesson and of the power and control struggles that occur in classrooms. Bernstein's theory of power and control and his framework of classification and framing of the instructional and regulative discourses of the lesson, which have not been previously applied to an analysis of the pedagogic discourse constructed by secondary pre-service teachers, will be used in this project to interrogate the three data corpuses identified in the pilot study.

According to Bernstein (1996), power relations create, legitimise and re-produce boundaries and spaces between different agents or categories of socialisation. In a classroom context power relations determine and describe the boundaries and spaces between students and teachers and discourses and texts and space and time. Power operates to produce dislocations and interruptions in social space, thereby establishing legitimate relations of order between the different agents of socialisation. Control relations establish legitimate forms of communication that are appropriate for each of the different categories or agents. Control relations transmit the boundary relations of power and attempt to socialise individuals into preconstituted relationships. Control relations, through legitimate forms of communication within and between categories or agents, carry both the power of reproduction and the potential for its change. Bernstein's theory of power and control relations are used in this paper to analyse the strength of boundaries that exist and are created in the pre-service teacher's classroom, the processes by which boundaries are legitimised and the ways in which institutional boundaries or categories of socialisation are reproduced. Bernstein uses the concepts of "classification" and "framing" to explain the power and control relationships of the classroom and of the construction of educational knowledge by the teacher and the students.

Bernstein (1977: 88-94; 1996: 21-26), states that classification is the relationship between agents or categories of socialisation and is a function of their degree of insulation. Strong insulation (classification) has explicit boundaries, clear distinguishing characteristics and high levels of specialisation. Levels of distinctiveness and specialisation weaken as strength of insulation declines. Classification is determined by the underpinning principle of a social division of labour which relates to social power relations. In relation to the education knowledge code which defines the institutionalised curriculum (knowledge), pedagogy (teaching and learning strategies) and evaluation (performance standards and measurement tools), classification is used to analyse and to describe the strength of curriculum insulation. Strong classification (+C) or insulation is indicative of tight control over the content and scope of the approved, formal curriculum; precisely defined discipline and subject
boundaries; and high levels of specialisation within subjects and within disciplines. It is also indicative of restricted or limited control by learners and teachers over what is to be learned in schools and when it is to be learned. Weak classification (-C) indicates that the curriculum is loosely defined and may lead to or encourage the development of new fields and processes of learning. Learners and teachers are afforded more control over what is to be learned and when it is to be learned.

While classification is used to describe the power and control relationships of "what" is taught and learned in a classroom, framing (Bernstein, 1977: 88-94; 1996: 26-28) is used to describe the power and control relationships that influence "how" teaching and learning is done. Framing refers to the locus and relative strength of control of what is transmitted and what is received and of what may and may not be transmitted in the pedagogical relationship of teacher and taught. Strong framing (+F) indicates that the transmitter (teacher, student, parents, education system, text, television, internet) explicitly regulates the content, sequencing, form, pacing, location and discourse that constitute the learning context. If the framing is weak (-F) then the acquirer (teacher, student, parents) has increased, apparent control over one or more elements of the pedagogy.

Bernstein's concepts of social order (regulative discourse) and discursive order (instructional discourse) are important to explore at this juncture. According to Halliday (1978), Bernstein postulates that education is a major conduit of cultural transmission in any society and that pedagogic discourse is the carrier of ideological messages for external power relations. Regulative discourse (RD) refers to the forms that hierarchical relations take in the pedagogical relationship. Where framing is strong, the regulative discourse will tend to attach positive conduct, character and performance labels to acquirers. If the framing is apparently weak, then the regulative discourse will attempt to label acquirers in terms of their creativity, participation and level of initiative. Instructional discourse (ID), which is always embedded in the dominant regulative discourse, is concerned with the selection, pacing and sequencing of the knowledge to be taught. It is important to note that while the strength of framing can vary over the elements of instructional discourse (strong pacing; weak selection) and between discourses, weak framing of instructional discourse is a function of weak framing of regulative discourse.

Generally, where classification and framing are strong there is visible pedagogic practice. The rules of the regulative and instructional discourses are explicit, are known to and are understood by both teacher and taught and the range of options available to both in terms of what may and may not be transmitted in the pedagogical relationship is clearly bounded. Where classification and framing are weak, there is invisible pedagogic practice. In this situation, the rules of the regulative and instructional discourses are implicit and are usually unknown to the acquirer (Bernstein, 1997: 116-136; 1971: 88-90). The range of options available to teacher and taught in the control of what is transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship is both broader and more unclear.

Following from the discussion of Lemke's (1993) theoretical framework of learning and teaching, this brief discussion of Bernstein's (1971 - 1997) theoretical framework of the structuring of educational knowledge indicates that the following evidence is required to investigate the research question

- Evidence of what the pre-service teacher intends to teach in a lesson; how s/he intends to do it; and why s/he chooses the particular lesson content, structure and processes;
- Evidence of what is actually taught and learned in a lesson;
- Evidence of the processes and language used by the pre-service teacher and the students in constructing a lesson;
• Evidence of the power and control relationships that describe the learning context and the curriculum and pedagogy found within it; and
• Evidence of how and why the classification and framing of the regulative and instructional discourses and of the activity structures and thematic patterns of a lesson change within a lesson and from lesson to lesson.

A pilot study involving the analysis of a planned lesson taught to a Year 8 English class by a final year pre-service teacher was used to assess the utility of Bernstein's theoretical framework in the identification, analysis and evaluation of this evidence.

The Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot study was to test the efficacy of Bernstein's theoretical framework, in terms of revealing and describing the layers of complex variables that shape learning and teaching practice in a classroom context. This pilot study involved the application of Bernstein's theoretical framework, particularly the concepts of classification and framing of regulative and instructional discourses,

• to describe what was happening at each stage of the construction and enactment of the planned lesson, with a focus on the classroom talk of the pre-service teacher and of the students and the power and control relations that existed in the classroom;
• to describe the moves that occurred in the construction and enactment of the planned lesson; why these moves occurred; and how they were managed by the pre-service teacher;
• to offer explanations as to why the classroom talk recorded in the lesson was constructed in particular ways at different times during the lesson; and
• to theorise about how the teaching practice of the pre-service teacher and the learning outcomes of the students might be improved.

Data collection

"Belinda" - a final year, secondary, pre-service teacher - provided the researcher with a copy of her lesson plan for a 35 minute Year 8 English lesson (Appendix A). An audiotape of Belinda teaching the 27 students in her Year 8 English class was made with her knowledge and prior approval. The approvals of the school leadership and of the Year 8 class teacher ("Di") to audiotape this lesson were obtained in advance by the researcher. The transcript of the audiotape of the lesson (Appendix B) was produced using Silverman's (1993:118) simplified transcription symbols.

Following the lesson, the researcher used a semi-structured, open-ended strategy (Silverman, 1993:95; Fontanta & Frey, 1994:365-368) to interview Belinda about the lesson and its outcomes. When Belinda agreed to participate in the study, the researcher told her that the post-lesson interview would focus on her reflections on the lesson - what she thought went well and what she would do differently if she were to reteach the lesson. This approach was intended to encourage Belinda to share what she perceived to be the key features of her present and desired practice. It was also designed to give Belinda the opportunity to comment on the pedagogical relationship that she had formed with this group of learners. As the planned lesson was being enacted the researcher decided to raise the issues of learning outcomes and lesson closure in the interview as there were significant differences between what Belinda had planned to achieve in these areas and what was actually observed. As the interview unfolded, the researcher decided to probe the place and influence of Belinda's mentor in the pedagogical relationship as Belinda used the mentor to legitimise her course of action on some occasions, while at other times she obviously
ignored her mentor's advice. Belinda gave her prior approval for the audiotaping of this interview. The transcript (Appendix C) of the audiotaped interview was also produced using Silverman's simplified transcription symbols.

**Analysis - layer one - the lesson plan**

Belinda's lesson plan is replete with examples that show that she accepts responsibility for making her students conform to the classroom participation behaviours that are expected of them by the school, by her mentor and by herself. The language of the lesson plan clearly illustrates that Belinda assumes that she has, as the class teacher, a position of legitimate power and control over the educational knowledge. It is her responsibility to ensure that her students acquire this knowledge. The following examples of the regulative discourse from Belinda's lesson plan serve to illustrate the clear boundary relations that are being established between herself and her students as categories of socialisation.

