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From one, to another.

Work.
Work with, what is.
Towards what could be.

Try.
Not to be distracted,
by,
what should.
Be.

Hope.
Once you see…
The Whole,
you see the holes,
and …
because the whole is infinite,
you see…
there is always more holes,
to see.

Hope.
for a whole, to be.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to all my colleagues in the teaching profession. Partners in thought and action, in the past, in the future and now. You make a difference.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise, glory and thanks to God. In His grace He has given me the opportunity and vitality to engage with this process.

To my supervisors, Prof. C.P.H. Myburgh and Prof. M. Poggenpoel, thank you for leading, supporting and encouraging me in this process. Also for the countless ways you gave material and psychological support that enabled me to continue my studies and training.

Thank you to the faculty and the faculty members of the departments of Educational Psychology and Nursing, of the University of Johannesburg, for offering of their time and expertise during the process of completing this research.

To the NRF (National Research Foundation) and the University of Johannesburg for financial assistance and offering access to world class opportunities for study and further professional development.

To the participants to my research for sharing their experiences with me and allowing me to share my experience with them. Thank you for allowing me to share our story. The management and various heads of institutions involved in this study for giving their support and allowing me time, and access to the field where this study was completed. Thank you for entrusting me with this important task.

My wife Lieze and my children, Carla and Franco and our family and friends, thank you for your boundless love, support and encouragement. Thank you for being part of my being and my becoming.
ABSTRACT

Constructive communication practices between secondary school teachers and learners play an essential role in the relationships, support of development and self-actualisation of learners. Learner development is facilitated via teacher-learner interaction in the context of a healthy relationship. In my master’s dissertation (Prins, 2009:85-87) I describe that learners sometimes experience a rigid attachment of the teacher to his or her own perspective and role as sender during communication. In essence, this type of communicative interaction is associated with a breakdown in true communication. It is basically a refusal by the teacher to respectfully engage and authentically listen to the learners in their care. I call this mode of interaction a parallel-monologue. The experience of this parallel-monologue seems to represent an important dimension of the experience of disrespect during the communication between teachers and learners and also inhibits the development of an authentic supportive and constructive educational relationship between a teacher and a learner. The refusal, by the teacher, to listen respectfully to the learners in their care is characterised by a psychological atmosphere where there is a lack of mutual respect, a negative intrapersonal experience, and an absence of important principles of effective teacher and learner interactions. The experience is associated with low trust, frustration and aggression. Such a mono-logical communication approach is unsatisfactory. An approach to teacher and learner communication interactions that fails to incorporate constructive communication, in the form of respectful dialogue, is strongly associated with learners’ experience of aggression during communication interactions with teachers. Constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school is an essential element of healthy learner development and self-actualisation. Against the preceding background and rationale the following research question was formulated and this question will determine the focus of this thesis: What can be done to address the monologue between secondary school teachers and learners?

The aim and objectives of the inquiry was the development, implementation and evaluation of a model to facilitate constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners. Steps in theory generating research, as described by
Chinn and Kramer (2011:197, 2008:237) as well as concepts describing the practice of theory generating as described by Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968) was used to develop the model. The research was carried out in two phases with the first phase focusing on describing what the model is and the second phase describing how it works. This logic of form and function is fundamental to the research design. In the first phase the model was developed, the concepts were placed in relation to each other and I described the model. After developing the model the model was evaluated using the evaluation criteria of Chinn and Kramer (2011:197, 2008:237-249). To complete the first phase, the newly developed model was presented to a panel of experts. This panel found the model to be, applicable to its purpose as well as clear, simple, general and accessible. In this model the relationships between the identified parts, which constitute the main concept – facilitation of respectful dialogue, are reciprocal. As the learner experience respect during the facilitation of the teacher the communication between them becomes more respectful. As the communication between the teacher and the learner becomes respectful it initiates a dialogue. The dialogue between teacher and learner reinforces the respectful communication and enhances the facilitation. This process leads to constructive outcomes during the communication. The more the learner experiences respect in the facilitation of the teacher the more it enhances the dialogue during the communication and the more the teacher and learner communication interaction supports healthy self-actualisation and development.

In the second phase I implemented the model. This research rests on phenomenological principles and methods (Giorgi, 2002) and is strongly associated with naturalistic inquiry (Patton, 2002:39-45; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) model for trustworthiness in qualitative research was implemented in this study. The research design is iterative and data collection and analysis is qualitative and descriptive in nature. Methodologically, this qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research made use of a single case study (Yin, 2009:46-47). A workshop, based on the psycho-educational model as a frame of reference initiated the process of implementation of the model and this particular implementation of the model constituted the case to be studied. Qualitative data was collected throughout the process of implementation and was instrumental in demonstrating how the model works for the participating teachers. The research
made use of purposive sampling and voluntary participation. Ethical measures were adhered to during the research process and the principles of equality, freedom of choice and movement, as well as autonomy was respected by the researcher during the research process. The rights of the scientific community were respected and the principles of: autonomy; non-maleficence; beneficence and justice guided my facilitation and research practice. Two criteria were used for purposive and voluntary sampling. A participant had to be currently employed as a teacher in a particular secondary school teaching grade 8 to grade 12 learners and a participant had to have at least one year of experience teaching in a secondary school. Ten teachers volunteered to participate in the workshop and subsequent data collection process. This, qualitative, theory generating, single case study was instrumental in answering the research question. The purpose of the research was to describe, implement and evaluate the psycho-educational model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The three phases of the workshop: creating a facilitative space, creating a respectful space and creating a dialogical space, worked very well to implement the model. The operational version of the research question is - How is this model working for you?

The operational version of the research question was adopted in all the protocols that were used to facilitate the collection of data throughout the process of implementing the model. The use of various qualitative methods of data collection enabled the researcher to give a thick description of participant experience during implementation and also enhanced triangulation. Based on the lived experiences of participants it became clear that the reflective process of the model raises teachers’ awareness from “I” to “US”. The model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respectful communication and the model reminds teachers of the continual process of facilitation of respectful dialogue, which needs time and reinforcement and has its particular challenges. This research makes a significant contribution to theory and practice in the field of the Psychology of Education. The central story line in the data indicates that via this model, teachers become aware of themselves and others as individuals with unique experiences and personally meaningful life-worlds. Teachers become acutely aware of the important role played by facilitation of respectful dialogue as an important aspect of teacher learner communication interaction and also the important role it
plays in all human communication interactions, even beyond the context of the classroom. I make the recommendation that this model be applied to educational practice and teacher training as well as continuous professional development of teachers. I also recommend that the model be replicated and generalised in future research. This research, developing, implementing and evaluating the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue reaches the goals it set out to achieve and makes an original contribution to theory of the Psychology of Education by describing a psycho-educational model that can be used for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners. The research also makes an original contribution to practice by implementing and evaluating this model in a workshop for teachers based on the model. It is my belief that this research has the potential to impact policy in education and beyond by creating an original, unique and effective frame of reference for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school.

My conclusion is that the model employs basic principles and tenets of Person Centred and Gestalt psychology. The model works because it raises teacher awareness of both own communication interactions and the communication interactions they observe between others. This self-awareness and awareness of others, created by implementing this model, is supportive of insightful awareness and creative adjustment of teachers to the unique and demanding challenges posed by respectful and constructive communication interaction with secondary school learners. This awareness, created by implementing the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue, is supportive of constructive communication interactions and self-actualisation.
In ‘n sekondêre skool speel konstruktiewe kommunikasiepraktyke tussen onderwysers en leerders ‘n essensiële rol in die verhoudings, ondersteuning van ontwikkeling, en die self-aktualisering van leerders. In die konteks van ‘n gesonde verhouding word leerderontwikkeling deur onderwyser-leerder interaksie gefasiliteer. In my meesters dissertasie (Prins, 2009:85-87) beskryf ek dat leerders onderwysers soms as rigied ervaar en dat onderwysers vasklou aan hul eie perspektief en rol as sender tydens hul kommunikasie met leerders. Basies kan hierdie tipe kommunikatiewe interaksie as ‘n verbreking van ware kommunikasie beskou word.

Dit is basies ‘n weiering van die onderwyser se kant om respekvol betrokke te raak en outentiek na die leerders in hul sorg te luister. Ek noem hierdie tipe interaksie ‘n parallelle-monoloog. Die belewenis van die parallelle-monoloog blyk ‘n belangrike dimensie van ervaring van disrespek te wees gedurende kommunikasie tussen onderwysers en leerders. Dit inhibeer die ontwikkeling van ‘n outentieke, ondersteunende en konstruktiewe opvoedende verhouding tussen ‘n onderwyser en ‘n leerder. Die versuim van die onderwyser om respekvol na die leerders in hul sorg te luister, word gekenmerk deur ‘n atmosfeer waar daar ‘n gebrek is aan wedersydse respek, ‘n negatiewe intrapersoonlike ervaring en die afwesigheid van belangrike beginsels vir effektiewe onderwyser en leerder interaksies. Die belewenis word met lae vertroue, frustrasie en aggressie geassosieer. So ‘n monologiese benadering tot kommunikasie is onbevredigend. ‘n Benadering tot onderwyser- en leerder-kommunikasie wat nie daarin slaag om konstruktiewe kommunikasie in die vorm van respekvolle dialoog te inkorporer nie, word sterk geassosieer met leerders se ervaring van aggressie tydens kommunikatiewe interaksies met onderwysers. Konstruktiewe kommunikasie tussen onderwysers en leerders in ‘n sekondêre skool is ‘n essensiële element van gesonde leerderontwikkeling en self-aktualisering. Die volgende novorsingsvraag, wat die fokus van hierdie tesis bepaal, is teen die voorafgaande agtergrond en rasionaal geformuleer: Wat kan gedoen word om die monoloog tussen sekondêre skool onderwysers en leerders aan te spreek?

Die doel en doelstellings van hierdie ondersoek is die ontwikkeling, implementering en evaluasie van ‘n model vir die fasilitering van konstruktiewe kommunikasie tussen
sekondêre skoolonderwysers en leerders. Stappe in teoriegenererende navorsing soos beskryf deur Chinn en Kramer (2011:197, 2008:237), sowel as konsepte wat die praktyk van teoriegenerering beskryf volgens Dickoff, James en Wiedenbach (1968), is gebruik om die model te ontwikkel. Die navorsing is uitgevoer in twee fases, met die eerste fase wat fokus op die beskrywing van wat die model is en die tweede fase wat beskryf hoe hierdie model werk. Hierdie logika van vorm en funksie is fundamenteel tot die navorsingsontwerp. In die eerste fase is die model ontwikkel. Die konsepte is gedefiniëer en beskryf en hul verwantskappe tot mekaar binne die model is beskryf. Na ontwikkeling van die model is die model aan die hand van die evalueringsskriteria van Chinn en Kramer geëvalueer (2011:197, 2008:237-249). By die afhandeling van die eerste fase is die nuut ontwikkelde model aan 'n paneel deskundiges in die veld van model-ontwikkeling voorgelê. Die paneel het gevind dat die model toepaslik is vir die doel waarvoor dit ontwikkel is; sowel as duidelijk, eenvoudig, algemeen en toeganklik. In hierdie model is die verwantskappe tussen die geïdentifiseerde dele waaruit die hoof konsep fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog bestaan, wederkerig. Soos die leerder tydens fasilitering van die onderwyser respek ervaar, word die kommunikasie tussen hulle meer respekvol. Soos die kommunikasie tussen die onderwyser en die leerder meer respekvol word, inisieer dit ’n dialoog. Hierdie dialoog tussen onderwyser en leerder versterk die respekvolle kommunikasie en verbeter die fasilitering. Hierdie proses lei tot konstruktiewe uitkomste tydens die kommunikasie. Hoe meer die leerder respek ervaar tydens die fasilitering van die onderwyser, hoe meer verbeter dit die dialoog tydens die kommunikasie en hoe meer ondersteun die onderwyser- en leerderinteraksie gesonde self-aktualisering en ontwikkeling.

In die tweede fase van die navorsing het ek hierdie model geïmplementeer. Hierdie navorsing rus op fenomenologiese beginsels en metodes (Giorgi, 2002) en is baie sterk geassosieer met ’n naturalistiese benadering tot ’n ondersoek (Patton, 2002:39-45; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln en Guba se (1985) model vir vertrouenswaardigheid in kwalitatiewe navorsing is in hierdie studie geïmplementeer. Die navorsingsontwerp en data insameling en analyse is kwalitatief, beskrywend en dynamies van aard. Metodologies maak hierdie kwalitatiewe, eksplorerende, beskrywende, kontekstuele en teorie-genererende navorsing gebruik van ’n enkele gevallestudie (Yin, 2009:46-47). ’n Werkswinkel, gebaseer op die onwikkelse psigo-
opvoedingsmodel as verwysingsraamwerk, het die proses van implementering van die model inisieer en hierdie implementering van die model is die spesifieke geval wat bestudeer is. Kwalitatiewe data is deurlopend ingesamel, tydens die verloop van die proces van implementering, en is instrumenteel in die demonstrasie van hoe die model werk vir die deelnemende onderwersers. Hierdie navorsing het gebruik gemaak van ‘n doelgerigte steekproef en vrywillige deelname. Etiese maatreëls is tydens die navorsingsproses gevolg. ’n Deelnemende onderwyser moet minstens tweeduizend sekondêre skool aangestel wees om graad 8 tot 12 leerders te onderrig en onderwyser moet ten minste een jaar onderwys-ervaring in ’n sekondêre skool hê om te kwalifiseer vir deelname. Tien onderwyser het vrywillig aangebied om aan die werkswinkel en opeenvolgende data insamelingsproses deel te neem. Hierdie kwalitatiewe, eksplorerende en teorie-genererende, enkele gevalstudie is instrumenteel in die beantwoording van die navorsingsvraag. Die doel van die navorsing is die beskrywing, implementering en evaluering van die psigo-opvoedkundige model vir die fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog tussen onderwersers en leerders in ’n sekondêre skool. Die drie fases van die werkswinkel: skepping van ’n fasiliterende ruimte, skepping van ’n respekvolle ruimte, en die skepping van ’n dialogiese ruimte het baie goed gewerk om die model te implementeer. Die operationele weergawe van die navorsingsvraag is: Hoe werk hierdie model vir jou?

Die operationele weergawe van die navorsingsvraag is in al die protokolle aangewend om aan die kwalitatiewe data in te samel gedurende die verloop van die proses van implementering van die model. Die gebruik van verskeie kwalitatiewe metodes van data insamelings het die navorser in staat gestel om ’n gedetailleerde beskrywing te gee van deelnemer-ervaring tydens implementering van die model en het ook triangulering verbeter. Gebaseer op die beleefde ervaring van die deelnemers het dit duidelijk geword dat die reflektiewe proses van die model onderwersers se bewustheid van “ek” tot “ons”. Die model begelei onderwyser om ’n ruimte toe te laat wat bevorderlik is vir onderrig en leer deur respekvolle
kommunikasie aan te moedig. Die model herinner onderwysers ook aan die deurlopende proses van die fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog, wat tyd en versterking verg en ook unieke uitdagings bied. Hierdie navorsing maak 'n oorspronklike bydrae tot die teorie en praktyk in die veld van die Sielkundige Opvoedkunde. Die sentrale storielyn in die data dui daarop dat onderwysers via hierdie model meer bewus word van hulself en van ander as individue met unieke ervarings en persoonlik betekenisvolle lewenswêrelde. Onderwysers word intens bewus van die belangrike rol wat die **fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog** speel tydens onderwyser- en leerderkommunikasieinteraksie asook die belangrike rol wat dit speel in alle menslike kommunikasieinteraksies, selfs buite die konteks van die klaskamer. Ek maak die aanbeveling dat die navorsing toegepas word op onderwyspraktyk en onderwyser-opleiding, insluitende aaneenlopende professionele ontwikkeling van onderwysers. Ek beveel ook aan dat die model herhaal en veralgemeen word in verdere navorsing. Hierdie navorsing behels die ontwikkeling, implementering en evaluerings van die model vir die fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog en bereik die doelwitte wat vir die navorsing gestel is. Die navorsing maak 'n oorspronklike bydrae tot die teorie van die Sielkundige Opvoedkunde deur die beskrywing van 'n psigo-opvoedkundige model wat gebruik kan word vir die fasilitering van konstruktiewe kommunikasie tussen onderwysers en leerders in 'n sekondêre skool. Ek is oortuig dat hierdie navorsing die potensiaal het om 'n impak te maak op beleidsontwikkeling in die onderwys en selfs buite hierdie konteks, deur die skepping van 'n oorspronklike, unieke en effektiewe verwysingsraamwerk vir die **fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog**.

My slotsom is dat die model die basiese beginsels en aannames van Persoon Gesentreerde en Gestalt Sielkunde implementeer. Die model werk omdat dit onderwyserbewustheid van beide hul eie kommunikasie interaksies, sowel as die kommunikasie interaksie wat hulle tussen ander waarneem, ontwikkel. Hierdie self-bewustheid en bewustheid van ander, wat deur die implementering van die model geskep word, is ondersteunend van insiggewende bewustheid en kreatiewe aanpassing van onderwysers by die unieke en veelseidente uitdagings wat gestel word deur respekvolle en konstruktiewe kommunikatiewe interaksies met sekondêre skoolleerders. Hierdie bewustheid, geskep deur die implementering van die model
vir die fasilitering van respekvolle dialoog, is ondersteunend van konstruktiewe kommunikatiewe interaksie en self-aktualisering.
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CHAPTER 1
RATIONALE AND OVERVIEW

"It is within your most meaningful relationships that you autonomously live in the present to actualise the person you have the potential to be" (Johnson, 2009:6).

1.1 INTRODUCTION

People are constantly in a state of being and becoming. In being and in becoming, human beings need other humans. It has become increasingly clear to me, throughout my research as well as in my daily practice as a teacher, that constructive, supportive communication and collaborative educational relationships are key ingredients of any educational process. The capacity and the competence of a teacher to enter into educational relationships, to facilitate growth and development, and even to end and exit the educational relationship elegantly, is of the utmost importance. This is a prerequisite for facilitating or mediating any form of learning and development, whatever the aim of the particular learning opportunity might be. This competence of the teacher to actualise constructive and educationally sound relationships is facilitated by the teacher’s capacity to communicate with learners. Constructive communication interactions facilitate actualisation of human potential.

Communication is of great importance to teacher-learner relationships as well as teaching and learning. In my masters dissertation (Prins, 2009) I explored grade 11 learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers, with a focus on relationships between secondary school learners and their teachers. The basic question I asked was, given that this relationship is built and maintained via teacher-learner communication, what is grade 11 learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers? I investigated learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers, as well as what can be done about the experience of aggression during teacher-learner communication. What emerged during the phenomenological study was that grade 11 learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers, is closely associated with the
experience of disrespect. Various ways of experiencing disrespect was described by
the grade 11 participants. These various forms of disrespectful aggressive
communication give rise to disconnection and a break in the teacher-learner
relationship. Theoretically, in terms of educational communication, this breaking or –
disconnection, can be described as a disrespectful parallel-monologue (Prins,
2009:87). In essence, the structure of this type of communicative interaction
described by the participants in my research is a rigid attachment of the teacher to
his or her role as sender during communication. It is a refusal to respectfully listen to
the learners in their care. Both are talking, mainly the teacher, but they don’t hear
each other and they don’t talk to each other. They are talking in each other’s
presence, but they are not communicating with each other. They are not in
communion with each other. There is talking but essentially very little or no true
listening to each other takes place. The experience of the ‘parallel-monologue’
represents an important dimension of the experience of disrespect and aggression in
the communication and relationship and also inhibits the development of a truly
constructive and supportive relationship between teacher and learner. A key
ingredient in the constructive and supportive educational relationship is the quality of
the communication that happens between learners and their teachers (Pretorius,
2007:219). A significant attribute of effective and constructive communication that
builds supportive relationships, is that it can be characterised as respectful,
that a conversation between a teacher and learner should be structured in such a
way that the learner feels encouraged to explore issues.

In essence to describe a communication interaction between two people as
“Dialogue” is to describe something about the quality of that interaction and, to
describe the quality of an interpersonal interaction is to describe something of the
impact that interaction has had or is having on the participants involved in that
interaction or communication. To call a particular communicative interaction
constructive is to ascribe an impact of beneficial value to the participants to that
interaction. Constructive dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary
school seems to be an essential element of healthy learner development and
actualisation of the learner. Gunter (1965:25) explains that the world of people
interacting with people is quite different than people interacting with objects. When
people encounter each other neither of them has ultimate control, like in the world of people interacting with objects. It is a dialogical situation where both people are addressed and both must answer. They encounter each other and the “I” meets the “you”. It is unlike the “It-world” of objects where there is just one point of view. There is more than one “will” or intentionality present in the meeting. A meeting between two is not a monologue but a dialogue, not loneliness but communion. The “I” stands in relationship to the “You” which is quite different than me interacting with an “It” or object. Martin Buber (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2011) explains that in the, I-Thou relationship between people, both parties enter with their full being. He also explains that this kind of relationship is exceptional, rare and difficult to sustain, because of its intensity. Generally, people tend to foster I-It relationships where other beings are reduced to objects of thought or social roles.

Lähteenmäki (1998:76) explains that the communicative function of language is often neglected with little consideration of the important role of the listener or role of ‘other’ in an interaction. Communication is always based on the relation between the self and the other. Goleman (2006:313) states that in the modern society the fostering of I-it relationships threatens the well-being of people. He explains that Martin Buber warned against the “thingification” of people and the depersonalisation of relationships. According to Goleman (2006:313), the idea of a “social self” or the sense of identity that develops as people observe themselves via the mirror of their relationships plays a significant role in their development as people. According to Palmer (Johnson & Reed, 2008:296) people have a paradoxical need for both community and solitude. He explains that human beings were made for relationships and without a rich and nourishing network of connections people wither and die.

Johnson (2009:6-11) describes that it is only within meaningful, significant and constructive relationships that people may improve interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualisation and it is via interpersonal skills that such relationships are initiated, built, and maintained. The importance of interpersonal relationships and the skilful and effective handling of such relationships is echoed by Pretorius (2007:130-132), where he describes that teaching is essentially a social event and teaching and learning is always performed in the context of social interaction and social behaviour. Pretorius (2007:130-132) continues to explain that teaching and learning is an
interpersonal event concerning people who communicate ideas, skills, attitudes and feelings. He emphasises that the quality and the nature of the communication in the teaching situation is an essential determinant of the quality of the learning activities and socialisation of the learner. He states that the teacher’s task on the one hand is to actualise relationships conducive to the personality and development of the learners, and on the other hand to create a classroom climate in which the mutual relationships between the teacher and the learners can develop favourably.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Bloch (2005:102) writes that a single good teacher can make a difference to students. He asserts that the evidence affirms the central role of teachers and that at school and in class boundaries are set, and the techniques are inculcated for how to study and for methodologies and ways of achieving learning that is meaningful and relevant. He believes that the classroom and interaction between learner and teacher, is the starting point for all else that happens in education. Jensen (2009:18-20) describes that a lot of learners come to class with a narrower range of emotional responses than teachers might expect and learners’ behaviour may often seem inappropriate and disrespectful to teachers. Jensen (2009:18-20) continues to argue that every proper response not observed in schools, is one that needs to be taught. He is also of the opinion that every emotional response other than the six hardwired emotions of joy, anger, surprise, disgust, sadness and fear must be taught. If learners do not bring emotional responses, crucial to a smoothly running complex social environment, such as a school or a classroom, the school must teach them. He explains that what learners do bring to school are strong “relational” forces that drive their school behaviours. Walker (2009:122-129) declares that the best teachers don’t simply teach content but they teach people. Effective teachers don’t only develop the cognitions of learners but care about their development as people. To have a significant long-term impact on learners, she believes classrooms must provide good instruction and build positive relationships. According to Walker (2009:122-129) this balance is particularly important for learners who enter school with low academic and poor social skills, a situation most seasoned teachers in South Africa are unfortunately all too familiar with. She finds it astonishing how
seldom teachers manage to implement both effective instructions, as well as maintain positive collaborative relationships with learners.

Hattie (2009:118-121) explains that various factors correlate positively and contribute significantly to learner performance. He explains that the teacher-learner relationship has a significant ‘effect size’ on the positive outcome of learner academic performance and positive attitude. He also explains that to build relationships with learners, teachers need to develop the skills and capacity to do so. The teacher needs respect for what the child brings to the class and to allow for the experiences of the child to be recognised in the classroom. He explains that such skills as listening, empathy, caring and having positive regard for others all have significant positive correlations with positive learner outcomes. Hattie’s (2009:128) meta-analysis provides powerful statistical support that positive teacher-learner relationships are critical for learning to occur. He explains that a positive relationship between teacher and learner involves showing learners that the teacher cares for them as people as well as for their learning and also sees learner perspectives and can communicate it back to them. Hattie (2009:128) explains that developing a warmer socio-emotional climate in the classroom and fostering effort and engagement of all learners requires teachers to enter the classroom with certain conceptions about progress, relationships, and learners, and he emphasises that teachers should approach their role as that of a change agent. Teachers should believe that all learners can learn and progress and that achievement for all is possible. He explains that teachers demonstrating to all learners that they care about them and their learning are both powerful and effective. The following experience of a participant to my own research (Prins, 2009:74-76) points to the importance of motivation and constructive communication in the classroom.

“She motivates you yes…so we need motivation as well, we need a lot of that,... I mean there is six other subjects... seven or eight other subjects, so got this thing that I am with this teacher now, I’ve got things to do and I might give more attention to that than, this, and I might be thrown back on the path if I could only be taught or dealt with the right way.”
“So, it's a motivation and it's a communication in the sense of speaking straightforward but still being calm, because we don't like teachers that “burst.” I don't even like my mom bursting on me, that is what feeds the conflict and throws fire, you know petrol on the fire. It's just making it worse... The more teachers that can take kids and deal with the situation in a calm and collected way... the better. So she is communicating with you but she, sticks to the facts... Although she is communicating in a way, I understand that right, she wants you to succeed...that's what she is actually communicating.”

Another participant describes that:

“Ja, die juffrou is so met daai vak, dan is daai vak so. Ja dan doen ek so teenoor daai vak... Die vak is soos die juffrou is...” (Translated) “Yes, the teacher is like that with the subject, then the subject is like that. Yes then I perform like that in that subject...the subject is like the teacher is...”

Stipek (2006:46) describes that she has been studying classroom motivation for the past thirty years and has come to the conclusion that her observations confirm a broad body of research that has demonstrated that learners function more effectively when they feel respected and valued and function poorly when they feel disrespected and marginalised. According to Booyse and Du Plessis (2005:33-35), the National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa includes the seven roles of the educator and the first role of the educator, described in this policy, is that of learning mediator. They continue to describe a mediator as somebody that goes between, facilitates a dialogue and makes it possible for an idea or feeling to be communicated. They continue to describe that playing the role of a learning mediator involves setting up a dialogue between the learners and various sources of information as well as between learners and educators, ensuring that meaningful communication continues to take place in the learning environment. I assert that meaningful communication, often described as respectful and dialogical in nature, cannot take place under conditions that I have described as a “parallel-monologue”.
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The focus on meaningful, respectful dialogical communication and positive constructive relationship building between secondary school learners and their teachers emerged as a central focus in the data of my research (Prins, 2009:60). In my investigation into grade 11 learners' experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers, it became clear that the experienced aggression during teacher learner communication interactions creates a “break” or disconnection in communication. This experience impairs the teacher learner dialogue and relationship. A typical participant response to the question: ‘How is it for you when your teacher is aggressive when communicating with you?’ is as follows:

“The communication that comes in between teacher and learner in a sense there is various aspects but if in general if we are talking about a communication, and what it has to have, it takes two to tango. You can’t say I’m trying to communicate with a learner that doesn’t want to communicate that means that either there is a personality clash or communication gap in the sense of, of you know - I’m older than you but I don’t want to listen because I don’t think what you have to say is valid. I’ve got my own mind and I’ll make it up”

In my Master’s dissertation (Prins, 2009:87) I explain that central to grade 11 learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers, is the experience of disrespect which gives rise to disconnection and a break in the teacher-learner relationship. Theoretically, in terms of educational communication, this breaking or disconnection can be described as a disrespectful ‘parallel-monologue’. In essence, this type of communicative interaction or the quality of such an inhibiting and unsupportive, even aggressive and destructive communication described by the participants in my research, is a rigid attachment of the teacher to his or her own perspective and role as sender during communication and is basically a refusal to respectfully listen to the learners in their care. The experience of the parallel-monologue seems to represent an important dimension of the experience of disrespect and distrust during the communication between teachers and learners. It inhibits the development of a true supportive and constructive educational
relationship between teacher and learner. Such a “Mono-logical” approach is clearly unsatisfactory. My conclusion is that an approach to teaching that fails to incorporate respectful and constructive communication practices facilitative of relationship building as an integral part of teacher-learner interaction is strongly associated with grade 11 learners’ experience of aggression. As such the parallel-monologue is associated with poor learner teacher relationships, and a frustrating or even aggressive classroom climate which is unsupportive and even inhibiting of learner actualisation of potential. It is also clear that such an emotional climate between teacher and learner is not conducive to collaboration and learning in the classroom because it damages the teacher-learner communication and relationship. Hattie (2009:118-121) identifies the importance of constructive relationships as an important factor in successful and effective education, especially for those who enter schools from a low socio-economic background. I agree with Fitzsimmons and Lanphar (2011:1-2) when they explain that one’s overall impression of school life is deeply rooted in either the memory of emotional attachment or emotional disengagement and the emotional aspects of the school experience is underrepresented in literature, especially as it pertains to the current South African educational context. I can’t help but wonder what the long term impact of such teacher behaviour might be.

The gap I will address in this thesis is how secondary school teachers can be facilitated to actualise constructive communication between themselves and secondary school learners. My thesis is focused on the personal and interpersonal experiences of teachers and learners in the secondary school. I advance the thesis that a constructive interpersonal process between secondary school teachers and secondary school learners is facilitative of a positive intrapersonal experience and process that enhances growth and supports development and actualisation of potential. I also advance the idea that, inversely, an inhibiting and even, destructive interpersonal communicative interaction, I would like to call the parallel-monologue, result in a negative intrapersonal experience that inhibits growth and healthy development. Against the preceding background and rationale the following research question was formulated and this question will determine the focus of my current inquiry:
What can be done to address the monologue between secondary school teachers and learners?

1.4 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH

The main purpose of this research project that flows from the problem statement is:

To describe, implement and evaluate a psycho-educational model to address mono-logical communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school.

The following objectives will guide the enquiry towards the attainment of the main purpose:

- To describe a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners.
- To implement this model in a workshop for teachers based on the model and to evaluate the model.

To achieve the objectives of the research I will employ a qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research design. The research design will consist of two phases. In Phase one, a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school will be described. In Phase two, the model will be implemented and evaluated.

1.4.1 Potential significance of this research study

The potential significance of this study will now be discussed in terms of the opportunities it will offer to teachers to partake in a psycho-educational learning opportunity, the development of knowledge and opportunity for theory generation and the development of reflective practice in teachers and within the teaching community.
1.4.1.1 Psycho-educational and experiential learning opportunity for teachers

Basically the potential significance of this research is to operationalise and evaluate a psycho-educational model that could be utilised for the facilitation of constructive communication and relationships between teachers and learners in a secondary school. In my opinion this holds the promise for improving pedagogical communication, relationships and interpersonal interaction and connection during teaching and learning in the secondary school and will also facilitate development of learners, as well as effective teaching and learning. The value is not only in theory generation but also facilitating reflective practice and implementation of effective educational practices by teachers involved in the workshop. Ultimately, healthy constructive communication and relationships between secondary school teachers and learners will be facilitative of healthy learner development and self-actualisation of learners as well as teachers.

1.4.1.2 The development of knowledge

I believe developing this model can make a significant contribution to knowledge about communication interactions between teachers and learners in a secondary school.

a) General knowledge about learning interactions

Relationships and communication play a central role in governing all human interactions and development. I believe that this research has the potential to contribute a conceptual framework that could be adapted and adopted in many spheres of society where interpersonal communication and relationships play a pivotal role in constructive interactions between people. Taking into account that the model was developed from an inquiry, essentially focussed on interpersonal conflict it could also conceivably contribute to understanding and managing conflict, in a wider context of human and social interactions.
b) Educational knowledge

In light of the central role and importance of communication and dialogue as a pivotal general principle in education training and development, this research will make a significant contribution to describing and understanding the implications and strategies of teacher learner interactions and communication. It will support the development of relationships as it pertains to the secondary school and support the development of healthy educational relationships between teachers and learners.

1.4.1.3 The development of educational practice

The research will focus on and highlight the importance of interpersonal communication and relationships in a learning environment and as such will add to understanding in the fields of general Didactics, Socio-pedagogics, and especially Psychology of Education. The psycho-educational model and its operationalisation in the workshop that will be developed can possibly make an impact on the educational practice of the participating secondary school teachers and, if the workshop successfully facilitates the outcomes it was designed to achieve, future attempts at replication might be made by the researcher. Reflective practice (Thompson & Thompson, 2008:20-21) of participating teachers could be enhanced and augmented by the workshop because of its psycho-educational, experiential and reflective nature.

1.5 PARADIGMATIC PERSPECTIVES

Thomas Kuhn (1996: vii-xiv) explains that paradigms are universally recognised scientific achievements that provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners. Covey (1999:23) describes paradigms as invented models or explanations of something else. Creswell (2007:19) refers to Guba (1990:17) where he explains that a paradigm is a worldview or a basic set of beliefs that guide action. I view paradigms simply as the ways in which I view the world. In this regard I align myself with the Theory for Health Promotion in Nursing (University of Johannesburg, Department of Nursing, 2012:3-8). I am a teacher and have developed some paradigmatic perspectives closely associated with teaching and...
learning. I believe that the *Theory for Health Promotion in Nursing* with its emphasis on the promotion of health or growth via an interactive process between a sensitive supportive professional and an individual within a group, family and community context is a congruent and trustworthy paradigm applicable to how I view education and the healthy development of individuals within the educational system. In particular I have the viewpoint that the *Theory for Health Promotion in Nursing* aligns with my view that the main function of education is to support individuals and groups to develop and grow toward the healthy actualisation of their full potential. I believe that in essence the role of the teacher is one of a facilitator and mediator of healthy development, growth and self-actualisation of individuals within a social context. In this regard I find the views of Okun (2002:32) informative with regards to how I view my role as a professional teacher and helper. She asserts that the underlying prerequisite skill in any effective helping relationship is empathic communication. She believes that the helping relationship is the cornerstone of the helping process. My views are aligned with those of Okun (2002:21) where she describes that in a helping relationship there are basic characteristics of effective helpers, namely respect, unconditional acceptance of the other as person, empathic understanding of other’s experiences from their perspective, as well as authenticity and congruence during communication. I also align myself with the views of Casement (1991:6) when he explains that the psychodynamics of any helping relationship may be universal and that it is therefore important to become familiar with how the helper and client interact and communicate with each other. I will now give a more detailed description of my paradigmatic perspective with reference to my meta-theoretical, theoretical as well as my methodological assumptions, and I will clarify the way I view my world of teaching, learning and development.

### 1.5.1 Meta-theoretical assumptions

A basic meta-theoretical assumption I adhere to is the approach that people are in constant *interaction* with their environment. Bigge and Hunt (1962:50-51) explain that this belief can be described as a belief in the “neutral-interactive principle of human nature”. According to Bigge and Hunt the concept of *interaction* is made possible by the concept of *relativism*. They continue to explain that a central idea of relativism is that an object derives its qualities not only from within itself but also from
its total situation or surroundings. They conclude that this philosophical stance basically means that no object has meaning apart from its context and when this idea is applied to the study of people it means that one can only understand what people are like by studying them as they operate within their environment as a whole. My belief is that people are conscious beings in constant dialogue with their world and that human beings construct meaning from experience that will impact on further meaning making and actions in the world. Frankl (2011:119) describes that human conscience can not only lead people to meaning but can also lead people astray. He continues to describe that people can never be sure that it is true meaning conscience mediates and that meaning refer to unique situations and the equally unique persons confronting them. Frankl explains that values can be described as meaning universals and as such they are subject to social change and even the “decay of traditions”. He offers the insight that in an age where meaninglessness seem to rule the day, education, instead of confining itself to transmitting traditions and knowledge, must see its principle assignment in refining the individual’s conscience. He explains that the crumbling of universal values can be counteracted only by finding the unique individualised meanings people hold.

Frankl (2011:119) asserts that it is by virtue of an alert conscience that people can resist the effect of a sense of meaninglessness; a psychological crises caused by a lack of meaning or “existential vacuum”. Frankl explains that there might also be cases in which such crisis becomes severe enough to result in clinical symptomatology called noögenic neurosis. According to Frankl, in contrast to animals, a person is not told by drives and instincts what he or she must do, and in contrast to people in former times, are not necessarily told by traditions and values what should be done. People neither know what must be done, nor what should be done. Being confused as to what they wish to do, people now want to do as others do – which, in Frankl’s view is conformism - or people do what other people wish them to do – which is, totalitarianism. He explains that when people’s “will to meaning” is frustrated, they seem to resort back to a “will to power” or a “will to pleasure” as a more primitive form of the uniquely human search for meaning. In essence, according to Frankl (2011:119), one’s whole life is the answer to the question to its meaning and in essence morals have to be ontologised as well as existentialised.
For Frankl the answer to the meaning of life lies in the answer to the question – *Why do I exist?* Existential philosophers share common ground in emphasising the individual’s quest for existence (Brennan, 1982:306). Brennan also explains that Merleau-Ponty described phenomenological psychology as the study of individual and social relationships between consciousness and nature. According to this view individuals do not acquire existence from antecedent physical events but instead the individual moves toward the environment by bringing aspects of the environment into his or her existence. Brennan (1982:311) states that Martin Buber does not place emphasis on consciousness or “self-dialogue” but rather stressed dialogue between persons and between the person and God. He views relationships as a significant phenomenon in human existence. Brennan explains that for Buber in his major work “*I and Thou*”, out of the dual contributors of a dialogue comes unity. I believe that human beings are physical, cognitive, emotional, as well as spiritual beings and as such the healthy development of all these elements of the whole person should be taken into account, especially in education. I believe that people exist, not only in a physical sense but also in a metaphysical sense. I also believe that God exists and that He is the omniscient creator and originator of all that is, physical and metaphysical. I believe that in the beginning, God created order in the universe. Furthermore, I believe that all that exist do so to a purpose and therefore people’s existence is meaningful.

Gadamer (*In* Michelfelder & Palmer, 1989:21) states that to understand or “*Verstehen*” something means “to have appreciation for something”. He asserts that the ability to understand is a fundamental human endowment and that this sustains the communal life of people with others as partners to a conversation. People are both the influencers of and the influenced in their individual life worlds, and as such have intention, attention and agency and can develop capacity for making meaning and understanding, for making decisions impacting on themselves and others. In fact, I am asserting that it is exactly this “will to meaning” this “existentialising” of an “ontology” that in my view can also be described as the actualisation of the Self. Willig (2008:69-71) describes that what matters from a phenomenological perspective, is how people experience a particular event or “phenomenon”. However, at the same time, it recognises that the meanings people ascribe to events are the product of interactions between actors in the social world. According to
Willig, this means that people’s interpretations of experience are not entirely idiosyncratic or “free-floating”, but are bound up with social interactions and processes that are shared between social actors. Huitt (2009:1) describes that humanism is a school of thought that believes human beings are different from other species and possess capacities not found in animals. Humanists give primacy to the study of human needs and interests and a central assumption is that human beings behave out of intentionality and values. My study builds on the meta-theoretical assumption that people need other people to fully actualise and become all that they have the potential to be, thus people play a central role in the growth and development of people. How people interact has great significance, especially in the domain of education. I believe that interpersonal communication – how I say and what I say and communicate – especially in my capacity and role as a teacher, is central to learners’ process of being and becoming in the world. I am in their world as they are in mine, and communication and relationships are central to the idea of human growth and development, in fact, of education itself. I ascribe to a psycho-educational approach where people’s problems and ambitions can be dealt with by teaching them the skills needed to overcome their challenges or achieve their aims. According to Hornby, Hall and Hall (2003:16), in using this approach the teacher or counsellor shares his or her skills with learners by means of facilitating, modelling or directly teaching the skills needed to meaningfully engage with their challenges and aspirations. It is based on a process of exploring problems and/or ambitions; setting of personal goals; teaching skills and finally, monitoring progress and achievement. They also describe that a psycho-educational approach often uses an experiential learning process to facilitate growth and development in learners.

1.5.2 Theoretical assumptions

De Jager, Oberholzer and Landman (1985:2) describe that the communicative way of living is the use of one's senses that enable people to explore and make sense of themselves and their world. Trenholm (2011:1) declares that in the constant interplay between communication and experience ones world is shaped. She continues to describe that without the ability to communicate, people would not be able to form relationships with others, and would not understand the world around them. Crain (2000:366) emphasises that self-actualisers are, in many ways, like a good
phenomenologist in that they have the capacity to suspend and go beyond conventional ways of understanding and ordering experience. Brennan (1982:314) states that for Maslow the proper result of self-actualisation is a harmonised personality that fully utilises individual talents, intellectual capacities and self-awareness. I believe that a teacher should, above all else, facilitate healthy actualisation of learners’ potential and this process of actualisation is mediated via teacher learner communication, learner interactions and experiences.

1.5.2.1 Conceptions of school, learning and teaching within a psycho-educational perspective

Lipman and Palmer (Johnson & Reed, 2008:293) emphasise the importance of dialogue as a pedagogical tool, and suggest that the role of the teacher is to create learning communities that are eventually owned and maintained by the learners themselves. For Lipman and Palmer the ultimate goal of education is for each individual to become his or her authentic self. Corsini (1977:120-131) describes that the basic theory underlying client-centred therapy can be explained by understanding that if certain conditions are present in the attitudes of the person designated “therapist” in a relationship, namely congruence, positive regard, and empathic understanding, then growth and change will take place in the “other” person. According to Corsini (1977:26) this hypothesis theoretically holds true in any relationship in which one person assumes the attitudes of congruence, empathy, and positive regard, and the other perceives these attitudes. Corsini continues to explain that this view of human nature, postulates the existence of the one motivational force in humans; the tendency towards self-actualisation. Rogers (1979:1) confirms this stance that student-centred teaching and client-centred therapy has much in common, since the three growth-promoting conditions apply to any situation in which the development of the person is a goal. Rogers (1979:1) explains that the individual has within him or herself the resources for self-understanding, for altering self-concept basic attitudes, and the resources to alter his or her self-directed behaviour. He explains that these resources can be tapped if only a definable climate of facilitative psychological attitudes can be provided. Rogers (1979:1) describes these three distinct attitudes bringing about conditions for this growth facilitating psychological atmosphere as: Genuineness – realness or congruence; Unconditional
positive regard – acceptance or prizing and finally, Empathic understanding. Rogers (1979:8) explains that people in an environment infused with these attitudes develop more self-understanding, more self-confidence, and an increased ability to choose their behaviours. Rogers explains that people in these conditions learn more significantly that they have more freedom to be and become. Corsini (1977:125) explains that for Rogers the teacher is the one who can release students as well as him or herself for growth. The teacher becomes a learner, eagerly seeking new meaning and insight alongside his or her students. Corsini explains that for Rogers education is not a mass of facts presented on examination papers, but a becoming process whose goal is an ever richer process of meaningful living. In this process of meaningful being and becoming, the teacher is not a transmitter of ultimate truth but rather, they are there to facilitate for each student freedom to find his or her own truth and wisdom. The teacher facilitates an adventurous and exiting process of not knowing and finding out together, to create an educational space that offers freedom to learn. Johnson and Reed (2008:293) explain that for Lipman and Palmer, community of truth is grounded in the claim that reality is a web of communal relationships, and we can know reality by being in community with each other. Palmer (In Johnson & Reed, 2008:293) explains that the teacher as one who knows his or her own heart, facilitates active participation of members of the group and as the group focuses on a common subject worthy of their respect, they engage in increasingly complex patterns of communication with each other.

Dewey (Johnson & Reed, 2008:101), arguably the grandfather of modern Democratic and scientific approaches to education, defines the educated person and education itself as: “...a continual process of reconstruction of experience”. And he continues to explain that the educated person is a sense-maker. A person who can wrest as much meaning as possible from her or his experiences. Dewey (Tanner & Tanner, 1980:283) hoped to discover how a school could become “a cooperative community” and at the same time develop individuals and satisfy their own needs. Dewey (Tanner & Tanner, 1980:399) emphasised the difference between superficial attention paid to subject matter when a learner is told to attend in order to learn, and reflective attention – judging, considering, and deliberating (Dewey, 1933). In my view, Paulo Freire’s ideas (Johnson & Reed, 2008:207) in “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” expands on Dewey’s ideas of education as democratic,
**communicative, conscientizing, liberating and creative.** Paulo Freire explains in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Johnson & Reed, 2008:207) that a careful analysis of teacher-learner relationships inside and outside school often reveals its fundamentally *narrative character*. According to Shor and Freire (1987:11-14), this *narrative character* of the teacher-learner relationship involves a narrating teacher and a patient, listening learner. They take part in a process in which content, whether based on values or empirical reality tends to become lifeless and petrified. In this ‘mono-logical’ *narration* instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the learners must patiently receive. The more learners store these deposits the less they develop the *critical consciousness* which would result from their own intervention in the world as the transformers of their own world. For me, this is exactly the point at which this one directional narrative or “parallel-monologue” results in a breakdown in communication and effectively the relationship between teacher and learner. According to Tyminski (2010:310) teachers acting without reflection can trigger a shift into this direct telling mode, which may hamper or remove an opportunity for learner *sense making*. He believes that teachers who engage in “teacher lust” or an excessive one directional “telling” should be educated to raise their awareness of these tendencies and should be encouraged to make more conscious and reflective choices. As a teacher I believe that I should pay close attention when Goleman (2006) and others describe that how people connect with others has great significance. I am convinced that this significance most possibly might include the frustration of the learners’ effort at ontologising and existentialising – their efforts at making sense of their individual life world and their efforts at becoming the active participants and shapers of their world.

Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2010:40) assert that Bronfenbrenner has shown convincingly that, **interactions that occur in face-to-face, long-term relationships are the most important in shaping lasting aspects of development.** They explain that interactions such as these between a mother and a child, a child and his or her best friend, or between a teacher and a learner, are called “proximal interactions” and that these proximal interactions are affected by **personal factors** as well as by **the social contexts** they occur in. Pretorius (2007:10-11) asserts that the child is unable to self-actualise without education and education can only take place if the teacher and child co-exist in a truly communicative relationship and only through
communication is it possible for a person to experience what he or she is and should become. Pretorius (2007:219) explains that education is actualised via interaction between adult and child and refers to Kirstein (In Pretorius, 2007), who asserts that education simply cannot happen without communication and that teachers cannot communicate with learners without creating a preformed field for education. Communication is therefore a key concept regarding the educational relationship. In the long run a lack of attention to reflective practice and conscious teaching from professional teachers will have negative implications for individuals exposed to such “mindless” teaching, as well as for society as a whole. I align myself with Thompson and Thompson (2008:10) when they express the view that learning will not take place and practice will not develop if professionals can’t make connections between their thinking and their doing. I believe growing up is a process of being and becoming. In this process teachers must work with what is, towards what could be, and try not to be overly concerned with what should be. In this process of being and becoming, human beings need other human beings. More precisely, people need other humans to be congruent, empathetic and to demonstrate unconditional positive regard. Human and humane growth and development is facilitated via teacher-learner communication in the context of a healthy relationship that can simply not exist without these healthy, growth promoting conditions. Constructive communication practices between secondary school teachers and learners play an essential role in the relationships, development and self-actualisation of learners. In essence I believe that a teacher’s awareness and deliberateness, even educational intention during communication interactions with learners, is central to creating constructive educational relationships and a growth promoting context. Constructive communication facilitates healthy relationships that are conducive, supportive and facilitative of learner self-actualisation and development.

1.5.2.2 Other definitions of key concepts

In this thesis I will describe a psycho-educational model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. I will initiate the operationalisation of the model in a workshop. In this process I will create clear guidelines and examples for the practice of this model to facilitate
teachers’ implementation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and secondary school learners.

a) Psycho-educational

Jones and Robinson (2000:356) refer to the Association for Specialists in Group Work (1992) and describe psycho-educational groups as those that are designed to help participants develop knowledge and skills for coping adaptively with potential and/or immediate environmental challenges, developmental transitions, and life crises. They continue to describe that the distinct feature of psycho-education is its significant educational component and that this also points towards the use of structured exercises to help facilitate group processes. They also describe that group leaders typically plan topics and exercises for each session in advance, an activity very similar to developing a curriculum. The most important task of the group leader is determining the curriculum for the group, deciding which exercises to use in each session and which collaborative goals to set.

b) Model

Mouton (2009:117) describes that certain aspects of meaning or dimensions of meaning are more closely associated within a given field of meaning and that together these dimensions constitute the connotations ascribed to a concept. He continues to say that it is only within the framework of a theory or a model that such relationships are defined systematically and in this way theories and models create theoretical definitions that logically systematise the most important dimensions of a given phenomenon. Mouton and Marais (1996:138-142) describe that the model is the primary conceptual framework that has a heuristic function. They maintain that the difference between models and theories are largely differences of degree. They assert that the heuristic function is the most common characteristic of models, while the explanatory function is usually attributed to theories. They explain that there is an analogical relationship between the model and the real life phenomena of which it is a model. Mouton and Marais (1996:39) refer to Kaplan (1964:265), who describes that models can also be viewed as scientific metaphors. By investigating a specific phenomenon, the researcher reveals certain similarities or relationships and
systematizes and simplifies these in the form of a model of that phenomenon.
A model of something is an ‘as if framework’ in which a model of X claims that X is structured in the manner suggested by the model. Mouton and Marais (1996:138-142) refer to Harre (1970:55), who surmises that ‘models’ are heuristic in nature and have properties of precursor theoretical models. Models provide questions, pointers and directions for inquiry. A model might, if pursued, lead to a better understanding of the phenomenon or domain under investigation. In this research my aim will be to develop such a model.

c) Facilitation

Wikipedia online dictionary (2011) states that the term facilitation, refers broadly to an activity which makes tasks for others easy. According to Tight (2002:28) a facilitator is a person who has the role of helping participants to learn in an experiential group. He adds that teaching is no longer seen as imparting and doing things to learners, but instead is redefined as facilitation of self-directed learning. Huitt (2009:4) explains that teachers who are more facilitative of growth and change tend to provide: Response to student feeling; use student ideas in on-going instructional interaction; have more discussion and dialogue with students; praise students; are less ritualistic and more congruent; smile more when interacting with students and tend to tailor content to the individual students’ frame of reference.

d) Communication

The implication of communication as sharing together a common factor is thinking together about a problem; not merely receiving, but to share together and to create together (Krishnamurti, 2006:1-9). Krishnamurti is of the opinion that the receiver and the sender of a message share responsibility for the message being communicated. He also states that a message is not really “transmitted” and “received” but created during a shared communication event. Krishnamurti (2006:1-9) states if people merely sit there and listen to a few ideas, agreeing or disagreeing they are not in communion, communication, with one another and they are not sharing together if they are not participating. Kneisl and Trigoboff (2009:203-204) explain that Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1969) base their theory of human
communication on the assumption that communication is synonymous with interaction and in the presence of another all behaviour is communicative. Kneisl and Trigoboff (2009:203-204) explain that this approach to communication is concerned with the pragmatics, or the behavioural effects of human interaction. It is a conception of human communication as a reciprocal process and according to this theory, one cannot, abstain from communication because all the different kinds of behaviour – activity or inactivity, verbalisations or silences – communicate messages in the presence of another person.

Barker (2010:11-19) explains that communication derives from the Latin word ‘communis’, meaning ‘common’ or ‘shared’ and that it belongs to the family of words that includes communion, communism and community. He explains that communication then is the process of creating shared understanding and conversation is the main way people build relationships, share information and promote ideas. Conversations are the way people create shared meaning, so to improve communication skills, conversation needs to be improved. Barker (2010:22) explains that conversations are dynamics of talking and listening and that the quality of the conversation depends on the listening that takes place in the conversation.

e) Teachers and learners

According to Freire (Johnson & Reed, 2008:207) education must begin with the solution of the teacher-learner contradiction. Teachers should create egalitarian relationships by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so both participants to the teaching-learning interaction are simultaneously teachers and learners. I believe that this reconciling happens in the context of the relationship and communication interactions between teacher and learners. In this interaction, teachers and learners are both listeners and speakers and therefore, participants to a communicative interaction. Reconciliation of the teacher learner dichotomy begins with the practice of teaching as listening and learning as talking or communicating.
1.5.3 Methodological assumptions

Leedy and Ormrod (2001:153-154) explain that in a phenomenological study the researcher makes some generalisations of what an experience is like from an insider’s perspective. Higgs and Smith (2006b:55) explain that the central idea of phenomenology can be described as: “We are in the world and the world is in us”. With reference to phenomenology, Higgs and Smith (2006a:115) pose the central question phenomenology engages with as: “Who am I? Who is this “I” that constantly interacts with the world around me?” According to Crain (2000:371-373), a phenomenological orientation supports a humanistic approach to the psychological growth and development of people. He explains that in a phenomenological orientation, one tries to suspend or “bracket” one’s customary categories of observation and to see people and things as openly and freshly as possible. In this orientation, one must suspend preconceptions in order to enter into the inner world of the developing child’s experiences. Crain suggests that in a phenomenological orientation to psychological development of a particular child, the central question is always to ask how the world looks and feels to this particular child. Crain (2000:364-365) states that phenomenologists highlight immediate experience of the world as it reveals itself, before it is put into mental categories.

Typically uniquely human experiences, such as empathy, wonder, imagination and inspiration, is often the focus of the phenomenological psychologist because what matters, from a phenomenological perspective, is how people experience a particular event. Bigge and Hunt (1962:340) describe that reality consists of what one makes of that which comes to a person through their senses or otherwise. Patton (2002:39-55) asserts that qualitative research designs are naturalistic because the research takes place in real world settings and the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest. Patton asserts that naturalistic inquiry assumes that change is a natural, expected, and inevitable part of human experiences and that documenting change is a natural, expected, and intrinsic part of fieldwork. According to Patton (2002:52), qualitative inquiry is philosophically supported by the doctrine of “Verstehen” which means understanding and refers to the unique human capacity to make sense of the world. He explains that the verstehen tradition stresses understanding that focuses on the meaning of human
behaviour, the context of social interaction, an emphatic understanding based on personal experience, as well as the connections between mental states and behaviour.

Creswell (2007:16-17) builds on the “axiomatic” issues advanced by Guba and Lincoln (1988). He describes that in the choice of doing qualitative research, researchers hold the ontological assumption that reality is subjective and multiple. Qualitative researchers are interested in reality as seen by participants to the study. He explains that the epistemology of researchers is such that they attempt to lessen distance between themselves and that being studied. This research rests on *phenomenological principles and methods* (Giorgi, 2002). Steps in theory generating research, as described by Chinn and Kramer (2011:152-226), as well as concepts describing the practice of theory generating as described by Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429), will be used to develop a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. I will adopt a functional and pragmatic approach in which I conduct research to improve both my own practice as well as educational practice in general via the process of theory generation and evaluation (Creswell, 2007:22). The model will be evaluated by implementing it in a workshop for secondary school teachers, constituting a single case to be studied. I invoke postmodern principles of *logic and justification* as criteria for truth and I will establish *trustworthiness* by implementing Lincoln and Guba’s (1985:301-331) model of trustworthiness for naturalistic inquiry.

1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

I will now describe the basic design of this research and the methods I will employ to answer the research question and attain the goals of the research.

1.6.1 Research design

To achieve the objectives of the research I will employ a qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research design. In Phase one, a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school will be described. In Phase two, the model will be
implemented and evaluated. I will make use of a single case study approach and the sample will be purposive. Participation will be voluntary. The criteria for sampling and the single case will be discussed in chapter two. The application of these methods will meet the main purpose of the research project.

1.6.2 Research method

Theory-generating research will implicate the research method as set out in the following paragraphs. This research project will follow the four steps described below in a non-linear fashion and I will use analysis, synthesis and derivation, as well as different reasoning strategies. The following four steps will constitute the theory generating research method.

1.6.2.1 Step 1 – Concept analysis

Concept analysis can be described as the classification and identifying of the central concepts. I will utilise my previous research to assist me in identifying the central concept/s for this research project, and then define and classify the identified central concept/s. I will use the strategies of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429) in conjunction with the strategies of Chinn and Kramer (2011:162-172) for concept analysis. Data will be gathered from existing literature, as well as my own research completed in 2009. I will then integrate it into a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. Concept analysis will take place in two stages. I will first identify the central concept of the model from my research completed previously (Prins, 2009). In the second stage of defining the concepts of the model, the central concept will be defined utilising dictionary and subject literature to identify essential characteristics of the concept. The concepts will be classified by means of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach’s (1968) survey list asking: Who is the agent? Who is the receiver? What is the procedure? What is the dynamics? What is the outcome?
1.6.2.2 Step 2 – Placing concepts into relationships

I will describe how the identified and defined central concepts interrelate with each other. A full description of how concepts will be placed into relationships will be provided in chapter two.

1.6.2.3 Step 3 – Describing the model

I will utilise Chinn and Kramer's (2008:237) criteria for the descriptive components of a model and evaluate the described model based on Chinn and Kramer's evaluation criteria (2011:197). A full description of the criteria and its application to this research will be provided in chapter two.

1.6.2.4 Step 4 – Implementation and evaluation of the model

A single case study strategy with embedded units of analysis (Yin, 2009:46) will be used to gather data to evaluate the model as implemented. The case study will be instrumental and evaluative in nature (Thomas, 2011:98-99). The implementation of the model by the researcher during the workshop, as well as by the participating teachers, will enable the researcher to collect data on how the model works for participating teachers. The model will be evaluated based on the data collected, using evaluation criteria from Chinn and Kramer (2011:197), namely: clarity; simplicity; generality; accessibility and importance. The applicability of the model to its purpose will be evaluated.

1.7 TRUSTWORTHINESS

In this research Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria and strategies for trustworthiness will be operationalised in keeping with the philosophy, principles and practices of naturalistic inquiry. Creswell (2007:16-19) describes Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) model for trustworthiness in qualitative research and explains that the dependability in naturalistic inquiry shifts its focus from the dependability of the researcher, procedures and instruments, to the dependability of the qualitative data. Lincoln and Guba (1985:290) as well as Krefting (1991:215-217) view truth value, applicability,
consistency, and neutrality as valid criteria to determine the trustworthiness of both quantitative and qualitative research. This research adheres to Guba’s model of trustworthy research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:316-325; Krefting, 1991:215) and the strategy of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability will be applied to satisfy the aforementioned criteria. Lincoln and Guba’s (1985:301-331) model of trustworthiness will be operationalised in this research.

*Credibility* – for the criterion of truth-value;
*Transferability* – for the criterion of applicability;
*Dependability* – for the criterion of consistency; and
*Confirmability* – for the criterion of neutrality.

The strategies for triangulation (Miller & Dingwall, 1997:38) play an essential role in case study research and will be described in more detail in chapter two.

### 1.7.1 Ethical measures

Ethical measures will be adhered to during the research process. These will include the approval of relevant institutions including: the ethical committee of the Faculty of Education of the University of Johannesburg (*Appendix A*); and the relevant Department of Education and the Schools where the research will be conducted. The informed consent of teachers will be obtained as well as their informed agreement to partake in the research (*Appendix B*). Secondary school teachers will be given an opportunity to participate voluntarily after meeting the researcher and attending a short briefing about the research. Participants may withdraw their participation at any stage of the research. During the research the right to privacy, confidentiality and anonymity will be respected during qualitative data gathering, in the analysis, and thereafter. The principles of equality, freedom of choice and movement, as well as autonomy will be respected by the researcher during the research process. The rights of the scientific community will be respected. Furthermore, four principles by Beachamp and Chidress (Sharf, 2010:17; Dhai & McQuoid-Mason, 2011:2-4) will provide a principle based framework for ethical research. The principles are: Autonomy; Non-maleficence; Beneficence; and Justice. These principles will guide my facilitation and research practice.
1.7.1.1 Autonomy

Autonomy is the view that participants make their own autonomous decisions and decisions made by them should be respected as such. It also implies that participants will not be judged for the autonomous decisions they make. Participation in the workshop and accompanying case study research will be voluntary. Autonomous decisions of participants before, during and after the workshop will be respected. Voluntary participants will be thoroughly briefed and informed of the nature of the workshop and the research they will be engaging in; their informed consent will be obtained before participation begins. Participants will also be briefed on the timelines and how much time the workshop and research process will take. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the process at any time without consequences. Their anonymity and the confidentiality of their experiences and responses will be protected at all times by strategies like the use of participant numbers, non-disclosure of names and places mentioned, and/or the use of pseudonyms. Permission to audiotape will be obtained from participants and relevant institutional heads, and only the researcher will have access to the audiotaped materials. The original data will be destroyed two years after publication of results.

1.7.1.2 Non-maleficence

The principle of “do no harm”. Participants will never be manipulated for own gain, deceived, or even inadvertently hurt by participation in the research. In the research process and in the implementation of the model, I will take care to be respectful of participants’ wishes and preferences and by reflective practice ensure not to expose them to undue and harmful situations. The researcher will be available at all times for support and assistance, and further assistance will be provided if requested by participants.

1.7.1.3 Beneficence

The principle of promotion of health and well-being will be respected. I will do more than just avoiding causing harm; the welfare of participants will be actively promoted.
The workshop will be based on rigorous psycho-educational principles and practices that have a high possibility of supporting and facilitating participants to gain knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with constructive, healthy and effective communication and healthy relationships. The model and the workshop will be carefully researched and designed to facilitate constructive interaction and make a positive impact on participants.

### 1.7.1.4 Justice

Justice refers to fairness in dealing with participants and other professionals. Provision of high quality services and fair treatment of others is fundamental to justice and one of the biggest challenges can be treating one person fairly while not violating the rights of others. Particular care will be taken to accommodate participant preferences with regards to disclosure and non-disclosure of thoughts, feelings and experiences, as well as preferences associated with food and comfort breaks or other special requests that can be accommodated without infringing on the rights of other participants.

### 1.8 DIVISION OF CHAPTERS

- Chapter 1: Overview and rationale of the research
- Chapter 2: Research design and method
- Chapter 3: Developing a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school
- Chapter 4: A description of the model as a framework of reference for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school
- Chapter 5: Implementation and evaluation of the model
- Chapter 6: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations

### 1.9 SUMMARY

In this chapter I provided an overview and rationale of the research and in the next chapter design and methodology of this research project will be described.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

"You must learn to use your life experiences in your intellectual work: continually to examine and interpret it. In this sense craftsmanship is the centre of yourself and you are personally involved in every intellectual product upon which you may work" (Wright Mills In Neuman 1997:16).

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Neuman (1997:1) describes that research is a way of going about finding answers to questions and social research is conducted to seek answers to questions about the social world. Neuman (1997:16) explains that researchers are people who become absorbed in a desire to create and discover new knowledge and gain a richer understanding of the social world. In broad terms this study may be viewed as such an attempt to create richer knowledge and understanding around the implementation of a model to facilitate constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners.

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001:8-9), the ultimate aim of any scientific inquiry is to generate and/or verify theory, and “theory” is viewed as a set of interrelated constructs and propositions that specify relations among variables to describe, explain and predict phenomena. Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429) describe that a theory is an “invention of concepts in interrelation”. They explain that a theory is a conceptual framework to some particular purpose. If the model or theory is subject to interplay with reality, in an attempt to determine the adequacy of the intervention for the purpose the theory is designed to fulfil, one may be willing to consider a theory a good one. A scientific inquiry is therefore the search for knowledge by using recognised methods of data collection, analysis, and interpretation and at its most basic level it is an approach to a systematic process of creating trustworthy knowledge and developing practice. I view this inquiry as such an attempt – to generate theory from practice and also link theory to practice. It is an
attempt to develop theory for teaching practice, from teaching practice, using rigorous and recognised research strategies and methods.

### 2.2 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to describe, implement and evaluate a psycho-educational model to address mono-logical communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. In the first phase of the research the objective will be to describe a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners. The model will be evaluated by a team of expert model builders at the end of the first phase. The objective in the second phase will be to implement this model in a workshop for teachers based on the model and to evaluate the model based on the qualitative case-study data collected during implementation.

### 2.3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2010:34), a research design is a strategic framework. This framework for action serves as a bridge between research questions and the practical execution or implementation of the research. They continue to describe that it is this rigorous, designed and planned nature of the research process that distinguishes research from other forms of observation. Patton (2002:39-55) explains that qualitative research designs are naturalistic because the research takes place in real world settings and the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest. Patton asserts that naturalistic inquiry assumes that change is a natural, expected, and inevitable part of human experiences and that documenting change is a natural, expected, and intrinsic part of fieldwork. According to Patton (2002:52), qualitative inquiry is philosophically supported by the doctrine of “Verstehen” which means understanding and refers to the unique human capacity to make sense of the world. He explains that in this research tradition, understanding that focuses on the meaning of human behaviour is stressed. It also focusses on the context of social interaction, an emphatic understanding based on personal experience, and the connections that exist between mental states and behaviour.
2.3.1 Research design

The design used for this research can be described as qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory generating. The design will make use of the principles associated with naturalistic inquiry (Patton, 2002:39-44), utilising a single case study (Yin, 2009:46-50). The single case will consist of implementing the model in a one day workshop, operationalising the psycho-educational model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. Research on the implementation of the psycho-educational model will rest on phenomenological philosophy and principles and participating teachers’ experience.

2.3.1.1 Qualitative

According to Patton (2002:55), qualitative inquiry is particularly orientated towards exploration, discovery and inductive logic. Patton (2002:67) claims that the qualitative inquirer works back and forth between parts and wholes to separate variables and complex interwoven constellations of variables. Qualitative inquiry is also a ‘sorting-out then putting-back-together’ process (Patton, 2002:67). Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2010:35) describe that qualitative research put forward designs that are more open, fluid, and changeable, and not defined by purely technical terms. A qualitative approach to research, and in particular research design, is an iterative process that requires a flexible, non-sequential approach. In this research these principles and practices of qualitative research will be adhered to.

2.3.1.2 Exploratory

Chinn and Kramer (2011:249) describe that exploring is an approach to understanding and analysing the values inherent in situations, as well as the actions that flow from those values. Exploring also interacts with a process of clarification that may create ethical knowledge. McMillan and Schumacher (2001:101) explain that exploratory research is done in new areas of inquiry. They claim that qualitative exploratory studies often examine phenomena that have not been studied before and
such research often develops theory. Mouton (1996:102-103) describes exploratory research as referring to research where very little previous research has been conducted and typically, in such exploratory research, attempts will be made to collect new data and develop new hypothesis to explain the data. He describes the main aim of exploratory studies is then to establish the ‘facts’ and gather new data that can point to interesting patterns in the data. This research was exploratory in the sense that an attempt was made to systematically develop a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school before being implemented in a workshop for teachers. The experience of participants during the implementation of the model, were then explored as an indication of if and how the model works.

2.3.1.3 Descriptive

This research uses a descriptive design to document the phenomenon of interest. According to Terre Blance, Durrheim and Painter (2010:44), descriptive studies aim to describe phenomena by seeking observations of the phenomena that focus on the accuracy and consistency of the observations. In this research accuracy and consistency of descriptions will be enhanced by the triangulation created via the use of several methods of qualitative data collection. Mouton and Marais (1996:138-140) argue that the heuristic or descriptive function of a model is the most common characteristic of models and there is an analogacl relationship between the model and the phenomena of the model. They explain that by investigating a phenomenon, the researcher reveals certain similarities or relationships, and systematises these in a simplified form, as a model of that phenomenon. In this study the phenomenon described and of which theory was generated by the research design, is the teacher-learner communication interaction between secondary school teachers and secondary school learners. Describing this phenomenon is central to the research. This research defines and describes a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school and this model was evaluated and implemented in this research.
2.3.1.4 Contextual

Neuman (1997:331) explains that qualitative researchers emphasise context to understand the social world. The meaning of a social action or statement depends on the contexts it appears in and not taking context into consideration could easily skew or twist the meaning. Terre Blance, Durrheim and Painter (2010:276-277) explain that the understanding of phenomena in context and as they are lived by participants in the research using context-derived terms and categories in a description of the phenomena, is central to interpretive qualitative research. They also argue that the development of research methods to cater for the importance of context in collecting and interpreting data is the central achievement of qualitative methodologies. In this research protocols and methods of qualitative data collection will be specifically designed and implemented for the context and research problem of this study. Patton (2002:62-63) also describes the central role of context in qualitative research. He explains that naturalistic inquiry preserves natural context and that in contrast to quantitative research, qualitative inquiry elevates context as critical to understanding. In this study the importance of context was acknowledged throughout as extensive use was made of qualitative methods and a phenomenological philosophy and approach to qualitative research (Creswell, 2007:57-58). I have been sensitive to the context and contextual meanings created by secondary school and challenges of daily interactions between secondary school learners and teachers. The experience of the participating teachers during implementation of the model was the focus of data collection.

2.3.1.5 Theory-generating

Chinn and Kramer (2008:219-220) propose a framework for deliberately examining, describing and critically reflecting on emerging theoretical models or theory without imposing preconceived notions of meaning. They define theory as: “A creative and rigorous structuring of ideas that project a tentative, purposeful, and systematic view of phenomena.” This will be the theory definition I adhere to in this research. Chinn and Kramer (2008:219-220) propose that, once theories are developed, the questions – What is this? and – How does it work?, should direct the further development of a particular theory or model. I base my description of “A psycho-
educational model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school” on this logic of form and function. I identified and defined the main concepts as well as described the psycho-educational model in chapters three and four, and in chapters five and six I described the implementation of the model and its working. In chapter three, I identified and defined the central concept of the model in a three step definition process and used Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach’s (1968) survey list to classify the concepts. In chapter four the concepts were placed in relationships and I developed a complete description of the model. After the development of the model, it was evaluated by a team of experienced model developers. The evaluation of the model was done using Chinn and Kramer’s (2011:197-205) criteria for evaluation of a model: clarity; simplicity; generality; accessibility and importance.

The completion of this first evaluation indicated the completion of the first phase of the research which focused on describing what the model is. The question of “does this model work”, or “how does it work?” was addressed in the second phase. In chapter five I described the operationalisation of the model and its implementation initiated during the workshop. Data collected during the implementation of the model were used to evaluate the model again after its implementation. Throughout the research I developed conceptualised and clarified theory to illuminate the phenomenon of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and secondary school learners. The theory generated took the form of a psycho-educational model that was operationalised in the workshop and the implementation and evaluation of the model constituted a single instrumental case of implementation.

2.4 REASONING STRATEGIES

In the development, description and evaluation of the psycho-educational model for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners, different reasoning strategies were used, which included analysis, synthesis, induction and deduction.
2.4.1 Analysis

Analysis is the division of any complex entity into its component parts, as well as the systematic examination of data (Corsini, 2002:46). According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1993:21), analysis is the breakdown of a whole into its constituent elements so the hierarchy of ideas is clarified and described and the relations between the ideas are explicitly expressed. They continue to describe that analysis involves the identification of the elements and the systematic exposure of the connections and the interactions between the elements. It exposes the arrangement and the structures that holds the whole together. Both analysis and synthesis were used when I identified, classified and defined the concepts of the model. Analysis was of particular use when I did concept analysis and looked for the essential attributes of the central concepts to be defined.

2.4.2 Synthesis

Synthesis is a process of combining elements to form a whole (Corsini, 2002:46). Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1993:21) describe that a synthesis is putting together parts or elements from diverse sources to form a whole. It involves the process of working with parts and elements and arranging or combining them in such a way that they constitute a pattern or structure not clearly discernible before. It is a process of drawing on a selection of elements which will be arranged into a new pattern. Although synthesis will be part of identifying, classifying and defining the concepts of the model, synthesis was of particular use when I wrote the relationship statements as part of the development and description of the model. I also used it when observing the central storyline in the data and when deriving the meaning of the data based on the case study.

2.4.3 Induction

Inductive logic is reasoning from particular instances to general conclusions or from experiences to broad generalisations (Corsini, 2002:483). Corsini (2002:483) also describes inductive reasoning as a process where inferences and general principles are derived from particular observations and cases and reasoning from the specific to
the general. Corsini calls induction the cornerstone of the scientific method because it underlies the process of generating hypotheses from particular facts and observations. Solomon and Higgins (2010:17) explain that the most familiar inductive argument is generalisation from a number of particular cases. According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1993:115), inductive thinking is the establishment of a universal truth by the idea that a particular instance or instances will reveal the necessity of a connection between two or more phenomena. Mouton and Marais (1996:110-115) describe that in inductive argumentation, genuine supporting evidence, such as observations, can lead to highly probable conclusions and supporting statements or premises lend gradual support to the conclusions. In an inductive argument the conclusion does not follow of necessity and if one accepts that the premises are true, the question that arises is how much support do they provide for the conclusions drawn from them.

Mouton (2009:77) describes that in an inductive argument the conclusion reached is supported by the observations made thus far, and the argument is therefore supported by the premises. According to Mouton (2009:78), in a retro-ductive inference the conclusion is an inference based on the best explanation of the observed events. A conclusion is offered as an explanation that provides an account of what has been observed. During the development and description of the psycho-educational model for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners, I used data from my master’s degree (Prins, 2009) to lend inductive support to the description of the model. Data from my master’s study provided phenomenological descriptions of what constructive communication and positive relationships between secondary school teachers is, is not, and ought to be, based on the lived experience of secondary school learners, and therefore provided an empirical base on which the model could be found. This model could be implemented and ‘retro-ductively’ tested – much like a “naturalistic experiment”. This case study then generated inductive support for the conclusions drawn based on data obtained by implementing the model. The data lends inductive support for how the model worked for participants in the case of implementing the model.
2.4.4 Deduction

Deduction is a conclusion or inference derived by reasoning from formal premises or propositions (Corsini, 2002:255). Corsini (2002:255) explains that deductive reasoning is a fundamental process for discovering truth by making theoretical statements and then establishing hypotheses to be checked by obtaining evidence to support the validity for the assertion. This is also known as a hypothetico-deductive reasoning process. Solomon and Higgins (2010:16) describe deduction as a progression from one true statement to another. The final conclusive statement is true based on previous statements. According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1993:61), deductive thinking and reasoning is thinking by inference. A deduction is a conclusion drawn by reasoning from facts or premises. Mouton and Marais (1996:110-115) describe that in a deductive argument the supporting evidence is linked to a conclusion on the basis of semantic considerations, either implicitly or explicitly and the conclusion is already contained within the premises and therefore the conclusion is an explication of the premises. In deductive arguments the conclusion is based upon the meanings of the central concepts in the specific statements.

Mouton (2009:77) explains that in deductive arguments the conclusion to the argument is contained in the premises and is therefore an explication of the premises. In this research project, deductive reasoning was used when I described the operationalisation of the model. Although the model was generated and described based on the data of my master’s thesis, the application and operationalisation of the inferred principles and practices associated with parallel-monologue and on the other hand, constructive communication, constituted deductive reasoning based on principles, as inferred from the original data. The model served as a structured and logical framework with a specific process and principles to facilitate the development of secondary school teachers’ abilities and competencies to actualise constructive communication with secondary school learners. Deductive reasoning played a fundamental role in developing and describing the model. Competencies associated with constructive communication were facilitated during the workshop and I proposed a model to facilitate the constructive communication between the teachers and the learners in a secondary
school based on both data from prior investigation as well as knowledge obtained from literature. Deductive reasoning also played an important role after implementation of the model in the second phase of the research when conclusions and recommendations were made.

2.5 THEORY-GENERATING RESEARCH METHOD

The research methods for this research will be described in the steps for theory generating research. These steps were followed simultaneously in a non-linear fashion, and will now be described.

2.5.1 Step 1 – Concept analysis

Chinn and Kramer (2011:182) describe that theory is a creative and rigorous structuring of ideas and these ideas or concepts are expressed by word symbols that form the conceptual structure. They explain that structure is created using a method that draws on the creativity of the theorist and the theorist can explain how the method was applied. Chinn and Kramer (1995:77-91) describe that concept analysis is central to conceptualisation of theory and describe it as creating conceptual meaning through identifying, defining and classifying the central concepts in a theory.

2.5.1.1 Identification of central concepts from my Master’s Degree data

Identification of the central concept was done by using results from my previous research (Prins, 2009:36-88) where secondary school learners shared their experiences of aggression while communicating with their teachers. Learners experienced intrapersonal and interpersonal reactions to experienced aggression during communication with teachers as well as numerous practices of disrespect by both peers and teachers. Overall, learners described the experience of a lack of important principles for respectful and constructive relationships and it boiled down to a consistent one-sided communiqué by the teacher that demonstrated little to no respect for the learner as an interactive, developing person. These learner experiences formed the foundation from where I identified the central concept/s for this research.
2.5.1.2 Defining the central concept/s of the model

Chinn and Kramer (2008:182) describe that the concepts contained within a model or theory must be defined and they must have a logical relationship with one another to form a coherent structure or pattern. During the process of defining the central concept, I used various sources of evidence for generating and refining essential attributes of the central concept of the model. These attributes also included empirical indicators for the concepts and these indicators may be utilised as criteria for identifying the phenomena related to the model in future research. I implemented a three step definition process in which I used dictionary definitions of the central concept together with definitions from the subject literature of the central concept to identify essential attributes of the concept. From these sources of evidence I developed the essential attributes for the central concept and the essential concepts and related concepts were identified. To give further meaning and create understanding of the central concept, I constructed a model case of learners experiencing the central concept. The specific context for the intended meaning of the defined concept was described in the model case. All the essential and related concepts that formed part of the definition of the central concepts were reflected in the model case. In this way the model case was a prime example of the central concept.

2.5.1.3 Classification of the concepts of the model

For the classification of the concepts of the model, Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach’s (1968:415-435) survey list were used. This survey list includes the following questions to direct the classification of the concepts of the model: Who is the agent? – The person who performs the action. Who is the recipient? – The person to whom the agent performs the action. What is the procedure? – The process or strategy of the actions of the agent. What are the dynamics? – The internal motivation of both the agent and the recipient that contributes to the desired outcomes of the action. What is the context? – the area in which the action takes place and finally: What is the outcome? – the final result of the agent applying the procedure to the recipient.
2.5.2 Step 2 – Placing concepts in relationships

The concepts of the model were placed in relationships, by writing relationship statements. These relationship statements as a whole provided substance and form to the model (Chinn & Kramer, 2011:192). Chinn and Kramer (1995:96-97) explain that the relationship statements describe, explain or predict the nature of the interactions between the concepts of the model. The model even contained several levels of relationship statements that range from simple to complex statements. A relationship statement was designed to introduce new concepts to the model. In this research the relationship statements described the interrelations between the identified concepts of the model.

2.5.3 Step 3 – Describing the model

Chinn and Kramer (2008:220-233; 2011:185-196) describe that there are six questions that can be used to give a full description of a model. I used these questions as a guide to be clearer about the requirements for each of the descriptive components of the model. The components and guiding questions that were used to give a full description of the model in chapter four are as follows:

- **What is the purpose of the model?** Answering this question addresses why the model was designed and also gives a clear indication of the contexts and situations to which the model can be applied.
- **What are the concepts of the model?** Answering this question identifies and describes the ideas that are structured and related to each other within the model.
- **How are the concepts defined?** Answering this question clarifies the meaning of concepts within the model. It questions what empiric experience is represented by the ideas within the model.
- **What is the nature of relationships?** Answering this question addresses how concepts are linked together. It focuses on the various forms relationship statements can take and how it gives structure to the model.
- **What is the structure of the model?** Answering this question describes the overall form of the conceptual interrelationships.
• **On what assumptions does the model build on?** This question addresses the basic truths taken to underlie the model that impacts on all the aspects above and are fundamental to the theoretical reasoning.

Chinn and Kramer (2008:237; 2011:197) describe criteria that can be used to form a complete critical reflection on theory. They explain that the description of a model can be said to be a more objective question. Answering the question “what is this?” they continue to argue that critical reflection involves asking questions about how well the model serves some purpose. They describe the value of a critical reflection by asserting that as the researcher questions the worth of an emerging theory, the researcher will form insights that will help him or her know how the theory might be used and how it might be further developed. The following criteria and questions were used to evaluate the model:

- **Clarity** – *How clear is this proposed model?*
  - Clarity is described by considering the semantic clarity, semantic consistency, structural clarity and the structural consistency of the model.

- **Simplicity** – *How simple is this proposed model?*
  - Simplicity means that the number of elements within each descriptive category, particularly concepts and their interrelationships, are minimal.

- **Generality** – *How general is this proposed model?*
  - This question addresses the scope of experiences covered by the model.

- **Accessibility** – *How accessible is the proposed model?*
  - This question addresses the extent to which empirical indicators for the concept can be identified.

- **Importance** – *How important is the proposed model?*
  - An important theory is forward looking; usable in practice, education, and research; and valuable for creating a desired future. A theory’s importance is closely linked to its clinical significance or its practical value.

Applicability can be described as how well the model fits its purpose. The applicability of a theory or model – how applicable this proposed model is to the purpose it was designed for – will play an important role in the evaluation of the
model. An independent coder, panel of experts, supervisor and co-supervisor, as well as the doctoral committee and I, used the criteria to evaluate the model after it was described by the researcher. The implementation and evaluation of the model initiated by the workshop constituted the case to be studied. Consensus discussions confirmed the results from the single case study and the data obtained from the case study was also used by the researcher to evaluate the model using the criteria described. This step will be addressed in chapter five.