Table 2 Extracts from Lesson Plan (Appendix A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content/Strategies</th>
<th>Worthwhile Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher lines the students up outside and instructs them to enter the room &quot;quietly&quot; and find their name cards and stand behind the desk silently. NB: If this task isn't done properly, they will repeat until they get it right.</td>
<td>Students line up, listen to instructions, enter the room and stand silently behind their desks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher explains the reasons behind the new seating plan once the students are seated.</td>
<td>Students sit down. Students will understand the reasons behind the new seating plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher explains to the students that they are now starting a new unit of work - One Act Plays.</td>
<td>Students will understand what they will be generally doing throughout this unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher generates a discussion about, &quot;What is a Radio Play&quot;?</td>
<td>Students participate in discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instructs the students to turn to such and such a page, and asks for volunteers for readers to play particular characters.</td>
<td>Students volunteer to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher then facilitates the reading of the play, stopping to pinpoint areas of interest.</td>
<td>Students listen and make note of important points - either by highlighting handout or jotting them down in notebooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher recaps the main differences of a play.</td>
<td>Students answer questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belinda as teacher and code transmitter lines students up; instructs them; explains the reasons; generates a discussion; asks for volunteers; facilitates; and recaps. The students
as code acquirers line up; listen to instructions; stand silently; sit down; will understand; participate; volunteer; make notes; highlight; and answer questions. These examples of strong framing, together with the planned time allocation for each segment of the lesson plan (Table 3), indicate that Belinda expected to dominate and to clearly regulate all aspects of the learning context, as she perceives is her right and responsibility as transmitter.

The examples in Table 2, together with the following extracts from Belinda's lesson plan also serve to illustrate the apparent strength of framing of the planned instructional discourse. Belinda as transmitter (and her mentor) is responsible for and is in control of the selection, pacing and sequencing of the knowledge to be taught.

**Holistic Objective:** Students will acquire an understanding of the genre they will be using throughout the unit.

**Analytic Objectives:** Students will

- Recognise the difference between a play and prose (knowledge)
- Enjoy reading a play (attitude)
- Interpret the differences they see within the play read in class (Skills)
- Apply reading skills to read the play selected (Process)

**Learning outcomes:** Students will be able to identify the major differences between a play and prose.

Clearly the expectation is that the students will learn what Belinda has selected for them to learn in this lesson and that they will learn it through the particular activities and experiences that she has constructed. Unfortunately, it is not clear what precisely is expected to be learned. What constitutes an appropriate understanding of the genre? Which genre is to be used throughout the lesson? What precise differences between a play and prose are to be recognised and what constitutes satisfactory recognition of differences? What differences are students expected to see within the play and what constitutes satisfactory interpretation of these differences? What reading skills are students to apply in the play reading? Bernstein (1971: 205-206) defines framing as

*the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, and pacing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship.*

In terms of the lesson plan it could be argued that the framing of the instructional discourse is superficially strong but is actually weak in terms of the specific knowledge that is to be transmitted to the learners. The available data do not provide direct information about the strength of curriculum insulation. However, based on the content and structure of Belinda's lesson plan, the assumption can be made that the curriculum taught by Belinda to her English class is strongly classified and insulated by her mentor as an agent of the school's and the education system's formal English language and secondary schooling curriculum. Because curriculum classification and the framing of pedagogic relations are strong, Belinda
views herself as the transmitter of visible pedagogic practice in which the rules of regulative
and instructional discourse are explicit and are to be regularly reinforced by the transmitter.

The foregoing analysis of Belinda's lesson plan can be summarised by the following
Bernsteinian equation

**Instructional discourse** Strong classification Apparently strong framing

**Regulative discourse** Strong classification Strong framing

ID +C +F  
RD +C +F

Figure 1. ID/RD relationship - Lesson plan.

**Layer two - the lesson**

Interestingly an analysis of the audio transcript (Appendix B) of the lesson shows that

- lesson pacing did not proceed as planned (Table 3);
- there was no closure to the lesson as planned so it is difficult for Belinda, the
  students or an observer to ascertain what, if anything was learned through the
  lesson;
- the main objective of the lesson - to identify the major differences between a play
  and prose - was not only poorly defined, but was ignored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson phase</th>
<th>Time planned for each phase</th>
<th>Time taken for each phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory management</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>6 minutes 20 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of new unit</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>2 minutes 00 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play reading and discussion</td>
<td>17 minutes</td>
<td>26 minutes 40 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement and closure</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>0 minutes 00 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the framing of the regulative discourse is relatively strong throughout the lesson, the
superficial strength of framing of the instructional discourse promised in the lesson plan is
lost throughout the delivery of the lesson. The following extracts from the audio transcript of
the "Introduction of new unit" phase of the lesson illustrate a change in focus from that
of identifying the major differences between a play and prose to reading through the play
and further slippage in framing due to lack of clarity and precision in the statement of
planned lesson outcomes.

Turn 21 - *We're going to look at plays; We're going to read a play in class.* The planned
objectives of the lesson are changed significantly because of Belinda's preoccupation with
classroom control rather than with management of learning experiences to achieve planned
At Turn 47, learning objectives are still being clarified and still remain different from those stated in the lesson plan. This major shift in the focus of the lesson makes an evaluation of lesson effectiveness, in terms of planned outcomes, very difficult.

**21 T:** We're going to start a new unit of work. We're going to look at (.) plays.

**We're going to read a play in class. (04.2) Shane?**

**23 T:** Who can tell me about plays? (03.2) Jack?

**24 S:** You've got to act.

**25 T:** You've got to act. Yeah. What else about play when you read them? Ben?

**47 S:** Are we going to do it in front of the class?

**48 T:** We're not going to perform our parts. Your assessment is going to be a radio play and its going to go onto a tape, OK. So you don't perform it in front of the class.

Exchanges of this type, involving T/S/T/S turn taking and unnatural pauses (greater than 03.0 secs.) are typical of this phase of the lesson and indicate weaknesses in the framing of both the regulative and instructional discourses. Unnatural pauses in institutional discourse are "dangerous" in the sense that they signal to participants that the transmitter may have lost control of the focus and direction of the discourse and of the expected pattern of turn taking (Silverman, 1993). This may result in other members in the pedagogical relationship attempting to take control of the discourse or to establish an alternate discourse.

Throughout the lesson there is no reference to the characteristics of prose, nor is there any effort to summarise the characteristics of a play. The majority of the discourse is concerned with dealing with emergent student control issues;

**50 T:** OK. Eddie sit down mate. Let's have a look at the first page there. (13.1)

**51 Ss:** ((General chatter)) (02.1)

**52 T:** OK, guys! Just listening. (05.1)...........

or is repetitive of students contributions (Turns 24 and 25 above); or is dismissive of their questions and efforts to influence the lesson content

**16 S:** Are you our new teacher?

**17 T:** For the next four weeks (06.8). OK, now we're going to start a new unit of work.

**18 S:** Miss are we going to be doing that spelling comp?

**19 T:** No. We're not doing a spelling comp today.
Why has the apparently strong framing of the instructional discourse in the lesson plan not been realised in the delivery of the lesson? One explanation is that Belinda only wanted the students to read the play (Appendix C).

5 I: So the object of the lesson was to get them to (.) read the play[...

6. R: [ I wanted them to read the play and identify with the characteristics of play,

   like they got, they got the cast members, they got that (.) the brackets where the action and all that. That was basically it. It was just an introduction so they could associate that further on.

In summary then, Belinda wanted the students to participate in the reading of the play and to know who the characters were. Understanding the meaning of surface features - brackets - of the written drama genre, was unplanned and incidental in the development of the lesson. She did not address the other objectives that were superficially stated in her lesson plan. Possibly these objectives were only included in the lesson plan to satisfy her mentor and to impress her supervising lecturer because of her perceptions of their expectations of a "good lesson" and of her place in the power relationship that existed between her and these two expert, authority figures.