2.5.4 Step 4 – Implementation and evaluation of the model

Data were collected throughout the process of implementation. The data collection process closely followed the process and stages of the experience of implementation of the model by the researcher and participants. Particular data collection methods were used to triangulate data at various stages throughout the process of implementation of the model by participating teachers as well as the participant researcher. The research question of this single case, theory generating, qualitative and explorative research design is: What can be done to address the monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school? The model proposed a possible answer to this question.

The operational version of the research question is: How is this model working for you? This question was put to participants and used for the gathering of all qualitative data after the workshop and throughout the entire process of implementing the model. It was used in all protocols to facilitate data collection. During the workshop the workshop documentation as well as audio recording of the evolving workshop conversation and field notes were used as data gathering techniques to document the workshop. After the workshop Reflective Journaling, Naive sketches, Individual Phenomenological interviews, two focus group interviews, as well as more field notes were used to collect qualitative data on participant experience of the model. All protocols for collecting data during the various stages of implementation focused on the operationalised version of the research question as described above.
2.5.4.1 The workshop documentation

The researcher, who was also the facilitator of the workshop, choreographed the workshop by using a “script” consisting of various learning tasks. These tasks called for written reflection based on an open ended question, as part of the task. The learning tasks also aimed to create opportunities and help facilitate conversation between participants. Some tasks also called for physical participation and communication interaction. The individual reflections of participants based on the learning tasks were transcribed as part of the documentation of the workshop. These individual reflections gave insight into how the central concept was implemented in the workshop. Every participant received a laminated A4 colour copy of the model diagramme, as part of their workshop notes. Participants were encouraged to display it on the wall of their offices and classrooms. Another A4 colour copy of the model diagramme was inserted as the second page in participants’ reflective journals to support reflection during reflective journaling in the first two weeks after the workshop.

2.5.4.2 The audio tape of the workshop

All the phases of the workshop were audio taped and transcribed to document the evolving conversation during the workshop. The transcription of the workshop conversation was a typed record of how the implementation of the model happened during the workshop. It gave a detailed account of the development of the central concept of the model during the workshop and answered the research question – What can be done about the monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school?

2.5.4.3 Reflective journals

The reflective journaling encouraged and supported reflections on the model during the two weeks after the workshop, before the individual phenomenological interviews with each of the ten participants. Each participant was asked to write four reflective diary entries, two in each of the two weeks, one on a Wednesday and the other on a Friday. These journal entries gave particular insight into participants’ practical
applications, challenges and experiences related to how the model worked for participants when implemented in the classroom. It provided insight into how the model evolved for participants as they grappled with and used it in their teaching practice (see reflective journal – Annexure C).

2.5.4.4 Naïve sketches

Just before starting each individual phenomenological interview, each participant was asked to reflect on the model in a short summative essay. This short essay served as an opportunity to summarise the main aspects of participant experiences related to the model in the classroom and it also served to prepare the participants and helped them to be comfortable during the interview (see protocol for naïve sketch as well as interview protocol – Annexure C).

2.5.4.5 Individual phenomenological interviews

The reflective journals formed part of the participant booklet, as Annexure B. Annexure A of this participant booklet (protocol) is a colour copy of the model. These reflective journals were collected at the individual phenomenological interviews. The journals were photocopied and given back to participants. After giving participants an opportunity to complete a naïve sketch in the form of a short description based on the operational research question, the interview took place. Interviews lasted for approximately one hour. All the participants were interviewed and the researcher aimed to achieve data saturation. (see an example of protocol and a significant interview – Annexure C).

2.5.4.6 Focus group, evaluation discussion and written reflection on process

The first focus group was scheduled to happen about a month after the workshop. During the focus group the research question was discussed as well as what participants experienced as the outcome of the process for them. The model evaluation criteria of Chinn and Kramer (2008:234-247) were also discussed in relation to the model and participants were asked to share their views on the model.
Participants were also asked to express their views in a short written reflection based on the research question (see example of protocol for focus groups – Annexure D).

2.5.4.7 Field notes

Throughout the process of the workshop, implementing the model, and collecting data, I wrote observational, methodological, personal and theoretical notes. These field notes played an important role in forming important ideas about how the model works for participating teachers. (see example of protocol for field notes - Annexure C).

2.5.4.8 A final reflection and a second focus group

I created one more opportunity for reflection and data collection after four and a half months had passed since the workshop. This was done as a final step in the data collection process and I made this decision with two objectives in mind: to create an opportunity for more reflection and a feeling of closure for the participants. Also to create an opportunity to collect data based on participant experience at the end of the first term of a new school year to see what participant experience of the model was like, four months after the workshop and initial implementation of the model.

2.5.4.9 Single case study

Yin (2009:10-13) describes that a case study design is especially relevant and helpful when it comes to asking “how” or “why” something worked. In this research project, the unit investigated was the workshop and implementation of the psycho-educational model to facilitate constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. It is evident by looking at the design of this research that the design and method for research are congruent with using a single case study. Yin (2012:173) describes that the types of data collected in a case study should capture the hypothesised understanding of the activity being evaluated. The hypothesised understanding of the model in this thesis is that it would impact on the constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. Yin suggests that following an input-activity-output-outcome chain of evidence
related to the hypothesised logic model will enable a case study to cover both the **processes** and the **outcomes** of the activity being evaluated. Yin also explains that the use of a **case study protocol** to organise data collection is a desirable prelude to systematic data collection. According to Yin (2012:173), the protocol for data collection covers all the procedures and other instruments that may be part of the data collection. In this research, protocols were created for the workshop based on the model in the form of participant notes or scaffold for the facilitation of the workshop. These participant notes formed part of the data collection along with protocols for the reflective participant journals, naïve sketches and phenomenological interviews, as well as focus groups and field notes, as described above. Yin explains that the most important part of the protocol is a series of queries posed by the researcher to him or herself. The line of inquiry followed in this research was: What is the input? What are the activities? What is the output and what is the outcome? The most central aspect of my line of inquiry in this research project was – **What is the participating teachers’ experience of this particular implementation of the model?** These queries represent the researcher’s line of inquiry, which is represented in figure 2.1, that illustrate the **process of developing and researching** the model via its **description and implementation**.

Figure 2.1 gives an overview of the development of the theory generating research process. The model plays a fundamental role as a frame of reference for developing the workshop and the workshop is in and of itself an implementation, a putting into use, of the model. Implementation of the model happened in three stages: **Inviting participants** to take part in the workshop and data collection process; **completion of the workshop** and lastly; **follow up and data collection**. Data collection happened in two phases, data collection during the workshop and data collection after completion of the workshop. After data collection and analysis by the researcher and the independent coder, the model was also evaluated by the researcher, based on the data collected during the case study.
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FIGURE 2.1: The operationalising and process to research a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school
a) Target population and sampling criteria

In this single case study, purposive sampling (Creswell, 2003:185; Vaughn, Schuman & Sinagub, 1996:5) was used. The model was implemented via a one day workshop for secondary school teachers and as such constituted a single instrumental case of implementing the model (Yin, 2009:10). The model was evaluated in a single case of implementation, which can be viewed as instrumental in developing and evaluating the model. Teachers took part in the workshop and accompanying research on a voluntary basis and the sampling of participants was purposeful (Creswell, 2003:185). According to Yin (2009:38), the sampling logic used in a case study is replication logic built on experimental thinking rather than that of inferential logic. In the final chapter of this research, after evaluation of the model opportunities and possibilities for replication are discussed. The sampling criteria for the purposive sampling were:

- **Participants had to be currently employed as a teacher, teaching in a secondary school.**
- **Participants had to have at least one year experience teaching in a secondary school.**

b) Data collection

According to Creswell (2007:75), multiple sources of data should be used to collect data during a case study. The qualitative methods of data collection employed for this study made use of workshop documentation and audio recording, reflective diaries, naïve sketches, individual phenomenological interviews, as well as focus group interviews and field notes. With permission, audio recordings were made of the sessions during the workshop as well as the follow up individual phenomenological and focus group interviews. Digital audio recordings were transcribed and used for qualitative data analysis. Using multiple data sources enhanced triangulation and trustworthiness (see figure 2.1). The question that was posed to participants is: **How is this model working for you?**
There were two phases of data collection:

- **Phase 1: Data collection during the workshop** – based on implementation of the model during the workshop.
- **Phase 2: Data collection after the workshop** – evaluation of implementation of the model. Phase two had two stages of collecting data. The first stage happened immediately after the workshop and the second stage commenced approximately four and a half months after the workshop, at the end of the next academic term after teachers had an opportunity to implement the model in their classrooms.

These phases and stages of data collection constituted a prolonged engagement with the field and it is my belief that it facilitated a dense description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:316-325) of the implementation of the model. This description, based on the experience of participating teachers with the model in their own educational practice, enabled the researcher to answer the research question by understanding how the proposed model worked for secondary school teachers.

c) **Data analysis**

Tesch’s method of open coding (Creswell, 2003:192) was used to analyse data and construct categories of participant experience. Teachers teaching in a secondary school in the North West Province were given the opportunity to participate in the workshop based on the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in secondary schools. This research made use of an independent coder during analysis of the data (see figure 2.1). The steps for data analysis were as follow:

**Step 1: Getting a sense of the whole** – Read all transcriptions carefully.

**Step 2: Pick one document** – Go through it asking “what is this about?” write notes in the margin.

**Step 3:** After reading the transcripts of several participants, and making notes in the margin – **Cluster together similar topics** as major, unique and leftover topics. List all the topics.
**Step 4: Use the list of topics and look at the data again.** Abbreviate the topics as codes and write the codes next to the appropriate segment of text.

**Step 5: Find the most descriptive wording for the topics and turn them into categories.** Look for ways to reduce the total number of categories, grouping topics that relate to each other.

**Step 6: Make a final decision on the abbreviation for each category** – alphabetise these codes.

**Step 7: Assemble all data material belonging to each category** in one place and – perform preliminary analysis.

**Step 8: Recode existing data** – if necessary

### 2.5.4.10 The process of implementing and evaluating the model

The workshop and the process of implementing the model by participants, created an opportunity to collect data based on the entire process of operationalising and implementation of the model. An overview of the process can be seen in figure 2.1 above.

### 2.5.4.11 The role of the researcher

I had the challenge of not only acting as the researcher, therefore managing the process of data collection during the implementation of the model, but I was also the psycho-educational facilitator of the workshop and therefore also a participant to it. This means that I acted as a participant researcher during this research. My involvement in the process held the benefit that I understood the process and had insight into its unfolding and development. I also bracketed my foreknowledge (Willig, 2008:71; Patton, 2002:104-107). My actions, along with other contextual factors, impacted on the experience of participants and I collected data from all participants in various ways, at multiple points, and from various perspectives during the process of implementing the model. The major strength of this qualitative research design was the use of multiple strategies of qualitative data collection that enhances triangulation.
2.6 TRUSTWORTHINESS

In this research Lincoln and Guba's (1985) criteria and strategies for trustworthiness were operationalised in keeping with the philosophy, principles and practices of naturalistic inquiry. Creswell (2009) describes that according to Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) model for trustworthiness in qualitative research, dependability in naturalistic inquiry shifts its focus from the dependability of the research procedures and instruments, to the dependability of the qualitative data. Krefting (1991:215-217) explains that the truth value of a qualitative inquiry is obtained via the discovery of the human experience of the participants as the particular experience under investigation is lived and experienced by them. Creswell (2003:196) describes triangulation as the use of multiple sources of data to understand a phenomenon. In this research trustworthiness were greatly enhanced by the use of data triangulation (see figure 2.1). The services of an independent coder (Yoon & Johnson, 2008:602) were utilised in the analysis of the data and consensus discussions were held. Lincoln and Guba (1985:290), Krefting (1991:215-217), as well as Myburgh and Poggenpoel (1995:8) views truth value, applicability, consistency and neutrality, as valid criteria to determine the trustworthiness of both quantitative and qualitative research. This research adhered to Guba’s model of trustworthy research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:316-325; Krefting, 1991:215) and the strategy of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability will be applied to satisfy the aforementioned criteria. An overview of the strategies, criteria and their applications can be viewed in table 2.1.

2.6.1 Credibility

Truth value was enhanced through credibility strategies such as prolonged engagement within the field, keeping a reflective journal, triangulation of data sources and data collection methods, as well as informal clarification of experiences during interviews (Krefting, 1991:217-218). Phenomenological in-depth interviews (Kvale, 1983:174-176) were utilised and contributed greatly to the credibility of the research. The supervisor and co-supervisor clarified ideas and conclusions continuously. The research proposal and progress were presented to peers and relevant specialists, which functioned as a peer review and audit group.
2.6.2 Transferability

Applicability was enhanced via the strategies of transferability, such as purposive sampling and dense descriptions of participants and context, as well as their answers to the research question (Krefting, 1991:220). Thick descriptions of data gathered during the case study of implementing the model enhanced transferability.

2.6.3 Dependability

Consistency was enhanced by applying strategies of dependability, such as the precise and comprehensive description of the methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation of results of the qualitative study (Krefting, 1991:221). Replication of the study will be made possible by comprehensive description of research methods and strategies. A coding and re-coding procedure (Krefting, 1991:221) was used. Tesch’s method (Creswell, 2003:192) was utilised by both the researcher and the independent coder. Krefting (1991:221) describes that dependability can also be enhanced by triangulation. According to Krefting (1991:215-217), in qualitative research the emphasis is on the neutrality of the data rather than the neutrality of the researcher.

2.6.4 Confirmability

Krefting (1991:217-218) proposes that confirmability of the data will be the criterion for neutrality in qualitative research and that truth value of research will also greatly enhance neutrality. Neutrality in this research was enhanced via strategies of confirmability, as described under truth value through credibility strategies in the beginning of this section. Table 2.1 on the next page gives an overview of the strategies, criteria and their application in this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Prolonged and varied field experience</td>
<td>Research is naturalistic and researcher will have prolonged engagement with participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Reflexive journals will be kept by facilitator/researcher and participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td>The research design makes ample use of triangulation of data collection methods such as reflective journals, individual interviews, focus group discussions, field notes, as well as independent coder/s during data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member-checking</td>
<td>After data analysis member checking will be used to corroborate understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer examination and Structural coherence</td>
<td>Peers, relevant specialists and supervisors will function as a peer examination group of both the process and products of the research. The progress of the research will be presented at the end of the various phases of the research process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>Purposive sample</td>
<td>Sampling procedure is purposive and participation is voluntary. Demographics of participants will be described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dense description</td>
<td>Dense description of findings and direct quotations will enhance possibility of other researchers to replicate or transfer findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dense description of methodology</td>
<td>Dense description of the qualitative, exploratory descriptive, contextual and theory generating design. Dense description of model development, implementation and evaluation. Workshop documentation audio and written, reflective journals, data collections as described. Open coding will be used by both researcher and independent coder. Model will be evaluated by peers as well as specialists in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependability audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code-recode procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific strategies of data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Dense description of both the model to be implemented and evaluated as well as the process and outcome of the research process. Dense description of what the model is, how it works as well as how I have come to know this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions, limitations and recommendations for teaching practice and further development of theory and research will be discussed in chapter six.

2.8 SUMMARY

I have selected a qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research design to fulfil the objectives of this research. The results from the data collected through this research design will be described in chapter five.
CHAPTER 3
DEVELOPING THE MODEL FOR THE FACILITATION OF CONSTRUCTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN TEACHERS AND LEARNERS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

“A model is the conceptualisation of the description of a phenomenon through concepts and statements, and is represented in a logical format” (Bruce, Klopper & Mellish, 2011:43-44).

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429-430) describe theory as a conceptual framework that has a particular purpose. Chinn and Kramer (2008:219-220) proposes an organising framework for deliberately examining, describing and critically reflecting on theory. The following section is based on data gathered during my master’s dissertation (Prins, 2009) and serves as a brief description of the key elements in the qualitative data and results. These key elements will be the foundation on which I will create the model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. A qualitative, exploratory, descriptive and contextual research design was utilised to gather the following data. It is a qualitative investigation to explore and to describe learners’ experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers and the research rests on phenomenological principles and methods (Giorgi, 2002).

3.2 IDENTIFYING THE CENTRAL CONCEPT OF THE MODEL

The following is a discussion of the central theme identified from my master’s dissertation (Prins, 2009). It describes the experience of a parallel-monologue during communication with teachers. The experience of the unacknowledged “voice” of the learner and the significance of teachers’ unwillingness to listen to the learners in their care can be observed in the following.
“...Because if you get to a point where you can’t say anything anymore, it is as if you are being hushed, like you are in jail or something, they are telling you if you behave yourself they will reduce your sentence, but you are still going to stay in jail...it is actually very sad because you don't get to say what you want to say and then you feel closed and then other, other reactions start coming in like I had ...like some people will get self-pity then we get other people that are anger-based that is why you get people that shoot their teachers and, you know because either they're misunderstood, they didn't get their chance to speak their mind or they had certain needs not met in their family like, family based as I said you know personality-wise.”

This experience of the parallel-monologue, which communicates disrespect for the learner as a developing person, is intensified when it is experienced in front of others – like peers and friends – and is closely associated with the grade 11 learners' experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers. The following experience is closely associated with the central theme of the parallel-monologue.

“The communication that comes in between teacher and learner... in a sense there is various aspects but if in general if we are talking about a communication, and what it has to have, it takes two to tango. You can't say I'm trying to communicate with a learner that doesn't want to communicate that means that either there is a personality clash or communication gap in the sense of, of you know... I'm older than you but I don't want to listen because I don't think what you have to say is valid... I've got my own mind and I'll make it up”

Baxter (2004:3) explains that in a constitutive perspective to communication the view is held that relationships are constituted in communication practices and that selves and relationships are constructed in the interaction of self and other. She builds this view on the Russian cultural theorist Mikail Bakhtin who asserts that people achieve self-consciousness by revealing themselves to others and also that the basic reason
for loss of self is being cut off from others or isolating oneself. Baxter explains that self and other are similar, yet different, and that during interaction people occupy the same space and time differently. Each individual has a unique perspective, an “excess of seeing” which provides the other individual with a more complete and whole view, and in this sense others are central to the individuals’ capacity to know themselves and the world and to develop health and wholeness. Pretorius (2007:219) states that if the teacher wishes for the lesson situation to be recognised as an educational situation, he or she must recognise the child behind the student as a child in need of support for development. He states that the teacher must acquire a basic pedagogical attitude and relationship, and actualise a pattern of genuine communication with the learner. Only with such a genuine educational relationship will self-actualisation of the learner be promoted.

Theoretically, in terms of educational communication, the breaking or disconnection between teacher and learner can be described as a disrespectful parallel-monologue that does not actualise the basic pedagogical attitude, relationship and patterns of genuine communication. In essence, this type of communicative interaction described by the participants in this research is associated with a breakdown in true communication and boils down to a rigid attachment of the teacher to his or her role as sender during communication. It is basically a refusal to respectfully engage and authentically listen to the learners in their care. The experience of the parallel-monologue represents an important dimension of the experience of disrespect in the communication relationship and inhibits development of dialogical communication crucial to the development of a truly supportive collaborative and pedagogical relationship between teacher and learner. This experience of the parallel-monologue which communicates disregard is intensified when it is experienced in front of others – like peers and friends – and is closely associated with the experience of aggression, lack of mutual respect and poor learner-teacher relationships. Based on the data in my master’s dissertation it became clear that the parallel-monologue can be described as: A disrespectful communication interaction characterised by an egocentric focus on the position of sender during communication resulting in a miscommunication where both parties are sending messages at the same time and in the same space but no one is receiving these messages. In essence it is an egocentric refusal to listen during a communicative interaction and can be viewed
as a major **destructive element in relationships** between teacher and learner. It is associated with the **experience of disrespect and growing frustration and resulting feeling and/or acts of aggression** by the participants, possibly because **the self of one or both parties feels objectified and/or disregarded during the interaction**. How does this parallel-monologue develop? What goes wrong during the interaction for the communication to degenerate to what can be qualitatively described as a parallel-monologue?

I have noticed that during the occurrence of a parallel-monologue event, true communication breaks down because of a lack of listening from at least one of the parties involved in the interaction. It is an interaction where there is a lack of respect and empathy, an imbalance between the sending and receiving of messages; an emphasis on being understood instead of creating a common understanding. This can occur for any number of reasons but all of them would boil down to the fact that the two parties involved do not have a similar intention or goal in mind during the interaction. Each party brings to the communication interaction their own intention. If their intentions coincide or is somehow similar they should be able to “hear” one another without much effort. However, when their intentions are opposed or is somehow discordant, the potential for the parallel-monologue to occur in their communication interaction is enhanced. The longer the teacher and the learner persist in a pattern of sending messages without a willingness to also receive them, without recognising and respecting the unique and personally meaningful life-world of the other, the greater the potential becomes for frustration and forms of aggression to occur between them. In essence, if I am unwilling to somehow change or adapt during our interaction and expect the other party to keep on receiving and accepting my intention, via my communication “to” them, instead of having an open and creative stance towards communication – a conversation “with” them – I perpetuate the pattern of communication interaction that can be described as a parallel-monologue. This experience is characterised by: the experience of a lack of mutual respect, a negative intrapersonal experience of aggression associated with the interpersonal experiences while communicating and ultimately, an experience of the lack, or absence, of important principles of communication such as authenticity, regard and empathy. Figure 3.1 on the next page is a diagramme developed from my (Prins, 2009:118) master’s dissertation and illustrates a **framework for**
FIGURE 3.1: A framework for the facilitation of respectful, dialogical communication (Prins, 2009:118)
the facilitation of respectful dialogical communication. This framework will be used as a guide for the development of a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school.

Figure 3.1 is a diagramme developed from my (Prins, 2009:118) master's dissertation and illustrates that when an altruistic sender communicates with an altruistic receiver and both are willing to set aside their own frame of reference and listen to the other respectfully and without judgement, it facilitates a dialogue in which authenticity, respect and empathy fosters a constructive communication, supportive of a helping relationship maintained by unconditional acceptance. This constructive communication and supportive relationship serves as a barrier against aggression and facilitates a relationship where growth, development and self-actualisation is facilitated.

When an egocentric sender communicates with an egocentric receiver and neither are willing to let go of their own perspective long enough to truly listen to the other, it leads to a parallel-monologue as described above. The egocentric disrespectful sender that refuses to switch roles in the communication and also listen to the receiver of his or her message, could influence the interaction negatively by forcing the receiver into a defensive egocentric mode of communication, thus instituting the parallel-monologue. The altruistic respectful receiver refuses to be dragged into this monologue and applies active listening and I-statements, or just basically listen authentically and patiently until the egocentric sender feels respected and understood. The respectful, authentic and empathetic sender is a good listener and therefore is willing and able to alternate between sending and receiving messages, facilitating a shared space for communication by keeping a good balance between talking and listening. An authentic, open “show me” approach to the interaction facilitates empathy and communicates respect that counteracts the egocentrically driven parallel-monologue. The authentic attitude of unconditional acceptance communicated by the altruistic sender builds contact in the communication and a relationship of trust that, in the long run, allows the egocentric communicator to become less defensive and also, less likely to cling to his or her own perspective or to be defensive. This kind of interaction counters the escalation of aggression.
associated with the repeated occurrence of the parallel-monologue. The following phrase captures and illustrates the essence of respectful dialogical interaction:

“Ok - to me, it looks like you are unhappy about something …and I would like to help you if I could. If you like, you could explain it to me and I will listen and then try to explain how I understand you...”

From my previous research (Prins, 2009:115) I identified that the way to counter this type of disrespectful parallel-monologue during interactions is the – facilitation of respectful dialogue during interaction with learners. I will use this framework (illustrated in figure 3.1) and associated ideas to guide the development of the model. I now turn my attention to the description of a model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school.

3.3 DEFINITION OF THE CENTRAL CONCEPT – FACILITATION OF RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE

During the process to define the concept facilitation of respectful dialogue, I will use sources of evidence for generating and refining criteria that include indicators for the central concept of the model. The central concept identified – Facilitation of Respectful Dialogue – will be defined using various dictionary definitions as well as subject literature. To give further meaning to and create understanding of the concept ‘facilitation of respectful dialogue’, I will also construct a model case of the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school to serve as an illustration of the central concept. The developed model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue will then be implemented in a secondary school and this case of implementation will be studied to give an indication if and how this model works.

3.3.1 Dictionary definitions for the concept ‘facilitation’

The term ‘facilitation’ was searched in a variety of dictionary texts and the result of the definitions is presented in table 3.1 on the next page.
TABLE 3.1: Dictionary definitions of ‘facilitation’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of facilitation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To make easier</strong> or more convenient</td>
<td>Collier Standard Dictionary International edition (Funk &amp; Wagnalls, 1973:453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To make</strong> something <strong>easy</strong> or easier. Latin: <em>facilis</em> - easy</td>
<td>Chambers Concise Dictionary (Brooks, 2004:412)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To make an</strong> action or <strong>process</strong> possible or <strong>easier</strong>. Facilitator. A person who helps somebody do something <strong>more easily</strong> by discussing problems, giving advice, etc. rather than telling them what to do. A thing that helps a process to take place.</td>
<td>Oxford Advanced learner’s Dictionary (Hornby, 2010:525)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Subject literature definitions of ‘facilitation’

Subject literature was searched to clearly define the term ‘facilitation’ and is presented in table 3.2 below.

TABLE 3.2: Subject literature definitions of ‘facilitation’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of facilitation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of an environmental setting in providing personal space that permits communication with others.</td>
<td>The Dictionary of Psychology (Corsini, 2002:362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…is concerned with helping people individually or in groups, to work effectively and efficiently to achieve a particular goal or learning outcome. A combination of skill, technique and art involving interacting with students to draw out their ideas and lead them to new meanings or understandings.</td>
<td>Bruce, Klopper and Mellish (2011:112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of an acceptant climate…the climate for self-directed learning by students.</td>
<td>Rogers (1951:392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Facilitator …is a person who has the role of helping participants to learn in an experiential group…Facilitation of self-directed learning.</td>
<td>Tight (2002:28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a range of skills and methods to bring the best out in people as they work to achieve results in interactive events.

Facilitation skills involve helping others by making things easier for them. The art of designing and arranging or creating a space for a conversation. A space that makes it safe to participate freely in the conversation. Conversations are absolutely essential to the process of facilitation. It’s in the talking together and sharing of personal experiences, opinions and ideas that clients can start seeing things differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Essential attributes</th>
<th>Related attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facilitation | • To make a process easier.  
• Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely.  
• Self-directed learning. | • Space that permits communication with others.  
• Talking together and sharing of personal experiences.  
• To learn in an experiential group. |

Based on its identified essential attributes, facilitation can be defined as making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others. Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group.

3.3.3 Dictionary definitions for the concept of ‘respect’

The term ‘respect’ was searched in a variety of dictionary texts and the result of the definitions is presented in table 3.4 on the next page.
TABLE 3.4: Dictionary definitions for the concept ‘respect’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of respect</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have deferential regard for, to esteem. To treat with propriety or consideration. To respect as inviolable; avoid intruding upon. Consideration. Expression of consideration or esteem.</td>
<td>Collier Standard Dictionary International edition (Funk &amp; Wagnalls, 1973:1073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show or to feel admiration or high regard for someone. To show consideration, thoughtfulness or attention to, or to look back at, or consider.</td>
<td>Chambers Concise Dictionary (Brooks, 2004:1027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration; good opinion. To show consideration, thoughtfulness, willingness.</td>
<td>Pharos English Dictionary for South Africa (2011:586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite behaviour towards or care for somebody or something that you think is important.</td>
<td>Oxford Advanced learner’s Dictionary (Hornby, 2010:1258)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4 Subject definition of ‘respect’

Subject literature was searched to clearly define the concept ‘respect’ and is presented in table 3.5 below.

TABLE 3.5: Subject literature definition of ‘respect’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Respect</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An attitude indicating valuing of another person and treating the person accordingly. CARE – Communicated Authenticity, Regard and Empathy – Qualities assumed by some theorists to be necessary in a psychotherapist and for therapy to be successful.</td>
<td>The Dictionary of Psychology. Corsini (2002:835;191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If teachers accept students as they are, allow them to express their feelings and attitudes freely without condemnation or judgment, plan learning activities with them rather than for them, create a classroom atmosphere relatively free from emotional strain and tension consequences follow which are different from when these conditions do not exist.</td>
<td>Rogers (1951:384;392)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Definition of Respect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on a definable climate of facilitative psychological attitudes. The following three core conditions constitute this growth-promoting atmosphere:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genuineness</strong>, realness or congruence - the more the therapist (teacher) is him or herself in the relationship, putting up no professional facade, the greater is the likelihood that the client (learner) will change and grow (develop) in a constructive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong> caring or prizing – <em>unconditional positive regard</em>. It means that when the therapist (teacher) is experiencing a positive, acceptant attitude toward whatever the client (learner) is at the moment, therapeutic movement or change (learning) is more likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathic</strong> understanding – This means that the therapist (teacher) senses accurately the feelings and personal meanings that are being experienced by the client (learner) and communicates this understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respect emerges from the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity. A relationship in which people experience a sense of dignity and receive messages of respect is of inestimable value. |

| Demonstrating respect is based on the principles of respect, fairness, kindness, love and civility. The overarching principle, however, is the intrinsic worth of individuals – the importance of each individual as part of the human family. |

| Rogers (1979:1-2) |
| Kneisl and Trigoboff (2009:36) |
| Covey (2006:145) |

After defining the concept ‘respect’ using both dictionary definitions and a description of the concept from subject literature, the essential attributes of the concept was identified in table 3.6 on the next page.
TABLE 3.6: Essential attributes of the concept ‘respectful’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Essential attributes</th>
<th>Related attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>• Genuineness</td>
<td>• Authenticity, realness, congruence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unconditional positive regard</td>
<td>• Acceptant attitude. Accept students as they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Empathy</td>
<td>Accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity.</td>
<td>• A relationship in which people experience a sense of dignity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the identified essential attributes, being respectful can be defined as **genuineness**, authenticity, realness and congruence. It is demonstrating **unconditional positive regard** and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating **empathy** by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them. Living the **value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity** by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity.

3.3.5 Dictionary definition of ‘dialogue’

The term ‘dialogue’ was searched in a variety of dictionary texts and the result of the definitions is presented in table 3.7 below.

TABLE 3.7: Dictionary definitions of ‘dialogue’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of dialogue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk between two or more people.</td>
<td>Pharos English Dictionary for South Africa (2011:173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A conversation in which two or more take part.</td>
<td>Collier Standard Dictionary International edition (Funk &amp; Wangnalls, 1973:353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An exchange of opinions or ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free interchange of different points of view, a discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A conversation. A discussion, especially between two groups, with a view to resolving</td>
<td>Cambers Concise Dictionary (Brooks, 2004:325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict or achieving agreement. Originally from Greek Dia-logos - conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definition of dialogue

**Conversation.** A formal discussion between two groups or countries, especially when they are trying to solve a problem or end a disagreement – constructive dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of dialogue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation</strong> and collective thought - building a context for thinking together - a setting for maintaining conscious collective mindfulness.</td>
<td>Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (1994:358-359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In dialogue people become observers of their own thinking…exploring complex difficult issues from many points of view.</td>
<td>Senge (2006:223-226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of exchanging various points of view concerning what is right, good, or responsible and interacts with the process of justification to challenge and authenticate ethical knowledge.</td>
<td>Chinn and Kramer (2011:248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A conversation.</strong> A genuine, open equal honest communication between two people, an I-thou relationship as advocated by Martin Buber. <strong>A dialectical communication.</strong></td>
<td>The Dictionary of Psychology. Corsini (2002:835;191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A simultaneous unity of differences in the interpretation of utterances. Simultaneous fusion with, yet differentiation from, another. To engage in dialogue, participants must fuse their perspectives to some extent while sustaining the uniqueness of their individual perspectives. A unity in conversation through two clearly differentiated voices or perspectives. Dialogue is simultaneously unity and difference. A centripetal-centrifugal tension and on-going flux of verbal-ideological forces. The interplay of utterances takes the interactants to places unforeseeable at the beginning of the conversation and in</td>
<td>Baxter (2004:4-19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.6 Subject definitions of ‘dialogue’

Subject literature was searched to clearly define the concept ‘dialogue’ and is presented in table 3.8 below.

#### TABLE 3.8: Subject literature definitions of ‘dialogue’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation</strong> and collective thought - building a context for thinking together - a setting for maintaining conscious collective mindfulness.</td>
<td>Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (1994:358-359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In dialogue people become observers of their own thinking…exploring complex difficult issues from many points of view.</td>
<td>Senge (2006:223-226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of exchanging various points of view concerning what is right, good, or responsible and interacts with the process of justification to challenge and authenticate ethical knowledge.</td>
<td>Chinn and Kramer (2011:248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A conversation.</strong> A genuine, open equal honest communication between two people, an I-thou relationship as advocated by Martin Buber. <strong>A dialectical communication.</strong></td>
<td>The Dictionary of Psychology. Corsini (2002:835;191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A simultaneous unity of differences in the interpretation of utterances. Simultaneous fusion with, yet differentiation from, another. To engage in dialogue, participants must fuse their perspectives to some extent while sustaining the uniqueness of their individual perspectives. A unity in conversation through two clearly differentiated voices or perspectives. Dialogue is simultaneously unity and difference. A centripetal-centrifugal tension and on-going flux of verbal-ideological forces. The interplay of utterances takes the interactants to places unforeseeable at the beginning of the conversation and in</td>
<td>Baxter (2004:4-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unscripted ways. It is an on-going flux punctuated by important moments of wholeness. A momentary sense of unity through a profound respect for the disparate voices in dialogue. A dialogic moment is a fleeting experience of mutuality in which parties perceive some transcendent sense of invented or created wholeness from the complete attention that each gives to the other’s whole being. To engage in dialogue, voices interpenetrate one another and thereby constitute and change one another. A pool of common meaning. A stream of meaning flowing among and through us and between us and it makes possible a flow of meaning in the group, out of which may emerge some new understanding, something creative.</td>
<td>Bohm (2004:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a collaborative dialogue people care enough about each other to listen seriously, and the parties involved works hard to understand just exactly what it is the other is trying to say so meaning can be created. Dialogue is the essence of Collaborative interaction. Researchers have found that effective empathy comes from attempts to collaboratively understand a client’s experience within an emerging and shared frame of reference.</td>
<td>Teyber (2006:28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue is a moment where humans meet to reflect on their reality as they make and remake it. There are four requirements for true dialogue: Turn taking – You talk, then I talk. Dialogue demands engagement. Turn taking opens up the possibility for mutual learning. Connecting – What each person says in conversation should be connected in some way to what the other person has said. The need to actively listen to each other and respond in terms of what they think the other person is saying. Mutual influencing - In true Dialogue the parties are open to being influenced by what the other person has to say. Co-creating outcomes – Good dialogue leads to outcomes that benefit both parties. In true dialogue, neither party should know exactly what the outcome will be.</td>
<td>Shor and Freire (1987:11-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egan (2010:129-130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After defining the concept ‘dialogue’ using both dictionary definitions and a description of the concept from subject literature, the essential attributes of the concept was identified in table 3.9.

**TABLE 3.9: Essential attributes of the concept ‘dialogue’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Essential attributes</th>
<th>Related attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>• A conversation</td>
<td>• An open, equal, honest communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A dialectical communication</td>
<td>• Simultaneously unity and difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes.</td>
<td>• Out of which may emerge some new understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After identifying the essential attributes of dialogue, the following definition emerged. Dialogue is a conversation where there is, open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding.

3.4 CREATING CONCEPTUAL MEANING FOR THE CONCEPT FACILITATION OF RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE

The identified and defined essential attributes of the concepts related to the central concept will be used to define it. The following table (3.10) will summarise the essential elements of the facilitation of respectful dialogue.

**TABLE 3.10: Essential attributes – facilitation of respectful dialogue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Essential attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>• To make a process easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-directed learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on its identified essential attributes the facilitation of respectful dialogue can be defined as making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others. Creating a space, that makes it safe, to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group. In the sharing there is genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. There is demonstrating of unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them. Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity. Essentially it can be described as a conversation where there is open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding.

3.4.1 Model case of the facilitation of respectful dialogue

I constructed the following dialogue as illustration of the central concepts in the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The dialogue was constructed with the help of two grade 12 drama learners. They created and performed a dialogue in response to the request to create a dialogue between a teacher and a learner that will demonstrate a challenging interaction. The following model case is based on their efforts with adjustment to improve clarity and illustration of the central concept. The model case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Essential attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Respectful** | - Genuineness  
- Unconditional positive regard  
- Empathy  
- The value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity. |
| **Dialogue** | - A conversation  
- A dialectical communication  
- A collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes. |
will illustrate clear basic concepts of facilitating respectful dialogue. What follows is a constructed illustration of facilitating respectful dialogue during a challenging communication interaction between a learner and a teacher in the secondary school:

**From monologue to dialogue – A model case**

Teacher: I don’t have the rest of your tasks, you still need to hand them in.
Learner: A…Ho yes sir, um I’ll bring them.
Teacher: When shall I have them?
Learner: Today I still have um…I started the stuff, but then umm..
Teacher: This is matric, and …I do need your tasks …
Learner: Sir, I did the tasks, but then my laptop crashed and I had to…
Teacher: Ok …?
Learner: I had to do the work, again sir, I promise, I did the work sir…
Teacher: I find that hard to believe?
Learner: Sir, other teacher understand …why can’t you? (Parallel-monologue)
Teacher: I am not other teachers … (starting to become angry, but notices the need for constructive communication)

Pause – Teacher thinks …
Teacher: To the class. Now, everybody – please continue with the previous task and hand it in, in front when you are done, please.
(A decision to facilitate respectful dialogue – making the learning process easier.)

Teacher: Let’s talk, come with me please (Takes Learner aside)…Let’s sit down together … Ok - to me, it looks like you are unhappy about something …and I would like to help you if I could. If you like, you could explain it to me and I will listen and then try to explain how I understand you…

(Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely. Facilitating self directed learning as well as genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. There is demonstrating of unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting learners as they are.)
Learner: I want to do my tasks but, sometimes, I just can’t do them in time
Teacher: So …you feel like you don’t have the time you need…
Learner: Yes sir, it’s hard, I have a million and one things to do and almost no time to get them done…
Teacher: Yes, it’s hard sometimes… we all have deadlines to meet, if we don’t it does make things difficult. It can feel overwhelming at times. Is that how it feels now?

(Demonstration of **empathy** by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced.)

Learner: Umm…yes, I think so … I don’t know what to? It’s just too much sir…
Teacher: Yes, it’s a problem but …why don’t you come this afternoon so we can sit together to come up with a plan …would you want to, do that?
Lerner: Umm…I think so, maybe…yes sir, I would like that!

(Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity.)

**Later that afternoon…**
Teacher: Welcome, I am so glad you decided to come, let’s sit down and see if you and I can figure something out together.
Learner: Um,…ok
Teacher: So, what have you been thinking?
Learner: It’s difficult - I write it down but I never get everything done!
Teacher: It can be challenging and frustrating at times, I know - Let’s look at your calendar together…what do you have planned for today?
Not sure sir…here it is.

(A dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding. Essentially it can be described as a **conversation** where there is open equal honest communication.)
3.5 CLASSIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

The concepts of this model are classified according to the survey list of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:422-435), namely the agent, the recipient, the context, the dynamics, the terminus and the process.

- **The agent** - In this model there are ultimately three agents at work
  - The first agent is the psycho-educator who facilitates respectful dialogue of the participating teachers.
  - The second agent is teachers teaching in a secondary school facilitating respectful dialogue between them and the secondary school learners.
  - The third agent is the secondary school learners who facilitate respectful dialogue between themselves and the secondary school teachers.

While the implementation of the model by the psycho-educator and the participating teachers might be quite overt and intentional, it is foreseen that learners might act as agents without necessarily having explicit awareness of implementing the model.

- **The recipient** in this model is primarily the participating teachers. Learners in the secondary school which is mostly fourteen to nineteen years old will also benefit via interaction with participating teachers. The teachers will receive exposure to the model and will be encouraged to implement and reflect on the model during their teaching practice. Successful implementation by teachers will benefit the learners that interact with participating teachers.

- **The context** of this model is the secondary school and in this inquiry the model will be implemented and evaluated in a particular secondary school.

- **The dynamics** of this model consists of the communicative interactions between teachers and learners in the secondary school. The interaction is initiated by the experience of frustration and disrespect brought about by the experience of a parallel-monologue that may arise during challenging communication interactions between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The facilitation of
responsible dialogue will be a way of addressing and responding to this challenge of frustration and aggression.

- The terminus is respectful dialogue that could lead to constructive communication. The secondary school learners in the care of secondary school teachers will experience constructive communication with their teachers via teachers’ effort to facilitate respectful dialogue. Teachers might also have a more constructive experience of respectful dialogue as they engage students while being guided by the model. In this way the model might initiate an evolving and continuous process of respectful dialogue amounting to constructive communication.