The foregoing analysis reveals that the promised strength of classification and framing of the instructional and regulative discourses of the lesson is not realised in the implementation of the lesson. The following equation is useful in describing Belinda's practice as the lesson plan and lesson implementation layers are exposed and are critically analysed.

Lesson Lesson
Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>+F</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>+F</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. ID/RD relationships - Lesson plan and lesson implementation phases

Layer three - the interview

The following extracts from an interview with Belinda (Appendix C), immediately following this lesson, affirm her view of her role in the classroom as transmitter of the power and control relations that her mentor expects will be recontextualised in her practice. According to Bernstein (1996: 42-51) recontextualizing rules regulate the formation of specific pedagogic discourse as a discourse is relocated. In this case, the recontextualised theory of learning is behaviour management through repetition and negative reinforcement. Learning is recontextualised in Belinda's practice as student control.

1 I: What I'm interested in is what you thought about the lesson. What went well in the lesson? What went according to your plan?
2 R: .......... Oh they read according to my plan....... They umm (.) I knew they 

wouldn't settle the first time I brought them in so I was 
expecting that I'd have to take them out again (.) so that wasn't 
unexpected......................

most of my plan went according (.) to how I set it out (.) but I 
wasn't (.) I don't know, I find it really difficult in trying to (.) 

a:::rm keep the kids on task........

What is happening here? Firstly, the apparently strong framing of the instructional discourse 
of the lesson plan has been further weakened by Belinda's emphasis on - Oh they read 
according to my plan - as her first response to the foregoing question about the strengths of 
her implemented lesson. Secondly, because the framing of the regulative discourse is 
superficially strong but is actually weak, the students are labelled as being difficult to 
manage. Belinda expects that the students will misbehave and that she will have to practise 
them in conforming to approved and expected school standards. The actual weakness of the 
regulative discourse is flagged by Belinda's comment - I find it really difficult in trying to keep 
the kids on task

Belinda's concern about the actual weakness of the regulative discourse and her confusion 
about her roles and responsibilities as teacher is further confirmed by the following 
exchange with her peer student teacher "Nerida". Nerida suggests that these students 
should also be labelled as being manipulative because she feels that they may be being 
noisy so that they can waste class time by practising quiet entries and exits to/from the 
classroom. Belinda is confronted by the expectation that as code transmitter she must 
implement further control strategies that will maintain her dominant position as "teacher" in 
the classroom.

35 I: And that's got a settling effect on them hasn't it?

36 R: Yeah. It does (.) But I (.) I don't (.) as (.) I was talking to Nerida about it just 
 afterwards, and Nerida said, "Do you think (.) they (.) are aware now (.) that 

they can waste time (.) while you're doing that?"

37 I: Yes (.) possibly =

38 R: = And so (.) I've got to try and think "OK" (.) of another way to do it.

39 I: Yes.

40 R: You're not going to pull the wool over my eyes. ((Laughter)).

The strength of Belinda's mentor's ("Di") role in recontextualizing the expected school and 
professional regulative discourses in Belinda's practice is illustrated by the following 
exchange.

43 I: = It just appeared that (.) they came in and if you were going to let them be 

noisy then they would have been.
44 R: See they're different (.). Ahm (.). I thought (.). One, I did it [practise entry to

the classroom]. I was expecting to do it because it was the first
day back after the holidays (.). and I intended them to be rowdy
anyway (.). and they take a while to settle but when Di does it
(.) they just know. She just has to be there and they know. (.).
"OK, we've got to be quiet". Whereas they don't know that with
me yet. I don't have that presence (.). so

In saying, Whereas they don't know that with me yet. I don't have that presence, Belinda
realises that she has not assumed the power and control relations that Di has constructed
with these students. The regulative discourse of her practice is weakly framed.

What is really happening here and why is it happening? A more detailed analysis of two
episodes from the reflective interview are discussed to seek answers to these questions.

1 I: 1 What I'm interested in is what you thought about the lesson. What went

2 well in the lesson? What went according to your plan?

2 R: 3 ((Giggles)) Oh they read according to my plan. ((Giggles)) (.). Yeah. No.

4 They umm (.). I knew they wouldn't settle the first time I
brought them in

5 so I was expecting that I'd have to take them out again (.). so
that wasn't

6 unexpected. Umm. But according to what I wanted them to
achieve, I got

7 most of it done except that I actually wanted them to write
down some

8 simple definitions, but I never (.). I should have done that
before I actually

9 started when we read (.). ahm (.). the characters, and I should
have written

10 the definition then of they've got a cast and what a cast is
and what that

11 is for .hhh and that, but I didn't get that done, but otherwise
(.). most of

12 my plan went according (.). to how I had set it out (.). but I
wasn't (.). I

13 don't know I find it really difficult in trying to (.). a:::rm keep
the kids on
14 task (.) with them like knowing (.) whether I should stop and go "OK (.)

15 let's come back and say this" because I have (.) six or so learning

difficulty kids there. (.) Well kids with learning difficulties (.) severe ones

17 (.) and like Eddie probably didn't have a clue (.) about (.) That's why I

18 stopped half way through the (.) play and got them to clarify so that other

19 kids who weren't comprehending what was going on could hear it in (.)

20 other words I guess. (.) So you know.

In lines 1 and 2 of this episode the Interviewer (supervising lecturer) tries to establish an equal and collaborative relationship with Belinda by indicating interest in what she has to say about her lesson, with a particular focus on what went well and what went according to her lesson plan. While there is no explicit demonstration of a superior/subordinate, assessor/assessed or transmitter/acquirer relationship in the Interviewer's questions, the implicit, unequal power relationship that exists is reflected in Belinda's nervous, defensive and subordinate posture in responding to these apparently genuine and positive questions.

Belinda’s nervousness is evidenced by her giggles (line 3) and by the frequent pauses (.), incomplete thoughts, restarts and changes of focus that characterise her relatively lengthy response. Belinda's defensiveness and subordinate posture is in stark contrast to the apparently strong framing of the regulative and instructional discourses found in her lesson plan (Appendix A). "But" is used five times through her response - twice (lines 6 and 11/12) to attempt to put a positive interpretation on what happened and three times (line 8 - but I never...; line 11 - but I didn't...; line 12 - but I wasn’t...) to acknowledge that planned elements of the lesson were forgotten or omitted. This acknowledgment is further reinforced by the use of I should have done/written... in lines 8 and 9. In line 3 (they read according to my plan); lines 6 and 7 (according to what I wanted them to achieve, I got most of it done); and lines 11 and 12 (most of my plan went according to how I had set it out), Belinda attempts to balance her negative perceptions of the lesson by claiming compliance with her lesson plan and the achievement of planned lesson outcomes. In her responses she appears to be trying to establish the interviewer's criteria for teaching competence - "What does he want/expect me to say?"

This is a matter of real concern. Belinda knows that the interviewer observed the lesson and that he knows what happened. Therefore Belinda must believe that she actually implemented her lesson as planned and that students did actually achieve the planned outcomes. Belinda's lesson plan did not clearly define planned learning outcomes and there was no actual closure to the lesson (although it was planned) so no one could know what, if anything was learned by any student in this lesson. Belinda assumes that because the play was read by members of the class then each student in the class achieved the learning objects listed in her lesson plan.
In line 13 (I find it really difficult........ keep the kids on task) and lines 15 and 16 (I have six or so learning difficulty kids...), Belinda attempts to rationalise her admitted shortcomings in the delivery of this lesson by drawing attention to the labels that have been assigned, probably by the mentor teacher, to the class and to individuals within it. Belinda appears to accept these labels (line 17 - Eddie probably didn't have a clue) and expects that labelled students will behave/achieve according these expectations. While Belinda appears in her lesson plan to have strong framing of the regulative and instructional discourses of the lesson, these blaming comments indicate that she has little confidence in her ability to manage the regulative discourse and no idea as to how to plan and manage the instructional discourse for the class or for the individuals within it.

Belinda's relationship to the students is one in which she views herself as the transmitter and controller and they are the acquirers to be controlled, as illustrated by her comments -

Line 3 - they read according to my plan;
Line 6 - .... what I wanted them to achieve .....;
Line 7 - .... I actually wanted them to write down ....;
Lines 8 & 9 - .... before I actually started when we read ....;
Line 12 - .... how I had set it out .....; and

Lines 17 & 18 - That's why I stopped halfway through the play and got them to clarify ....

Within this context she attempts to excuse her inability to effectively manage the regulative and instructional discourses of the lesson by referring to the previously cited "difficulty" labels (lines 13, 15 - 19) that have been ascribed to her students. Belinda sees these children as being difficult to manage and slow learners, so she structures the pedagogic discourse accordingly and assumes a posture of almost blameless helplessness.

The analysis of this episode of the reflective interview with Belinda, together with the analyses of her lesson plan and extracts from the lesson transcript, exposes the following layers of Belinda's performance as a teacher in this lesson

Lesson Lesson Lesson

Plan Implementation Reflection

ID +C +F -C -F -F

RD +C +F +C +F -C -F

Figure 3. ID/RD relationships - Lesson plan, lesson implementation and lesson reflection phases
Belinda shows strong framing and classification of both discourses in her lesson plan for the benefit of her mentor and supervising lecturer. During the delivery of the lesson, the strength of classification of the regulative discourse is retained while the classification of the instructional discourse and the framing of both discourses is exposed as actually being weak. Belinda does not know precisely what instructional outcomes are to be achieved and she has real difficulty in managing both the behaviour and learning of the students. The reflective interview with Belinda reveals that she is quite uncertain about what she is trying to teach to whom and why. Weak classification and framing of both discourses results in a generally unsatisfactory lesson for the students and for Belinda.

An analysis of the following episode, which appears towards the end of the interview transcript, sustains the foregoing conclusions.

55 I: 1 One of the things I noticed when (.) ah (.) you were asking questions. And

2 you really spread the questions all around the class which was great. (.)

3 But (.) at the end of every question except one, that I can recall, you

4 named the kid immediately (.) rather than giving them time to think. (.)

5 Why do (.) Why do you do that?


57 I: 7 Say ah (.) Ah [

58 R: 8 [ What do you (.) I say the question and then go, "What do you think

9 Ben?"

59 I: 10 Yes. (.) So the tag comes immediately after the question =

60 R: 11 = Instead of just letting someone putting their hand up?

61 I: 12 Yes.

62 R: 13 I don't know. I didn't think of that one. ((Said laughingly))

63 I: 14 I'm not criticising.

64 R: 15 No.

65 I: 16 I'm just saying it [

66 R: 17 [ That's a good point =

67 I: 18 = that's interesting (.) that you did that.

68 R: 19 I guess because I don't like to give these guys (.) a lot of room to then
20 just wander off because a lot of them won't stay focused.

69 I: 21 No.

70 R: 22 So (.) I guess tha. I tend to leave my questions in other classes open-

23 ended and I don't (.) ask someone (.) I wait for them (.) but with these

24 guys I tend to I guess. But (.) I don't know. Mainly, probably to keep

25 them (.) focused and not let them just lose it (.) and go off again. (.)

26 Because it takes a long time to bring ((Giggle))

71 I: 27 To bring them back again. (.) Although they were pretty good I thought.

72 R: 28 I think they are. They (.) ah (.) my first lesson with them was ((Giggle))

29 really strange. It was (.) they were everywhere. They (.) I didn't get

30 anything done really. It wasn't a bad lesson. Di said to me (.) she said "As

31 far as I'm concerned (.) Belinda you did an all right job you know (.)

32 You've just got to work on ((Giggle)) (. getting their attention" (. so

In this episode the supervising lecturer (I) gently, but assertively presses Belinda on an
aspect of her questioning technique that pervades the lesson discourse (lines 1-5). Belinda
immediately adopts a nervous, defensive posture and hedges with the interviewer for twelve
turns (lines 6-18) before providing her response. Interestingly her response (lines 19-20 and
24-26) indicates that she uses questions to control and manage the behaviour of students
who have been labelled as being difficult to manage and easily distracted from learning
activities. She makes brief reference (lines 22-23) to using questioning for other purposes in
other classes. Open-ended (line 22) and I don't ask someone (.) I wait for them (line 23),
together with questions written into her lesson plan may indicate that Belinda understands
the power and place of questioning in framing the instructional discourse, but she asks the
interviewer to believe that this happens in other classes (line 22). Why hasn't it happened in
this class?

After some hesitation, redirections, restarts and reinforcement of student labels (lines 26, 28-
29) Belinda finds her excuse in lines 30 to 32. Di (the mentor) essentially told her (or she
heard) that she was doing well; that she had to get the students on task (strong regulative
discourse); and that it really did not matter if the students did not learn anything (I didn't get
anything done really. It wasn't a bad lesson. Belinda you did an all right job you know).

Of course, this analysis reflects the philosophy, knowledge and experience of the
researcher. Belinda's practice is seen and interpreted through his provenance. Belinda has
demonstrated a different set of perceptions about the classification and framing of the
regulative and instructional discourse constructed in her classroom through her planning for
teaching, her teaching practice and through the reflective interview. It is probable that the
teacher mentor (Di) would express different perceptions about Belinda's practice based on
her individual provenance. This does not alter the fact that there are real and identifiable
deficiencies in each of the layers of Belinda's practice and that Bernstein's framework is a very useful tool in exposing and analysing these layers and the linkages between them.

Discussion

The results of this pilot study provide insights as to how and why an apparently appropriate, well-planned and achievable teaching/learning program did not realise its intended outcomes for the students or for the teacher.

The analysis of the first layer of Belinda's teaching practice - the lesson plan - revealed that at the surface level, she had selected definite content and behavioural knowledge to impart to the learners during the lesson; that there was a clearly planned order and sequence in which students would learn this knowledge; and that the pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught was clear to all and was to be further reinforced through the practising of the planned behavioural knowledge objectives. In Bernsteinian terms, the regulative discourse of the lesson plan, that is the content and methods selected to transmit and to reinforce the power and control relationships in the pedagogical relationship, was strongly classified and was strongly framed. Similarly the instructional discourse - the selection, pacing and sequencing of the knowledge to be taught - appeared to be strongly classified and strongly framed. However a closer analysis of the planned learning objectives revealed that they were unclear and open to wide interpretation, indicating that the framing of the instructional discourse was not strong. Belinda did not have a precise idea of the learning outcomes that she wanted students to achieve through their participation in the lesson.

The effect of this was revealed by the analysis of the second layer of Belinda's teaching practice - the lesson enactment. Belinda clearly did not have a clear idea of the educational knowledge that she wanted students to learn however she was definite that they should behave in ways that were approved of by the school and by her mentor. The analysis revealed that Belinda experienced difficulty in controlling the students after the first phase of the lesson and so her attention was diverted from the implementation of an already weakly framed instructional discourse to that of trying to sustain the framing of the regulative discourse. The effect of this was that Belinda abandoned her planned knowledge goals and had the students read the play as a means of sustaining the weakening regulative discourse and pedagogical relationship. In this process of recontextualization of learning as control, the classification of the instructional discourse became weaker. The lesson may not have failed in the realisation of planned learning outcomes if the instructional discourse had actually been strongly framed and sustained by the initially strongly framed regulative discourse and an apparently strong pedagogical relationship between Belinda and her students. Why did this happen?

The analysis of the third layer of Belinda's teaching practice - her reflection on her practice - revealed that she really did not know how to control student behaviour nor did she know how to effectively manage the learning context or how to establish and maintain an effective pedagogical relationship with her students. The classification and framing of the regulative discourse of the lesson were weak. Within this context, she did not know precisely what she wanted the students to learn or how learning outcomes could be effectively realised and assessed. Not only was the framing of the instructional discourse weak, but Belinda was also confused about what constituted the educational knowledge curriculum in terms of her own constructs of effective leaning and teaching and in terms of the constructs held by her mentor, by the school and by the supervising lecturer. Belinda may believe that if she could learn how to control the students as well as her mentor Di did, then everything would be well. In fact, she may believe in the light of her practicum experiences that good teaching and effective learning are synonymous with tight teacher control of student behaviour.
From the results of this pilot study it is clear that a first step in assisting Belinda to effectively realise planned learning outcomes for the learners in her classes, is to help her to state explicit, precise and relevant learning objectives that are achievable and are understood by the learners. Belinda must have a commitment to the realisation of relevant, planned learning outcomes for each of the students in her class. The framing of the regulative and instructional discourses of the teaching/learning episodes throughout Belinda's lessons must be strong. The implications for the design, delivery and evaluation of programs of pre-service teacher development and the professional development of classroom-based supervising teachers and of university-based teachers are obvious and challenging.