- The process in this model is the facilitation of respectful dialogue in a secondary school. The process is iterative and dynamic. Participants to this inquiry will be given the opportunity to experience the facilitation of respectful dialogue and reflect on their communication with learners in their care. Participants will be provided with opportunities to identify, come to know, and practice principles of facilitation of respectful dialogue that will support them in their efforts to communicate constructively with the learners in their care. Participating teachers might then implement the model during communication interaction with learners in their care and this initial implementation might lead to an evolving and continuous process of constructive communication based on the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue.

3.6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I outlined the conceptual framework that will be used to further develop the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue. This model will initiate and guide the constructive communication process. The central concept and related concepts for the model was identified, defined and classified. In the next chapter the model will be described.
CHAPTER 4
A DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL AS A FRAMEWORK OF
REFERENCE FOR THE FACILITATION OF RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND LEARNERS IN A SECONDARY
SCHOOL

“A model is an abstract representation of a process, a description of its structure or
function. Models are useful because they help us understand how a process works”
(Trenholm, 2011:22).

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will create a description of the model as a framework of reference for
the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary
school. Constructive communication between teachers and learners will essentially
be conceived of as the facilitation of respectful dialogue. I will design and
implement a workshop to operationalise the model. The model as conceptual
framework will play an integral role in both the design of the specific activities in the
workshop programme, as well as the concepts participants will be exposed to in the
workshop. Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429-430) describe that the
purpose to which a theory was formulated plays a central role in the determination of
its evaluation. In essence their argument is one in favour of a goodness of fit
between form and function. Does the theory do what it was intended to do with
regard to the reality it is intended to describe and or in some way influence? Dickoff,
James and Wiedenbach (1968:131-135) describe that a common but limiting notion
of theory is to view only those conceptual frameworks that allow prediction on their
bases, as theory. They also advise that theories get described and clarified in their
operationalisation, implementation and evaluation. I will base my description and
operationalising of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between
teachers and learners in a secondary school on this logic of form and function. A
diagramme explaining this model is provided in Figure 4.1.
FIGURE 4.1: A diagramme explaining the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school context.
4.2 OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL

The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school suggests an answer to the research question. *What can be done about the monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school?*

An in-depth discussion of the definitions, as well as the strategies to be used, will now be described under the structure and the process of the model. This discussion will be based on Chinn and Kramer’s (2011:184-204) guidelines for description and critical reflection of empirical theory. In the graphic representation (figure 4.1) of the model, the following initial elements can be identified as distinct concepts of the model and will be clarified as this chapter progresses:

- The **grey area** at the bottom representing the communication interaction between teacher and learner. The communication interaction described as the *parallel-monologue* is seen as the foundation or starting point of the model. A point in time where the teacher or even the learner realises a need for more constructive communication based on frustrating interaction.
- The big **grey oval** at the back that *gradually turns to purple* represents the *psychological classroom space or psychological atmosphere* that gradually becomes more constructive as the nature of the *communication interactions* change.
- The **big green arrow** represents creating a respectful facilitative psychological environment – a safe space, and the actions associated with *facilitation* and being *respectful*.
- The **blue oval** and **red oval areas** represent the separate experiential fields or *unique life-worlds* of the *teacher and learner* and also the unique Self, I or me, of both the learner and the teacher.
- The **purple area** between the blue and red ovals represents the shared and combined experiential field of both the teacher and the learner and this *intersecting and shared life-world* is seen as *facilitative* of *respectful dialogue*. 
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The blue and red arrows between the oval shapes indicate the nature and direction of the communication and interaction between learners and teachers as well as between the various elements of the model.

The big green and purple curved arrows on the left and the right indicate how respectful facilitation interact and reinforces dialogue while dialogue in turn supports and augments respect and creates a facilitative communication environment.

These basic elements, identified concepts and interaction between these elements will be further analysed and expanded upon under the discussion of the structure of the model to follow.

4.3 STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

I will use Chinn and Kramer’s (2011:184-196) questions for critically reflecting on developing theory to guide my description of what “the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school” is, before I will focus on the description of how the model works in relation to its purpose in the next chapter.

4.3.1 The purpose of this model

The purpose of this model is the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. This respectful dialogue creates the opportunity for constructive communication to develop between teacher and learner.

4.3.2 The context of this model

The context of this model is the secondary school. The model could potentially apply to whenever teachers and learners in a secondary school interact and communicate. Learners in the secondary school are typically teenagers of between 14 to 18 years of age. The main physical space where teachers and learners interact is the classroom, but it could also be the sports field or the school hall – depending on the
focus or the specific purpose of the various interactions, such as academic, sports or cultural activities. The purpose and the site of the interaction can also cover a wide range of purposes and physical environments, such as camp sites – for a specific educational purpose, such as leadership development – or a boarding house – where the purpose of interaction would cover a range of aspects related to the daily living routines of learners. The main distinguishing features of the context of this model however, are the interpersonal communication and interaction between teacher and learner. Interpersonal communication between teachers and learners occurs mainly in the classroom during the lesson or classroom situation while pursuing academic development and actualisation of the potential of the learner. Implicit in the assumptions and purpose of this model is the educational intention of the teacher and learner interaction.

4.3.3 The assumptions of this model

Pretorius (2007:219) asks the question: “How does the child experience his togetherness with the teacher?” Pretorius (2007:219) asserts that teachers must acquire a basic pedagogical attitude and relationship with learners. He believes that teachers must actualise patterns of genuine communication with learners. Goleman (2006:86) is of the opinion that a person in moments of true connection with others will take into account what the other person is feeling, saying and doing, and in moment of disconnection a person’s communication becomes “verbal bullets” used to shoot the other person down. Pretorius (2007:225) claims that one-sided communication means that the teacher is delivering a monologue or sermon, instead of actualising a two-way discussion with the learner. Barker (2010:22) explains that in a conversation the dynamics of talking and listening determine the quality of the communication and it is the quality of the listening, in particular, that impacts the conversation the most. Grobler and Schenk (2009:16-17) explain that for Rogers (1987:483) every individual self exists in a continually changing world of experience of which that person is the centre. They continue to explain that the experiential world includes conscious and unconscious experiences that are knowable only to the individual, which means that another person can only form an idea of the experience of another if the individual shares it with that person. In this model teachers and learners are seen as such unique selves that exist in unique and continually
changing worlds of experience. The model emphasises the possibility of sharing these life-worlds in constructive communication via the process of facilitation of respectful dialogue. There is a need to systematically describe a model or theory of constructive communication and relationships that can be used to guide and inform communicative practices and teacher-learner interactions in the secondary school. **Without facilitation of respectful dialogue, education is not possible.** Based on these assumptions I want to strongly emphasise the relevance of the following statement as the main implicit premise of this model and research project: “**Human development occurs mainly as a result of successful interpersonal communication**” (Oberholzer In Pretorius, 2007:219). This model conceives of teachers and learners as people in communicative interaction and not solely according to their function in the process as teacher or learner. It re-conceptualises “teacher” and “learner” as roles and functions that can be taken on and shared by people in the interactive process of teaching and learning. In this interactive process the teacher is also one who learns and the learner is also one who teaches as they share and take turns to listen and speak in a process of creating shared understanding and meaning through conversation and the process of respectful dialogue. In this thesis I assert that the **model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue** can facilitate such patterns of **genuine and authentic communication interaction with learners**. The model is based on Phenomenological, Humanistic, Person centred (Rogers, 1951:389-394; Rogers 1979:1-2) and Gestalt Psychology principles (Yontef, 2002:23; Yontef & Jacobs In Wedding & Corsini, 2014:299-335; Buber, 1958:10-20; Jacobs, 1989:16; Zimberhoff & Hartman, 2003:102) and the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue builds on the assumptions that:

- Human beings live in multiple and diverse personally meaningful life-worlds and in this sense, psychologically each human inhabits the world differently and in this sense inhabits different worlds.
- As far as every human is free to have attention and intention, he or she is also free to decide when, how and to what to direct his or her awareness and actions to. To the extent that a human being can be aware and mindful, he or she can be free to make decisions while interacting with the world.
• As people are continually in interaction or dialogue with the physical as well as psychological space that they inhabit, human beings can only truly be understood by careful and respectful consideration and understanding of their context of living that can be shared with one another.

• As humans live in their personally meaningful life-worlds it may happen that they become momentarily egocentrically trapped in their own meanings by a lack of listening to others or a deficit of being listened to, by others. The persistence of this listening deficit may result in a disrespectful communication pattern called a parallel-monologue which may also trigger frustration and aggression. A break in the person-world dialogue.

• When this kind of communication or life-pattern of interaction called parallel-monologue occurs, the facilitation of respectful dialogue is a way to counter this pattern and might lead to the restoration of health, wholeness and self-actualisation.

4.3.4 The concepts of the model

A model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in the secondary school is centred on the concept ‘facilitation of respectful dialogue’ between teacher and learners. Facilitation of Respectful Dialogue has been identified and defined in the previous chapter and I will now describe the theoretical definitions of the model.

4.3.5 The theoretical definitions of the model

In the following section I will explicitly define the key concepts that interrelate within the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in the secondary school.

4.3.5.1 The definition of the central concept

Facilitation of respectful dialogue in this model is defined as: Making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others.
Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group. In the sharing there is genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. There is demonstrating of unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them. Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity. Essentially it can be described as a conversation where there is, open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding.

The collaborative creation of an experience of respectful dialogue is an outcome based on the communication interaction described and is viewed as constructive communication for the purposes of this model. The following descriptions are the central aspects of the model that lead up to the facilitation of respectful dialogue between the teacher and learners in a secondary school:

- **Facilitation in this model is defined as:**

  In this model facilitation can be defined as making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others. Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group.

- **Respectful in this model is defined as:**

  In this model being respectful can be defined as genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. It is demonstrating unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by
them. Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity.

- **Dialogue** in this model is defined as:

In this model **dialogue** is defined as a **conversation** where there is, open equal honest communication. It is a **dialectical communication** where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a **collaborative interaction** leading to **co-creating outcomes** out of which may emerge some new understanding.

### 4.3.6 The relationship statements of the model

As the dialogue between teacher and learner reinforces the respectful communication, it enhances the facilitation. The more the learner experiences respect in the facilitation of the teacher, the more it supports and enhances the dialogue during the communication interaction, and the more the teacher and learner communication interaction becomes dialogical the more it supports respectful facilitation. *The relationships between the identified parts, which constitute the main concept ‘facilitation of respectful dialogue’, are reciprocal.* The analysis of the relationships between aspects of the main concept ‘facilitation of respectful dialogue’ indicates the following relationships:

- **Facilitation** influences **respect** and respect influences facilitation.
  - As facilitation increases, respect also increases and as respect declines so does the experience of facilitation. *Facilitation and respect influence each other reciprocally in this model.*
- **Respectful facilitation** influences **dialogue** and dialogue influences respectful facilitation.
  - As respect increases, dialogue also increases and as dialogue declines so does the experience of respect. *Respect and dialogue influence each other reciprocally in this model.*
Respectful **dialogue** influences **facilitation** and facilitation influences respectful dialogue.

- As dialogue increases, facilitation also increases and as facilitation declines so does dialogue. **Dialogue and facilitation influence each other reciprocally in this model.**

The facilitative dialogue impacts the experience of respect as the experience of respect impacts on the dialogue, making it more or less facilitative. This process of interaction between these aspects progresses as follows:

- As the learner experiences respect during the facilitation of the teacher the communication between them becomes more respectful.
- As the communication between the teacher and the learner becomes respectful it initiates a dialogue.
- As the dialogue between teacher and learner reinforces the respectful communication it enhances the facilitation.

### 4.3.7 The structure of the model – a detailed analysis

In this section I will give a detailed analysis of the structure of the model using the shapes and colours in diagramme 4.1 to describe and create meaning for the various elements or concepts and how they interrelate. I will describe the structure in a series of consecutive progressions or phases, leading up to the complete structure as viewed in diagramme 4.1. Throughout the description of the model the significance of the shapes and colours will be explained. The structure of the model will be described in three phases:

- **Phase I – Creating a Facilitative space**
- **Phase II – Creating a Respectful space**
- **Phase III – Creating a Dialogical space**
The first phase is illustrated in figure 4.2 below. The small bright blue oval on the left represents the teacher as a communicator and therefore a sender and receiver of verbal and non-verbal messages via their behaviours. The bright red oval represents the learner as sender and receiver of messages via their verbal and non-verbal behaviours. The grey oval at the bottom and in the background represents the idea of a shared communication space created by teacher and student interaction. The one directional blue and red arrows, illustrates the problematic nature of this conception as essentially two monologues happening in the same space and time with little to no sharing of meaning happening. I chose blue to represent the teacher because of its association with a “bigger picture”, overview or “broader, whole perspective” and I chose red to represent the secondary school learner because of its association with “emotion” and passion – a strong attribute of the learners in the secondary school or adolescent stage of development.

FIGURE 4.2: Phase I - Creating a Facilitative space – stage I: Recognising and acknowledging the parallel-monologue

In figure 4.3 below the larger two-toned oval in the background illustrates the idea that this shared communication space can be inhibiting or non-facilitative in nature as indicated by the grey colour in the bottom half of the oval, but can also progress or evolve into a constructive communication space, as indicated by the purple colour at the top of the big oval in the background. At the same time this big oval also represents the larger context of the communication event, like the classroom, sports field, boarding house or educational setting of the teacher-learner interaction.
FIGURE 4.3: Phase I - Creating a Facilitative space – stage II: Experience the need for a facilitative space

In figure 4.4 below, the green arrow at the bottom represents the creation of a space for conversation that makes it safe to participate freely in the conversation. This refers to a psychological climate as well as a physical space and time that make it easier to have a conversation. I chose the colour green for this arrow to denote the idea of new growth and vibrancy associated with facilitation. The smaller green oval on top of the two-toned grey and purple oval illustrates the idea that facilitation creates a shared communication space that makes it safe for the learner to participate in the conversation. It creates an atmosphere of support for growth and development. The big green arrow at the bottom illustrates the working with and facilitation of the parallel-monologue and the creation of a fruitful “Green zone” or facilitative space that makes conversation easier. Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely.
Taken as a whole this picture represents the establishment of the realisation and awareness of a facilitative psychological space as opposed to a psychologically, growth inhibiting space. It also illustrates the starting point or the foundation the model rests on as has been described and unpacked in chapter three.

In figure 4.5 below, the final progression in the first phase of the model, the big green arrow with two tails, indicates the bringing together of teacher and learner perspectives. There is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning. The big green arrow pointing upwards illustrates the movement of the conversation by both teacher and learner away from the parallel-monologue towards respectful dialogue via the facilitative environment that makes the learning process easier by creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely and permits communication. The light green at the bottom of the oval represents new growth and the change to a darker green at the top represents a maturing and development of this space.
FIGURE 4.5: Phase I - Creating a facilitative space – stage IV: Moving together into a facilitative space

In the second progression or Phase II – Creating a respectful space, illustrated in figure 4.6 below, the small bright blue oval on the left still represents the teacher and the bright red oval still represents the learner. However, here they are conceptualised as two individuals each with their own unique experiential life-worlds and not only as senders and receivers of messages. This recognition of each other’s unique experiential life-worlds implies respect. The intersection of the red and blue ovals in the middle of the diagram, inside the big green arrow, symbolises the beginning of a shared intersecting life-world based on being respectful towards each other. The purple colour of the intersection represents the idea that this intersecting life-world is a shared blend of both the teacher, represented by the blue oval, and the learner’s unique way of viewing the world, represented by the red oval. This shared intersecting life-world belongs neither to the teacher nor to the learner, but it does add meaning to both. The colour purple represents this unique blend of perspectives that creates a shared experience of a life-world created between teacher and learner.
FIGURE 4.6: Phase II - Creating a respectful space – stage I: Acknowledging the need for respect

In figure 4.7 below, the blue arrows emanating from the red oval and the red arrow emanating from the blue oval illustrates the changing nature of this communication interaction from a parallel-monologue to a respectful interactive communication where each of the participants understands and respects each other’s views. Both the teacher and the learner are living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity. They are having a relationship in which they experience a sense of dignity. Being respectful is based on genuiness, authenticity, realness and congruence. It is demonstrating unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting learners as they are. The teacher demonstrates empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them.
A communicative interaction is created where both teacher and learner are able to communicate the others’ views back to them. Because of authenticity, unconditional positive regard, empathy and the lived value or belief in the inherent worth and dignity of the other – being respectful – the nature and quality of the interaction changes to a communication environment facilitative of constructive communication. This respectfulness, characterised by authenticity, unconditional positive regard and empathy, strengthens the relationship so more and diverse meaning can be shared. The picture represents the establishment of the realisation and awareness of a facilitative psychological space as opposed to a psychologically inhibiting space. In addition the importance of authentic, non-judgemental and empathetic listening as the demonstration of being respectful is also highlighted and illustrated by the red arrows emanating from the blue oval, which represents the respectful listening of the teacher and the blue arrows emanating from the red oval, illustrating the respectful listening of the learner.
In the third progression or Phase III – creating a dialogical space, as illustrated in figure 4.8 below, the shared life-world of the teacher and the learner is bigger, as indicated by the big purple overlap between the life-world of the learner and the life-world of the teacher at the top of the diagram.

![FIGURE 4.8: Phase III - Creating a dialogical space – stage I: Experiencing dialogue](image)

The “shared – us” in the middle at the top indicates that there is a dialogue, a conversation where there is open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding and a constructive outcome to the communication interaction.
The curved blue and red arrows coming together in the middle indicates the contributions of both teacher and learner to a common life-world where meaning is shared in respectful conversation. Both contribute to this common pool of meaning and both extrapolate new meaning from this shared experience and life-world as indicated by the curved red arrow leading back to the blue oval and the curved blue arrow leading back to the red oval. The teacher and learner are now influencing each other’s life-worlds. This “shared-us” belongs neither to the teacher nor to the learner and comes into existence as a shared experience of meaning between the teacher and the learner. Facilitation of respectful interaction then leads to dialogue, which in turn reinforces and facilitates the respectful interaction that can be described as a dialogue or constructive communication.

Finally, in figure 4.9 on the next page the big green arrow at the top indicates the continued development and growth of the facilitation of respectful dialogical interaction where the teacher and the learner may continue sharing a meaningful life-world. The big purple and green arrows on either side of the green oval illustrate the reciprocal nature of the facilitation of respectful dialogue. It shows that the respectfulness created by dignity, authenticity, unconditional positive regard, and empathy maintains a facilitative space for conversation and that this dialogical conversation reinforces respectfulness and a facilitative environment. Dialogue then is not an outcome that can be permanently reached and attained but can be retained and developed with continued respectful facilitation.

4.3.8 The process of the model

As described under the structure of the model the process of the model is constructive progressive and essentially inductive in nature. The basis of the model is that there exists a parallel-monologue between teachers and learners that if left unchecked, can become a negative and even detrimental interpersonal and intrapersonal experience. The way to address this challenge is through the facilitation of respectful dialogue leading to constructive communication.
FIGURE 4.9: Phase III - Creating a dialogical space – stage II: Reinforcing respectful dialogue via facilitation
The process of this model consists of three phases. In Phase I – the creation of a facilitative space – the teacher facilitates a safe space for conversation. In this phase the focus is on a facilitative attitude as much as skills and knowledge related to the concept facilitation. It basically comes down to the teacher making a conscious decision to create a facilitative experience rather than an inhibiting one. In Phase II – the creation of a respectful space – the teacher demonstrates and models lived respectfulness by demonstrating dignity, authenticity, unconditional positive regard and empathy in his or her interactions with the learner. These aspects are actually modelled throughout all the phases but is emphasised in Phase II by paying particular attention to authentic, non-judgemental and empathetic listening, and reflecting back understanding of learner experience. In Phase III – the creation of a dialogical space – the continued contribution to and drawing from a common pool of meaning, created by respectful listening, creates a dialogic conversation where a shared and common life-world comes into existence between the teacher and learner. Ideas are shared in an open, reflective and non-judgemental way that brings perspectives together while leaving room for differences without fear of being judged. This dialogical quality of the conversation then further enhances respectfulness and augments the facilitative environment. This three phase process, leading up to an experience of constructive communication, consists of the reciprocal process of the facilitation of respectful dialogue as described. In practice the process is about creatively and collaboratively working with a group of people to create a psychological atmosphere that contributes constructively to the experience of being in the group (Yalom, 2005:6). It is about creating a meaningful, positive, affirming and constructive experience of interpersonal communication based on the facilitation of respectful dialogue.

4.4 EVALUATION OF THE MODEL

Chinn and Kramer (2008:234-247) describe criteria that can be used to form a complete critical reflection on theory. The evaluation of the model was done by peers as well as more experienced model developers and a panel of expert model developers from the faculty of Education and the faculty of Health Sciences from the University of Johannesburg. An internationally acclaimed researcher was also part of
The evaluation of the model is based on the criteria advanced by Chinn and Kramer (2011:197-205). The evaluation and critical reflection on the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue is based on the criteria of the **clarity**, **simplicity**, **generality**, **accessibility** and **importance** of the model. Under the criterion of **clarity** the model evaluators indicated that the model is well described. That there was logic in the model that followed through that made it clear and understandable and that the progression and flow is excellent. Some of the descriptions of the clarity of the model will be shared below:

“**Your model is clear and well described**”

“**Consistency was evident throughout the investigation. Logical flow of the argument excellently applied**”

“**Model is clear and progression and flow is excellent**”

The panel described that the number of elements within each descriptive category of the model is minimal and sufficient for the purpose of the model. They described the **simplicity** of the model as follows:

“**I found your model to be simple and clear**”

“**Concepts and interrelationships is very understandable and clear**”

“**Model was easy to understand and follow**”

Under the criterion of **generality** the model evaluators indicated that the model is general and possibly could be implemented in contexts other than the secondary school.

“**The model is applicable to classrooms in secondary school but can also be transferred to other relationships, husband and wife, parent and child, therapist and patient and more**”
The model was also found to be accessible:

“The model is great and the elements within is descriptive”

“The model is applicable and functional”

The overall impression of the model held by the model evaluators was that the model is important. The panel of experts described the model as excellent, worthwhile and very inspiring. Also that the model could make a difference in the experience of learners and teachers and change future experiences.

“I think your model would or could make a difference in the experience of learners and teachers and change future experiences”

It is clear that model evaluators view this model as clear, simple, general, accessible and important. The model evaluators indicated that the model fits excellently with the purpose of facilitating respectful dialogue. It was found to be extremely applicable to the classroom in the secondary school but it was also found by the model evaluators that the model can be transferred to other relationships. The researcher also used these criteria after the data collection phase was completed and I concur with this evaluation.

4.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I described the model as a frame of reference for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in the secondary school. I gave an overview of the model, its structure and its function, as well as a description of an evaluation based on the criteria advanced by Chinn and Kramer (2011:197-205). In the next chapter I will describe the case study of a workshop for secondary school teachers that initiated the process of implementation of the model. This case of implementation will be instrumental in demonstrating how the model for the
facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in the secondary school works.
CHAPTER 5
IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE MODEL FOR THE
FACILITATION OF RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE BETWEEN TEACHERS
AND LEARNERS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

“Operationalization or operational definition consists of linking the key concepts in
the problem statement to the actual phenomena to be studied” (Mouton, 2009:125).

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chinn and Kramer (2008:219-220) propose that, once theories are developed, the
questions “What is this?” and “How does it work?” should direct the further
development of a particular theory or model. In the previous chapters I defined the
model and gave a description of it as a frame of reference for the workshop. In this
chapter I provide a description of how the model was operationalised and
implemented in the workshop, which set the implementation of the model by the
participating teachers in motion and begins to answer the research question.

In this chapter I will also focus on describing how the model works, and how I have
come to know how it works. I will give a description of the preparation to
operationalise and implement the model in a workshop, based on the model as a
frame of reference. I will describe how the workshop for secondary school teachers
initiated the implementation of the model and how this particular process of
operationalising of the model constitutes a single case of implementing the model in
a particular secondary school. I will describe the implementation in three stages,
namely: inviting teachers to participate; implementing the model in the workshop and
the follow up and collection of data. Qualitative data was collected throughout the
process of operationalising and implementation and I will describe how this case of
implementation is instrumental in demonstrating how the model works. The model
was evaluated by the researcher, based on the case study data, according to the
5.2 PREPARATION OF THE WORKSHOP

To implement and evaluate the model successfully as a single case study through a workshop, preparation needed to be done. I started off by gaining consent from the management of the school where the model was going to be implemented. I also obtained ethical clearance from the ethics committee of the Faculty of Education of the University of Johannesburg (see annexure A). Embarking on the first stage of implementation – inviting teachers to participate, I then shared some of the basic ideas of the model and the workshop in a short 10 minute advocacy talk with the grade 8 to 12 teachers from a particular school. I asked for voluntary participants to respond to an e-mail invitation to all grade 8 to grade 12 teachers at the particular school. My next step was to respond to these e-mails with a confirmation that I received their response. To this confirmation I attached an overview of the research process they would be embarking on with me, as well as a programme for the workshop and confirmation of a suggested date for the workshop. I also gave each of the participants a very short biographical questionnaire and a participant informed consent form (see example annexure B). This short questionnaire then became the first page, or cover page, for each of the individual participants in the case study master file, and was used to describe the purposive sample of voluntary participants. All the teachers who volunteered met the criteria for participation in the workshop and research process:

- **Criterion one** – Participating teachers must have at least one year of teaching experience in a secondary school.
- **Criterion two** - Participating teachers must currently be employed as a teacher in a secondary school.

The voluntary, purposive sample of secondary school teachers currently teaching in a secondary school with at least one year experience teaching secondary school learners can be described as follows: Ten participants in total took part in the workshop and data collection process. Five were male and five were female. Uneven numbers were assigned to female participants and even numbers to males as participant numbers. This was done to help organise and track the data collection
process from each of the participants. All participants are teaching learners across an age range of three or more years, which includes senior and junior secondary school learners with ages ranging between 14 to 18 years. Four participants are between the ages of 20 and 29 years, four participants are between the ages of 30 and 39 years, and two are 43 years of age. All 10 participants are currently practicing teachers at a particular secondary school and they are teaching a range of subjects including English first language, Setswana, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Geography, Visual Art and Design, Information Technology and Life Orientation.

5.2.1 Key approaches guiding the implementation of the model

In the second stage – *implementing the model* – the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue was used as a frame of reference for ‘*A teacher’s workshop*’. The frame of reference for this workshop is the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school as described in previous chapters. In the next section I will describe important approaches and strategies used for the workshop and especially how the model formed a frame of reference for the workshop.

Experiential learning played an important role in my design and strategising about the operationalising of the model in the workshop. Grobler and Schenck (2009:115) explain that according to Rogers individuals exist in the continually changing world of their own experience of which they are the centre. They also suggest that each member of a group’s experience is unique and known only to themselves and a safe emotional climate is needed for members of a group to feel able to share these experiences with each other and with the facilitator. According to Corey and Corey (2006:11-12 In Kneisl & Trigoboff, 2009:813), in psycho-educational group work the facilitator works with group members who are relatively well-functioning individuals but who may have an information deficit in a certain area. They describe that psycho-educational groups’ focus on developing members’ cognitive, affective and behavioural skills through a structured set of procedures within and across group meetings. Generally the goal is to prevent an array of educational deficits and psychological problems, and group work deals with imparting, discussing, and integrating factual information. New information and skills are incorporated through
the use of planned skill-building exercises. In the workshop participants where facilitated to describe their views and experiences with the facilitation of respectful dialogue. The key aspects of the central concept guided the design of the workshop to have three key phases – *Creating a facilitative space* for participation – *Creating a respectful space*, so participants would feel safe to contribute and – *Creating a dialogical space*, so experiences and understanding could be shared, challenged and broadened in the ‘here and now’ of each phase as it unfolds during the workshop conversation and experience of the participants.

### 5.2.2 Strategies used by the facilitator

The major approach and strategies used in the workshop will relate almost directly to the model, in effect powerfully modelling the central concept of the model itself. A major strategy I used throughout all tasks is experiential learning strategies. Hornby, Hall and Hall (2003:51) explain that the type of learning that use group work activities and encourage students to use their own experience as the content of a lesson, rather than abstract discussion, can be described as *experiential learning*. They define experiential learning as learning which takes place in a structured workshop, classroom or laboratory setting when learners are encouraged to be active in exploring their personal repertoire of feelings, attitudes, values and behaviours. The steps in the experiential learning cycle can be summarised by the verbs – *Do; Review; Learn; Apply*. Hornby, Hall and Hall (2003:51) believe that with skilled facilitation, exploring of the self and relations with others can be highly rewarding and may result in lasting changes for those participating in such an experiential learning event. This approach to learning and the strategies based on an experiential learning approach clearly emphasises the experiences of the participants themselves as the content of the learning. In the operationalising of the model in the workshop, participants were encouraged to reflect, in the moment, on current as well as previous experiences to anchor their learning. Participants were also encouraged to write reflectively about their application of the model in the two weeks directly after the workshop, and in the individual phenomenological interviews participants were asked to share their experiences of their own implementation of the model with the researcher.
Another major strategy that I used was to create, and even model as far as possible, an atmosphere for effective facilitation. According to Maree and Ebersöhn (2002:108-111), conversations are absolutely essential to the process of facilitation, which refers to the art of designing and arranging or creating a space for conversation. They believe that this space should be created in such a way that it makes it safe for people to ‘dance’, or in other words to participate freely in the conversation. They explain that it is crucial that the conversations are in the form of dialogues in which both the facilitator and the clients participate and they emphasise that it is in the dialogue or the ‘talking together’, that the ideas are shared and new ideas, alternatives, opportunities, possibilities, insights and meaning emerge. Maree and Ebersöhn (2002:110) explain that it is in the sharing of personal experiences, opinions and ideas that people can start seeing things differently. Different voices can enter into the telling of stories which will allow for the co-evolvement of new ideas, and facilitating change by encouraging new meanings. In the workshop all participants where continually supported and encouraged to share their experiences and their stories as part of the larger workshop conversation.

According to Maree and Ebersöhn (2002:110-111) what you say as a facilitator needs to be meaningful and must be based on people’s worlds of experience which you will have discovered together in your conversations with them. The important part that dialogical conversations and sensitive listening play in the process of facilitation, cannot be emphasised enough. As a participant researcher, and an experienced secondary school teacher, it helped me to listen to and understand the experiences of participating teachers since I share the experience of being a teacher and facilitator with the participants. According to Grobler and Schenk (2009:13), the facilitator should never threaten people’s ideas of themselves or who they perceive themselves to be and needs to demonstrate this acceptance of people for who they are, to all participants through his or her physical attitude, mental attitude and behaviour. During the workshop I constantly strived to get a sense of the life-worlds of the participants. The way in which I achieved this was by careful application of basic communication skills. These skills can all be directly related to the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue as described in the previous chapter. The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue guided my actions as a facilitator of the workshop.
Grobler and Schenk (2009:46-50) describe that **attentiveness** is one of the basic communication skills that a facilitator needs to practice actively throughout the process of facilitation if he or she wants to create a safe space for communication. When a facilitator is attentive, he or she enters the participant’s total life-world, experience and selfhood. Attentiveness is the way in which the facilitator orientates him or herself towards the participants so they feel sufficiently at ease to share their experiences, ideas and emotions. It stands to reason then, that in order to understand a participant’s experiential world, and his or her perceptions and realities, facilitators need to **listen carefully** to what people are experiencing and how they are experiencing it. All experiences should be heard and understood from within the participant’s frame of reference. Listening attentively then facilitates empathy. According to Grobler and Schenk (2009:52-53), **empathy** is being able to see what the client’s world is like to him or her and also to see how the client sees him or herself. They explain that the facilitator attempts to, without prejudice, hear and understand, and to convey this understanding verbally and non-verbally and therefore the facilitator temporarily needs to set aside his or her own frame of reference. The major strategies I used in the workshop were: **Experiential learning; Effective facilitation of conversation and Effective use of basic communication skills** such as **attentive listening and empathy**. I believe these strategies also served as modelling some of the concrete behaviours associated with the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue and in effect supported me in modelling the model to participants during the workshop.

Facilitation of **experiential learning tasks, creating an atmosphere for effective facilitation** as well as **basic communication skills** such as **questioning, listening, empathising** during the process of **facilitation of respectful dialogue**, was the major strategies used throughout the workshop. The strategy of modelling the facilitation of respectful dialogue via the three phases – **creating a facilitative space, creating a respectful space and creating a dialogical space** – played a major part in the strategies used. These three phases of the workshop corresponds directly with the central concept of the model – facilitation of respectful dialogue. The strategies used correspond with the facilitation of the phases but also overlapped across the three phases. Facilitation via the use of experiential tasks and conversation was also a major strategy. In conversation, especially respectful
listening, empathy and **respectful open ended questioning** played a major part as a strategy. Dialogue was facilitated throughout all tasks and interactions but also received particular attention and focus during the third and final phase of the workshop.

### 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL

The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school was implemented in a workshop that will serve as a single case study. During and after the workshop, qualitative data was collected from the participants. The data collected forms the basis for a further critical reflection and evaluation of the model. The process in the workshop is based on the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school as described in the previous chapter. Participating teachers were facilitated to become aware and construct meaning in a process of facilitation of respectful dialogue during the workshop. The workshop was designed to be implemented in three phases: Phase I – *Creation of a facilitative space*; Phase II – *Creation of a respectful space* and; Phase III – *Creation of a dialogical space*. Figure 5.1 on the next page illustrates how these phases lead up to an experience of constructive communication and how the model relates directly to the design of the workshop.

#### 5.3.1 The workshop programme based on the model

The workshop programme consisted of three distinct Phases. Each of these phases aimed to provide distinct opportunities for participants to **experience and reflect** on the various aspects of the central concept of the model. The main aim of the workshop was the *operationalising* of the model and to initiate and facilitate its *implementation* by participating teachers. The workshop itself also constituted an implementation of the model by the participant researcher and the workshop design operationalised the various aspects of the model. All the workshop tasks and activities taken as a collective or ‘a whole’ aimed at achieving this.
5.3.2 The workshop process

The basic structure of the workshop consisted of scripted tasks that guided the participants through the learning experience. The three phases of the workshop was directly related to the central concept of the model as described under the structure of the model in chapter four. As one of the participants observed later in the process:

“I believe that if I had learnt this model, ok this is now my sixth year of teaching, if I had learnt this model in my first year of teaching by now it could have stuck in my mind that… respect, respect, respect. Dialogue, dialogue, dialogue. Facilitate, facilitate, facilitate. I would always have that and I think next year I am going to make a very big model… constantly reminding me of those things, in a years’ time my
teaching will be a lot better and I will be doing that, respect, facilitate and dialogue off the cuff.”

Participants were supplied with participant notes that guided the experience of the workshop as well as the reflective processes and conversations that followed. Although tasks were scripted, the main driving force of the workshop remained the evolving conversation between participants, and tasks were simply indicators along the way. Maree and Ebersön (2002:108) explain the idea of choreography, in a caring context, and that it refers to the art of designing and arranging or creating a space for a conversation. The idea of creating a set of participant notes is one of “scripting” or “structuring” or “choreographing” the conversation and interactions. The notes provided a scaffold of sufficiently open-ended but also adequately clear questions, statements, tasks and activities that would serve as a guide to the conversation that would unfold on the day. Several protocols where also created to facilitate the collection of data throughout the process of operationalising and implementing the model. These workshop notes where collected after completion of the workshop and copied to be analysed as an important contributor to the triangulation of data based on the workshop, along with an audio track transcription of the workshop conversations, as described in chapter two. The original notes were given back to the participants soon after the workshop to support implementation of the model by the participants. During the period after the workshop, reflection of participants was facilitated by asking them to take part in reflective journaling for a period of two weeks. This was followed by the writing of a naïve sketch on the day of the interview with each of the 10 participants. The process of data collection concluded with a focus group interview and later a discussion of the transcribed data, which served as a participant check. Participants were asked to read the transcription of their own individual data consisting of four reflections, one naïve sketch, transcript of individual interview and the focus group interview. A second focus group discussion took place four months after the workshop, at the end of the first term of the new school year. Field notes were taken during this focus group interview and participants wrote a final reflection on the process. Table 5.1 shows how the various experiential learning tasks are related to the phases of the workshop. The three phases of the workshop is directly related to the main concept of the model – Facilitation of respectful dialogue. The model was operationalised in
the three phases of the workshop – *creating a facilitative space; creating a respectful space* and *creating a dialogical space* – and in this way the workshop and the actions of the facilitator also modelled the model to participants and created an opportunity for experiential learning.

**TABLE 5.1: Workshop overview with reference to the model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I – Creating a facilitative space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks 1.1 to 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one rule – put in basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating definitions and our definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on own – one rule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II – Creating a respectful space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks 2.1 to 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one rule continues – draw and discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing the one rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robots activity and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on the one rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing the model case – dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III – Creating a dialogical space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks 3.1 to 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch video 1 (x2) - notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch video 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion – What happened here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk -talk and Fishbowl discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will it work for me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview and process going forward – organisational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.2.1 Phase I – Creation of a Facilitative space

In this model facilitation can be defined as making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others. Creating a space that makes it safe to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group.

a) The main objective during Phase I

The main objective in this phase was to create a space that is facilitative of the aims of the workshop. Teachers experienced a facilitative psychological atmosphere by engaging in reflective learning tasks specifically designed to bring awareness of the importance of the concept facilitation, as well as to think deeply and reflectively about their own practice and how it can be considered facilitative. Data on this phase of the workshop was collected via workshop documentation of task 1.1 to 1.5 as well as audio recording of the workshop conversation and transcription of the audio track. These tasks, and how participants responded to them, will now be described.

b) Participant tasks and activities in Phase I and participant responses

In this section I will explain the facilitated learning tasks that the participants were challenged to engage with, as well as how they responded to these tasks. The participant responses will be a selected combination of written and verbal responses, from the transcription of the workshop tasks and soundtrack based on workshop tasks 1.1 to 1.5. Only a small selected sample of participant responses will be shared here to illustrate the experience of participants.

The first task, 1.1 – Broken telephone – consisted of a “broken telephone” exercise where participants had to pass on a message verbally by whispering a phrase in the ear of the person sitting next to them. I gave a phrase to read, and then pass on, to both ends of the line so the message would go down the line in two different directions simultaneously crossing over in the middle of the line. After the activity the participants were asked to re-write the main message of the quote in their own
words. This activity leads to an engagement with the conversation and an open, non-judgemental atmosphere. These were some of the significant written responses:

“The most important thing to know is that I do not know.”

“Our actions are based on our thoughts not on the reality before us, as long as we are not aware of the reality, we will not change.”

I was happy that this task set a very good tone for the tasks to follow and created a facilitative space where it would be acceptable to acknowledge a need for clarity or better understanding and where participants would engage and try to clarify challenges in a collaborative way without judgement. The following responses demonstrate participants’ engagement with and understanding of these attitudes as well as some of the important concepts and attitudes related to the model:

“The broken telephone game reminded me of the few times you have misunderstandings in the classroom… I assume I know what they want to tell me…and I assume what they want me to understand, out of my own reference, which is not the same reference that they are coming from, so we regularly get that we need to explain and analyse communication between students and myself, to understand really what they mean.”

“…like your body communication, how are they responding to you? So sometimes like you might be failing to notice the tiniest of things of which later on it can become a skill somehow. Like how do you maintain and how do you create, a space of successful communication within your classroom walls?”

Some of the major realisations of the group in this task seemed to be that teachers often overlook or are unaware of important detail in the communication between teachers and learners and that these details play a significant role in the effectiveness of the communication process. The questions asked by participants
clearly pointed the way for the further development of understanding of the model during the workshop. During task 1.2 – *The one rule* – I asked participants to write down the one rule they believed should be followed by everyone during the workshop. I asked them not to share their thinking with anyone at this stage. Here is what participants shared in their written responses:

“*Keep an open mind. Allow for differences of opinion.*”

“No interrupting when others are talking.”

“*Respect for all.*”

In this brief task and the overview of it one can already see the basic principles of the model that formed the frame of reference for the workshop emerging in the conversation. It is clear that participants felt that people should be able to share their thoughts openly and honestly without being interrupted or feeling judged for having a different opinion. It is clear that people wanted to be treated respectfully. I did not engage participants in a conversation about this task at this point. I collected the written response of each participant on a tear of slip and used the slips in Phase II task 2.1 – *Creating a respectful space.* I also asked participants explicitly to: *NB! – “Keep your one rule in mind as we go through the workshop – try and practice your rule as we go…”* Participants were then asked to evaluate themselves based on how well they thought they followed their own “one rule” both as reminder and reinforcement of this idea but also as a subtle reminder of the role of authenticity in teaching and learning (Kreber & Klampfleitner, 2013:468-469; Ramsey, 2011:5). Participant responses to this self-evaluation will be described in task 1.5. I will give a clear indication of the impact of this task. For task 1.3 – *Writing my definition* – I asked participants to write down their own definition of facilitation. The original definition written by some participants will be indicated in the next task as an example of how participants responded. In task 1.4.1 I asked participants to “pass on their definition” to the person sitting next to them. Participants received the definition of facilitation written by the person sitting next to them and then had the task to first read the definition carefully, and then to add what they thought was still missing in that particular definition. The basic rule to this task was that nothing may
be taken away or criticised. Participants were only allowed to add aspects to the definition and only had one minute to add some of their own thinking before passing the paper on and adding to the next definition received from the person next to them. I will share a short excerpt with additions to illustrate how the rotating definitions were used to facilitate conversation about facilitation:

“I said – Creating an environment for successful communication…”

Some of the additions to this definition, by other participants where:

“Guide someone in the process of finding their own knowledge base.”