Conclusion

Bernstein's theoretical framework has been invaluable in this pilot study because it has provided the researcher with a set of linked conceptual constructs that could be systematically applied in the analysis of the various available data. This approach to data analysis revealed successive layers of interrelationships and meaning within each set of data and between the different sets of data. The theoretical framework also provided the researcher with a coherent lexicon of conceptual constructs with which to describe, to discuss and to report all aspects of the study.

On the basis of the results of this pilot study, it is suggested that Bernstein's theoretical framework would be an appropriate methodology for the investigation of a larger sample of cases of this type or for researching a small number of cases over time, both with and without planned developmental interventions.
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APPENDIX A

LESSON PLAN

Class: 8 English

Unit: Drama - One Act Plays

Period: 3

Duration: 35 min. (10.10am - 10.45am)

Holistic Objective: Students will acquire an understanding of the genre they will be using throughout the unit (plays)

Analytic Objectives: Students will

- Recognise the difference between a play and prose (Knowledge)
- Enjoy reading a play (Attitude)
- Interpret the differences they see within the play read in class (Skill)
- Apply reading skills to read the play selected (Process)
Building on existing knowledge about plays and prose

Leading to the development of their own radio script

---

Selected assessment instruments

Observing students. Questioning techniques. Students will highlight important pieces of information OR take notes.

---

Classroom organisation

Normal seating arrangement - new seating plan

---

Resources

Name place cards

Mainly Humorous text or a photocopy of selected play

---

Learning outcomes

Students will be able to identify the major differences between a play and prose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CONTENT/STRATEGIES</th>
<th>WORTHWHILE LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 min | Teacher lines the students up outside and instructs them to enter the room “quietly” and find their name card and stand behind the desk silently.  
*NB. If this task isn’t done properly, they will repeat until they get it right.* | Students line up, listen to instructions, enter the room and stand silently behind their desks. |
| 2 min | Teacher explains the reasons behind the new seating plan once the students are seated.  
*ie This seating plan is to (1) help me get to know your names more quickly and (2) to see how effectively you work. I will be reconsidering the arrangements after a week etc.* | Students sit down.  
Students will understand the reasons behind the new seating plan. |
| 10 min | Teacher explains to the students that they are now starting a new unit of work - One Act Plays.  
Teacher generates a discussion about, “What is a Radio Play”?  
**Possible Questions**  
Who can tell me the difference between a play and prose (a novel/book)?  
What is the difference between a play we go to the theatre to see and a video?  
How are those types of plays different from a radio play?  
**Possible Answers**  
The action is set out and described so it can be acted out, whereas in a novel, it is set out in a story format.  
We get to see the whole action at a play but a video we only see selected pieces - what the director chooses.  
A radio play you only hear. | Students will understand what they will be generally doing throughout this unit.  
Students participate in discussion. |
| 17 min | Teacher hands out a copy of the play they are going to read OR hand out a class set of Mainly Humorous.  
Teacher instructs the students to turn to such and such a page and asks for volunteers for readers to play particular characters.  
Teacher then facilitates the reading of the play, stopping to pinpoint areas of | Students receive a copy of the play.  
Students volunteer to read.  
Students listen and make note of important points - either by highlighting handout or jotting them down in note |
**Possible Questions**

At the beginning of the play, what do we see?

What do the words in brackets mean? What are they?

What are the stage directions for?

**Possible Answers**

A list of characters, a paragraph setting the scene etc.

Stage directions.

Telling the actor where to go or how a particular line should be said.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 min</th>
<th>Teacher recaps the main differences of a play.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Possible Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who can tell me two differences we have noted about plays today? Hands up. OK. Such and such, what do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the words in brackets during a character's speech called? What do they mean?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Answers**

Characters, setting, narrator etc.

Stage directions - telling an actor where to go or how to say a line etc.
LESSON TRANSCRIPT

Year 8 English

(T = Teacher; Ss = Student(s); S1-8 = Characters;) 2.32.7 = Min.Sec.Tenth sec.

1. Ss: ((General chatter as students enter classroom and move to desks)) (2.32.7)
2. T: OK, Sorry guys [ (2.32.7)
3. Ss: [ ((General chatter continues)) (04.4)
4. T: Excuse me [
5. Ss: [ ((General chatter continues)) (08.9)

6 T: Excuse me! ( ) had long enough to line up and be quiet (04.9). I want you to enter the room.

You won't be sitting in your usual places. Your name cards are on the desk. I want you to find

your name and stand QUIETLY - and I emphasise the word "Quietly" - behind your new place.

7 Ss: ((General chatter as students move to their new places)) (1.00.4)
8 T: OK! Outside again NOW please. (32.7) Eddie don't touch him.

9 Ss: ((General noise as students move and line up outside the classroom))

10 T: EXCUSE ME. I did not bring you back out here so that you could talk. (03.5) Now we've

done this before. (03.7) I seem to recall last time you came back out again. When I said "Go in

the classroom quietly", I meant it. Now stand behind your desks, silently this time.

11 Ss: ((Noise as students move as directed)) (35.9)
12 T: That's much better. Thank you.(03.6) Now you can sit down.

13 Ss: ((Noise as students sit)) (18.5)

14 T: Now the new seating plan I've got you sitting in is not permanent. It's just to help me get to

know your names. (03.0) And also to see how you work next to this person. (02.4) If you don't

like where you're sitting you can see me, but I will not be changing it for at least a week.
15 Ss: ((Subdued chatter)) (09.0)

16 S: Are you our new teacher?

17 T: For the next four weeks (06.8) OK, now we're going to start a new unit of work.

18 S: Miss are we going to be doing that spelling comp?

19 T: No. We're not doing a spelling comp today. (01.0) Chris!

20 Ss: ((Subdued chatter)) (11.5)

21 T: We're going to start a new unit or work. We're going to look at (.). plays. We're going to read a

play in class. (04.2) Shane?

22 S: ( )

23 T: Who can tell me about plays? (03.2) Jack?

24 S: You've got to act.

25 T: You've got to act. Yeah. What else about plays when you read them? Ben?

26 S: Ah (.) it's a group of people (.) usually.

27 T: Yeah, a group of people are normally in a play. What else? Susan?

28 S: Characters are in a play.

29 T: You have characters. Chris?

30 S: When you read you have the person's name and what he says and [ 

31 T: [ and what they say. Good! Yes, (Student's name)

32 S: There's usually, like one frame, sort of thing.

33 T: What do you mean by frame?

34 S: Like its (01.6) It's like ahm (01.7) You take (01.0) there's (01.4) take Romeo and Juliet. Yeah,

um, it's based on one frame of mind sort of thing. Whereas like you [ 

35 T: [ you mean like from one person's perspective?

36 S: Yeah, pretty much.

37 T: A typical perspective, but same difference. OK. ( )
38 S: What was that?

39 T: Uh uh. Chris?

40 S: There can be ah (.) musicals or (. ) like [ 

41 T: [ yeah. Or like operas or things like that. Anything else about plays? (Student's name)?

42 S: Everyone has a part to speak in a play.

43 T: Yeah. Characters have something to say within them. OK. We've got an example. I'm going to hand it around. (04.2) We're going to read this play. We're not going to act it out. We're just going to read it. ((Teacher moves around the class handing out scripts))

44 Ss: ((General chatter)) (04.9)

45 S: Are we going to ( )?

46 T: What's that?

47 S: Are we going to do it in front of the class?

48 T: We're not going to perform our parts. Your assessment is going to be a radio play and its going to go onto a tape, OK. So you don't perform it in front of the class.