“To help students create meaning in context.”

Here are some personal definitions shared by other participants. These personal definitions were also shared and extended like in the example above.

“So…I wrote…to create an environment that is conducive to learning to help students understand context, to create the right balance between explaining and helping the learner and to create an eagerness in students to want to learn for themselves…”

After this round of sharing own definitions and the additions made by other participants, the conversation continued with participants trying to synthesise some of the ideas to create a clear and concise definition. What is interesting to note about this task is that it opened up the conversation for people to allow others’ views to influence their own views and in this way facilitate an experience as well as understanding of the concept – Facilitation as well as building respect and dialogue.

In task 1.4.2 – Our definition – there was an evolving conversation, leading up to the collaborative creation of a definition and understanding of facilitation:
“I think guiding …the word guiding should be in there …the fact that you guide them and you do not tell them …you do not enforce, you guide. To guide students …on the path of finding their own knowledge.”

“…you can’t just ask a question and then answer - it is a process, it’s a dialogue that you are creating so… so you know… Yes you ask the question and get the answer but shouldn’t you then continue the process so I think then, dialogue.”

“…I think it partly answered my question I’ve been waiting to ask… say now you are facilitating a discussion… say in a science class, there is a desired outcome.”

“I feel you can have your own view, but it needs to be challenged.”

“But if it is a protected space so you feel confident enough to challenge …or to be challenged, if there is trust then you don’t mind if someone challenges you …but if it isn’t a safe space then if someone challenges you it can be seen as aggressive.”

“– isn’t that a better way of putting it because creating dialogue between teacher and student and between students themselves is not only about answering questions but about brainstorming, about listening to other people.”

This is the final definition of facilitation that participants agreed captured most of their thinking and understanding of the concept after the conversation based on the rotating definitions task 1.4.2 – Facilitation – Phase I.

“For us facilitation is guiding people to actively find their own knowledge and meaning by ensuring effective communication through enabling dialogue in a conducive environment. It is a
In task 1.5 – The “One Rule” Reflection – I asked participants to write down their “one rule” again. The purpose was to remind participants and also facilitate the development of thinking and reflection on this idea of one rule that they believe should be followed. I then asked participants to evaluate themselves in terms of how well they stuck to their own “one rule” by rating themselves out of 10 and then explain the reason for their rating. I also asked them to explain how they thought they could maintain or improve their score. Basically the task is designed to draw out ideas and personal reflections on respect and the role it plays in interactions. I also believe that the task introduced the idea of authenticity in a subtle yet powerful way. This task formed a foundational activity for task 2.1 in Phase II, focusing on creating a respectful space. This is a summary of how a few of the participants evaluated themselves on their own one rule at the end of phase I.

“Keep an open mind. Allowing for differences of opinion – I did fairly well: I have incorporated other’s ideas and tried to allow for the fact that my knowledge is limited.”

“Respect for all – I did very well, I was listening and spoke when asked to: Because I adhered to my rule. Continue to be considerate and respect everybody.”

By looking at these responses to task 1.5, it is clear that participants were fully engaged and held themselves responsible to be authentic and keep themselves to the requirements they set in the beginning. The underlying idea of this task is also to create a sense of authenticity and holding yourself accountable for your own actions. Although not explicitly discussed at this point, I do feel that this task played an important part in setting the tone of the workshop. After a short but well deserved break, the workshop resumed with a focus on Phase II – Creating a respectful space.
5.3.2.2 Phase II – Creation of a Respectful space

In this model being respectful can be defined as genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. It is demonstrating unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them. Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity.

a) The main objective during Phase II

The main objective in this phase was to create a space that is respectful and therefore facilitative of the aims of the workshop. Teachers experienced a respectful psychological atmosphere, by engaging in reflective learning tasks specifically designed to bring awareness of the importance of the concept of being respectful as it is defined in the model, as well as to think deeply and reflectively about their own teaching practice and how it can be considered respectful. Data on this phase was collected via workshop documentation of task 2.1 to 2.5, as well as audio recording and transcription of the evolving conversation. These tasks, and how participants responded to them, will now be described.

b) Participant tasks and activities in Phase II and participant responses

In this section I will describe participant experience of Phase II of the workshop. This will be done to share some of the most significant aspects that came to the fore in the data and illustrate how this phase of the implementation of the model made a contribution to the operationalising of the model.

Task 2.1 – “The One rule” continues – worked as follows: For this task the tear off slips created in task 1.2 during Phase I, was placed in a container and participants were asked to draw one slip each. If participants drew their own rule, they were asked to put it back and draw again. Participants where then asked to respond to the following question: Why do you think this rule is important to the person who wrote it? These are some of the written response that participants wrote before a
discussion about this question was facilitated. After the conversation participants again got a few minutes to jot down some of their observations and impressions from the conversation.

“*Keeps an open-mind – I think…* - Being ready to be open for individual’s views and value individual’s thought. Do not be self-centred be open for opinions value individual views.”

“We should keep an open mind - I think… - When we learn new things we are set in our old ways. To change the way we think we must keep an open mind. Mind change is behaviour change.”

“To give each other time to talk and do not interrupt each other. I think… - He/she espouses the value of respect - of respect for other people’s thoughts. Collaborative effort is of paramount importance which occurs through listening to each other.”

Task 2.1 facilitated the development of thinking about respect and in task 2.2 – *What is “the one rule?”* – participants were asked to contribute to a conversation around the question: What would you say is, the one rule? After discussing the answer to this question, I asked participants to write down this one rule in a space provided under task 2.4 and then return to task 2.3. Here are some significant contributions to the conversation about the one rule:

“*Ja, I think, for me respect will be to place value in what another person has to say…* um I might disagree with what you are saying but I do place value in what you are saying… I respect your thought, I place value in your thoughts and as a result, I need to… listen… without interruption.”

“*…respect brings interest and honesty… ja… that is simply saying that without respect we don’t have a conducive space… respect is like the centre.”*
“I said he or she espouses the value of respect... respect for other people’s thoughts... and secondly they believe that collective performance is of paramount importance... which occurs through listening to each other.”

“I am not an introvert as such but... the environment intimidates me and I end up not saying what I want and think I am not saying what a should say and what I want to say... So imagine little kids that... in our classrooms sometimes... that are like that, that can never say anything... There is that fear of actually sharing your idea... that some will say... no, that is stupid.”

“Yes... listening is the function of being respectful...”

In this conversation the link between empathetic listening for a message, being open and listening as an important aspect of respect, is clearly coming forward and participants seem to all agree and feel very strongly about it. In Task 2.3 – “Robots” – the activity was a fully experiential task in the sense that it challenged participants to take part in a physical activity that involved physical, mental and emotional involvement. Here are the instructions to the activity to clarify: “In this task half the group will be “robots” while the other half will be “robot operators”. The task is for the robots to collect all the balls of a particular colour from inside the circle of beacons, and place it in their basket, without ever touching the balls of a different colour or any of the beacons placed in a circle around the balls. “Robots” will be blindfolded and “operators” may only use verbal instructions to guide them. The operators may not enter the circle of beacons. Pairs will be penalised with one ball put back in the circle per mistake. To complete the task each pair must collect all 6 balls of the colour allocated to them. Challenge – each partner may only collect 3 balls after which operator and robot must switch roles.”

Some comments during the activity were: “We all are the winners in this task! We want to do more. shu... that was fun! Very interesting!”. In this task, which lasted for about twenty minutes, there were lots of laughter and involvement. My field notes indicated that I believed this task worked very well. It brought an element of
excitement, cooperation and competition that lifted the spirits and energy of the group. I also think it illustrated the importance of clear communication and how empathy or switching perspectives is crucial when communicating with someone. The fact that partners had to switch roles (robots with robot operators) half way through the task illustrated well how challenging it can be to see another's perspective. Bringing in more practical and experiential elements is often difficult and time consuming but the correct use of it can greatly enhance other more reflective or abstract tasks. It links well with the model because it brings out the importance of respect and empathy. Here are some of the significant reflections of participants based on this task:

“It gave one an opportunity to get a feel of both roles, and also for one to realise what both roles go through and to be considerate of the type of reaction and action one gives.”

“I can apply this in the classroom, in the way I communicate with a student and vice versa.”

“Despite the noise and business, I need to listen and be able to take instructions to learn to filter out information that is not needed.”

“...you have to be creative. The responsibility lies with the sender. You also need to know the kind of person you are sending the message to... you need to study the receiver and be able to know. You can’t say if your receiver is deaf then you give them a call.”

“She had to do the empathy because she was giving me the instruction... she needed to think about where I am at...”

In the next task, task 2.4 – The “one rule” (continued) – I asked participants to write down what they think the one rule is, after discussing the rules they made for themselves in task 1.2. All 10 of the participants wrote down the same word – Respect. I then asked participants in the second part of the task to evaluate themselves again on this one rule, which we had now determined is respect. I also
asked them to share why they were giving themselves this particular evaluation of how well they adhered to this one rule. *Listening and empathy* once again came to the fore as very important skills to have and to demonstrate if the teacher is going to show respect to the learners. The following participant experiences explain it well:

“In order to exhibit effective facilitation it is vital to enforce constructive communication. Communication enables participants to share ideas, however communication that lacks empathy and respect defeats the whole purpose of effective facilitation - participants will not feel safe to be expressive.”

“It highlights the responsibility we have as facilitators. How we can achieve our desired outcomes by effective communication and creating a conducive environment and understanding respect. Respect is emphasised by listening to others and not interrupting them as they talk. It allows for an environment that can accommodate different views and keep diversity flowing.”

“Yes... I think it was highlighting the challenges, and obviously making us aware of... we know that there are challenges but sometimes we don’t get to think about them, it is once you start being involved in maybe discussions like this that, then you start to realise... and the consciousness helps and I go back to the first part of not noticing, ... the importance of consciousness whatever it is that we do, or maybe the people that we are, in this space of teaching.”

In Task 2.5 – *A model case* – teachers read the model case as presented in the previous chapter and had to finish the challenging interaction between teacher and learner in the way they thought it would play out. This is one example:

*Teacher: I need the marks - the deadline is this afternoon.*

*Learner: But sir, I have Maths homework and I am writing a test tomorrow.*
Teacher: That is not my problem. I have a deadline and you had two weeks to do the work.
Learner: But I do not have computer access.
Teacher: You have homework period to work on that.
Learner: But I had music lessons.
Teacher: Ok, I don't care. I need it by this afternoon.
Learner: Sir, I've lost the instruction sheet.
Teacher: So is that the reason you did not do it?

My field notes based on this task and this phase, indicate that I felt a bit disappointed in the effort and approach participants took to the model case - possibly because a lack of clarity about the task on my side. On the other hand it was also made clear that the interaction does not have to end badly. All pairs demonstrated a distinct lack of empathy in the dialogues. This might be because teachers view non-completion of work as disrespectful or do not want to be perceived as “soft” on this issue. All and all I was excited about the way the tasks and conversation in this phase was pointing towards important concepts that constitute the central concept of the model. These concepts and the central concept were going to be introduced fully in the last phase – Creating a dialogical space. After a 40 minute lunch break, we continued with the third and final stage of the workshop.

5.3.2.3 Phase III – Creation of a Dialogical space

In this model dialogue is defined as a conversation where there is open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding.

a) The main objective during Phase III

The main objective in this phase was to create a space that is dialogical and therefore facilitative of the aims of the workshop. Teachers experienced a dialogical space by engaging in many opportunities for reflective conversation with each other, as well as the facilitator, throughout the workshop. They engaged in learning tasks
specifically designed to bring awareness of the importance of the concept dialogue, as well as to think deeply and reflectively about their own practice and how it can be considered as dialogical. Data on this phase was collected via workshop documentation of task 3.1 to 3.5 as well as audio transcription of the workshop conversation. These tasks and how participants responded to them, will now be described.

b) Participant tasks and activities in Phase III and participant responses

In this third and final phase of the workshop I will describe participant experience and reflection to video clips based on the model case as well as participant interaction with each other as they are introduced to the model in both its graphic and written form, as described in the previous chapters. For task 3.1 – A video clip based on the model case – I asked senior drama students from one of the classes I teach to help me. I gave them the challenge to write and perform a challenging communication interaction between a teacher and a learner. What they produced was very similar to the model case I shared in the previous chapter. They produced two short 5 minute clips. One of the clips illustrates a very emotional conflict between teacher and learner around the completion of work, and another clip, based on the same scenario but with a much more positive outcome to the communication interaction between teacher and learner. These two short video clips where produced and recorded approximately one year prior to the workshop. Clip one is shown as a reference point or baseline of how ineffective or even destructive teacher learner communication can become if not facilitated properly. It also serves as an example of what I have called the “parallel-monologue”. The clip demonstrated a very volatile, verbal conflict that rapidly escalates to the point where the student leaves the room with the words “I’ll be back for you”. Here are some participant responses to the first clip:

“Student is disrespectful, however teacher responds in a way that reinforces the disrespect. By insulting the student and screaming at him the dialogue is one-sided. A sense of enmity is created. The student tried to provoke the teacher – ignoring him in front of the others and speaking to him individually might work better.”
“The teacher is so harsh and he is not listening.”

In task 3.2 – a reflection on the first video clip – I asked participants what advice they would give the teacher and the learner and also what they would keep in mind to help them make the interaction more constructive if they were placed in a similar situation. Here are some of the thoughts the participants shared:

“The teacher should first try to keep it calm and not to be carried by emotion - The learner could have listened and shown respect to the teacher by asking to speak with the teacher in private.”

“Do not over indulge in an upsetting conversation between the teacher and learner; you can approach the learner personally after the lesson.”

“Acting and speaking in anger is not the best way forward. Take time to cool off. Do not discuss these issues in front of the class; do not interrupt the lesson, speak to the student afterwards.”

For task 3.3 – A model to support our understanding – participants watched the second clip. In this clip there is still a confrontation about work not done, but the teacher puts the rest of the class to work and then attends to the learner aside where the other learners can’t follow the conversation. Also in this conversation the teacher tries to listen to the explanations of the learner as well as affirming a belief in their ability to do better in the future. Here is some of the participant responses to what could be learnt from these video clips:

“Listen to their reasons – have empathy, explain your position – motivate. The teacher also apologises. Being open to their ideas and respecting them; Being reminded to have empathy and put yourself in their shoes and the shoes of their parents. How would I want someone to speak to my child? Educate them in how and why you want them to behave. Teach them how to act.”
“Teacher controlled his emotion and acted calm to the situation. The encouragement of the teacher is the eye opener for the learner to show his ability and full potential.”

At this point in the workshop I gave a short lecture on the basic concepts covered in the workshop and the central concept of the model – facilitation of respectful dialogue. This was done to facilitate consolidation and integration of the model. I used the graphic representation of the model as described in the previous chapter as well as the written explanation and definition of the central concept. Participants received a laminated colour copy of the graphic representation of the model as well as the written explanation of the central concepts to serve as a reminder of the model and also to refer to as they wrote their reflective journal entries in the two weeks after the workshop. Here are some of the participant responses in conversation after I have shared the model with them via a Power Point, slide presentation:

“But x if you touch on x’s point of robots... and the self-concept ... now you have a child who grows up in a family and... where he has done something wrong, the parents don’t beat around the bush, they give it to him and that gets him to be on the straight and narrow. He now comes to school and gets a totally different treatment... and the child is now caught up in two worlds... where ... he starts to think now, there is a little bit of dishonesty here, this is not how things are supposed to be... hence you will still get kids who will repeatedly do, wrong things, because our way of communication is ineffective according to what they know...”

“...we are saying let there be a dialogue here, let the child learn to take responsibility... but people don’t want to entertain that. This is the way we have been brought up and this is the self that we understand, and this is the way to discipline.”

For me this part of the conversation clearly indicates dissonance between the constructive communication the model suggests and some of the more traditional approaches to discipline. The participants are noting that as one of the major...
challenges of implementing this model. The participants feel challenged to expand their current thinking, based on the model. Task 3.4 and 3.5 developed reflection on the workshop and the model in pairs and as a group. In task 3.4 – The “walk and talk” – I asked participants to have a conversation in pairs. I asked participants to take a 10 minute walk-together and discuss the question – How will this model work for me? I also asked them to decide between the two of them who will be number two and who will be number one – I did not tell them why they needed this number. Task 3.5 – The fishbowl conversation – was a follow on from the walk and talk task. When participants returned from the “walk and talk” I asked all those who decided to be number two, to sit in a small circle with me. I asked the five remaining participants, the number one’s, to sit in a bigger circle around us. The inner circle got the instruction to share their thoughts around the phrase – Me and my partner discussed that... The outer circle got the instruction to listen carefully because after the first discussion they would move to the centre circle to answer the question – What did you observe in the previous discussion? Here are some of the main pieces of conversation that emerged from the facilitated respectful dialogue:

“We looked at the model again and we discussed the progression of just the parallel and then to the middle and then to the top where the successful communication takes place, and that has to take place over time because you can get to know someone or only get to know your students by building trust which takes time.”

“Me and my partner we looked at the positives of this model and also the challenges that may come with the model. We said that it allows space where people can air their views that is in case of your students and you concerning a certain situation and then also it encourages respect in the form of listening to each other as we agree that I am going to listen to you and you are going to listen to me and in a way you are going to end up building respect between the two of you and also it helps manage situations that might end up getting out of hand and we said ok, those being the positives we see some challenges here, because we are asking ourselves now if I am dealing with a student in this way and that way how do you cater for
maybe management and parent, that are in this space, are they not maybe going to affect this facilitation process in a way while I am still in a process of trying to build this relationship with the student?”

“So me and my partner said that this model could work for us to a great extent ...so we had some positives. So, so the first thing was that it will help because you are bringing two people that are supposed to work together and you are creating an element of respect, but for there to be respect there needs to be mutual understanding between the parties, so I might know about this, but how about the kids? How do you bring them in? That is one of the main challenges.”

“So we need to explain to them that this is what we expect of them. Teach them how to act, this model just reminds us again to have empathy, how would I want someone to speak to me, at that age, try to remember myself when I was that age, a grade 9 rebellious horrible little person and also how would I want someone to speak to my child?”

“Because you know they are impossible and you know they are not always doing the right thing, but you love them regardless so you should have that kind of way of dealing with things.”

“We said that the teacher is the one who is responsible, for making sure that they move away from the parallel-monologue and into the facilitation process so that now they can start developing that sense of respectfulness and then eventually get into the dialogue.”

“Or actually the teacher is the one who needs to facilitate this whole conversation, so sometimes it could get to a point where this parallel monologue has been happening, between the teacher and the learner and then the downside could be that it has been happening for too
long and now the teacher wants to start developing this facilitation and try to create a sense of respect and dialogue... will the learner be able to buy into it? How late is it?”

“...maybe we can bring up the concepts in the model. And try to explain them to the kid but, not necessarily saying that this is a model? Maybe to talk about facilitation and to talk about respect and lay them down and telling them that starting from today I want us to work in this way.”

“...and it seems like everybody is saying like it is effective, but what I picked out was that there is no doubt in my mind that the teacher is a facilitator, of this constructive communication process. Even if the child is an instigator, you as a teacher you need to bring him back. It is your responsibility as an adult.”

These significant and thick descriptions of the model and related issues illustrate that the operationalising and implementation of the model succeeded. Participants’ experience indicate that there is a deep awareness and understanding of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue and issues related to constructive communication at the end of the workshop. As a conclusion to the workshop I also asked participants to write their answers to the question – How has the workshop been for you? Here are a few representative statements:

“The workshop was a life changing experience.”

“The workshop has been an eye opener and challenging some of the views I have held.”

“The workshop has been an eye opener for me in terms of how best we can communicate. The model was very significant for me.”

I also asked participants to respond in writing, to the question - How will this model work for you? Here are some of the responses:
“The teacher started to be the centre to model the whole thing by first educating the learners and giving back the same respect that he/she intended to get.”

“I am going to put it up at my desk to refer to it visually. I will take it into my mind when planning my lesson and also keep it in mind with specific students.”

“It will help me allow students to be open and share their views so that I can also learn from them. It will help me help my students to become better social beings.”

“It will bridge the gap between myself and the learners. It will happen by me as an adult to initiate a conversation with the learner, with elements of mutual respect guiding our conversation.”

“As the teacher and adult I am the one who always have to initiate, start with the show of respect. I have to always know that I model behaviour and attitude.”

“Keep calm and model the behaviour. It will help to build a relationship and enable learning to take place.”

5.3.2.4 Reflection on all three Phases of the workshop based on data and field notes

In this section I will use field notes based on my personal observations and reflections on the day of the workshop to create a reflection on the phases of the workshop and also to make additional observations where it might be relevant. Participants were relaxed and in a positive mood, excited about an opportunity to share their classroom experience. Some participants where more willing and outgoing, while others were more reserved. All and all I believe the atmosphere created by the efforts of all involved was respectful and facilitative of good, in-depth, conversation and I was well pleased with the outcome of the workshop at the end of
the day – a dialogue. The tasks worked well, especially the experiential learning task called "robots" beautifully illustrated the importance of a listening focus and empathy. The importance of respect, authenticity or honesty and trust also came up in the conversation. There were strong moments of dialogue which I feel prepared the group well for each of the consecutive phases of the workshop and modelled the central concept very well. The workshop procedures and tasks created plenty of opportunity for both personal and group reflection.

It is always a challenge to know how long a conversation should be allowed to go “off topic” but in general participants were very focussed and disciplined about listening to each other and making contributions that would drive the conversation forward. I was quite anxious before the workshop started as there was no guarantee of how participants would respond to the tasks. As the workshop started I was soon having fun and joking with the group. It took some self-discipline to keep myself and the group focussed but the times I did deviate from the scripted structure, I feel was natural and necessary to keep positive energy and spontaneity going. The definition of facilitation constructed via the rotating definitions activity not only created a very effective process of group inquiry and rich conversation but also the end product, the actual definition created, captured a lot of helpful information about the nature and practice of facilitation. Aligning this definition with the theoretical one created in chapter 3 might yield interesting insights. Also, I believe that these sessions served as a model of facilitation as it created a safe space where people could share openly and honestly. The tasks facilitated good thinking and dialogue around the main concepts of the model and all the people involved maintained a respectful attitude. I believe the operationalisation of the model in the workshop moved constructive communication to the front of people’s consciousness. Based on the data collected via the transcription of both the written workshop tasks and reflections as well as the transcription of the soundtrack and my field notes, I am convinced that the three phases of the workshop succeeded in creating a facilitative, respectful and dialogical space that strongly modelled constructive communication and succeeded in operationalising the model and initiating its implementation by the participants. The workshop gave participants an experience and a deep understanding of all aspects of the central concept of the model. The atmosphere was pleasant and focussed. People wanted to participate and make a contribution. Almost all tasks worked very
well to get the concepts across and developed understanding and appreciation. I was very excited but also, very focussed. I tried very hard to remain open and facilitate conversation so participants could see the model, modelled in the workshop conversation. A few challenges was highlighted but I did get the sense that the model “rung true” for all participants – everyone I spoke to was excited to try it in their own classrooms. The follow up collection of data after participation in the workshop will describe the experience of implementation of the model by the participating secondary school teachers in their classrooms. And will describe how the model worked for participants.

5.3.3 The data collection process during implementation and evaluation

The third and final stage of implementation consisted of follow ups and more data collection after participants attended the workshop. As described in chapter two, data was collected during the process of implementation by using the following qualitative data collection methods: Workshop documentation, audio track of the workshop conversations, reflective journals, naïve sketches, individual phenomenological interviews, focus groups discussions and field notes. The data collection process closely followed the process and stages of the experience of participants and particular data collection methods were used to triangulate data at various stages throughout the process of implementation of the model by participating teachers as well as the participant researcher. The research question as described in chapter two is: What can be done to address the monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school?

5.4 DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

Rule and Vaughn (2011:3-4) explain that a ‘case’ is a particular instance and what makes it a case is that it is singular and distinct. They explain that a case is a circumstance or a problem that requires investigation and therefore also refers to the body of evidence that supports a conclusion or a judgement. This case study can be defined as a study of this particular instance of implementation of the model and how it worked or, simply how the model worked in this case. In this section I will unpack the most significant parts of qualitative data as it unfolded in the implementation of
the model. The main themes and categories of participant experience will now be described based on the process of open coding used by the researcher and independent coder (Creswell, 2003:192). These themes and categories taken together will describe how the model worked for the participating teachers in this particular case. I have also evaluated the model based on the data and my experience of implementing the model. In the third stage of implementing the model I conducted 10 phenomenological interviews, one with each participant, two weeks after the workshop. Before the interview, participants were asked to write a short naïve sketch based on the operationalised version of the research question. Participants were also asked to bring along the four diary entries they were asked to write during the two weeks after the workshop and prior to participating in the individual interview. The data collected during this stage of implementation, more directly addresses the operationalised version of the research question and will receive considerable focus in the next section. At the end of this stage a focus group interview was conducted and more short reflections were written. I also conducted a follow up reflection and focus group discussion four and a half months after the workshop to get a better understanding of the possible long term impact of the model based on participant experiences. In the next section I will describe significant topics and themes as they relate to the operationalised version of the research question: **How is the model working for you?**

5.4.1 The overall experience of the model – The central storyline in the data

“Botho - you need to be thoughtful, I think …thoughtful of others”

McLeod (2009:60-61) explains that the model of experience devised by Gendlin (1962) proposes that meaning arises from the symbolisation of a ‘felt sense’ and that this felt sense contains all the diverse meanings that the event might have for the person. He continues to explain that these meanings can only be accessed through symbolisation which usually happens in words but might also happen through images. McLeod (2009:60-61) continues to suggest that when a symbol captures the meaning contained within a feeling, there is a sense of fit, and then a sense of movement or change as this clarification of meaning allows other meanings to emerge.
5.4.1.1 Some overall impressions of participants relating to a “felt sense” or experience via exposure to the model

McLeod (2009:60-61) also explains that for Gendlin (1966) this provides a framework for validating the use of theory through a process of what he calls ‘experiential explication’ that works by observing if a concept is helpful by bringing about a shift in the felt sense of a problem. In this case study data it becomes clear that the model is descriptive and explains the experiences of participants well for them. It creates awareness of own communication as well as the general communication environment and interactions of others, which creates a sense of fit and understanding. My sense as participant researcher is that the model, combined with the experience of the workshop, implementing this model and the involvement of participating teachers, brought a sense of shift in the felt sense and understanding of teacher and learner communication for participating secondary school teachers.

“When there is mutual trust and there is respect, the environment is conducive and the child is honest, because if they are honest then both of you can easily move to the outcome, that of dialogue.”

“We can go to our African saying that goes... I am because of other people. So obviously, because like, ...I am strong because there is x here and... you know every person plays an important role, you might not see yourself sometimes as contributing but you make a difference to my life...”

“I think the world now itself, the way it’s designed, the world now is so egocentric... the culture of egoism. People are so egocentric and it’s about me, I, I, I, all the time... so obviously if I have ego, ego I think goes with no respect because it’s all about me so the world now, it’s like that but obviously as a learning institution helping the young ones, in every element we have to teach and if you say respect obviously we need to teach them that we need each other as people.”
“The most important thing that I have learnt... I think it will be about respect you know... if you have respect, like in Setswana they will say... they will call it - ‘Botho’... it’s like you need to be thoughtful, I think... if you have ‘Ubhuntho’ - thoughtful of other’s.”

“The sense of humanity is being developed...”

Being thoughtful or mindful can also be described as being fully vibrant, alive and present in the moment and being mindful dovetails with self-awareness (Scheick, 2011:1). It connotes being open to self and also conscious of attending to inner thoughts and emotions. It is attending and reflecting inwardly while also listening and nonjudgmentally caring about others. According to Scheick (2011:1), self-aware mindfulness supports learning about self and life, embraces uncertainty, invites discovery as well as healing relationships. Mindfulness is the ability to be conscious about communication and moving away from mindless responses only based on own cultural frames of reference (Dray & Wisneski, 2011:30). According to Sherretz (2011:93), mindful teaching practices can foster relationships between teachers and learners. For her, mindful teaching is the opposite of being mindless and describes that it holds strong connotations to being mindful in the sense of, caring for, and also that mindful teachers are actively thoughtful about their students’ needs in the present moment. Sherretz (2011:94-95) emphasises that mindful teachers create opportunities for students to develop relationships and connections with each other and with them by creating opportunities for connection in conversation and dialogue. She also stresses that mindful teaching fosters understanding, motivation, engagement, creativity and self-directed learning in learners. Byrnes (2012:23) explains that mindful awareness is situated within each individual teacher and yet it is connected to, influenced by, as well as impacts on, the external world. It is the teacher’s work to understand her or his own inner life that supports the capacity to teach with compassion, integrity and mindful awareness. According to Byrnes (2012:35) it is the unique whole of these three aspects that create a contemplative orientation to teaching where the sum is greater than its parts and where the intention towards wholeness creates the potential for both personal and societal transformation. Byrnes (2012:37) asserts that in this contemplative orientation to teaching, teachers create a space for learning that links the inner and external life in
meaningful, transformative ways. Mindfulness helps the teacher to notice what is new or different in the external environment as well as their own inner reactions and responses (Dunoon & Langer, 2012:12). In mindfulness the accent is on perceiving directly without immediately analysing, categorising or judging. Huston, Garland and Farb (2011:407) explain that mindfulness in the field of communication has been considered as how consciously people plan their approach to a communication interaction. They also explain that mindfulness is a means of expanding one’s moment-by-moment experience by allowing for qualities such as acceptance and that it allows for observing both what is occurring internally and externally.

Mindfulness is used to refer to a kind of expanded awareness and its function in adaptive communication. Frauman, Rabinowitz, Kernodle and McKethan (2010:16) describe that the development of self-directed learners is linked to mindfulness which is facilitative of new ideas and the recognition that new information is relevant and that one has the ability to utilise it. Mindful teaching creates the platform for producing novelty and thinking and acting flexibly (Fleullen, 2011:8). Mindfulness then allows one to attend to what is currently happening in the present moment and respond directly. It is being present in the here-and-now which enhances the learning environment for both teachers and learners and contemplative practices enhance learning to be a more holistic education (Montgomery & Walker, 2012:98-99). According to McClain, Ylimaki and Ford (2010:310-311) mindfulness is being present in every moment and fully experiencing what is happening, paying attention as if it really mattered. It is being fully present when with others and recognising our interdependence. The Shuters Compact Setswana English Dictionary (Dent, 1992) describes ‘Botho’ as having ‘character’ or being ‘humane’. According to Setswana mother tongue speakers, the concept of ‘Botho’ is very much a Setswana equivalent of the better known concept Ubuntu, and also denotes the idea of respect and dignity. Archbishop Desmond Tutu (Hamilton, 2011) explains that Ubuntu can be described as saying that my humanity is caught up and bound up in what is yours. It is the idea that I cannot really be fully human without you and it resonates with the concept of respect for our shared humanity and dignity – as well as Martin Buber’s (1958) concept of “I and Thou”, an altruistic and shared sense of us. The model facilitates the development of altruism, unselfishness, or I believe a felt sense of
‘Botho’ or, thoughtful humanity. I also believe that where people experience ‘Botho’ they also experience a sense of belonging – a basic human need.

5.4.1.2 Participant experiences of the facilitation of respectful dialogue

This research employed the services of an independent coder and the following is the report on the research by the independent coder: The researcher did 10 in-depth interviews, as well as a focus group after the workshop has been done. Triangulation took place as a result of participants’ journal entries at various stages, their naïve sketches, as well as their written reflections just before the focus group was employed. Field notes were made with and during each interview and the researcher himself personally reflected on these field notes. Reflection features strongly in this study and data saturation occurred.

Each of the interviews were very lively and lasted an hour or longer. The overall response of the participants was very positive. The model and workshop seemed to be a trigger for the teachers to open up about their own way of communication and how this study made them much more aware of more effective ways of communication. They also shared challenging classroom events and the fine balance between the role of a teacher giving lessons and that of shaping learners to develop fully. During interviews, some of the participants asked some valuable questions regarding discipline, power and “unreachable” learners. The researcher guided them to find their own answers and allowed further pondering on it. All the participants would like to see this model being employed at more schools as well as at different set-ups in the community. Most of the participants also want this model and process to be reinforced from time to time because of the value it added to their own lives and their ways of teaching. The question that the participants were asked is: How is this model working for you?

An overview of themes and categories is described in table 5.2 on the next page.
TABLE 5.2: Participant experience of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue in the secondary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.1</td>
<td>An experience of overall enhanced self-awareness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Awareness of own thoughts, feelings and behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Teachers take time to think about their own responses and therefore think before they react.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Understand themselves and also the way in which their actions influence others better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Remind teachers of the natural strategy or instinct they already follow without realising it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Awareness of the responsibility of the outcome of classroom’s conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>The model serves as a reminder and reflector of the communication that is happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.2</td>
<td>Teachers grow to be empathic with learners:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The model grows teachers so they become sensitive to where learners come from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Support teachers to understand that learners are all at a different place in their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>To know learners cultural background and cultivate the value of diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>When conveying knowledge, teachers now consider the background of learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Teachers open themselves up more to learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.1</td>
<td>The model supports teachers to become education-intentional:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Teachers encourage learners to accept responsibility for their own learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Role model and display respectful behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Clarify learning intentions, expectations and targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Always handle interactions with students in a positive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Clarify with learners the understanding of messages sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Speak to disruptive learners separately from the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.2</td>
<td>Teachers become aware of their role as facilitators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Teachers are guided in their responsibility for classroom management and constructive communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Allow valuable interactions between teachers and learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Create space for feedback from learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Teachers become conscious of the two-way process of dialogue and shift from talking to listening as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teachers allow space for sharing and conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teachers ensure that the messages sent, has been understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.3</td>
<td>Teachers develop respect for learners as human beings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Pay attention to learners as fellow human beings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>In the safe space of respect and authenticity, learners start to build trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4.1</td>
<td>A continual process of constructive communication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Plan ahead to incorporate the principles of the model in future lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Teachers understand that constructive communication is a growing process that takes time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>The visual presentation of the model helps to guide teachers in challenging situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>While some learners seem to be unapproachable, the model serves the majority of learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4.2</td>
<td>The model requires continuous reinforcement of its guidelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Teachers need to share and discuss the model with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>There is a need for more opportunities to share – a “Shared Us” among teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4.3</td>
<td>Share it! – The value of the model in the classroom and beyond:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>A model for couples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>A model for parents and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Of use in the wider community and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>The model is transferable to teachers and learners in other schools and contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.1.3 The themes and categories

An extensive consensus discussion was held between the researcher and the independent coder and during the discussion consensus was reached.

The central storyline: The reflective process of the model raises teachers’ awareness from “I” to “us”. The model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respect. The model reminds teachers of the continual process of respectful dialogue, which needs time and reinforcement. Based on participant experience of the implementation of the model it became clear to both the researcher and the independent coder that the model worked in this case by:

- Raising teacher awareness from “I” to “us”.
- Guiding teachers to permit a conducive space for teaching and learning by encouraging respect.
- Reminding teachers of the continual process of constructive communication.

5.4.2 The model raises teacher awareness from “I” to “us”

McLeod (2009:201) explains that the central theme of an analysis made by Schmid (2001) is that it limits the potential of a relationship to consider it as taking place between two separate persons. He argues that an essential aspect of being human is understanding and accepting a sense of ‘we’. There is a sense of a collective or a shared reality that transcends the individual perceptions of any one person. He explains that acknowledging this involves being open to ‘otherness’ and seeking to establish a ‘Thou-I’ relationship, and this underpins the possibility for relational depth. Corsini (2002:511) explains that the “I-thou” relationship refers to the existential phrase relating to the importance of real, honest, intense and complete meeting between people. The model raises the awareness of teachers so that they become aware of a need to share their life-world and decisions with the learners in their classrooms. Teachers have an experience of enhanced self-awareness and also grow in their empathy with learners. These aspects will now be described.
“That is respect... even if I have ego, but I always tend to be conscious of myself and the kind of person I am... it's not about me, it's about us... it has to be about us.”

Trumble (2011:1) explains that although teachers try to define what they do in terms of the taught curriculum, the power of relationship in teaching and learning is realised at an interpersonal level. Unrath and Kerridge (2009:283) claim that reflection on education often brings awareness that perceptive empathy and altruism are the foundations of good teaching. It points to exemplary teachers as possessing attributes such as deep understanding; respect for students or altruism; ability to use knowledge; passion for teaching and learning; multidimensional perception; awareness and reflectiveness. Oruç Ertürk (2013:1) describes that altruism is most definitely a source of teacher motivation and successful teaching. Paulsel (2004:1) suggests that teachers often spend much more time learning the subject matter of what they teach, than learning how to interact with students. For him this points to a disconnect between the kind of training teachers receive to prepare them for the task of teaching and what has been found as key elements of effective teaching.

5.4.2.1 An experience of overall enhanced self-awareness

Bernstein-Yamashiro and Noam (2013:100) explains that adolescents often misinterpret situations and communications and also that teachers need to take the lion share of responsibility in communication. Wedding and Corsini (2014:301) claim conscious awareness as a focussing of attention on what one is in touch with in situations requiring that kind of attention. They continue to explain that awareness, or focussed attention, is needed in situations involving complexity or conflict, and situations in which habitual modes of thinking and acting are not working. Corsini (2002:875) relates that self-awareness is an attainment of insight into personal attitudes, motives, reactions, defences, strengths and weaknesses; which is a major goal of psychotherapy also sometimes known as self-understanding.

Self-awareness for Dann (2012:26) is awareness of own thoughts, feelings and behaviour in the present. She explains that there are three levels of awareness; awareness of the outside world or what happens to a person; awareness of the
inside world or *what happens in a person* and also an awareness of fantasy activity, the things one feels, thinks and even emulates or simulates, but are not actually part of the ‘here and now’. De Mello (1992:46-47) explains self-awareness as an experience of “I” observing “Me”. He claims that it is an act of watching everything inside and outside of a person and to see it as if it is happening to someone else with a non-judgemental attempt to understand. He suggests that one is only in control of what one is aware of. De Mello (1992:71) also explains that listening is extremely important, but that the most vital part about listening, is listening to oneself when listening to another, otherwise oneself can’t hear the other. When listening to another person it is important to also listen to oneself otherwise one is not aware of how one is judging and filtering information. He explains that ultimately having self-awareness is a process of discovering one’s self.

Potter (2004:35) describes that consciousness generally means *awareness of our own mental acts* and that people can distinguish between those acts and their content. He explains that attention can be focussed on either the content or the act of thinking itself. He describes that in the first instance people have direct consciousness, where the content or object of thought holds centre stage. He proceeds by stating that in any moment, attention may be shifted or re focussed to attending to itself and people may have an awareness of being aware called – *Reflex consciousness*. Goleman (2013:3-4) states that mental focus and attention is from the original Latin *attendere*, meaning “to reach forward”, and that it is this ability that connects people with the world and shapes and defines experience. It is the ability to give attention that underlies awareness of the world and enables the voluntary regulation of our thoughts and feelings. Participants made the following statements:

“In your conversation with the learner you need to have that consciousness that there is “self” between you and the learner. *I bring “self” and you bring “self” as well. ...Before we can have this conversation there has to be respect, there has to be authenticity, and this is what I mean.”
“I think it’s about, active consciousness. Because when you are actively conscious about something…it leads you to think about it…and it challenges your thinking…and through that your thinking can result in deeper action. But if you are not actively conscious about something…the result is you do not have, or…know where you are and you continue with your same thinking and your same action. In the classroom when you are unaware…you know, um then, you stay where you are. And you do not dare to connect with your learners.”

MacLellan (2014:59-60) explains that reflexive consciousness and consciousness of identity or ‘Self’, is a teacher’s most important possession and supports understanding and responsiveness to social contexts teachers find themselves in. Tan (2013:816) states that research on effective teaching indicates that effective practice is linked to inquiry, reflection and continuous professional growth. She states that reflection can be understood as a process of internal dialogue with self, facilitated by thinking or writing and external dialogue and shared reflection with others. This reflective dialoguing moves reflection as a private practice to a shared one and it is critical that this sharing, takes place in an atmosphere collegiality, collaboration and mutual support. She contends that dialoguing is reflecting with others and it entails going through the process of questions and answers that supports members of the group to gain new insights about situations, beliefs and values, while also helping members to understand challenges in each other’s practices. Jennings, Frank, Snowberg, Coccia and Greenberg (2013:374, 376) describe that the prosocial and social and emotional competence of the teacher impacts on the development and maintenance of supportive teacher-learner relationships. They explain that mindful professional development practices can reduce emotional reactivity and promote the mental health of teachers and learners. I believe that this research also demonstrates this statement to be true.

a) Awareness of own thoughts, feelings and behaviour

The following demonstrates how the model supports participants to become more aware of their own thoughts, feelings and behaviours when communicating and
interacting with learners. These are some participant experiences based on the model, shared in the phenomenological interviews:

“You had to explain and you had to argue and reveal your perspective and hear other people’s perspectives umm... create dissonance from there I was able to grow and I think... in most cases that is what I heard. A lot of dissonance between my beliefs and what other people hold and as such it placed me in an uncomfortable place but it was a point of growth where I could say ok, what have I learnt can I change the way I have been thinking? And indeed in most cases I did change.”

“Ja, I think that it has been part of the way I try and do things... in order to maintain good relationships with the learners... and it has become my own, without really thinking about it... but, what this brought about was the awareness. Which is quite different from just acting automatically... you know, now I am not acting from that point... or from that habit actually but I am developing a new habit of being aware when I do things and so... being aware brings more responsibility and without the awareness, in most cases you tend to point the finger at the other person...x and you do not bring yourself out of the conversation and look at it from a different perspective, it is always about you looking at it from your own perspective but in this case now I am able to look at it from the learners perspective as well as my perspective.”

“The model works with the development of self-consciousness. It is always easy to come up with solutions when you know the problem.”

“...the consciousness part of it I really liked a lot, a lot! I am conscious about consciousness now.”

“I was not aware. So, it raised that awareness I would say.”
“It made me aware and it opened my mind to that aspect and I am looking forward to next year and my teaching experience going to be totally different.”

Kearney, Kelsey and Herrington (2013:318) agree that mindful teaching practices help to resist the temptation to fall back on habitual patterns and enhances teacher’s abilities to engage in meaningful problem solving. They advise that being mindful helps teachers to know what they are doing and how they are reacting so that they can choose a thoughtful response instead of a mindless reaction. Salzberg (2013:26-27) explains that teachers ‘awake attention’ to what is happening inside and outside them in the present moment is important so they can respond with wisdom. She (Salzberg, 2013:26-27) explains that mindful teaching has potential to help teachers deal with and become aware of difficult emotions that often result from usual conditioned responses that might be triggered during interactions.

b) Teachers take time to think about their own responses and therefore think before they react

In this excerpt it is clear that the model supports participants in thinking about their responses during communication interaction with learners.

“…basically it has actually made me think about how I am communicating with my students in class and also like how to improve communication because of at times I feel that somehow maybe the problem I am having… I mean the reason why I am possibly having problems with discipline is because of I don’t communicate with them effectively maybe.”

“…obviously the impact will be positive… because if you are conscious about the communication, communication is a two way thing… it has a receiver and there is a sender and maybe I am a sender and then ja… it impacts a lot. Because you think through the things before you say them… because it comes with a whole lot of
responsibility… you have to be responsible for whatever it is that you are going to say.”

“Ja… it was easy because since we have had our session, I think I have been quite deliberate and conscious of the way in which I speak to the learners. And as a result I find it easy to translate it as well… onto paper, my experiences. Entrusting them onto paper… it is something I am fully aware of.”

“So making conscious decisions of how you communicate. Choosing your words properly and then ensuring that you try to eliminate as much …unpleasant communication as possible.”

Huston, Garland and Farb (2011:416) assert that people who are mindful are also less likely to pre judge or stereotype others, and are also more aware of their dispositions. Kruger and Adams (2002:121) explain that for teachers the process of becoming self-aware means acknowledging and attending to those factors that tend to influence their lives. It involves taking self-inventory, some introspection, and must also be accompanied by attempts to improve deficient areas.

c) Understand themselves and also the way in which their actions influence others better

The following experiences of participants illustrate how the model supports reflections of teachers on their actions and how learners might have responded to, or how they will respond to a particular communication interaction.

“…it required one to really think… um and what I also really enjoyed about it was that I was able to personalise it… and it became more personal as it was about me, it touched on me… on who I am and it was specifically about my job you know, I am always interacting with people so that made it much more relevant and constructive and valid.”
“I am conscious and I am trying to be aware of what I do, because if this more information that I have, however I am not always conscious and at times I act and it is only later on that I reflect, that I can come back and say wow, the conversation was sour because I left out, this aspect of constructive communication, in that moment you know... and then, what you can do is you can still go back and, and have a conversation with the learner... and you can repair it so... it offers you that as well.”

“... just thinking about the effect it could have on a kid... and for us to remember again that they are kids... just to be more aware of that again and the fact that when you say something that you don’t even remember afterwards... that it could really damage them... because they are... because you are such an important part of their life. Just to be aware of that again, to be sensitive to that.”

“I think I am more aware of my emotions and am curiously trying to keep things on an even keel.”

It is clear from the data that participating teachers are very aware of their communication interactions with learners. Schussler and Knarr (2013:71, 83-85) assert that teacher development programmes can help foster teacher moral sensibilities by helping them to connect intentions with their perceptions and practices during teaching. They describe that the key is helping teachers to become more aware of how their values affect what they do with learners every day.

d) Remind teachers of the natural strategy or instinct they already follow without realising it

The following experiences of participants illustrate that the model relates well to the natural strategy teachers already follow:

“I believe that most teachers instinctively follow this model anyway.”
“So, it feels as if it reminds me of a strategy that feels instinctive... so it feels to me if that is the way you have to do it and then if you don’t do it that way... then what is the point, so it feels to me that this strategy is just natural and if you are a teacher you are supposed to know to do that.”

“It is totally natural, that's the thing it feels totally natural... so that is maybe what I was struggling with, it didn’t feel like something new that I learnt because it feels to me... how can you not deal with kids in that way?”

“So for me it was more of reinforcing of what I have been doing and making me aware of the things I have been doing in my classroom that I sort of... haven’t given names for, or calling it a process of this but those things are happening...”

“Ja, you know as a teacher sometimes you go through educational psychology but sometimes you tend to forget about these things or maybe... you don’t go through them somehow in your training.”

“Yes it also made me aware of the things that I am doing well, things that I do but that I didn’t realise was so important to the learning that is taking place in the classroom.”

“A number of things that we discussed about the model have always been there in my classroom.”

“I would say that... it has been there in me but I think that the model rekindled it.”

The constant exchange between theory and practice is a reciprocal process (Wink, 2000:59; Corsini, 2002:746; Chinn & Kramer, 2011:12). It is clear that the model supported such a reciprocal process for the participating teachers. McLeod (2009:61) posits that one of the implications of Gendlin's analysis of theory use is that
it is important for concepts in helping professions to be “experience near” rather than “experience far”. He explains that if the concepts are too abstract it will not function in a manner where it symbolises and articulates implicit meanings and will not communicate the subtly sensed understanding that are at the edge of awareness. I assert that, based on the data collected in this case study, it became increasingly clear that the model for the facilitation of constructive communication does work and is effective because it is an “experience-near” model. According to McLeod (2009-61), Argyris and Shön (1974) describe that practitioners employ two quite different types of theory and an important distinction between the two is that the ‘theory-in-use’ describes what a person actually does, while the ‘espoused theory’ is used to talk about what has been done in the past. Argyris and Schön (1974) found that effectiveness in a wide range of occupations is associated with a closeness of fit between the theory-in-use and the espoused theory used by an individual and also that the careful reflection on practice was necessary in order to achieve such a fit.

It is clear, based on this case study that the model, as presented does represent such a theory-in-use and that it goes a long way towards achieving such a closeness of fit between theory and practice, which I might also describe with the concept “praxis”, which emphasises that theory is what is to be discovered in and via practice. The following participant experiences illustrate the close fit between the model and participant experience of their practice.

e) Awareness of the responsibility of the outcome of classroom conversations

In the next experience shared by participants, it is clear that the more they feel aware and become conscious of their own communication with learners the more they feel responsible for the constructive outcome of that communication interaction. Freedman, Echt, Cooper, Miner and Parker (2012:654) explain that careful attention to environmental factors and a socially supportive environment can greatly affect learner motivation and how they learn. Fried (2011:123) describes that emotions play a pivotal role in learning environments and that greater emotional awareness from teachers can help enhance or create a more supportive, collaborative and expressive classroom environment. Kruger and Adams (2002:121) confirm that
teacher self-efficacy as referring to the teachers’ perceived personal power to influence learners’ learning outcomes.

“I think… the more conscious you are, while talking to your learners, you realise that they are not aware of the model or... this form of communication, and they are still operating within their own way of doing things. So, when you are coming in and you have an awareness of what is happening, that places more responsibility on you in a way and whatever the outcome of the conversation... it kind of reflects on you. You kind of take up ownership of whatever the outcome of that conversation.”

“I am now very much aware of what I say when I am communicating with the students, and I always ask myself, where is this taking us? Are we going to benefit on what we want, or benefit at the end of this conversation.”

“But... for me the parallel-monologue normally comes at the higher grades... because at times there is a competition, between trying to make these guys understand and finishing what you have to finish... so now if you want to finish what you have to finish, in most cases it is a case of just telling them what it has to be.”

Van Uden, Ritzen and Pieters (2013:52) state that for teachers to experience self-efficacy they need to feel like they matter and have the ability to influence desired outcomes of the teaching learning interaction. According to Kruger and Adams (2002:121), to be an effective teacher one has to feel capable and competent as a facilitator of effective learning in the classroom. Reflective teaching practice and self-awareness will help a teacher to achieve feelings of self-efficacy and will also improve self-esteem of teachers. Based on this data, it becomes clear that the model brings awareness of responsibility for the outcome of teacher and learner communication interactions and that the model supports teachers to experience self-efficacy.
f) The model serves as a reminder and reflector of the communication that is happening

Corsini (2002:818) explains ‘reflect’ as: To bend or throw back. In the following participant experiences it can be observed that the model supports the teachers in “throwing back” or “bending” or “jumping back” to their head when it comes to the thinking about a communication interaction and therefore enables them to become more aware of what is happening in a particular communication interaction.

“Realising the importance of constructive communication in the classroom; the model just makes one to be aware of the type of communication happening in the classroom.”

“…but at the same time, being part of it, we were not aware that we are trying to do this but after the practical part and coming back to the book (Referring to notes) looking at that… we are aware now… ok this is what is happening. Wow we are doing one, two, and three this is what you were modelling.”

“It was constructive in the sense that, I learnt something. Or... it is something I have always tried to do, in my conversations or in my way of communicating... however it was put in a very plain and a simple way that I now begin to understand.”

“Also the need to apply it, some people will say, ok I don’t need this I am a good communicator and I can talk to these people anyway... but if you look into this model and get into the nitty-gritty of it, you will realise that we think we are good communicators... you would like to think so but if you look at this model you will realise that sometimes we get into that parallel monologue. ...so the model makes me sort of, jump back to my head whenever I am dealing with the kids in most of the things I do within the classroom.”
“And a good thing now, when you reach a stage of parallel – monologue… you can see, wow… we are being parallel here now and where can I meet this guy and what can I do. While in the past you would just say ag… go to hell. You give up and leave them like that but now you are aware like x was saying… awareness… umm, this is now where I am getting parallel with this guy, and I cannot let the situation be like this, I should bend it somewhere, so we could meet.”

“It is a beautiful reminder of the fact that we have to be sensitive in our dealings with young, hormonal, intense emotional little souls. We get bogged down in our focus on rules and boundaries because it is very necessary to have these boundaries when dealing with kids who have to test these boundaries by their very nature of being teenagers. We have to be consistent in our approach, however, we also need to be reminded of their complex life world.”

“So… then it forces you to reflect on your class practice.”

5.4.2.2 Teachers grow to be empathetic with learners

Corsini (2002:327) explains empathic understanding as insight into feelings, thoughts, or attitudes of persons achieved by projecting themselves into situations of others and Swank, Ohrt and Robinson (2013:23) report that empathy related to unconditional positive regard is the key aspects and precursors of altruism in those wanting to be helpful to others.

“I think for me aspects that I like about it is… is, be empathetic umm, you know showing respect to the receiver who is a human being by the way, and they are still young, They need ...you need to be conscious of the fact that you are dealing with another human being who wants to be respected... no matter what it is that they have done, they still want you to respect them. And... for me, being empathetic and being respectful and also being a solution seeker rather than blaming and blaming and blaming... but rather to seek
solutions in solving or having a conversation when communicating with someone.”

“Ja. I believe in that... umm, but not all... I mean also being empathetic. Making sure that you understand things from somebody else’s point of view... which is quite important for different experiences and cognitive levels... umm in most cases we tend to say it but we don’t descend to their level and as such that brings about a lack of understanding and where there is a lack of understanding the likelihood is people will end up in separate ways without solving what it is that they wanted to solve in the first place... so for me it’s that element of empathy and respect which stand out.”

“And also, the other thing is when you are communicating, especially in the classroom you must always sort of think of what each and every conversation was all about, did it go well? And look at both sides because at times we say things to the kids... and either reply or they don’t but I think that is also important to reflect on what actually happened in the classroom each and every day and how best can you improve on that.”

Arghode, Yalvac and Liew (2013:89-90) claim that exhibiting empathy is a key aspect of teachers creating a learning environment and cultivating an emotional environment conducive to learning. Grobler and Schenk (2009:187) explain that empathic understanding means that a facilitator attempts to understand people from their frames of reference by listening to their experiences and perceptions, and then conveying this understanding of their experiences to the people. They state that with empathic understanding people acknowledge, respect and accept other people’s different experiences and perceptions and also attempt to show understanding for these different experiences. The data collected makes it clear that the model and its operationalisation worked on both an intrapersonal level as explained in the previous section, but also on an interpersonal level for participants by supporting efforts at empathic understanding. Hall and Smotrova (2013:1) explain that teacher practices of self-talk, which can be conceived of as self-
dialogue, makes an important contribution to eliciting empathy. Corsini (2002:327) describes empathy as the objective awareness of another person’s thoughts and feelings and their possible meanings. Goleman (2013:3-4) suggests that self-awareness fosters self-management and empathy which is the basis for skill in relationships and that both these abilities are fundamental to basic emotional intelligence. He confirms that the ability to be mentally aware boils down to three basic abilities that people need to be equally nimble in. The ability to be inner, other and outer directed is of the utmost importance because, inner focus attunes people to intuitions, guiding values and helps with better decisions. The ability to focus on one’s own smooth connections to other people supports interpersonal abilities. The ability to direct focus outwards is also important to help people navigate the larger world. Ebersöhn and Eloff (2011:63) explain that for people, the intrapersonal self-awareness of who they are, and how they think, feel and make decisions, constitute a precondition for the establishment of interpersonal relationships. They assert that it is only really after own identity is established that the person can guide people not to stereotype others and have empathy with and appreciation for others. They explain that basic intrapersonal or self-insight and also a realistic and positive self-concept may be regarded as the precursor to interpersonal empathy and interpersonal effectiveness. The model seems to impact teachers’ self-talk in very constructive ways to facilitate empathy.

a) The model grows teachers so they become sensitive to where learners come from

In the following experiences, shared by participants based on their implementation of the model, it becomes clear that the aspect of empathy and especially being sensitive to where learners come from is impacted by the model.

“…well I don’t personally get it right but I do try my level best. But I think the element of empathy is helping me to understand it much better.”
“Yes it brought a consciousness that you always have to… look from the other side, from their point of view, from where they are standing, then we can see things differently.”

“But I think to me I am… or let's say, I have learnt that aggression seldom achieves anything. You know, it... umm, and actually if you want a kid to learn you got to make them feel like they are being heard.”

“…they start to want to explore some other things and you are also growing with that child as a teacher and that is when you should chip in and say I know what you are going through.”

“...and I haven’t gone through all the issues they have gone through and I think it would be... it would be presumptuous of me to think I can be connected to their life world... but at least I try to take it into account.”

“The feeling of empathy became aware to me.”

Castillo, Salguero, Fernandez-Berrocal and Balluerka (2013:883-884) describe that during adolescence a major factor buffering against aggression is empathy. They claim that empathy can be described as cognitive and affective sharing of the experiences of others. They explain that adolescent empathic abilities improve their ability to handle emotions such as aggression, and that experiences of empathy plays an important part in the promotion of psychological and social adjustment in youth. The model supports the development of empathy in the participating teachers and they became more sensitive to where learners come from.

b) To understand that learners are all at a different place in their lives

The following participant experiences make it clear that the model supports teachers in their efforts to understand the individual life-world of learners, which might differ considerably from that of the teacher.
“…it also helped me to realise that the whole class is never together at the same level... you are at a different level with every child somewhere on that model of communication. So with most of them you aim to go for the shared communication model but with some of them it is harder to build relationships ...you get stuck somewhere at the bottom... or the middle.”

“But that is something you strive for everyday... that is what you strive for... with some of them it is easier to get there sooner... but it made me realise or think about the fact that you can never just assume that you are standing in front of the class and you will all share the same experience... because every child is different and you also don’t have that same relationship with every child, some of them trusts you more, some of them you feel you have gone out of your way... or some just trusts you sooner in the year or whatever the case may be...”

“If there is a part of it that teachers are not getting, I was talking with someone about this school being an academic space. Now being an academic space, if a student is coming from a family that is dysfunctional but they are still passing and they are still ‘A’ students but they are coming from there and because they come from there they have some illnesses in their hearts... and they are somehow affected by that, it’s just that because we are in an academic space and we are really focussing on distinctions but we are not helping and healing the other part that is supposed to be healed... so, things like that we need to be conscious about.”

Rabow, Newman and Remen (2014:121) explain that literature indicates that positive outcomes for teachers may be common in curricula that focus on psycho-social issues and strong elements of humanism, which focuses on the dignity and freedom of individuals, and that student learning will be enhanced by relationship-centred education. They also assert that teachers experience greater professional satisfaction, connection, empathy and respect for students when involved with
courses and curricula that can be characterised as relationship-centred. One of the main aspects of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue can be that it is a relationship-centred model of teaching and that according to literature, such an approach to teaching possibly brings health and wholeness to both teachers and learners because of the focus on the development and acknowledgement of the uniqueness of individuals and where they are at that moment in time.

c) Know learners cultural backgrounds and cultivate the value of diversity

In a multicultural environment, like South African schools, it is important to realise that all learners will probably not share the same cultural background or even mother tongue. Yet the multicultural character and multicultural diversity and plurality should be acknowledged by the education system of such a society (Le Roux, 1997:17). The data illustrate that the model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school support teachers in their efforts to cultivate the value of diversity.

“I come from a completely different space with completely different learners and of course here we have a variety of different learners with different backgrounds and it made me more and more aware of where a particular student comes from and why they are behaving in a certain way.”

“...but you as a teacher you know that within my culture this is how we talk with learners... then you come across a learner of a different culture... then that learner talks to you in a different way... you may be affected by that... you may feel disrespected, but coming to a point of understanding the culture, you may see ok, this is how the learner knows how to communicate with an adult, but within my culture this is how.”

“The whole idea of life-worlds and the whole idea that you need to be able to realise where they come from, and even be open to speak to them about their issues.”
“Thru this constructive communication model, I started to give myself time to understand... what are the aspects that may cause this within my classroom? So, I think one of the things about classroom management, thru the understanding of different aspects that may come within the classroom, are the different culture that the learner comes from…”

“One particular student had an outburst, even though I attempted to approach him in a respectful manner. This shows that the model will greatly depend on the principles and values of each individual involved. I then realised, respect is a relative term.”

Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2010:123) assert that people have different beliefs about life and developing inclusive schools demands that educators acknowledge, respect and draw on these different views. They share the opinion that many problems and challenges between learners and teachers are caused by conflicting values mostly based on different cultural, family and peer group backgrounds. The data illustrate that the model supports teachers to consider this diversity when interacting with learners.

d) When conveying knowledge, teachers now consider the background of learners

In the process of teaching and learning, one of the most important aspects is to in some way “hook” onto the frame of reference of the learners. Creating a context for understanding which supports learners’ efforts to engage successfully with new learning is one of the basic skills a teacher needs to have if they are going to be successful in facilitating learning (Lemov, 2010:287). Başbay (2014:605) asserts that besides being equipped with knowledge of a particular field, teachers also need to have a clear understanding that differences in the classroom always need serious consideration. Higgins and Bonne (2014:60) describe that it is important to know learners and their background in order for them to feel respected and have respectful dialogue. The model supports teacher awareness about acknowledging various
contexts that form the background of the teacher and learner communication interaction.

“Ja, what is coming to my mind is the kind of questions you sometimes ask in class and even in the examination and the ambiguity you’ll find in the statements and maybe as a teacher you might find that you want that question to be answered from another perspective and the student will come and will answer it from another perspective only to find that the student is not wrong it is only that you did not notice the other side, the other perspective of of... of the question.”

“To use some aspects of it in my lesson. How can I also create some us time, some share time... what is their experiences of a certain aspect of the lesson... I was really thinking of doing that in my lesson plan.”

“...they will come up with something and... ok guys, since you all agree upon this, if one go a wrong way or a negative way... away from this, what are we going to do? So... I am making them to be part... of that.”

“So it is for you to understand that you also need to take back yourself to that age group and maybe if it is a cultural background that kind of a cultural background and that kind of a lifestyle. So I think it is also important for you to move into your student's space and understand and play around and try and get an understanding of what kind of a world revolves around them.”

According to Weissbourd and Jones (2014:43-46), cultivating empathy means expanding teachers’ circles of care. They explain that helping teachers understand their own biases and why they gravitate towards certain students and not others, is important for the development of empathy and powerfully shape classroom social interaction and therefore the learning that happens. They contend that children
develop empathy when it is alive and well in their relationships including, and maybe, especially in their relationships with their teachers. In a healthy school environment, adults in the space display empathy and care for children as well as other adults by knowing them and showing an interest in who they are as people. The model develops teacher capacity to investigate their own biases and opens them up to understand the various backgrounds of the learners in their care.

e) Teachers open themselves up more to learners

The following data describes how teachers become more open, approachable, and willing to engage with the overall development of students. This openness is also indicative of the development of empathy in participating teachers.

“That is why we ended up saying you need to move into their space and they need to move into your space... because when I give an answer I am going to give it in a more complex way because of my experience and my technical expertise with the subject... ok, so I give it in a different way but because of their age group and their level of understanding or even use of vocabulary they give it simpler... the answer is correct, it is only that they give it in a simple or a different fashion.”

“...but how about, I understand my own kids, that I teach and then it helps me to know, that there is a certain approach I can use with a kid that is open and cheerful and there is a certain approach you can use with another kid who is more reserved and is hurt by the tiniest of offenses... who picks up an offence in everything that you say. And with that kind of a kid you avoid taking a risk because you know very well she is easily offended. So, I believe that if we deepen our knowledge about our kids, and it might be difficult because teachers are very busy with other things, but I think if we really want results and if we really want a product or a citizen in the nation that is going to make a change or impact it's very important.”
“Because if you have to have kids coming into your space... that means you have to be accommodating and tolerant and... it actually encourages you to broaden out and open up more... which makes it for me, more of an environment of, or whereby we don't create limitations between ourselves and our students and they find it easy because students being kids, as long as you are available, they make use of you. So if you open up to them, they just come forth without you even asking them, do you have a problem? It's easy for them to come into your space and say... mam I have a problem may you please or can you help me with this because you are an open person to them and that is one thing that the model encourages us to do... to move into their space and also to give some space for them to come in.”

This kind of openness to the experience and perspectives of learners is characteristic of a humanistic approach to counselling and the facilitation of the development of healthy relationships, self-awareness and self-actualisation of others (Coll, Doumas & Trotter, 2013:54). In this openness, empathy is the foundational skill and perspective that forms the cornerstone of humanistic practice, which is supported by the model.

5.4.3 The model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respect

Ward (2013:57) contends that respect should be the major motive and first value to be sought in each learning encounter. McLeod (2009:186) explains that recent definitions of empathy has moved towards defining it as a wider and broader concept. At understanding it, as an important component of an authentic commitment to be engaged in the world of the other. He explains that this notion implies more of a unity of the core conditions. McLeod suggests that before Rogers and his colleagues used terms like ‘empathy’, ‘congruence’ and ‘unconditional regard’, they described their approach as an attitude and philosophy of ‘deep respect for the significance and worth of each person’ (Rogers, 1951:21). Respect has increasingly become one of the most important principles any successful educational context or system, large or small, should be able to account for. Liu (2013:22)
describes that when teachers want to establish positive teacher-learner relationships and create a classroom environment that is conducive to development of students, it is crucial for teachers to see themselves through their students’ eyes. Liu asserts that when teachers identify and understand how they and their students perceive and react differently to classroom interactions, they are more prepared to create a conducive environment for development and learning. According to O’Grady, Hinchion and Mannix McNamara (2011:1), how teachers understand respect influences their practice, and it seems as if there is often a disconnect between teacher and student perception of respect. Weissglass (2012) states that creating a foundation of respect in classrooms will enable teachers to learn from their students even as the students learn from teachers, and explains that learners know that their thinking is respected and valued when adults listen to their thinking and think with them. Also, that it is important to give learners the freedom and time to explore and express their thinking.

According to Weissglass (2012:30), most adults only give lip service when it comes to the importance of thinking, but young people need modelling and to be authentically respected in concrete and tangible ways. Pattison, Hale and Gowens (2011) explain that although innovative exercises and teaching techniques are critical, and does enhance student learning, it can’t be seen as a substitute for caring. They claim that good teaching is not a matter of technique, as much as it is a function of students perceiving that their teachers primarily care about them as individuals rather than focusing on the transfer of knowledge. They explain that student interaction based on respect and caring is one of the most important criteria for excellent teaching and they conclude that the combination of mind and soul is the key to achieving excellence in teaching, based on student rating of teachers.

“I see the model as giving freedom to both the receiver and the sender. When the receiver feels respected the healthier the process of communication. It shows how we are all responsible, the sender and the receiver but of course, with the sender most responsible.”
“I gained the consciousness of being responsible. This means even though I think the receiver has a level of responsibility but at the end I’m the one to always be judged for the flaws.”

“So that is the one thing that I have learnt, and also I knew that respect is very important but this workshop has broadened that aspect of respect as very, very important.”

Kaplan and Assor (2012:251) describe that their findings highlight the importance of autonomy supportive of I-Thou dialogue and support the claim that autonomy-supportive I-Thou dialogue might help adolescents to experience study and schooling as more pleasant and secure. They explain that an I-Thou dialogue can be defined as a dialogue where each participant feels respected by the other and that the other is trying to understand and support his or her needs. They also suggest that in situations of conflict such a supportive dialogue is characterised by open, yet respectful expression of disagreement and by an attempt to find optimal solutions.

Young-Jones, Cara and Levesque-Bristol (2014:497) assert that teachers play an influential role in the lives of learners and that pedagogy and teaching techniques have clearly been shown to impact learner motivation. They contend that specifically supportive conditions are more conducive to positive learning outcomes than controlling conditions. Such supportive conditions can be characterised as respectful and Cleary, Walter, Horsfall and Jackson (2013:264,276) claim that commitment to the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility is the core values from which flow the behaviours and principles that enable an academic community to translate their ideas into action. Of these principles they identify the preparedness to ‘listen, share and learn with others, with integrity and in respectful ways as the most critical to create a supportive environment for development.

McLellan and Nicholl (2013:165) describe that teachers can change their practice to influence a supportive and creative classroom climate and Rideout and Windle (2013:478) conclude that the relationships between teachers and learners is foundational for managing and creating an effective and supportive classroom environment. Pennings, van Tartwijk, Wubbles, Claessens, Van der Want and Brekelmans (2014:183) state that good teacher and learner relationships are
important for student motivation, academic achievement as well as for teacher well-being. They describe that these relationships develop from daily classroom interactions that can be facilitative or inhibiting of the development of such relationships based on agency and support. Baroody, Rimm-Kaufman, Larsen and Curby (2014:70-71) advocate that a responsive classroom approach is conducive to learning and social emotional learning. They suggest that teachers who show closeness through responsive, sensitive and respectful interactions with students benefit students in many ways including current and future high academic performance, social development, engagement in learning and high school completion. I assert that these aspects are promoted by the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue because of the constructive impact on teacher and learner communication and relationships. Rideout and Windle (2013:494) describe that the building of mutual respect in relationship with learners can be considered as foundational to an effective classroom. They describe the importance of mutual respect in opposition to an ideology of control as a preliminary phase of the development of a humanistic approach that emerges as teachers develop constructive relationships with students.

5.4.3.1 Teachers become education-intentional

Harrison and Murray (2012:141) explain that as teachers evolve as reflective practitioners they develop better self-awareness and gradually become more focussed on the learners and what is happening in the classroom than being self-absorbed with content. The data collected suggest that the model creates awareness, clarifies and supports teachers’ efforts at actualising an educational intention. A purposeful interaction that will be facilitative and supportive of learners’ learning needs creating a mindful interaction, an interaction based on “botho”.

“We want to see them better people, not only better in the workplace so that they can design cars and design whatever, that are things that we are teaching them here, but even being people... better people, thoughtful and that the world is not revolving around themselves but that it is about us as human beings... as living creatures.”
“The feeling generally were positive I mean the model kind of gives you a guideline of how to go about imposing constructive communication so obviously there would be instances where um... when you are trying to communicate the student will just give a go at you, or maybe even show you a bit of maybe disrespect... now as an educator firstly you will have to put your foot down and show that you don’t tolerate such behaviour and then afterwards try to facilitate the process.”

“Yes and I think in my consciousness of what I do, that comes out much more clearly. And I become intentional in bringing that out so that somebody will see that, I do respect them.”

Bronkhorst, Meijer, Koster and Vermunt (2014) explain that recent insights from researching expert teaching indicates that deliberate efforts at developing expertise is necessary if teachers are going to become experts. They advocate that the stimulation of deliberate and considered practices by teachers can develop their expertise and lead to better outcomes for learners. They also describe that the purposefulness of the design of the learning strategy or learning context makes the activity deliberate and it is the deliberate approach to the activities by the teacher that makes them deliberate and intentional.

a) Encourage learners to accept responsibility for their own learning

The model supports teachers’ efforts to help learners take responsibility for their actions, and own learning, as can be observed in the following:

“...I have used it in my classes after that, after the workshop... I was conscious about... like if I say this now, in this way and I am telling my kids to do this and then maybe doing it in a slightly negative way will they say that I am responsible if they do it? ...And if I say it in a positive way, being clear and making them own up to what they had to do? Ja, I could see the difference between just doing it without taking responsibility and also without making them to take their part,
the small portion of the responsibility of whatever it is that they are doing.”

“I believe that if I could apply this model effectively then my results will probably change with a very big margin because half of the time when you lose respect for your kids or they lose respect for you and time is consumed in trying to restore and regain and that takes a lot of time and energy... but if I could maintain that then it means a lot of time would be invested in learning and trying to teach more effectively and create understanding and I believe that for learning to also happen you need to have dialogue, like we said. And your kids need to be able to ask, and they need to be able to be free to say, this is what I don’t understand and this is what I understand.”

“If you could have that dialogue then learning would definitely take place because learning, for someone to learn you teach but teaching doesn’t force learning down their throats. So, for someone to learn, you need them to come in as much as you need to go in as far as you can into their understanding.”

“The learners start to take responsibility of their actions and maturity is displayed through their response and developed more respect towards their peers.”

Kreber and Klampfleitner (2013:466-467) explain that authenticity in teaching can be understood as a process of becoming aware of own unique purposes and responsibilities in life. They emphasise that people are the authors of their own lives and take responsibility for it. They explain that the existential, critical and communitarian perspectives on authenticity are all part of a strand of thinking where the focus is on the authentic being and becoming of both the teacher and the learner. Authentic learning can happen only when teachers and learners act freely in such a way that they foster growth in each other and the idea is that authentic learning leads to people becoming more engaged in their own learning and taking responsibility for their own learning process.
b) Role model and display respectful behaviour

According to participating teachers the model supports them in understanding their role as a teacher in terms of how and what to model to learners. Some also seem to feel strongly that modelling the behaviours associated with the model and its concepts is most important for younger, and junior secondary students, while direct teaching of the concepts and the model diagramme could be useful for older students.

“The anchor of this model is respect. I have learnt that if you show respect to your students they will also return the same amount of respect to you. It also has required me to enlarge my space by letting the students come closer to me so that they can understand why I approach and do things the way I do. I have been challenged also to be part of my students’ space so as to be able to understand their thinking. Doing this has allowed fruitful conversation to emerge between me and my students.”

“...and then I think respect needs to be our send nature as teachers, we just have to live respect. We don’t have to even... there has to be a point but, we don’t even have to speak about respect. Kids have to see how we handle ourselves, even when respecting them when we talk to them, even if we are angry and we have to reprimand them but you can use words... but there can always be respect.”

“The effectiveness of the constructive communication model between teacher and learner is guided by the sense of respect which acts as a building block between both parties. Teacher having empathy is a great start as to be welcoming to issues that individual learners may have. Private matter should not get in the way of being the role model to shape a future of a young South African citizen.”

“Ok so from my side I think here is a lot of positive around this model. I the first thing I have noticed in all the conversations we had...
is that it is always going to relate to teaching... so, the teacher should be the one who models the whole thing.”

Corsini (2002:603) describes that modelling is a process in which people expand their existing knowledge or skills by observing people’s behaviour and its consequences. According to Corsini, modelling influences can promote development of competencies, alter behaviour, and create an emotional disposition or shape images of social realities. This model facilitates teachers to become aware of their own communication and the responsibility to model constructive communication in the form of the facilitation of respectful dialogue.

c) Clarify learning intentions, expectations and targets

It becomes clear in the following participant experiences that the model works by reminding teachers to clarify their intentions and expectations as well as to clarify their targets for learning in dialogue with learners.

“…a conducive space for learning whereby the learners are able to discuss within themselves and with their peers, and also pulling the teacher in through the discussion so that if I put my expectation I put my expectation knowing that we have already discussed this.”

“It has made me more aware of the importance of respectful dialogue. It has positively impacted on my teaching and learning experience. If I successfully implement effective communication then I can achieve effective teaching and learning.”

“It is not only about finishing but, did the kids understand what they were supposed to finish... because if it is going to be a one-way kind of communication then... I don’t know if that is going to give you any results from the kids... it is going to give you results on your part because you did the teaching but, did the learning actually happen?”
Leggett and Ford (2013:42-49) describe that a focus on intentional learning as well as intentional teaching creates a more effective treatment of the teaching-learning interconnection. It emphasises the relationship between teaching and learning and the concept of the co-construction of knowledge. They explain that contemporary research explores the nature of the dynamic relationship between children, teachers and content. They contend that intentional teaching requires teachers to make informed, thoughtful decisions about learning opportunities for children and what needs to be understood is that while intentional teachers look for opportunities to teach, intentional learners constantly look for opportunities to learn. In this dynamic the role of the teacher changes from a provider of knowledge to one that promotes the innate drive for independent learning. The data illustrates that the model supports the participating teachers in clarifying teaching and learning intentions and expectations during the respectful dialogue.

d) Always handle interactions with students in a positive manner

The data collected clearly shows that the model supported teachers to handle their communication interactions with learners in a positive, or as defined by the model - constructive, manner.

“Because if it is the practical aspect of the model then it is not as simple as it sounds. Like we facilitate, we respect and then we make sure there is enough dialogue. So I think on the theoretic, just talking and discussing... yes it is simple - it is simply facilitation in a respectful space and make sure that there is enough dialogue and then that equals to effective communication... but on the practical aspect where you really have to implement it... for the learning to take place, I really need to implement this.”

“...is quite a practical model and it goes back to what x was saying, you realise the difficulty of the model when you now have to balance it with finishing of your curriculum and all those other challenges that you are going to get.”
“The two monologues happening parallel to each other and the process of constructive communication between the teachers and the learners has been not just an effective process but an eye opener to create the environment which is conducive for learning.”

“…so I try as much as possible to make our conversations as constructive as possible, especially in cases where I see that we are differing or where there is an unwilling kind of atmosphere…”

Sun and Sheck (2012:1) suggest that classroom behaviour such as talking out of turn, disrespecting teachers’ teaching, and behaviours that disturb teaching and learning, also violate student values. It is critical that teachers are authentic in modelling the behaviours they expect from learners by being constructive during their interactions and in effect demonstrating to learners how to act during challenging interactions.

e) Clarify with learners the understanding of messages sent

The model reminds participants to make sure that learners understand the messages sent during communication in an accurate and supportive way.

“I would say different kinds of... or different aspect of respect... respect may come in different ways and you might not be aware... but there are different ways of respect amongst different cultures.”

“That is the central point to the model for me. Yes. and, that is how the model worked for me... was to clarify that to, to show me very clearly that... all these different feelings and reactions that I had, actually all boils down to that central point... and that actually gives you something to work towards, next year.”

“Absolutely... it is my intention that in every lesson that you create a conducive space, implying that everyone is free, everyone feels that they can be honest about their understanding of whatever concept
Wells, Jones and Jones (2014:183) assert that the teacher can facilitate an alternative to student resistance by constructive interaction where new perspectives are invited and not imposed and the learner is seen as a valuable resource in creating solutions. One of the challenges might actually be for teachers to regulate their own behaviours so it facilitates respectful dialogue and the model can support teachers to do this via being a frame of reference for reflection on teacher and learner interaction.

f) Speak to disruptive learners separately from the class

One of the aspects of the experiences of disrespect that secondary school learners experience is to be addressed or reprimanded by a teacher in front of their peers (Prins, 2009). This aspect of addressing learners privately and not in front of their peers, also forms an important part of teachers’ experience in implementing this model. Participating teachers shared the following:

“I am here to facilitate learning so... ja.... how do I have a classroom environment that facilitates learning? ...the model is great but one needs to relay set the context a lot clearer I think... why are we trying to have this relationship with the student... well, so that we can maximize learning. That is what it’s about.”

“...you could have calmed down and asked the student to come into your space and have had a more dignified discussion with them as opposed to throwing a verbal wall between you and the students.”

“To some it means placing value on someone and to some it appears as a weakness to exploit. Some being aware of the importance of respect due to peer influence will continue to disrespect. However, if that individual is approached in a private/ closed place away from
peers, the model brings out the beauty of constructive communication.”

Tsouloupas, Carson and MacGregor (2014:230-231) assert that teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs are more resilient and persistent in their effort to overcome stressful events. They also explain that there is consensus among studies that dealing with learner misbehaviour is a fundamental skill that experienced teachers manage efficiently and less experienced teachers tend to struggle more with. The data suggests that participating teachers feel more equipped to deal with challenging interactions with secondary school learners based on the model.

5.4.3.2 Teachers become aware of their role as facilitators

Rogers (1951:389), under the heading ‘student-centred teaching’, explains that one cannot teach another person directly and learning can only be facilitated. He explains that questions should be asked like: What the purposes, of this student in this course, are? As well as: How his learning and growth can be facilitated? He posits that the true revolutionary nature of student centred teaching is revealed in questions like these. He claims that a course or an educational programme which has the facilitation of learning as its primary operational purpose would be very different from the type of education people are used to. He asserts that the educational system that is most effective in promoting significant learning is one in which the threat to the self of the learner is reduced to the minimum, and where a differentiated perception of the field of experience is facilitated. He continues to explain (Rogers, 1951:392) that when teachers accept students as they are and allow them to express their feelings and attitudes freely, without condemnation, and also plan their learning activities with their learners rather than for them, it would create a facilitative classroom atmosphere that is relatively free from emotional strains and tensions. He states that he is convinced that vastly different consequences would ensue in a student-centred classroom, than that which tends to be the case in a classroom where this is not the case. He explains that the creation of a conducive climate for self-directed learning by student is not the result of only one kind of practice. McCombs (In Reynolds & Miller, 2009:587-589) explains that the learner-centred perspective is a reflection in practice of the learner-centred
psychological principles in the programmes, practices and policies of people who support learning for all. She explains that being learner-centred is related to the beliefs, characteristics and dispositions of teachers and when teachers derive their practice from an understanding of learner-centred principles they: include the learners in the decisions about how and why they learn and how that learning is assessed; they value each learners’ unique perspectives; they respect and also accommodate individual differences in learner’s backgrounds, abilities, interests and experiences as well as, and importantly, they treat learners as co-creators and partners in teaching and learning. She also asserts that her experience and research has confirmed that learner-centredness is not a function of a particular instructional practice or particular programmes but rather a complex interaction of teacher qualities in combination with their instructional practices as they are perceived by learners. The data makes it clear that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue guides teachers to act more as facilitators of learning, rather than instructors and dispensers of knowledge.

“I have a tendency to take something out of someone’s hands if they struggle and I help too much so I’m certainly aware that I need to facilitate more and not help so much... but also not to the point where you become like a computer where there is no personal contact... maybe sometimes just a little nudge or a little push.”