49 Ss: ((General chatter as T continues to distribute scripts)) (24.0)

50 T: OK. Eddie sit down mate. Let's have a look at the first page there. (13.1) That's OK Eddie.

51 Ss: ((General chatter)) (02.1)

52 T: OK, guys! Just listening. (05.1) On the front page we've got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 characters. So I need eight volunteers.

53 Ss: Me, me, me, me, me

54 T: I knew it wouldn't be a problem to get volunteers. OK, let's see, the stage manager (01.8)

55 S: Can we draw on these?

56 T: You can draw on them. They're your copies. OK (. ) let's ha:x:ve (02.7) How about Karen?
57 S: Me?
58 T: Do you want to be the stage manager?
59 S: Fair enough.
60 T: OK
61 S: Can I be Bo-bo?
62 T: OK. Bo-bo? Mark. Ho-ti?
63 Ss: ((General chatter)) (05.8)
64 T: Tanya? Tanya's going to be Ho-ti? Court Attendant? Oh, no. (.) Chris.
65 Ss: ((General chatter)) (03.0)
66 T: You come over here.
67 S: ((Laughter))
69 S: Ho what?
70 T: Look, we've got two Jurymen.
71 Ss: ((General chatter)) (02.2)
72 T: Joshua an::::d
73 Ss: ((General chatter)) (04.0)
74 T: (Student's name)
75 Ss: ((General chatter and laughter)) (09.3)
76 T: OK. Just listen up for a minute guys.
77 S: We're supposed to be quite now.
78 T: I want you to pull out your books before we begin reading the play (.) I want cha to open up
and write today's date, put ya margin in and put a heading of "Plays" (02.5)
79 S: Is that like a title page? ((General chatter)) (01.2)
80 T: No (.) I don't want a title page.
81 Ss: ((General chatter)) (10.6)
82 T: Take out ya books [  
83 Ss: [ ((General chatter as students did task)) (32.5)  
84 T: Some people are taking their time in opening their books, writing a mar (.) drawing a margin and writing today's date and heading.  
85 Ss: ((General chatter)) (36.1)  
86 T: Put the diary away please.  
87 Ss: ((General chatter)) (06.8)  
88 T: Eddie.  
89 S: Yep.  
90 T: Got your heading and the date?  
91 Ss: Yep! ((General chatter)) (44.0)  
92 T: OK, guys! (.) Eddie! Sit down and face the front, please.  
93 Ss: ((General chatter)) (01.8)  
94 T: EDDIE.  
95 Ss: ((General chatter)) (07.1)  
96 T: OK Adam, since you haven't been given a character, read the introduction and the heading (.)  
   Just wait for a moment please.  
97 S: The origins of roast pig (.) of roast pig.  
98 T: Just wait a moment please Adam. (03.1) OK everybody. Put your pens down now please.  
   Put your colouring in pencils away. Not colouring in. (01.7) Colour in pictures for homework if you like. (02.8) OK Adam. Can you read the introduction for us please?  
99 S: The origin of roast pig, based on Charles Lamb's essay, de[  
100 T: [depicts  
101 S: depicts the supposed eastern origin of favourite western dish. (01.4) of a favourite western
dish.

102 T: That's good. OK. Do you want to read the cast members for us?

103. S: Me?
104. T: Yes.
105. S: Stage Manager (. ) Bo-bo (. ) Ho-ti (. )
106. T: That's right
107. S: Court attendant (. ) Judge (. ) Ho-wong (. ) Juryman 1, Juryman 2
108. T: OK. Excellent. (. ) Who's the stage manager? (. ) OK
109. S: Stage manager.
110. S: I suppose the[...
111. T: [ In a big loud voice so everyone can hear.
112. S1: I suppose the origins of many of the (. ) things we enjoy (. ) today would make a interesting

story. We don't have time to look at (. ) at a lot of these. But we're (. ) going to (. ) look at just

one (. ) quite a humorous affair it was. The origin of roast pig. (02.8) Thousands of years ago

in China a (. ) swineherd named Ho-ti lived [

113. T: [ A swineherd is just a man who looks after pigs.
114. S1: lived with his son (. ) Bo-bo. One day when Ho-ti was away Bo-bo (. ) ac[
115. S: Accidentally
116. S1: set the house on fire. (04.7) Here's what happened. He walks off. On

comes[
117. S: [ ((Laughter))
118. T: Kerry! What did Aaron just do?
119. S: He read what was in the brackets.
120. T: What's all in the brackets, what are they for?
121. Ss: The action.
122. T: The action. (. ) So it tells the characters what they're meant to be doing if

the actors are on

Stage. OK? (. ) You don't have to actually read what's in brackets. That was good. (. ) OK, Bo-

bo.

123 S2: Father. Come quickly. The house is on fire.

124 S3: Oh you foolish boy. Look at my house. How many times have I told you to keep away from

the fire?

125 S2: But it was an accident horrible father. I was just [

126 Ss: [ ((Laughter)) (04.8)
127 S2: honourable father. I was just tending the fire when the wind blew some sparks out
(.) out and
before I knew (.) what had happened the house wa (.,) the house was burning.

128 S3: You wicked boy. This is not the first time that you have burnt my house. An accident
was it?
This is how you repay me for my goodness to you. Take that ((Sound of a slap)). Perhaps
that
will teach you to be more careful.

129 S2: Oh Oh ((Giggles))

130 S3: But beating you does not bring my house back. More important it does not bring my pigs
back. Oh you are an ungrateful son.

131 S2: Oh my father (.,) all that you say is true. But I had forgotten about the pigs. The new litter of
pigs will ha (.,) all be burnt. Is (.,) there nothing we can do?

132 S3: There is nothing to be done. A new house can be built with little labour but no amount of
work can bring back the pigs.

133 S2: Mmm. Honourable father can you smell that delicious smell? It seems to come from the
house.

134 S3: You imagine things. There is no smell but the smell of burning house.

135 S2: No honourable father. This is such a smell as I have never (.,) detected before. It must be the
burnt pigs. I will have a look.

136 T: OK. Just before we go on. What's happened there? Who can tell me?

137 S: The house is on fire.

138 T: Yes. The house is on fire. So what's happened? (01.4) The son (.,) burnt the house down [

139 S: [ Yeah. Now the pigs were burning

140 T: Now the pigs were burning. OK
141 S: The pigs are cooking.

142 T: The pigs are cooking. What else is happened? (02.5) Chris.

143 S: He smelt the air.

144 T: Yes. Why did he smell the air?

145 S: Bo-bo walked up[ 

146 T: [ He could smell something different. (.) Couldn't he? Because in this culture they didn't ever have roast pig. The concept of eating a pig that was cooked was new to them. OK. So they (.) they used to eat it raw. (01.9) Next page (.) Ho-ti!

147 S3: Be careful or you will burn yourself.

148 S2: I cannot see anything. Wait.... Here is a little pig that has been burnt.

149 S3: Here let me see.

150 S2: It is very burnt honourable father. But there is no doubt this was a young pig. Oh! Ooo! I've burnt my fingers.

151 S3: Put them in your mouth, that will take the pain away.

152 S2: Oh! Mm! Mmmm!

153 S3: And what is the matter now?

154 S2: My fingers (.) Mmm (.) They taste wonderful.

155 S3: Oh that I should be (01.5) burdened with such a graceless son. First he burns down my house

and now he says that his fingers taste wonderful.

156 S2: But father they do. It must be the pig. Mmm! Mmm!

157 S3: Stop it at once I say you offensive boy. Give that to me. Oh! It's hot still. Oo! I've burnt myself.

158 S2: Put your fingers in your mouth father.

159 S3: Ooo! Mmm! Mmm! It certainly does taste wonderful [
160 Ss: [ ((Giggles)) (02.0)

161 S3: Here let me taste it again.

162 S2: To think that never before we have tasted roast pig. It truly is a marvellous (.) marvellous taste.

163 S3: But we must not allow the rest of the people to know. They would think that we were thankless creatures (.) to spoil the nature (.) natural taste of meat that the gods sent us.

164 S2: Then we will be the only ones who will know the suc (.) succulent taste of burnt pig. If others find out they will (.) take our (.) us before the judges.

165 Ss: [ Succulent

166 S2: succulent taste of burnt pig. If others find out they will (.) take our (.) us before the judges.

167 S3: Yes. And they will have to put us. Yes. And they will have us put to death. We must be careful. We will build another house and buy another pig and when she has a litter you will accidentally set the house to fire and (04.4)

168 S2: And we will have more roast pig. Oh honourable father that is a clever idea. Here father have some more roast pig. Mmmm!

169 T: OK. Just stop there. (.) What's happened now? When we get to the end of that scene. (.) Who can tell us? (.) Someone different. (01.8) Chris.

170 S: Um. They burnt their fingers and they put them in their mouth and think "Um this is nice" and then they (.) yeah [

171 T: [ Yeah. Who wants to go on from there? Joshua.

172 S: They like discovered that cooked pig tastes nice.

173 T: Yes. So they liked the taste of roast pig. (.) What else? What the scheme they've devised?

What have the father and son devised between them? John.

174 S: Me? (.) They're just gonna get another litter of pigs an they're gonna burn it.
175 S: They're going to buy another house and they're going to buy another mother pig and get some more little pigs then they'll accidentally burn the house then they'll have more roast pig.

176 T: OK. But in their culture. GUYS. (02.4) Hoy! Chris. Stand up please. Put your ruler down and stand up. If you can't keep your mouth shut you'll stand up. (06.3) OK. So what's happened in this culture they don't eat roast pig normally, they just eat raw pig. And now they've discovered that they really like it so they've got to be careful that the authorities don't find out.

If they find out, they can get in big trouble. So that's what's going to happen now, OK. (.)

We're going to change Ho-ti and Bo-bo characters (.) because they've had a lot of reading.

(02.9)

177 S: There's only a couple of words over the next page.

178 T: Aw. (03.6)

179 S: ( )

180 T: We'll give it to someone else anyway. ( ) one more. Down the back there. (01.6) Is it James? (.) OK James, you can read that when we get to it. Who's the stage manager? (04.2)

Who's the stage manager normally? (00.9)

181 S: Me

182 T: Aaron.

183 S: I want to be it.

184 T: Aaron do you want to give it to (.) Adam?

184 S: Yeah.

185 T: OK. (.) Following along girls? (.) Is the note interesting? (01.3) Can I have it please?

186 S: It's not even a note. (03.6)

187 T: That's OK. (.) Keep going guys. (02.5)
The two continued their houseburning as often as they could get a litter of pigs. But the neighbours began to notice that Ho-ti's house was being burnt down just a little too often for it to be an accident. Then someone noticed that there was always a litter of pigs in the house when it was burnt. Finally the neighbours set themselves to watch and sure enough they caught Ho-ti and Bo-bo tasting burnt pig. As they had feared Ho-ti and Bo-bo were summoned to appear in Peking to be tried by the High Court of China.

The court is to come to silence. Stand for the High Court Judge.

The court may be seated. Proceed with the case.

Your Honour. The case of Ho-ti and Bo-bo accused before the court this day of having committed an outrageous crime. It is said to be that they ate burnt pig.

Call the first witness.

Your Honour, I am here.

You will tell the court your name and the facts of this case that you know.

My name is Ho-wong. Your Honour, for several years now I and my fellow neighbours have noticed that the house of Ho-ti has been burnt down at an unusual number of times. That would make sorry, a normal man very angry.

You speak with sound reason.

Not only has the house been burnt many times your Honour, but on each occasion it has contained a litter of young pigs. Now to lose them would make a normal person very angry. But Ho-ti did not seem at all angry. In fact your Honour, he seemed pleased.

Is this true Ho-ti? (04.5)

Yes your Honour. Ho-wong tells the truth.

Continue your story Ho-wong.
202 S6: At least I (02.2)

203 T: At last

204 S6: No. At last I and my fellow neighbours began (02.1) being concerned for the good of our friend Ho-ti watched him carefully and we saw him set fire to his own house. Then he took of the burnt pigs that were inside and ate. And not only that but he gave to his son to eat. And greatly dis (.) and greater (01.5)

205 T: Disgrace

206 S6: Yes, disgrace the two of them seemed to enjoy it.

207 S5: Really this is the most disgraceful accusation that I have ever heard. It seems quite clear that the accused are guilty of this vile offence. What does the jury think?

208 S7: Your Honour we feel that the case is clear (.) too. However we would like to see some of this offensive burnt pig.

209 S5: Attendant, is there any of this repulsive roast pig to be exhibited?

210 S4: Your Honour, I have sent for my house to be burnt down with a pig in it.

211 S5: An excellent piece of thinking.

212 S4: Here comes the pig (.) burnt pig now.

213 S5: Take it across to the jury.

214 S7: See how repulsive it looks. This is clearly (.) dishonouring to the gods who have given us good, (.) wholesome, raw meat for food. Here, let me see it. Oh! Ooo! I've burnt myself.

215 S3: Put your fingers in your mouth.

216 S7: Oww! Mmmm! Beautiful! Here, let me try some more. Mmmm!

217 S8: Let me see the burnt pig. Mmm! It 's delicious.

218 S5: Gentlemen have you forgotten yourselves? Attendant, take the exhibit from them and bring it
here. Now, let me see. Put it here where I can see it better. Oww! I've burnt myself. Here, take
the plate back.

219 S3: Put your fingers in your mouth your Honour.

220 T: Big louder voice there James.

221 S5: Delicious! It melts in the mouth. I must have another taste. Pass the plate here. Mmmm! I
have never tasted anything so wonderful. ((Pages turning)) (04.8)

222 S6: Your Honour, do you forget the case against our friend and neighbour, Ho-ti?

223 S5: This is beautiful. Let me see the case against Ho-ti. Mmm. Ho-ti, stand forth.

224 S3: Yes your Honour.

225 S5: Ho-ti you are a man who knows much about pigs, are you not? (02.2)

226 S3: I am your Honour.

227 S5: Then Ho-ti I would like you to buy me as many pigs as you can lay you hands on. I'll burn
down my own house. Now, the case against Ho-ti and Bo-bo. Jurymen. Have you made your
decision?

228 S8: We have your Honour. Our verdict after tasting the burnt pig, is "Not guilty"

229 S5: Then I pronounce Ho-ti and Bo-bo "Not guilty"!

230 T: OK. Stage manager, finish it off for us.

231 S1: And so to the surprise of so many people Ho-ti and Bo-bo were released. It was not long
before shrewd people noticed that the judge's house kept catching fire with pigs inside.

Strangely enough, the same sort of thing seemed to happen fairly frequently with the
members' houses. People all over the country began to discover the secret
and soon houses
were being burnt down every day. Of course, the cost of pigs and houses
rose very sharply.

Finally someone discovered that it was not necessary to burn down a house
in order to eat
burnt pig. And so pigs began to be cooked in more simple ways. And so we have the true story behind the origin of roast pig.

232 T: OK. That's good. Someone tell us what happened in that end bit. (02.3) Jessica.

234 S: They like [ 

235 T: [ Just stay still please guys.

236 S: It was up to the judge and the judge tasted it and the jury tasted it and everyone liked it so he decided to let all do it because if they wanted to do it they couldn't do it without it being legal so they legalised it.

237 T: OK. That's good. (.) Now for homework. (01.2) Take out your diaries for me please. Just before you go. (04.4) Colour in the pages, but that's not for homework. (.) I want you to answer the ten questions on the back page of the play.

238 S: End up doing it?

239 T: You don't end up doing this one.

240 S: Aw!

241 S: Can we keep this?

242 T: So on the back. Yeah, you can keep this. So on the back page [ 

243 S: [ Can we do it in class sometime? This one. A play?

244 T: We will be doing another play but we won't be performing it in class. So write in your diaries to complete the ten questions on (.) end of it (.) at the back of the play.

245 Ss: ((General chatter)) (06.9)

246 T: Once you've got it in your diaries you can pack up and please put your name tags on the front desk as you leave.

247 Ss: ((General noise as students pack up and move out of the room)) (1.59.5)
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

"BELINDA"

(I = Interviewer; R = Respondent)

1 I: What I'm interested in is what you thought about the lesson? What went well in the lesson?

What went according to your plan?