Hrynchak and Batty (2012:797) describe that constructivist theory plays an essential role in team based learning or learning with others. In essence, constructivist learning combines aspects of private and public learning and Hrynchak and Batty (2012:797) suggest that in constructivist learning the teacher acts as a guide to facilitate the learning. The teaching therefore involves providing opportunities to express and expose inconsistencies between learners’ current understanding and new experiences and providing opportunities to develop new schemes of understanding. Also, the learning should be active and use relevant problems and group interaction while providing time and opportunity for reflection on new experiences. Hrynchak and Batty (2012:797) share that Albert Einstein held the view that: “I never teach my pupils. I only attempt to provide the conditions in which
they can learn”. The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue also caters for and develops co-construction of meaning that is the centre of a constructivist approach to teaching and learning.

a) Teachers are guided in their responsibility for classroom management and constructive communication

The model supports teachers in accepting responsibility for the process of constructive communication.

“I was more aware. You know I was so aware of it. And yes I am starting to be aware more and more... like when I am communicating with people, I know that I have this responsibility.”

“Constructive... yes, so in the facilitation space... because when you facilitate for me it's a two way process, you can't facilitate when there is no one to follow... to facilitate is probably more of a lead role in guiding the kids to something... so you also need your kids to be comfortable enough to follow in whichever direction you want them to go or... to guide them. So, a healthy relationship or that kind of respect between the students and you make facilitation a lot more, easier.”

“I think... facilitation also goes with maybe putting yourself in somebody’s shoes and I when I am understanding where they are coming from... what is it that makes them behave the way they are behaving and help them understand that, they can rise above whatever it is that is there. Not telling them to be somebody else, not preaching but helping them understand that, you are better than this... and maybe you say, let's go thru the process together... of helping you to become a better person.”

“I think... students are really selfish, because of where they are at... in life, they haven't learnt about... um, they are not at that emotional
level of... so you, as a teacher have to understand that... that you are going to be the one that gives, more of yourself to your learners... and to the relationship. And to be understanding...”

“...a teacher does create a certain kind of atmosphere... the teacher’s approach really creates an atmosphere...”

Hanna (2014:224-225) explains that learner disengagement and lack of motivation can often be ascribed to an attitude of contempt for school and their teachers. She believes that this attitude may be remedied by creating a safe classroom environment, where both teacher and learner can be honest with themselves and one another. She explains that teachers have the responsibility of creating a facilitative classroom atmosphere by creating a welcoming classroom environment where there is reciprocal respect and trust which also builds healthy relationships.

b) Allow valuable interaction between teachers and learners

The model supports teachers in their understanding of the importance of valuable interactions between teachers and learners as well as between learners themselves.

“...there comes a time when you just think these kids must know this, but there is no room for facilitation and there is no room for those discussions that are insightful, but what I have learnt is that those things are very, very important because they also help in the learning that is taking place in the classroom.”

“I had a picture of the learners here at this school, and I had my own picture about certain learners, seeing them around the school. But going and having time to sit with them communicating with them, and listening to them... it started to change everything on how I thought about them. Learners here, keep to themselves to talk... but, if they are given the chance to talk, things that you'll hear... you will also not be happy about them.”
“...just a different way, a reminder of stepping back and just considering the way you communicate. Without being too aggressive and without being too forceful... and just to remind you, that you are in a relationship where you have more power, so you are more responsible I think.”

“The one thing I constantly try to improve on is to involve students more, and to try to step back and facilitate rather than to step in and take over.”

Yung, Zhu, Wong, Cheng and Lo (2013:2451-2452) conclude that favourable interaction with students is a characteristic feature of exemplary teachers. Mehta and Fine (2012:33-34) assert that schooling is often conceived as a means to an end and that the real work only begins at a date sometime in the future. They claim that this is a limiting idea and that it is motivationally and developmentally more appealing to engage learners in complex learning tasks that call on their abilities to analyse, synthesise and create, and when students are treated as active meaning makers with the capacity to do interesting and valuable work now. They explain that to teach with this view in mind requires teachers to not only think in a particular discipline but also to think about a discipline – to think about how knowledge in a field is created and discovered and invite students to do that kind of work. This approach is rooted in a profound respect for who students are and also for what they can do.

c) Create space for feedback from learners

The model also helped participants to be open to feedback from learners and to respect their voice in the interaction.

“So... I sat down and I thought about it. And as I was thinking, this model was coming to me, especially the respect part of it and the kind of dialogue I will engage in with the learner.”

“Especially the respect part... as teachers sometimes we are in positions where we sometimes forget to apply that respect... part
when we deal with students, so ja it really came to me and every time I am very cautious when I am dealing with a student that is getting of the way, and I try and talk to them in a very respectable manner."

Zepke, Leach and Butler (2014:387,395) explain that high quality feedback to learners is one of the most effective issues teachers can address to improve learning and also that getting feedback from learners is an important aspect that can significantly impact teacher development and effective teaching.

d) Become conscious of the two-way process of dialogue and shift from talking to listening as well

Siegle, Rubenstein and Mitchell (2014:35, 41-45) describe that effective teaching is related to positive social relationships which include aspects such as teachers demonstrating care for learners. They explain that one of the effective teaching methods a teacher can use to give students responsibility for their learning is through classroom discussion that includes a level of Socratic dialogue. The model made participants aware of the importance of two way communication during their interactions with learners.

“I mean during the facilitative space at least you can express what you feel, and let the learner speak and then therefore you try to reach that common ground, as to – ok I am sorry mam, and I did this and I promise I would not do this, and then at least now everything is starting to take shape now all of a sudden there is constructive communication…”

“I might be a facilitator within the class but the facilitator who act as a role model to them, those learners. So the learners also need to be given a chance to express their view…”

“…so that is a sense of respect that you are not saying no, to them we know that you have never done this before or we know that you are always a trouble maker but, we are ready to listen to you thru
group work thru assessment, giving them ownership to work on their own and not interfering as a teacher but always trying to be... as a message sender, always try to be a message receiver.”

- Allow space for sharing and conversations

The model supports teacher understanding that it is crucial to allow space for sharing and discussion so learners can understand and interpret information during the learning process.

“Yes, there is no learning and teaching without communication... that specific kind of communication where you send information which is received...”

Porath (2014:627,633) claims that sometimes during the active process of conferring between a teacher and a learner it becomes a one-sided monologue. She advises that it is the teacher’s primary purpose to listen actively to what students can teach you about the way they think and make meaning. She explains that it is important for the teacher to be aware of their own experiences and how this might intrude on their ability to focus on the experience of the child. She advises that teachers should work towards achieving a shared understanding through authentic questioning of the student that can guide instruction to what the child needs. The model supports development of such a sharing space during conversations.

- Ensure that the messages sent, has been understood

It is also important to ensure that the message that was sent has been received and understood accurately.

“...because when you have that kind of communication where you send information and it is not received, you are doing the teaching but there is no one doing the learning... because they are not receiving the information you have sent to them. So for them to be
Mazer, McKenna-Buchanan, Quinlan and Titsworth (2014:1) suggest that when teachers lack immediacy and are unclear or demonstrate poor communication competence, like poor listening skills or lack in ability to effectively decode aspects of the communication situation, learners tend to report heightened negative emotional reactions. They assert that the communication abilities of the teacher impact the affective climate in the classroom. Harfitt (2014:226) explains that teachers might be apprehensive about receiving feedback from learners about teaching but that through the experience of hearing the learners’ voice they come to see and understand more about the learners’ perceptions about learning.

5.4.3.3 Respect for learners as human beings

Tomlinson (2011:94) claims that one of the most important, and perhaps the most powerful attributes a teacher can develop and grow in over the course of their career, is respect for students. Tomlinson explains that respecting students means regarding them with special attention, honouring them, showing consideration towards them, being concerned about them, appreciating them, relating to them, admiring their strengths and caring for them. She states that while young people are dignified and strengthened by adult respect, the absence of it is corrosive or as described in this research, inhibiting and even destructive. Lawrence-Lightfoot (2012:447) confirms that she believes respect is the most powerful ingredient in creating authentic relationships, nourishing good and productive school cultures and in building overall healthy communities. The data collected in this case study suggests that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue, as defined and operationalised in this study, worked for participating teachers and did facilitate respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in this particular secondary school. A participant shared: “I seem to be raising the word respect more in my class”.

“able to learn they need to understand - receive and understand and interpret and analyse that information that you have sent to them.”
a) Pay attention to the learners as fellow human beings

It is clear that the model supported teachers to pay attention to learners as fellow human beings in the process of being and becoming. The most basic challenge related to this model relates to teachers’ philosophy and beliefs about people and relationships.

“A lot, a lot, one day after the workshop I was talking... thinking about students. Students are human beings, as well but not only that we only have to respect human beings but I think every living creature needs to be respected, so I was thinking if we do some things, I don’t know how, in a negative way... and then we want to teach respect, and then we don’t show it because, maybe we are adults then... I have a problem with that.”

“...you need to be conscious of the fact that you are dealing with another human being who wants to be respected...”

Karnieli-Miller, Taylor, Cottingham, Inui, Vu and Frankel (2010:1309) contend that learners perceive respect as a way of being that applies in all settings and with all participants to the interactions and under all circumstances. They explain that respect seems to entail responding to a need and disrespect seems to involve ignoring the need or even bluntly violating it. Hawk and Lyons (2008:200) describe that it is the actions and the failure to act of the teacher that leads learners to believe that respect and care is missing. They claim that pedagogical caring contains significant elements of an ethic of care and that from the viewpoint of caring, the teacher will focus on the development of the learner as a caring human being as well as a performer, one who needs to attain and demonstrate competence in certain skills and knowledge or attitudes. They assert that the teacher clearly has to model and exemplify caring behaviour and that this pedagogical caring necessarily involves respect for one’s self and for the one cared for. They suggest that this kind of respect amounts to respect for the integrity of both parties in this caring relationship and also for the dignity and constructive developmental process of both parties.
Pedagogical respect is the common descriptor within the learning and teaching context.

b) In the safe space of respect and authenticity, learners start to build trust

Blanchard, Olmstead and Lawrence (2013:55-71) explain that one can inspire trust in others when you are able, believable, connected to others and dependable. They state that across cultures telling the truth has been the hallmark of trustworthy behaviours. They also claim that honesty includes forthrightness and this behaviour shows others that one is willing to risk repercussions should it be required, which makes a person someone others can believe in. They advise that actions should match words, which makes one congruent and authentic. Last but not least, a person should extend respect to others without prejudice or reservation. This will give others confidence that this person is fair and therefore also trustworthy. The following experience of participants, points towards the importance of building trust by being respectful.

“And if you establish a sense of trust, then that is the twin brother to respect. There will be a mutual respect between the learner and the teacher, and if you establish that kind of environment, which is a conducive environment, then you can initiate the conversation or communication between yourself and the learner.”

“But if you have a clear set of guidelines... such as – let’s be authentic, let’s be real and let’s be honest with each other and I trust you and you trust me, if we can reach that common ground... then we can have constructive communication.”

“...the teacher has to show respect to the learner. As the teacher shows respect to the learner you expect the same from them. And, you have to know the culture because sometimes it can be difficult if you make some assumption about the learner... this is what I think the learner is... all about, but you don’t know the state of the learner...
culture or you don’t have the background of that. So, as a teacher if you can try to put yourself in the shoes of this learner... so that you can be able to understand what is going on in the household of that learner. Then also it will be easy for you to have a relationship with the learner where you gain trust of the learner and the learner will gain trust from you.”

“Yes, and that is a big part of building that relationship, if they see that they can trust me, it’s a good building block to start on to build a good relationship.”

This fundamental truth about the becoming of an “I” via the being with and sharing with a “Thou”, is also explained by Kruger (1988:81); that the world is a world which is shared with others of whom one have originary knowledge of being in the world with, in the same way. He explains that for humans being in the world means being in relation with others, right from the start. According to Kruger, the mother’s face is the first to invite the child into the world and from this primary I-Thou relation flows potential for other such relations. Hendrix and Hunt (1997:199) describe that from the very first moment the new born baby is discernible as a distinct self that is able to interact with caretakers, and she shapes them as much as she is shaped by them. Kruger (1988:81) asserts that a person can move towards people, move away from people, or move against people, and one’s existence can be tuned predominantly in terms of love, anxiety or hate. Von Eckartsberg (in Giorgi, Fischer and Von Eckartsberg, 1973:357) suggests that it is one of the most basic characteristics of social relationships that people become involved with one another and in the process loose some of the autonomy they presume to have in a solitary situation. He explains that others can say yes or no and as soon as a person enters an interpersonal situation become mutually involved and determined in that interaction. Gunter (1965:25) also states that in the world of people there is more than one intentionality. The “I” meets the “Thou” and there is more than one point of view in this relation. There is no monologue in this encounter but a dialogue in which both must answer and take part in, and in this taking part in the conversation, intentionality, decision and freedom is actualised.
Covey (2011:36-38) claims that people too often relate to each other as objects and not as people. He asserts that people turn toward one another and "seek each other out". He asserts that if you treat a person as an "It", as an object to be used for own purposes, you also become an "It". The nature of the relationship between an "I" and an "It" is not the same as the relationship that exists between "I-Thou". Magano, Mostert and Van der Westhuizen (2010:3-11) convey that a conversation is a creation and not a repetition. Each new conversation constitutes something new and conversations create knowledge and if it is only an exchange of what is already known, the interaction won't be experienced as a conversation. The word ‘conversation’ comes from the Latin ‘conversatio’ which literally means that people ‘turn to each other’ and a good conversation shows a character of meeting each other and ultimately meeting oneself. Wheatley (2002:28) asserts that as people share different human experiences they will rediscover a sense of unity. According to Magano, Mostert and Van der Westhuizen (2010:3), in Setswana being in conversation is expressed as go buisana. In Setswana the word for, I or me is ‘ke’, the word for you is ‘O’ and the collective noun for me and you together is ‘Go’. In Sesotho the word for conversation is qoqisana; in isiZulu it is ukuKhulumisana or ukuXoxisana; and in Sepedi it is go bolediSana. They explain that all these words use the suffix - ana, to denote the meaning that conversation takes place in a setting of turn taking, listening and sharing of ideas. In Afrikaans the expression is – “n gesprek aanknoop”, literally to “tie a conversation together”. It is in conversation that people discover what they do and don’t know, and develop new ideas.

In his dialogues, the Greek philosopher Socrates used his dialogues to facilitate the learners' progress from would-be knowing to not knowing; and from not knowing to true knowledge. A true dialogical conversation makes the participants curious and challenges them to move to a higher level and Magano, Mostert and Van der Westhuizen (2010:11) describe that for them pedagogy of conversation is an important strategy for teachers to build the capacity of learners to participate in the development of democracy. Hutchins (1952:1) writes in book one of the Encyclopaedia Britannica series - called “The Great Conversation” - under the sub heading “The substance of a Liberal Education” that: “The goal towards which Western society moves is the Civilisation of the Dialogue...Nothing is to remain un-discussed. Everybody is to speak his mind” and later in the text, Hutchins (1952:58)
explains that a civilisation in which all men are compelled to agree is not one worth living in and that the only civilisation in which a free man would be willing to live is one that can conceive of history as one long conversation leading to clarification and understanding. I might add that this conversation would be impossible without the critical ingredient humans call – *respect*. Respect for the basic dignity of learners as fellow human beings is a basic belief that teachers must have, irrespective of the reciprocity between giving and receiving respect. It constitutes a basic belief in the dignity of others as part of the human race.

Solomon and Higgins (2010:213) explain a philosophy where relations with others are essentially conflicts because a person’s concept of self is strictly individual and others essentially become external obstacles or instrument to the realisation of this self. This view is highly problematic for relationships because each person will try to force the other to agree with their conception of themselves, which in turn will probably lead to an endless power struggle. They also present an alternative view which they call the “we” view, that there is pre-existing bonds between individuals. According to this view, from the moment people are born they establish bonds with others. Summers (2011:31) suggests that infants are preadapted for relating and that the infant and mother almost immediately set up a pattern of interaction in which each expects certain behaviour from the other and each will react negatively if this “conversation” is derailed. He states that for some theorists the formation of relationships is the most fundamental human motivation. Meyer, Moore and Viljoen (1994:157) claim that in Erikson’s theory of development, human development consists of continued unfolding of individual potentialities but also, that this natural unfolding happens based on the details of the challenges and possibilities the social environment hold for the child. The success of this developmental process gets influenced by the nature and the quality of the individuals’ interpersonal relationships. They (Meyer, Moore & Viljoen, 1994:161) explain that each developmental stage gets influenced by the new needs, possibilities and challenges emerging from each new phase, and that the developing person responds to these challenges by developing a particular ego-strength. It is telling and informative then that the first ego-strength, which underlies all the others that will develop according to Erikson’s developmental theory, is the development of basic-trust as opposed to basic-mistrust. In the first year children learn to approach their world with basic trust or alternatively with basic
mistrust and although the children then get confronted by new developmental crisis in consecutive years, on a less visible level they are also busy re-working the crisis of earlier developmental stages. Corsini (2002:96-97) explains that the acquisition of basic trust or hope is considered essential for the development of self-esteem and normal relatedness. Self-esteem then, is influenced by, and in turn influences others. Creating a society, or on a smaller scale, a school community where there is basic trust (hope), as experienced between learners and teachers in their “proximal process” (Bronfenbrenner, 2005:6) or relationships with each other, becomes of the utmost importance for the facilitation of healthy growth, development and self-actualisation. The model, as described in this thesis, makes a substantial contribution to the development of such basic trust between teacher and learner via the impact on constructive communication, defined in this model as the facilitation of respectful dialogue. In the words of one of the participating teachers:

“The sense of humanity and mutual respect escalate to trust which I believe the security of the learner relies on.”

5.4.4 The model reminds teachers of the continual process of constructive communication, which needs time and reinforcement

During the research and data collection process it became clear to participants that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue is not a quick fix or a silver bullet that will “solve” the challenges of teacher and learner communication interactions in the secondary school. A model is “an abstract representation of a process, a description of its structure or function. Models are useful, because they help us understand how a process works” (Trenholm, 2011:22). This model has helped participating teachers to consider the importance of constructive communication, how it works, as well as its structure and its function in the overall process of the education of learners. Based on the data collected, in this final section I consider the continual process of constructive communication, which needs time and reinforcement.
“It made me aware and it opened my mind to that aspect and I am looking forward to next year and my teaching experience going to be totally different.”

“I feel that come next year then definitely I would want to implement it into the classroom and then just see how it goes.”

This experience shared by participants indicates the intention of participants to implement the model in their teaching. It illustrated that respectful dialogue is not attained as a one-time outcome, but has to be facilitated as a continuous process.

5.4.4.1 A continual process of constructive communication

The following data illustrate the continual nature of the process of constructive communication.

a) Plan ahead to incorporate the principles of the model in future lessons

The following participant experiences demonstrate how the model reminds the participating teachers to plan ahead for their communication interactions with learners.

“All our workshop ideas, I am going to implement, start my year more energetic and try to find out what my kids like or don’t like, where they come from and how they lead their lives. Maybe my tutees meet their parents and try to understand and have conversation with them, the kids and find out maybe from the previous year’s teachers how they were doing and I am willing to invest and try to understand.”

“In the middle one you get a little bit of the life world shared but in the top one you get the big life world, shared and that was descriptive to me in, implying what I am aiming for. So, it took me a while but then after I figured it out, for myself it became quite clear.”
“Being more prepared; planning ahead and thinking ahead about future lessons; Marking exam papers also makes you think about how information was conveyed during the term and how to convey it in future lessons for better understanding.”

b) Teachers understand that constructive communication is a growing process that takes time

The following participant experiences illustrate how the model reminds participating teachers of how constructive communication grows over a long term and takes patience and persistence.

“And also it comes with the maturity of the student, as I said this is something that is going to happen over time.”

“So, for me to be able to achieve one two three... as I have already achieved one two three... I need to give myself time.”

“Because I believe a continuous process makes things to be more effective.”

“Yes it is applicable and maybe one part of it that we need to maybe bear in mind is that, we should not expect immediate results, we should know that sometimes it can be long term... results, maybe you start using it in gr. 7 and you start seeing a change in gr. 9 it won’t be suddenly... like that.”

“So I should lay the foundation, as a lay the foundation... we expect to go according to that foundation so, already I am working on preparing for next year... with the same model that I have been using... because it was late but it started working for me. It works fantastic.”
“This process takes time, all and all I feel good about this year, but will deliberately follow the model and adjust my lesson planning to include mere “share” time next year.”

“I will get better with time. The model itself is brilliant.”

Bathurst (2004:8) explains that trust and respect are allied ideas not qualities that develop in a short space of time, and that as people engage in dialogue over a period of time a deeper kind of trust develops that is authentic and creative.

c) The visual presentation of the model helps to guide teachers in challenging situations

The visual representation of the model guides teachers during challenging communicative interactions in the classroom and supports their planning for more constructive communication with learners.

“I try to visualise the model and keep it in mind as I teach.”

“Because the next experience or the next solution or, the next experiment is going to lead to another answer or another question... and then again you need to facilitate some more... so there will always be this continuum of... growth...”

“I would say, thinking to next year and what I want to implement in my class, I would say it is to be assertive or, more assertive... and, to incorporate the model as part of my planning...”

“I find that after writing the reflections after the workshop it was quite helpful that I have been in the workshop because I could quite easily tap back into the information that we discussed and then try and relate to the classroom situation and, of course I had a copy of the model up there so I could easily look at that model and think about it and, ok because sometimes you realise that you are only thinking...”
about... respect for example, but did you make an effort to move into the learners’ space during that conversation to try and put yourself into their shoes to understand what they were saying? You will realise that sometimes you fall short there, so it helped me to realise where I was falling short, as I was referring to it and trying to apply the model but, it wasn’t easy.”

d) While some learners seem to be unapproachable, the model serves the majority of learners

Participants shared that, although they believed that the facilitation of respectful dialogue generally had a positive impact on their communication interactions with learners, there are some learners that they feel it was difficult to make a positive impact on.

“...saying... that it varies from one individual to another, others will change immediately and others won’t change...”

“...with some students it does feel like I am having that parallel-monologue, and we don’t seem to share or communicate umm... within a shared space. It’s more like, I am telling you and presenting something and they might be communicating back but... we are not really connecting.”

“And you talk about it, maybe for a week and instil it in them, and every day you keep on reminding them... isn’t it what we said what we will do? What did we say about dialogue with each other? What did we say about respect? And you keep on instilling it in them.”

“I have attempted to use this approach several times now. On the overall it has worked well. Most students when approached in a respectful way respond positively. I have struggled however in finding or developing a shared space. It is a process that takes time and will depend greatly on the individual.”
5.4.4.2 The model require continuous reinforcement of its guidelines

Participants shared that although the model feels natural and a lot of the concepts and principles were being used in their classrooms, they enjoyed interacting with their colleagues and would like to talk and interact more.

a) Teachers need to share and discuss the model with colleagues

In the following participant experiences it became clear that participants wanted to stay engaged with the process and wanted more opportunities to share ideas and experiences.

“Yes so all and all I would say it is a good thing to reflect, a good thing to analyse every now and again, and I think it certainly would be great to have this conversation again in six months time. Or three months time or whatever and just to reflect…”

“If I think that colleagues are not performing or…not doing what they are supposed to do… so need to step back and stop being… get of my high horse and actually start having more empathy and thinking about… that though.”

“I don’t know how often other people get together but it’s teachers as a group... it’s teachers... just as teacher just to get together and share... that is so important.”

“Umm… It’s been feeling slightly like a confessional… and I actually think that is what was nice about it... just like, talking and thinking about these things again, and I don’t do that often enough so, it’s nice to just have a space where you can express your ideas... yea. So... I think we have got to do more of that.”
“For me yes... I don't recall any negative stuff... I don't think there was and most of the contributions that came was positive and the experience the contact amongst the colleagues was excellent.

b) A need for more opportunities to share - a “Shared Us” and a respectful dialogue among teachers

The data suggests that participants enjoyed this opportunity to share thinking and experienced the facilitation of respectful dialogue in the workshop as making a positive contribution to their professional and personal development. There might be a need to create more opportunities where teachers can share in a deliberate effort to create constructive communication around their profession. The operationalising of the model created a “Community of Inquiry” around its implementation (Golding, 2011:474).

“There is because... as colleagues we set one goal... we are here for one thing and for us to be able to work together, to be a solid team that is achieving wonders, obviously through that there has to be a lot of communication... we cannot do anything without communicating, we have to communicate things... we have to fight about things, because obviously we won’t agree on everything so we have to fight and in our fights we communicate and we have to look at how we are communicating so yes, the model works.”

McCollum (2006:11) suggests that in dialogue practitioners do not seek to eliminate conflict. There is no talk of resolving differences or building consensus. The aim of dialogue is cultivating understanding and more respectful ways of relating between people who disagree.

5.4.4.3 Share it! – Value of the model in the classroom and beyond

One of the important aspects that were clarified during the research is that the model as described was found to be very transferable by almost everyone that was exposed to it. My own sense of it is that as long as there is good will to reach a
positive outcome, exposure to the model can make a substantial contribution to any situation that relies on constructive interpersonal communication.

“"Yes, we all need it…”"

a) A model for couples

The data suggest that the model could be used to counsel couples.

“This model can be used in promoting constructive communication between couples.”

b) A model for parents and families

The data also suggests that the model could play a significant role in relationships amongst family members.

“I see it also as a form of character development; if you remember that time I said that I think you should share this also with married partners…”

“Whether it is very intimate… like in a marriage or, just with your own children it can actually apply to any... if I think for instance, of my own daughter, it is really important for me to share her life world…”

“Yes, definitely in a marriage… well, all relationships actually…”

c) Of use in the wider school community and beyond

The data suggests that the model could have wider applications within the school community.

“…you should share it actually with the rest of the school and we should exercise it, it can also be effective communication within the...
school amongst colleagues and amongst learners or just in a department.”

d) Model is transferable to teachers and learners in other schools and contexts

The data suggests that the model would be transferable to other similar contexts.

“I would actually say teachers need exposure to this... as well as students, I would say students as well... umm I don't see why we would hide this kind of information it is something that people can take with them forever. Wherever they are it doesn’t only end within a school context it can be a guideline in your communication with other people in different contexts.”

“Ja... in different setups, where it is not only teachers but both students and teachers... or it could even be between parents and children and I would really love to see that. And I would really love to see how it changes their perspective.”

“I think it plays a role in any relationship be it a classroom relationship or be it at home or maybe in a corporate environment it’s the same thing, because at home you have to have respectful dialogue maybe it’s not that huge on facilitation but most of the things, especially the top part I think it works everywhere...”

“...I think it’s for everyone.”

5.5 A FINAL PIECE OF THE DATA PUZZLE

The following paragraphs (5.5.1 to 5.5.3) were written by participants after a period of four and a half months after the workshop. I first provided participants with a copy of the transcript of all the data they had provided and asked them to check it to see if it represented their views authentically. All participants agreed with the authenticity
of the data. I also shared the themes and categories generated based on the data and participants agreed that it is an authentic representation of their experiences. For the final check I adapted the operationalised research question slightly to: **How has the model worked for you, in this term?**

Here are some key participant responses to the question after four and a half months have passed since the workshop. This question was sent out to participants to respond to before the final focus group conversation and it is telling that the majority of participant responses fitted neatly into the identified themes and main categories without participants being aware of these categories identified by the independent coder and researcher.

5.5.1 **The reflective process of the model raises teachers’ awareness from “I” to “us”**

“For me this helped me with consciousness, I’m more conscious than before. *It helped me think before I do, I listen first.*”

“The model has been effectively working for me as it comes to class room management and also teacher presentation preparation. It is clear that it is encouraging the interactive classroom environment as my learners may call it. The effectiveness of it engages the learner with the lesson with the teacher being the centre to oversee and guide. It has made my teaching to be learner centred where learners are not only relaying on the information from the teacher but peer trust and honesty is developed. **On the whole, what I have noticed is to be the only person who talks every time creates a non-constructive communication. The lesson is being broken down in pieces to accommodate the learner’s engagement from us-time, we-time to I-time and group.”**

5.5.2 **The model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respect**

“The model has again worked very well for me this term. **In times when I have had challenges with students I have remembered to respect them and give them space**
to voice out their opinions. However, I have remembered to address them in private space and try and understand the background of their behaviour. This has quickly uprooted the issue of disrespect as I also explained to the student how their disrespect impacts negatively on my lesson and on fellow mates. I found it useful also with one case of a student who constantly argued in class, in an attempt to respect their opinion I often gave them time to speak in class but this ate away my time in class. I then called the student to explain to them the importance of using class time wisely and since then I have seen a significant change in their behaviour. Communication is key in teaching and learning and if done in a respectful way it will yield good results.”

“Communication is a tool that impacts how I carry forth my message, verbally and non-verbally. In both ways, I tend to be guided by my values of mainly empathy and respect. The former, I take it seriously because of differences we have as humans, such as experiences, culture, language etc. These have potential to lead to misunderstanding, if another person feels respected, they are likely to listen to you and respect what you are saying despite whether they agree or disagree with you. Somehow, the values are intertwined and serve as a guide to how I communicate.”

“The year started with setting ground rules to create a respectful and conducive learning space in all my classes. The main emphasis was put on respect of self and everyone else in the classroom. It was less challenging to create a respectful space in upper grades and a bit challenging to create a respectful space with grade 7s. The grade 7s are always looking out for a correct response and can tease someone for giving a response they think is not correct. This has impacted negatively on some students as they become less willing to participate in class discussions because they do not trust their peers. I think the respectful space will eventually be achieved in a class with time as the students start to trust and respect each other. In general the model is working as it puts emphasis on a number of aspects that I have already been using in my classroom.”
5.5.3 The model reminds teachers of the continual process of constructive communication, which needs time and reinforcement

“The model has worked for me very well. Although I mentioned that I am more calm in my dealings with students, I have realised that I am also doing it in my dealings with other members of staff. I have encountered situations where the staff members in my Department do not follow the teaching plan as we agreed, I was so happy the way I approached the situation and managed to bring the teachers back on track without any qualms. I am now aware of my dealings in conflict resolutions as well as in the ways I help other teachers and students resolve theirs. Al in all, I do not follow the principles and give whatever step I take a name, but all I can say that theory is embedded in me and it just manifests as situations arise. However, I still insist that you take that theory beyond the classroom to marriage counsellors and personal development coaches!”

5.6 CONCLUSION

Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968:429-430) describe that the purpose to which a theory was formulated plays a central role in the determination of its evaluation. I have argued that in essence their argument is one in favour of a “goodness of fit” between form and function. Does the theory do what it was intended to do with regard to the reality it is intended to describe and, or in some way influence?

The purpose of this model is the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. In essence it aims to facilitate constructive communication. Based on the data collected from participating teachers it is clear that the model facilitates respectful dialogue that creates opportunity for constructive communication supportive of healthy and educationally sound relationships between teachers and learners in a secondary school setting. Ultimately the aim of such educationally sound relationships is the support and facilitation of healthy self-actualisation of learners. In this chapter data was presented to support the conclusion that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school does work, and that it works by a reflective process of raising teachers’ awareness from “I” to “us”. The
model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respect. The model reminds teachers of the continual process of constructive communication, which needs time and reinforcement and I conclude that the model is fit for the purpose it was designed to attain.

In this chapter I described the implementation and evaluation of the model and the results of the case study. I also evaluated the model according to the evaluation criteria of Chinn and Kramer (2011). In the next, concluding chapter, I will describe final conclusions, recommendations and limitations of this study and discuss ways of building and developing the model further.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE
MODEL FOR THE FACILITATION OF RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND LEARNERS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

“Over the ages, conversations have been used for teaching. Even before going to school, children learnt from their parents and from one another through conversation. What we remember from school, are those things we picked up in conversations; the moments when we were in full interaction with others, the subject and ourselves” (Magano, Mostert & Van der Westhuizen, 2010:7).

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Thompson and Thompson (2008:10) explain that learning will not take place and practice will not develop if no connections are made between thinking and doing, if one is not able to understand what it is that you are doing and why you are doing it as a part of a broader and more holistic picture of your work. Donaldson, Csikszentmihalyi and Nakamura (2011:98) explain the view that the twin assumptions that children are all the same and also that children have to be forced to learn, is pedagogically catastrophic remnants of the 19th century model of mass schooling. They describe that there is overwhelming scientific evidence that the prevalence of these assumptions and associated practices run counter to human nature and predict long term failure, non-optimal functioning, poor learning and poor well-being in a system. Rogers argued that if the creation of an atmosphere of acceptance, understanding and respect is most effective for facilitating the learning which occurs in therapy, then it might also be a strong foundation for the learning that happens in education (Rogers, 1951:384). Rogers (1979:1-2) explains that learners have vast resources for self-actualisation and self-directed behaviour if a definable climate of facilitative psychological attitudes can be created in a space. I have recommended, and after completion of this research I continue to recommend, that teachers be facilitated to become more aware of the impact of their communication interactions with learners and learn to practice the skills and attitudes related to the facilitation of respectful dialogue with secondary school learners (Prins, 2009:122).
The process and principles of communication is arguably the most important tool that teachers and learners have to accomplish educational goals. Data suggests that communication in the secondary school classroom can be especially challenging and improved communication practices and experiences can lead to improved teaching and learning experiences and to a more constructive classroom environment supportive of healthy development and self-actualisation overall (Prins, 2009:88). According to Hattie (2009:118-134), in the teachers’ view it is often the learners who are not learning and who are somehow, deficient. Hattie explains that building relationships with learners implies agency, efficacy and respect by the teacher for what the child brings to the classroom and allowing the experience of the child to be recognised in the classroom is of critical importance. He describes developing relationships as requiring skills by the teacher. This relationship imperative implies skills and professional values, such as the skills of listening, empathy, caring and having positive regard for others.

Based on the data collected about participant experience of the model during implementation, I now assert that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue works very well to this purpose. The model facilitates and support teacher awareness and creative adaptation to the challenges posed by teacher and learner communication interaction in the secondary school. In chapter one of this research I asked – What can be done about the monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school? My supposition was that a model for constructive communication by the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners as described in this thesis, can make a contribution to minimizing the use and impact of what I have called the experience of a parallel-monologue during teacher and learner communication interactions. I will now describe conclusions, recommendations and limitations of this inquiry beginning with an overview of the research.

6.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

This research rests on phenomenological principles and methods (Giorgi, 2002) and is strongly associated with Naturalistic Inquiry (Patton, 2002:39-45; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This research was completed in two phases. In the first phase I defined and
described the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. In the second phase I operationalised the model by implementing it as a frame of reference in a teacher's workshop on constructive communication. The process of implementing the model by the researcher and the participants served as a single case study. Participating secondary school teachers were invited to take part in the workshop and subsequent data collection phases where they were given opportunities to share their experience of implementing the model with each other and the researcher.

6.2.1 The background and rational

The experience of mono-logical communication seems to represent an important dimension of the experience of disrespect during the communication between teachers and learners and also inhibits the development of a truly supportive and constructive educational relationship between teachers and learners. It is basically a refusal, by the teacher, to listen respectfully to the learners in their care and is characterised by a psychological atmosphere of disrespect, frustration and even aggression. The facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school is an essential element of healthy learner development and self-actualisation and the prevalence of an inhibiting, disrespectful parallel-monologue would be damaging to healthy development and self-actualisation.

6.2.2 The research question and goal

Against the preceding background and rationale the following research question was formulated and this question determines the focus of this thesis: What can be done to address the monologue between secondary school teachers and learners? The main purpose of this research was to describe, implement and evaluate a psycho-educational model to address mono-logical communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. In this research I have drawn conclusions about how secondary school teachers actualise constructive communication and enhance relationships with learners in their care. The focus of the research and theory generation is on how secondary school teachers can be facilitated to engage in constructive communication with secondary school learners.
The implementation of the Models for the facilitation of respectful dialogue is posited as a possible answer to the research question.

6.2.3 The research design and method

This qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research design made use of a single case study (Yin, 2009:46-47) to operationalise and implement the model. The workshop, based on the model as a frame of reference, and subsequent implementation of the model by participants, constituted the case to be studied. As stated, the aim and objectives of the inquiry were the development, implementation and evaluation of a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between secondary school teachers and learners. Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) model for trustworthiness in qualitative research was successfully implemented in this study as various forms of data were used during extensive data collection phases that resulted in data triangulation, thick descriptions and data saturation. The research design is iterative and data collection and analysis is qualitative and descriptive in nature. This research design succeeded in facilitating the development and implementation of the model and in making a contribution to theory and educational practice.

6.2.4 The development of theory and a model described: The first Phase

The research was carried out with the view to improving my own educational practice as well as educational practice in general via the process of theory generation and evaluation. Steps in theory generating research, as described by Chinn and Kramer (2008) as well as concepts describing the practice of theory generating as described by Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach (1968), was implemented to develop the model. I based my description of “A psycho-educational model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school” on logic of form and function. I described the psycho-educational model in chapters three and four and I also described the case study of its implementation in chapter five. In chapter three I identified, defined and classified the major concepts of the model. I used Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach’s (1968) survey list to classify concepts and a three stage process, of general to specific definitions, to define the
central concept. In chapter four the concepts in the model was placed in
relationships and I described the model as a conceptual framework for the psycho-
educational workshop.

6.2.5 The implementation and evaluation of the model: The second Phase

In chapter five I discussed the implementation of the model in the workshop and its
subsequent implementation by participating teachers. I also described the significant
themes in the data collected during the case study. In this concluding chapter I base
my discussion on the operationalisation and implementation of the model and I will
share conclusions and recommendations based on the case study data.

The model was implemented and evaluated in three stages and data from all three
stages made a contribution to the final conclusions. In the first stage of implementing
the model, a short briefing was held at a particular secondary school, inviting
secondary school teachers to take part in the research. Teachers from a particular
secondary school who are currently teaching grade eight to 12 learners, were invited
to participate in the workshop as well as the qualitative data collection process. In
the second stage of implementation 10 participants – five males and five females
representing a diverse spectrum of language, age, training and teaching experience
– attended a one day workshop with the title “A teacher’s workshop on constructive
communication” in order to facilitate respectful dialogue between teachers and
learners in a secondary school.

The workshop, which took seven hours and thirty minutes to complete, used the
model as a frame of reference and consisted of three parts directly related to the
central concept of the model. The three parts of the workshop were called: creating a
facilitative space; creating a respectful space and creating a dialogical space. Each
of the workshop parts consisted of five learning tasks (Gravett, 2005:52-53) that
facilitated conversation and clarification of the particular concepts focussed on, and
also how these concepts relate to the other aspects of the model. The tasks were all
based on open ended questions and aimed at creating opportunities for informal
experimentation and a reflective experience that could anchor the development of
understanding of the central concept – Facilitation of respectful dialogue. The
completion of the workshop constituted the second stage of the implementation and the workshop in itself is an implementation of the model by the researcher. In the third and final stage of implementation and evaluation of the model, the focus was on providing opportunities for participating teachers to reflect on their practice and experience of implementing the model via the various methods of qualitative data collection used in this case study. Participants where keen to implement the model and readily shared their experiences related to implementing the model with the researcher.

6.2.6 The collection and interpretation of data

Several forms of data collection were used throughout the process of operationalising the model. Workshop documentation and soundtrack transcription of the workshop, reflective journals, naïve sketches, individual phenomenological interviews, as well as two focus group conversations at two different points in the research, and participant checks of their own data, was used to create a thick description of participants’ experiences regarding the model. Participant checks of transcribed data indicated that all participants view the data as authentic and representative of their views and experiences and a final focus group reflection, four and a half months after the workshop, revealed that participants retained a strong awareness of the model and its implications. Throughout the research I developed conceptualised and clarified theory to illuminate the model for the facilitiation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The theory generated has taken the form of a psycho-educational model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue that was implemented in a particular secondary school in the research. Data was collected during the entire process of operationalising the model and the model was implemented and evaluated based on the data of participant experience collected throughout the process of operationalising and implementing the model.

6.2.7 The conclusions and recommendations

Chinn and Kramer’s (2008:219-220) organising framework for deliberately examining, describing and critically reflecting on emerging theoretical models or theory without imposing preconceived notions of meaning was implemented in this single case,
qualitative theory generating design. They define theory as: “A creative and rigorous structuring of ideas that project a tentative, purposeful, and systematic view of phenomena” (Chinn & Kramer, 2011:257). They propose that once theories are developed the questions “What is this?” and “How does it work?” should direct the further development of a particular theory or model. These questions directed my theorising about the model. In chapters three and four I have defined and described the model which constitute an answer to the question – What is this? as well as – What is this (model) for? In chapter five I described the operationalisation and implementation of the model in a workshop as a case study and I evaluated the model. This constitutes an answer to the second question - How does it work? After the operationalising and implementation of the model in the workshop and the qualitative data gathering and analysis, the model was evaluated using the evaluation criteria of Chinn and Kramer (2008:237-249) and it was determined that the model is simple, clear, general, accessible and important. The model is, applicable to its purpose – the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. This model could be replicated and generalised in future research. Conclusions, recommendations and limitations will now be discussed.