2 R: ((Giggles)) (02.0) Oh they read according to my plan. ((Giggle)) (. ) Yeah. No. They umm (. ) I

knew they wouldn't settle the first time I brought them in so I was expecting that I'd have to

take them out again (. ) so that wasn't unexpected. Umm (02.2) But according to what I wanted

them to achieve, I got most of it done except that I actually wanted them to write down some

  simple definitions, but I never (. ) I should have done that before I actually

  started when we

  read (. ) ahm (. ) the characters, and I should have written the definition then of

  they've got a

  cast and what a cast is and what that is for . hhh and that, but I didn't get that

  done, but

  otherwise (. ) most of my plan went according (. ) to how I had set it out (. ) but I

  wasn't (. ) I

  don't know I find it really difficult in trying to (. ) a:::rm keep the kids on task (. )

  with them

  like knowing (01.6) whether I should stop and go "OK (. ) let's come back and

  say this"

  because I have (. ) six or so learning difficulty kids there. (. ) Well kids with

  learning

  difficulties (. ) severe ones (. ) and like Eddie probably didn't have a clue (. )

  about (. ) That's

  why I stopped half way through the (. ) play and got them to clarify so that

  other kids who
weren't comprehending what was going on could hear it in other words I guess. So you know.

3 I: So, what would you do differently next time if you just redid that lesson again? What would you do differently next time?

4 R: Um. I would with the characters, those two main characters I would have got them to read only the first page and then got another two kids to read that those two characters again, or another way is to share I around a bit more. Um. I don't know. Um. Perhaps I could have got them to write what they thought was happening in the play after say half-way. I don't know.

5 I: So the object of the lesson was to get them to read the play

6 R: I wanted them to read the play and identify with the characteristics of a play, like they got, they got the cast members, they got that the brackets where the action an all that. That was basically it. It was just an introduction so they could associate that further on.

7 I: So why get them to write things down?

8 R: 'Cause Di had said to me yesterday, make sure I get them to write something in the lesson

((Giggle))

9 I: OK. OK

10 R: And I didn't ((Giggle))

11 I: And why didn't you? What[

12 R: Well I was going to. The bell went early. ((Laughter))

13 I: The bell went early. And I guess the[

14 R: I should have structured it differently. I should have actually got them to write my definitions at the beginning instead of relying on time at the end. So
15 I: Would it be reasonable to get them to write some definitions in the next lesson to see [ 

16 R: [ Well that's = 

17 I: = if there's [ 

18 R: [ what my plan said. I was actually going to get them to do (.) the definitions the next lesson 

but Di had said "No". 

19 I: Right. 

20 R: Yesterday when she looked at my lesson plan, "I think you should get them to write something 

( ) within the lesson"

21 I: So (.) now its going to happen [ 

22 R: [ Now its going to happen anyway. ((Laughter)) (01.9) 

23 I: Probably the incident at the beginning [ 

24 R: [ Yeah. No it didn't help 

25 I: caused that 

26 R: I was late (.) for starters and then I had to get the name (.) um (.) cards out. And so, yeah (.) 

I was behind right from the beginning. 

27 I: But all those things are important aren't they? 

28 R: Well they all (.) That (.) Its bound to happen. 

29 I: Yes = 

30 R: = So = 

31 I: = It's the management. 

32 R: Umm. 

33 I: I though that was really good taking them outside and getting them to come back in again. 

34 R: Ah hum (. ) I've had to do it before with them. 

35 I: And that's got a settling effect on them hasn't it?
36 R: Yeah. It does (.). But I (.). I don't (.). as (.). I was talking to Nerida about it just afterwards, and

Nerida said "Do you think (.). they (.). are aware now (.). that they can waste time (.). while you're doing that?"

37 I: Yes (.). possibly =

38 R: = And so (.). I've got to try and think "OK" (.). of another way to do it.

39 I: Yes.

40 R: You're not going to pull the wool over my eyes. ((Laughter)) (03.3)

41 I: It didn't appear as though they were doing it to waste time. =

42 R: = No =

43 I: = It just appeared that (.). they came in and if you were going to let them be noisy then they would have been.

44 R: See they're different (.). Ahm (.). I thought (.). One, I did it (.). I was expecting to do it because it is the first day back after the holidays (.). and I intended them to be rowdy anyway (.). and they take a while to settle but when Di does it (.). they just know. She just has to there and they know (.). OK, we've got to be quiet. Whereas they don't know that with me yet. I don't have that presence (.). so (02.5)

45 I: OK. So whose advice are you going to take? Are you going to (.). think about what Nerida said and ah (.). maybe not do that again or are you going to persist with it and demand that when you're silent they get the message []

46 R: [ I'll persist with it, but I don't think I'll do that every time.

47 I: No.

48 R: I think I'll think of another strategy (.). to ah (.). put in place. And do (.). still do that but not every lesson (.). like
OK. There wasn't any real closure to the lesson.

Nope! ((Snigger))

Because of the time factor. What would you have done [ I was going [ to close the lesson if you had enough time?

I was going to do like a quick little quiz. It's just (.) something that I like to do when we (.) when I've got them (.) just their books put away and go "OK. Now tell me (.) what did we learn about our play today"? Can you tell me what were the factors that we were able to point out? (.) Just those things to get the kids then thinking "OK (.) What did we do and (.) what can I tell you about the play? (.) So (.) that's what I would have done.

One of the things I noticed when (.) ah (.) you were asking questions. And you really spread the questions all around the class which was great. (.) But (.) at the end of every question except one, that I can recall, you named the kid immediately (02.1) rather than giving them time to think. (.) Why do (.) Why do you do that?


Say ah (.) Ah [ What do you (.) I say the question and then go, "What do you think Ben?"

Yes. (.) So the tag comes immediately after the question = Instead of just letting someone putting their hand up?

Yes.

I don't know. I didn't think of that one. ((Said laughingly))

I'm not criticising.

No.

I'm just saying it [
66 R: [ That's a good point =

67 I: = that's interesting (. ) that you did that.

68 R: I guess because I don't like to give these guys (. ) a lot of room to then just wander off because a lot of them won't stay focused.

69 I: No.

70 R: So (. ) I guess tha. I tend to leave my questions in other classes open-ended and I don't (. ) ask someone (. ) I wait for them (. ) but with these guys I tend to I guess. But (. ) I don't know.

Mainly, probably to keep them (. ) focused and not let them just lose it (. ) and go off again. (. )

Because it takes so long to bring ((Giggle))

71 I: To bring them back again. (. ) Although they were pretty good I thought.

72 R: I think they are. They (. ) ah (. ) my first lesson with them was ((Giggle)) really strange. It was (. ) they were everywhere. They (. ) I didn't get anything done really. It wasn't a bad lesson. Di said to me (. ) she said "As far as I'm concerned (. ) Belinda you did an all right job you know (. ) You've just gotta work on ((Giggle)) (. ) getting their attention (. ) so

73 I: OK. Those kids that are (. ) have difficulty with reading (. ) is it reasonable to put them on the spot (. ) and get them to read to the class?

74 R: I don't think so. (. ) I mean I talked about this with Di. I (. ) because (. ) what I did in one class (. ) I actually set individual reading. And (. ) some kids couldn't do the individual reading (. ) so (. ) Di said to do it as a class but she never ever (. ) forces anybody else (. ) forces them to read.

And like um (. ) I wouldn't say to Eddie (. ) "Please read". But ah (. ) some of the others (. ) I would probably, if I knew (. ) once I get to know them a bit better and know their ability I probably would put them on the spot, if I knew they could handle (. ) what I was giving them but I wouldn't ask them to do something that would embarrass them in front of their peers
because they couldn't do it.

75 I: No. And you had a lot of volunteers didn't you?

76 R: ((Giggle)) They always volunteer. There's one in particular in Mark. ((Giggle))

77 I: Yes. Yes. So they. There's no problem with that.

78 R: No.

79 I: So it seems as though kids that are poor readers aren't all that (. ) shy about having a go [ 

80 R: [ No

81 I: Which is good. (03.0) OK (02.2) That's about all that I wanted to ask you about.

82 R: ((Giggle))

83 I: Thanks for that anyway.

84 R: That's OK

85 I: That's good.