6.3 CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH

In the process of addressing the research question and purpose I created a workshop, called “A Teacher’s workshop on constructive communication”. The workshop provided clear guidelines and examples for the practice of the psycho-educational model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The implementation of the psycho-educational model, initiated by the workshop, was approached as a single case study of the implementation of the model as described in this research and the themes in the data that came to the fore about the model, as well as the description of the central concept of the model, will now be reviewed. In the case study and gathering of data, the research question was operationalised consistently, throughout all methods of data collection and protocols as: How is this model working for you?
6.3.1 Conclusions to Phase One: A model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue defined and described

The central concept of the model identified from my previous research is the facilitation of respectful dialogue. This concept can be defined as making the learning process easier by creating a space that permits communication with others. Creating a space, that makes it safe, to participate freely. Where there is talking together, sharing of personal experiences and self-directed learning in an experiential group. In the sharing there is genuineness, authenticity, realness and congruence. There is demonstrating of unconditional positive regard and an acceptant attitude, accepting students as they are. Demonstrating empathy by accurately sensing the feeling and personal meanings that are being experienced by them. Living the value that human beings have inherent worth and dignity by having relationships in which people experience a sense of dignity. Essentially it can be described as a conversation where there is open, equal, honest communication. It is a dialectical communication where there is simultaneously unity and difference and a collaborative interaction leading to co-creating outcomes out of which may emerge some new understanding. The following relationship statement within the main concept – facilitation of respectful dialogue – was identified and helped to describe how the model works. The relationships between the identified parts, which constitute the main concept are reciprocal. As the learner experience respect in the facilitation of the teacher, the communication between them becomes more respectful. As the communication between the teacher and the learner becomes respectful, it initiates a dialogue. The dialogue between teacher and learner reinforces respectful communication and enhances the facilitation, while respectful facilitation enhances the dialogue. This process leads to constructive outcomes during the communication. The more the learner experiences respect in the facilitation of the teacher, the more it enhances the dialogue during the communication and the more the teacher and learner communication interaction supports healthy self-actualisation and development. In order to obtain a constructive outcome to teacher and learner communication interaction, it is important for teachers to work towards the facilitation of respectful dialogue during communication interactions with learners. This model initiates the facilitation of respectful dialogue.
6.3.2 Conclusions to Phase two: A case study, instrumental in demonstrating how the model works

The second phase of this research was approached like a single qualitative instrumental case study and several forms of qualitative data collection methods were used to gather descriptions of ten participant's experience of operationalising and implementing the model. The following themes came to the foreground in the data and describe how the model worked for the participants to the research.

The implementation of the model was initiated by teachers participating in a one day workshop and the workshop also operationalised the model. The operationalising of the model constitutes a single instrumental case of implementing the model. The results of the case study indicate that this model works. The analysis of the qualitative data, collected using various methods of qualitative data collection during the process of implementation of the model, indicates that the model works by enhancing and supporting teacher awareness of the nature and effect of both their own communication interactions, as well as the communication interactions they observe between others.

The model works by initiating a reflective process that raises teachers’ awareness from “I” to “us”. The model raises teacher awareness of how their communication interactions impact on learner experience in the secondary school. This theme emerged as central and the data indicates that the reflective process of the model raises the self-awareness of teachers. The data also indicates that the model raises teacher awareness of learners’ unique and diverse life-worlds and that the participating teachers grow to be empathic with learners.

The model also guided teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respectful communication. Teachers become acutely aware of the role of respect in their interactions with others, and especially of the role of respect in the classroom. Teachers are more mindful of having an educational intention when interacting with learners. Also, as part of this mindfulness the model guides teachers to act as facilitators rather than instructors, which also respect the autonomy and intentionality of learners. Teachers are guided
in their understanding of respect for learners as autonomous human beings in need of support.

**The model reminded teachers of the continual process of the facilitation of respectful dialogue, which needs time and reinforcement.** Participating teachers realised that it takes a daily commitment to the principles of the model to keep their communication interactions on track towards a constructive outcome. The model serves as a reminder that the process of the *facilitation of respectful dialogue* takes time and reinforcement because of its nature of being a continual process that evolves and changes as it progresses. The guidelines of the model need continuous reinforcement, via shared collegial conversations. It was also brought to light by the data that participants were glad for the experiences they have had with the process of operationalising and implementing the model in their classrooms and they felt strongly that the model should be shared beyond the contexts of this case and this school. In this model respect plays a central and pivotal role. Facilitation cannot occur in the absence of an emotional climate of respect. Disrespect creates inhibition and stifles dialogue. Respectful dialogue, once instituted via respectful facilitation, enhances the facilitation process and opens up the conversation to co-constructive outcomes. **This model can be said to develop awareness of the importance of the facilitation of respectful dialogue.** Data indicates that a lack of awareness of these fundamental principles and their implementation during teacher and learner communication, might easily lead to communication interactions that can best be described as disrespectful, inhibiting parallel-monologues.

### 6.3.3 The central storyline in the data

Based on participating teachers’ experience of the implementation of the model, I conclude that the model works well. Based on the lived experiences of participants it became clear that the reflective process of the model raises teachers’ awareness from “I” to “US”. The model guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to teaching and learning by encouraging respectful communication. It reminds teachers of the continual process of facilitation of respectful dialogue, which needs time and reinforcement and has its particular challenges. It was also brought to light by the data that participants were glad for the experiences they had with the process of
implementing the model and they felt strongly that the model should be shared beyond the contexts of this case and this school.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Rule and Vaughn (2011:132-136) explain that when concluding a case study it is important to also reopen the case by asking a basic question such as “so what?” or, “what next?”. What are the implications of the study, and how does this case relate to similar cases? They assert that reopening a case at its conclusion can be valuable to inform theory, improve practice, critique and revise policy, and also generate further research. The model for facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in the secondary school worked very well for the purpose it was designed to achieve and I will now make some recommendations for educational practice, teacher training and research, as well as some recommendations for application of the model within the field of education and training. I also make recommendations for theory, practice and policy and locate and link the model to a framework of existing and recognised theory within the field of psychology and education.

6.4.1 Educational practice, teacher training and research

I will now make recommendations for the use of the model, specifically as it relates to the field of education training and educational development in general. The model also clearly speaks to the application and development of the use of knowledge from the field of Psychology of Education, in the practice of education.

6.4.1.1 A recommendation for educational practice

A fundamental recommendation I want to make based on my experience in this research is that it is of critical importance to promote the idea of educational praxis. Kemmis (2012:894) explains that educational praxis may be understood as educational actions that are morally-committed and informed by traditions in the field but also to consider it as 'history-making educational action'. Ada (2007:110) offers a slightly narrower and more specific definition when she explains that praxis can be
understood as human liberation as the result of praxis which is a process of reflection as preparation for action, followed by reflecting on the results of action, which leads to new insights and therefore to new action, in an on-going cycle of development and learning. According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2010:422), the development of critical awareness according to Paulo Freire, involves a process of conscientisation, or a process of becoming conscious, and this process is undertaken experientially through an on-going process termed ‘praxis’ which happens individually as well as collectively. The model constitutes “praxis”, a relationship between theory and practice (Blackwood, 1987:211-212; Cawthon & Dawson, 2011:2; Chinn & Kramer, 2011:7; Thompson & Thompson, 2008:20-21; Zimmerman, 2009:46). My recommendation is that this ‘praxis’ process is fundamental in education at all levels and for everyone involved in education. The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue makes a contribution to the ideas related to communication, relationships, community, growth and development, maturity, teaching and learning, as well as the creation of knowledge. The model, as described, creates reflection and awareness of teacher communication which is an important aspect of educational theory and practice. Implementing this model in other educational contexts will develop praxis in education and will support the opening of a reflective dialogue between the practitioners involved and their own practice.

6.4.1.2 A recommendation for teacher training

The model, its rationale, and concepts, are rooted in the field of education and more specifically in the Psychology of Education. Therefore, it has wide application within the field of education and training.

a) A model in use: Continued professional development for teachers

Petraglia (2009:177) explains that Dewey argued that education should be less artificial and abstract and should draw more from teacher and student experience. He argues that for education to serve the needs of both the learner and society, it must be based on experience – the experience of the people involved. He further explains that for Dewey the teachers role is one of help and support to put the learners’ real-world experiences into fruitful dialogue. As described in the previous
chapter this model is very much a “model in use” and a model that “feels natural” to the teachers who use it. As such, it has great potential to inform continued professional development for teachers. The model may be shared in a more “theoretical” discussion and teachers might try it independently of any other training efforts. As recommended by the participants to this research it might be shared, deliberated and discussed by teachers with each other in a more formalised learning opportunity. The re-conception of teachers as also learners, implies continuous learning from-practice while in-practice. The researcher (or any other practitioner) might also embark on a process of deliberately asking teachers, or a team of teachers, to operationalise the model by teaching it to learners and observing the impact in a “case study” type exercise – much like the design of this research.

b) Teacher training: Introducing new teachers to praxis

Leigh, Beatty and Szwed (2008:196) explain that action research processes have been proven as an effective method for developing professionals and include a wide range of approaches and methodologies. Essentially, what these various forms have in common is collaborative analysis to help understand underlying causes that assist participants in understanding change and effectiveness. Wright and Grenier (2009:255) assert that if teacher educators want to provide students with grounding concepts to develop their own pedagogy, teacher education programmes must link theoretical concepts, such as those related to effective teaching, with practical, ‘real world’ teaching settings. Jenlink (2001:1) explains that learning to practice teaching in substantially different ways than one has ever before experienced can occur neither through theoretical imaginings alone nor through unguided experience alone. I agree that it requires a tight coupling of the two.

The model for the facilitation of constructive communication represents such a generation of theory from practice, as a theory for practice, and sharing the process as well as the product of this research will make a contribution to the development of praxis of teachers new to the field of practice. McLean (1995:1-4) explains that for John Dewey the best source of improved knowledge on teaching is teachers themselves. Looking at the richness of the data provided by the participants to this research this statement definitely rings true. He explains that in action
research teachers take part in a process where they conceptualise a problem or challenge, gather and analyse the data, interpret the result and then use the results to improve practice. He suggests that it is not a programme or specific intervention but a continuous process of asking “Is there a better way?” and determining what works best. In essence, according to McLean (1995:2) it is a process that teachers follow of systematically evaluating the consequences of educational decisions and then adjusting their practice to maximize effectiveness. Essentially then, action research is a process teachers follow to examine their own practice in order to improve and develop their teaching. He explains that many of the results of action research are reported in the form of case studies.

I believe that to be true of this research. For me, the journey of identifying and working through a problem by theorising from the basis of existing literature, observation and experience, and then creating and implementing a model to guide my teaching practice, and also guide the practice of others, has been a rich experience filled with the benefits of deep and meaningful learning. Cabaroglu (2014:79, 88) reports that professional development of teachers via the process of action research impacts significantly on the self-efficacy of teachers. He explains that the view of teachers as reflective practitioners suggests that by doing research, participants to action research become active knowledge producers while in a continuing process of addressing problems encountered during experiences in the field. He describes that in an action research process teachers explore what they are doing, why they are doing it, and what the impact of their actions have been. He asserts that in this way a different kind of knowledge base is created, one where teachers don’t function as objects of study but become active architects of the learning process and generators of knowledge.

In this inquiry it is clear that a very similar process as the one described unfolded over time. The participant researcher, who also acted as facilitator of the workshop, developed and implemented the model based on own experience and prior research, looking to observe the experienced impact of the model. Participants to the research also implemented the model and were given opportunities to reflect and discuss their experience during implementation, which I believe empowered them to become architects of the implementation. Cabaroglu (2014:88) concludes that learning to
teach is a highly contextually situated and idiosyncratic process and that involvement in an action research process promotes reflective practice and the ability to deal with genuine problems flexibly and creatively in the classroom as they arise. He asserts that inquiry oriented practices help teacher candidates to move away from prescriptive stances and towards more collaborative inquiry. I believe it moves teachers, aspiring or experienced towards, what I want to call teaching to learn, and that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue makes a contribution to this process, supporting teachers to learn from their own actions by being able to reflect on their own communication interactions and the communication interactions of others based on the model as a frame of reference. The methodology implemented in this research is an effective research strategy but also an effective way of developing praxis for all teachers.

6.4.1.3 A recommendation for further research

Poggenpoel, Myburgh and Van der Linde (2006:408-412) claim that qualitative research strategies can be viewed as a prerequisite for quantitative research strategies given a classical scientific method (Myburgh & Strauss, 2014:48). Poggenpoel, Myburgh and Van der Linde (2006:408) explain that according to Fox (1996:492) the classic method of scientific research consist of five steps: observation of natural phenomena; drawing conclusions as to what is happening; using these conclusions to formulate hypotheses about causal relationships; testing the hypotheses over time and finally, to develop theories to explain why something is happening. They describe that the way research results enter the classroom often leaves teachers unconvinced and the data teachers really believe comes from their own practical experience in the field. They continue to explain that researchers may use both qualitative and quantitative strategies based on the nature of the problem they are investigating and the goals they want to attain. They believe that this is in line with a post-modern approach to research where researchers have to demonstrate logic and justification throughout the process of creating trustworthy knowledge and that the research is not driven by the preference of a particular research strategy. I believe that this study indeed followed a classical approach to research by making the assertion that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue will constructively impact the monologue between teachers and learners in
a secondary school. I then implemented this model via a workshop for teachers who then decided to implement the model and shared their experiences in turn. I recommend that the model be used in further research by repeating a similar study in a different context and/or with different participants, but also that the model can be quantified, generalised or replicated to develop and refine the model. This can be done following a qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods approach.

a) Further qualitative research – changing contexts and participant perspectives

The model has been developed by using a single case qualitative, exploratory descriptive, contextual and theory-generating research design. This single case design could be altered to focus on teacher, as well as learner perspectives within the same unit of analysis, and cases of implementation within the same age group or across various age groups could be defined and analysed. For example, constructive communication interaction between secondary school teachers and grade nine learners, grade ten learners or grade twelve learners. Data collected from these cohorts could be compared and recommendations could be made for implementation of the model in specific grades or secondary school learners of various age groups. The facilitation of respectful dialogue, as defined and described by this model could also be investigated in contexts other than the secondary school, where close interpersonal communication and contacts is important, such as in an adult education and training programme or a thirteenth or “gap-year” programme addressing the needs of young adults as they enter the first year after completion of grade twelve.

b) Quantifying and generalising or replicating the model

It is my belief that there is also the potential for developing instruments estimating and measuring facilitation of respectful dialogue, based on its description and definition in this research. The research can then be generalised by using a mixed methods design or even quasi-experimental research designs. A particular teacher in multiple comparative case studies focussing on a single teacher and the learners they interact with can be used. Various teachers and particular learners they interact
with could be approached as multiple cases or cohorts. I am convinced that this model can and should be developed and have potential for transferability – for example in contexts where constructive communication between communicating parties is essential for growth and development of the parties involved. Especially where there is an intention to educate or facilitate development, I believe that the model can be re-contextualised and can make a fundamental contribution. I have reason to believe that wherever and whenever there is a need for communication between two or more parties to be or become more constructive in their communication interactions, this model can make a meaningful contribution as a frame of reference for action. Possible re-contextualising of the model in other studies could be:

A model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between:

- **Learners in a secondary school.**
- **Teachers and parents** in a primary or secondary school.
- **Teachers and administrators** in a primary or secondary school.
- **Mentors and mentees.** A model for coaches and facilitators of adult learning
- **Couples** in intimate relationships.
- **Parents and children** in a family.
- **Members of a particular community** such as democratically elected leaders and service providers in a particular region or community.

6.4.1.4 Limitations

Of course re-contextualising and application of the model as suggested would warrant much more research and investigation of the transferability, applicability and potential for replication or generalisability of this model in these various contexts, but even keeping that in mind I believe the potential for application of the model is only limited by the notion of development and constructive communication itself. I assert that the limitation of the model and its implementation is connected to a broad educational intention. If the intention is not to educate but to dominate, intimidate or manipulate, the model and its principles do not hold. If the intention is to educate,
facilitate or otherwise constructively and authentically support the development of others, the model holds true.

6.4.2 Recommendations for application - theory, practice and policy

The model has potential for further application to develop and expand educational theory, educational practice, as well as guiding the development of policy.

6.4.2.1 Application of results to theory

By describing a model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a secondary school, theory about teacher and learner communication and interaction is developed. I believe that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue can make a substantial contribution to the development of understanding and interaction anywhere where there is an identified need for growth and development via interpersonal interactions. I believe that the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue does not exclude forms of adult learning. In fact I am convinced that it can be extended to add meaningfully to speak to all forms of adult learning and even forms of adult-to-adult psychotherapy. I believe that one of the strengths of the model is that it creates clear understanding without dictating methods and techniques, which makes it very flexible and acknowledges creativity and agency of whoever engages with it or because of it. I think an interesting avenue of thought to explore would be to look at on-line learning opportunities and how they can be altered and developed to cater for respectful dialogue. More applications of the model to existing theory and theory development will be discussed under the model’s contribution to knowledge.

6.4.2.2 Application of results to practice

By implementing this model in a workshop for teachers based on the model and by participating teachers implementing the model, the research makes a considerable contribution to practice in the participating school. The evaluation of the model also indicates that the model might be effective when implemented in other contexts. The model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue is a model for practice created from
practice. A model created by a teacher for teachers. Although there is still a lot of work to be done on how the model applies to various contexts and participants, I believe that the model could potentially apply to teacher and learner communication interaction across pre-school, primary and secondary school, as well as the further education and training phases of schooling. I believe it can add substantially as a frame of reference guiding the design of learning opportunities by asking, “does this learning opportunity provide for the facilitation of respectful dialogue as a central part of the process?” The model also has potential to help resolve conflict, which often occurs in the context of education training and development. In conflict in general, as in the secondary school classroom, it is often the case that one or both parties provoke and even escalate the conflict by a lack of respect, empathy, authenticity and/or dismissing the dignity and identity of the other in some way. It is often characterised by an egocentric, rigid clinging to own perspectives and denial of the unique life-world and/or self of the other. This hampers progress in the direction of a shared meaning and understanding that is important in all forms of collaborative action which is part and partial of all society. A constructive approach to communication, making use of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue as a frame of reference, can acknowledge the current existence of a parallel-monologue and work towards a respectful dialogue between conflicting parties and also enhance mindfulness, awareness, respect and ultimately a dialogue, which might lead to more constructive outcomes to the communication interaction.

6.4.2.3 Application of results to policy

By creating an original, unique and effective frame of reference for the facilitation of constructive communication interactions the model makes a considerable contribution to support the development of policy. Walton (2010:1) explains that because of the complex nature of the challenges citizens will have to face in this century, there exists a pressing need for educational approaches that will cultivate a more dynamic and systematic understanding of cross-cultural social experiences and civic participation. Because the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue as described is aimed at the facilitation of respectful dialogue, and democracy cannot exist without a genuine appreciation for often very different and even opposing points of views on issues that impact on the life and experience of citizens, the model is
transferable to the context of the development of policy in a democratic pluralistic society. Not only the development of education within a democracy, but more specifically also the education of learners for democracy will benefit from the application of a model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue leading to constructive communication. Specifically the model can guide policies around communication and consultation of stakeholders on issues such as land reform, economic development and provision of basic services. Leaders in all communities and all sectors of the economy will do well to take notice of this model of constructive communication. In terms of the development of educational policy the model can support policies focussed on developing parent, child and school communication interaction and relationships.

6.5 UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

After completion of this case study, based on the implementation and evaluation of the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teachers and learners in a particular secondary school, I am convinced that using this model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners as a frame of reference does work very well. The model and the three phases of operationalisation in the workshop – *Creation of a facilitative space; Creation of a respectful space* and ultimately; *Creation of a dialogical space* – as described in the previous chapters, do facilitate *constructive communication* outcomes between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The theory is fit for purpose (Wickman, 2012:1). Stains (2012:33-43) concludes that reflection before, during, and after dialogue supports participants to dialogue, to gain a wider and a deeper view of own experiences and a stronger sense of their own capacity to decide how they want to communicate. He explains that reflection enables participants to a dialogue to reflect and resist the dysfunctional communication that often occurs around a divisive issue. I argue that the model as described in this research clarifies and supports reflection by creating a frame of reference for such reflection. I agree with Stains and assert that with the reflective and mindful foundation of this model teachers may learn to listen and speak with more curiosity, respect and care. In this research I have described, implemented and evaluated a model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue and the results indicate that this model works by
doing exactly that. The model raises teacher awareness of awareness. The model works by raising teacher awareness of themselves in interaction with learners and guides teachers to permit a space that is conducive to learning by encouraging respect. Via exposure to the model teachers become acutely aware of the essential role of respect for learners as developing human beings. By considering this theoretical description it enables me to reflect about not only what the model for the facilitation of respectful dialogue is and how it works, but also, and most significantly, why? The model works because it creates a frame of reference that brings awareness, understanding and organisation to teacher experience of communication interaction with learners, enhancing the organismic self-regulation and creative adaptation of teachers. The model supports the competency of the teacher to create a constructive teacher-learner communication interaction that develops teacher’s creative adjustment and contact with learners in their care via the facilitation of respectful dialogue.

The contribution to theory this research makes, is in taking the fundamental principles of Gestalt and a Person centred approach and placing them together in a model under the central concept of the model – facilitation of respectful dialogue. The thesis describes both what the model is, as well as how it works. The contribution is theoretical, via the description and operationalisation of the model, but also makes a definitive contribution to teaching practice by implementing the model in a single qualitative case study and using the data to describe how the model works. The model constitutes “praxis”, a relationship between theory and practice. A relationship between knowing and doing, between doing what I know, and knowing what I do, that can, and in the case of this implementation of the model, definitely did, encourage development of awareness, and a mind-set as well as the development of a skill-set and especially attitudes and values related to the facilitation of respectful dialogue. The development of this knowledge, skill and attitude counters the experience of a de-humanising, and frustration and aggression provoking parallel-monologue between teachers and learners in a secondary school. The model brings awareness, facilitates creative adaptation, and develops a paradigm of constructive altruistic sharing, described as ‘botho’ or ‘sense of humanity’ by participants. It affirms the importance of the facilitation of respectful dialogue between teacher and learner, in opposition to an I-It relationship where the intentionality and freedom of either the
teacher, or the learner, dominates the interaction. It counters the experience of an inhibiting and disrespectful monologue. In my review of the literature, clear applications in the classroom of Person centred Gestalt and Humanistic Psychological principles and associated philosophies are rare. This study contributes a model that builds on these principles and philosophies and carries their application and implementation into the secondary school and the communication interactions that happens between teachers and learners. The model is a deliberate application of these principles from the field of the Psychology of Education to the context of the teacher and learner communication interaction in the secondary school.

6.6 CONCLUSION

My conclusion is that the model employs basic tenets of Gestalt psychology (Wedding & Corsini, 2014:300-302) as well as important aspects of the Person-Centred approach to Psychology (Rogers, 1979:1-2). The model brings together facilitation, which has become a distinctly educational concept; respectful, which has a general meaning but also has definite and deep roots in Person centred psychology, and dialogue which has an even longer history and significant meaning within Gestalt psychology. In this fusing of perspectives the model makes a unique and creative contribution to theory in education and psychology. In implementing the model and evaluating it based on a single instrumental case, the research makes a contribution to both teaching practice as well as the discipline of the psychology of education. It is also my belief that the model holds great promise for replication and transfer to related fields. The model works by raising teacher awareness of both own communication interactions and the communication interactions they observe between others. This self-awareness, created by implementing this model, is supportive of self-actualisation and promotes of psychological health and wholeness because it creates a frame of reference teachers can use to guide their communication interactions with learners towards the facilitation of respectful dialogue during communication interaction. In addition, it also helps teachers to identify various challenges inherent in communication interactions in general, but more specifically, challenges associated with teacher and learner communication interactions, such as the parallel-monologue in the secondary school that may have a negative impact on self-actualisation and healthy development of learners.
Epilogue

So, what have I as teacher to offer my students? What can I attempt to share but my own lived truth as authentically experienced? My own and learners' experience and conversation with the world becomes the fertile soil in which, and from which, the seeds of personal knowing germinate for students as well as myself. The curriculum I create in collaboration with the learners I interact with is in its final analysis, personal images, created on the basis of our on-going conversation, whether it is a written or a spoken one. In this teaching of my students I am also a learner from my students, as in the world I am both a sender and a receiver of messages. Mine are not the only images dominating the learning. In this co-construction of meaning I give meaning, but I also receive meaning from the learning that happens between me and students. The communication I have and relationships I develop and sustain as teacher, enables or disables the being and becoming of students. I believe that in this interaction the facilitation of respectful dialogue is the fundamental competency of a helper and also the pivotal catalyst for psychologically healthy learning and wholeness. This dialogue between learners and teachers is in essence constructive in nature and educational in its intent. It is therefore not a mere "getting along" for the sake of social "nicety" but entails both convergent and divergent conversation. Thinking together as well as thinking apart and as such, its essential nature is fraught with dissonance. It is this tension in the dialogue, the inevitability of flux and flow created as two intentionalities interact in the world and with the world, which teachers need to come to know, understand and appreciate. That gives dialogue its essential enigmatic character of a simultaneousness of similarities and differences. The question of how the learner experience "being with" the teacher is an important one linked to how he or she experience their own being and becoming while in contact with the teacher. If learners experience disrespect and feel unheard and unable it will inhibit the dialogue and further contact. If learners feel respected and understood it facilitates further contact and actualisation of the potential of the learners' being and becoming in the world.

To the extent that it is a society with respect for dialogue and respect in authentic dialogue, the people belonging to that society of dialogue, becomes liberated as well as the liberators of others. They become the enablers and facilitators of freedom and
potential. I believe it is fitting to allow a grade 11 learner the last word, since the original thesis of this work was inspired in conversation with grade 11 learners about their experiences in education:

“Learning is not linear and one dimensional, where the young learn and gain wisdom from the elderly but can go in any direction as the youth have knowledge that they could share with their elders. Learning ultimately is multi-dimensional and anybody of any age can learn from another person of a different generation”

The Setswana idiom reads: “Ngwa ntae ke go lae bōlhogoputswa ga se molao.”

(Translated) “Child, teach me and allow me to teach you, let not my age be a dictator.”
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Background to the study
In my practice as a teacher, I have come to notice the importance of constructive communication practices between Secondary School Teachers and learners. It seems to play an essential role in the relationships, support of development and self-actualization of Secondary School learners. In my previous studies, I have investigated grade eleven learner's experience of aggression while communicating with their teachers and it came to the fore that learners sometimes experience a rigid attachment of the teacher to his or her own perspective and role as a sender during communication interaction with learners. I have described this one-directional communication and experienced lack of listening on the part of the teacher as a parallel-monologue and this experience seems to represent an important dimension of the experience of disrespect and aggression during communication between teachers and learners. This experience inhibits the development of true supportive and constructive communication and a healthy relationship between teacher and learner.

Such a "mono-logical" approach, where learners are spoken at and seldom listened to is clearly unsatisfactory, and my conclusion is that an approach to teacher-learner communication that fails to incorporate respectful and constructive communication practices and relationship building as an integral part of teacher-learner interaction is strongly associated with secondary school learner's experience of aggression while communicating with teachers.

Intention of the project
Research associated with this project attempts to:
Against the preceding background I formulated the following research question and accompanying aims and objectives. The question that will focus my inquiry will be: What can be done to address the monologue between secondary school teachers and learners? The aim of the inquiry is the development, operationalization and evaluation of a model to facilitate constructive educational communication between Secondary School teachers and learners. The specific objectives are:
- To describe a model for the facilitation of constructive communication between Secondary School teachers and learners;
- To operationalize the model in a workshop for Secondary School teachers and evaluate the model based on the data collected.

Procedures involved in the research
A single case study strategy will be used to gather data to evaluate the model as operationalized and implemented in the workshop for Secondary School teachers. The research method pursued in this study has been divided into two phases derived from the objectives of the study. Steps in theory generating research, as well as concept describing the practice of theory generating will be used to develop and describe the model. In Phase one of the research process I will describe the model for the facilitation of constructive communication between Secondary School teachers and learners by completing the following steps: concept analysis, placing concepts in relationships and describing the model in its entirety. In Phase two, the model will be operationalized and evaluated. Your role as participant will consist of taking part in the one-day workshop. During the workshop you will be asked to engage with some documentation and participate in discussion and activities. You will also be asked to share your views and understanding of some key ideas and concepts related to teaching and learning. Data, your contribution, will be collected via individual interviews, focus group interviews, workshop documents and video material of the workshop.

Potential Risks
There are no risks involved in participation in this study and non-participants will not be disadvantaged in any way.

Potential Benefits
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The research will be carried out with the view of improving my own educational practice as well as educational practice in general via the process of theory generation and evaluation. The potential significance and benefit of this study to participants and members of the teaching community can be briefly summarised in terms of the opportunities it will offer to teachers to participate in the learning opportunity the workshop will offer, the development of knowledge and opportunity for theory generation and the development of reflective practice by teachers within the teaching community that will participate.
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ANNEXURE C
Protocol’s for data collection: Participants Reflective Journal;
Participants Naïve Sketch; Protocol and Transcription of Individual
Phenomenological interview; Field notes
Individual interview Transcription

18 – 22 November 2013 – A phenomenological individual interview based on the question:

How is this model working for you?

Participant: P3 – 20 November a 39 Year old Female

Nested unit of analysis

The following codes will be used in place of participant names.

- Male = P + even nr.
- Female = P + uneven nr.
- Researcher = R

Description of particular participant/ unit of analysis:
She is a 39 year old …

Her expectation of the workshop was:
To learn as much as possible, and I always feel that a group setting is the best fertile ground to do so. When teaching privately, the largest groups were up to ten students. Adapting to a school setting with larger classes is my main focus.

➢ Journal Entry 1 – Wednesday 6 November

Please reflect carefully on the following question and write down your response:
Thinking back to your interactions with learners and the diagram of -The model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a Secondary School -

How is this model working for you?

I try to Visualise the model and keep it in mind as I teach. The one thing I constantly try to improve on is to involve students more, and to try to step back and facilitate rather than to step in and take over.

I have a tendency to want to demonstrate too much in practical lessons. This time when they asked me “How are we going to join the materials together?” my response was that:

- It was their responsibility to find ways of joining the materials together (as it was instructed that they were not allowed to use glue)
That we did experiments at the beginning of the project whereby they had a chance to find solutions

That I am their facilitation and would lend a hand, but I wanted them to think for themselves.

They were not exited at my response!

Journal Entry 2 – Friday 8 November

Please reflect carefully on the following question and write down your response:
Thinking back to your interactions with learners in the past week:

How is this model working for you?

There is a student in my class who I’ve tried to build a relationship for a long time. I feel the communication is only coming from me. He responds minimally and is emotionally unavailable. Today we had a setback which resulted in a talk with his tutor (with the student present). After the talk I feel more positive because I had a chance to express to him that we as teachers care about them (students) and act in their best interest. I hope that our communication improves because I sense a lot of anger in him and I don’t think he trusts me at all.

As for the rest of the class, it went well and I feel positive that the model is working for me.

Journal Entry 3 – Wednesday 13 November

Thinking back to your interactions with learners in the past 2 weeks:

How is this model working for you?

I took my model to my front desk to remind myself as I was teaching. The student at that desk started to cut the page creatively. I was very disappointed! (speaking of a laminated copy of the diagram of the model handed out at the end of the workshop)

Sometimes I feel that I am on a different level with each student. Some students “get” the subject and meaning and flourishes, we started sharing our life worlds.
Some students, I feel that I am talking over their heads. They are very pleasant students but doesn’t “get” the subtle subject meanings, is not very interested in the subject matter, or are not on the same page.

A simple action whereby the student cut the page, feels disrespectful to me and damages a relationship. Now I feel I have to start at a lower level and build up trust again.

I fell of the model

➢ Journal Entry 4 – Friday 15 November

After carefully considering the diagram of the model - please make recommendations based on your experience of the model:

How is this model working for you?

At the beginning of this lesson I gave clear instructions that we are going to do revision today. Two students ignored me, went to the back of the class and started “horse-playing” Before I could reprimand them, the action resulted in damage to tables, other students’ projects and their uniforms! I was stunned, started to talk but then (as I was reminded of the video clip) decided to take a “cool down” break. I stepped out of the class and around the corner, where I took 5 minutes to cool off. I went back to complete my lesson, and told the students that we would take up the issue after class.

In the case of this particular student who started the horse play-play, I never feel that the model is working for me! I realize that he has (possibly) got ADHD or another attention problem and NEVER sits still! He continuously walks around and fidgets with everything! This makes me feel that he is not listening to me (because he doesn’t seem to pay attention) But in effect it seems that he is listening the best when he is riding in his chair! It just feels to me like I am talking alone and he is ignoring me! Teacher: Bla bla bla - Learner: La la la?
As part of the interview process participants were asked to write a short response to the following-

Please write a brief summary of your experiences of the model in the past two weeks:

**How is the model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a Secondary School, working for you?**

**In the Naïve sketch on the day of the interview he/she wrote…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There has been positive and negative experiences in the past 2 weeks. At the end of the year I feel that I have come far with some of my students and in some other cases the shared dialogue was still at a minimum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What the model forced me to do was to focus on certain aspects also to deliberately try harder with some students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are at a level where there is shared dialogue between you and a student, you feel a sense of accomplishment, that the student “gets” you and/or your subject. With the students where there is still a parallel monologue, you feel frustrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This process takes time, all and all I feel good about this year, but will deliberately follow the model and adjust my lesson planning to include mere “share” time next year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protocol for Individual Interview

**Introduction and getting settled:**

- **How was writing about the model for you?**
  - Was it easy / did you find it difficult?
  - How did you feel writing about it?

**Body of the interview – the central question**

...so – **How is this model working for you?**

- What do you like about it?
- What don’t you like?
- Do you think it works in practice? How?
- Can you explain events where it played a role in your thinking or doing?
- Do you think it might play a role in the future?
- Did the model make you aware of areas you can work on in your communication with learners?
- When or where?
- What would you change?
- What would you definitely keep?
- How was taking part in the workshop for you?
- Did the workshop help your understanding of the model – How?
- Would you recommend the model to other teachers?
- Why? Why not?
- Do you think this model can play a role outside the classroom?
- How?
Ending and exit

- What is the most important thing you feel you have learnt by being part of this process?
- Is there anything more you would like to add about your experience with this process?
- Is there anything you would still like to ask?

Thank you for your time and contributions.

We then proceeded with the interview.

R: Ok x(P3) thanks for your time, I appreciate it.

P3: Mm.

R: So let’s get into it straight away umm …So how was writing about the model for you? Just now …how was that for you?

P3: Good because it feels like a summary, and also because it is at the end of the year we typically reflect a lot …so actually it is not only thinking of the last two weeks but actually thinking about where we started at the beginning of the year and how far we have come and so on …but the past two weeks I have really been working closely with the kids focussing on the model and I want to reflect more on that.

R: Ok.

P3: So …feeling good overall I would say.

R: So, the timing of the research one could say at the beginning of the year is better or in the middle of the year is better or at the end is better …but what is better for you about having it at the end of the year is that it is sort of naturally a reflective space …

P3: Yes.

R: And I am also hearing you say that in the …in your thinking, you were clearly thinking about before, and after exposure to the model.

P3: Definitely.
R: Which is an interesting way of approaching it, I think.

P3: Ja, definitely.

R: So …it is fair to say that you found it easy …enjoyable?

P3: Yes, absolutely.

R: Threatening?

P3: Not at all…not at all, it also helped me to realise that the whole class is never together at the same level …you are at a different level with every child somewhere on that model of communication. So with most of them you aim to go for the shared communication model but with some of them it is harder to build relationships …you get stuck somewhere at the bottom …or the middle or.

R: And back to the bottom and back to the middle…

(Laughter)

P3: But that is something you strive for everyday …that is what you strive for…with some of them it is easier to get there sooner …but it made me realise or think about the fact that you can never just assume that you are standing in front of the class and you will all share the same experience …because every child is different and you also don’t have that same relationship with every child, some of them trusts you more, some of them you feel you have gone out of your way …or some just trusts you sooner in the year or whatever the case may be…

R: So …you are saying it is definitely in your view this continuum …and definitely with each particular child …sitting, almost like a bar-graph at different …levels?

P3: Yes and I am also feeling that next year you will build even more on the relationships that you formed this year and with new students coming into the school, you have to start at the bottom.

R: You have to accept that it’s the beginning.

P3: The beginning, for our relationship yes.

R: And even though it is the beginning, can it still go smoothly?

P3: Yes of course ja.

R: So the hope is that for the majority, even if it is the beginning it will go smoothly?

P3: Ja. The hope is that, and of course also the realisation that you will never ever …I don’t think, in my opinion that you will never get along with everybody …I
don't think that there is a person that can always get along with everyone …there will always be one student that challenges you, that is going thru a difficult time …or that particular student might get along fine with the next teacher …it's just …life.

(Laughter)

R: Just a function of people being different.

P3: Ja …so I don't expect it to, but with the majority of students I do expect to at least achieve around the middle if not the top of the model.

R: A point of conversation for us is also the point of …sort of does the model work? And it can be quite a confusing think because, a working model, does that mean you are always at the top of the model …and therefore the model is working …or is it more a question of …the model works when it describes what is going on?

P3: I think the model works when it describes …what is going on, well. Because …like I said it is not as if you are going to achieve that level of communication with every single person.

R: So the top level would be the idea of the shared life world or the dialogue.

P3: Yes the shared life world …but the model describes well what is going on in a classroom situation …and what you aim for.

R: Yes …

P3: Because even if you have the least possible amount of communication where you deliver, you teach the lesson and the student doesn’t even respond or react or even responds minimally, it is still described in the model as it is there and it looks exactly like that too. Sometimes it just goes over someone’s head …

(Laughter)

R: Because there is no response? You felt that you put stuff out there and there is a minimal reaction to it at the other end …sometimes even there is a reaction but it’s not quite what you expected.

P3: Exactly …and that is still very descriptive for me in the model.
R: All right, I just wanted to clarify that a little bit because it seems that that is one of the tricky aspects of trying to understand some of this ... Umm so, right I am gone focus us now on so – How is this model working for you? That is the question and the first part of the question that I would like us to focus on …what do you like about it?

P3: Well what I would say is that …it is not a model where you can say …this is exactly what I am gone do and the outcome is going to be like that. But, the model gives me a good sense of where I am at a particular stage with a student and what I am aiming for…and I feel that if you do get to that place where you sometimes actually need minimum words or minimum …or it doesn’t feel like you have got to do all this hard work to motivate someone, that they are a bit self-motivated …because they get the subject and they get you …and you are in this level where you share a life-world then …you feel a great sense of achievement …it is a good feeling to be there with a student. (dialogue – when it works/ relation between shared us and dialogue - no longer I – I but us (see P2)

R: Um mmm ....

P3: When coming to the classroom and you deliver a lesson, you particular instructions and a certain student doesn’t respond or responds with the least amount of effort …it feels like you work extremely hard at that relationship every day and the results are just …very disappointing and you feel despondent. (Description of parallel-monologue)

R: Ja.

P3: So …how the model works for me, I would say is to …actually just guide me and give me direction …and aim but, at the same time, it’s a great sense of achievement when you get to that point, not expecting that to happen with every single student …I would say one or two students out of 25 I would not expect to ever get to that level …no …not even to the middle where as I would say at least with half the class I would expect to get to the middle.

R: So you believe that if you can get 50% of them to a level where there is respectful dialogue …then you feel that you will feel some sense of achievement and actually in terms of the class you are doing well.

P3: Yes.
R: Although 80% is better than 50 and 90% is even better but you don’t expect that every day?

P3: Yes …no I do believe that that will come with time …and I do believe that as I get to be more experienced …that it will be easier and that I will get the majority of the class to that level. But I also listen to past, new teachers and I hear them also that the first year is the hardest to …to, you learn by trial and error, that is why I said that next …starting day one next year, I am absolutely tackle the class differently than I did this year, because I know a lot more …so as time goes by I believe I can get to a higher level with the majority of the class.

R: There is a strategy, we can discuss it later but there is …and you can keep it at the back of your mind but there is a strategy if you want, that is maybe worth a try.

P3: Yes absolutely.

R: It is related to this model, maybe not directly but I have had some success with it in the past. So ….you are generally positive about the model and you feel it describes things well …and it has been useful for you …so the phrase we have used - it has been working for you?

P3: Yes.

R: That is what I sense …but then …so then it leads me to my next question - **What don’t you like about this model** …or what just doesn’t sit well or doesn’t feel quite it?

P3: Really at this moment …I can’t think of something …

R: So …the ideas in there all correlate with your life-world? And , your …experience?

P3: Yes.

R: So there isn’t any ideas in there that you feel mmm…this just doesn’t …fit?

P3: No.

R: Not a single one …

P3: No, not that I can think of no.

R: All right good …that is interesting. Umm …ok so maybe a question with an obvious answer then basically …based on the previous things …do you think it works in practice? You have unpacked some of that but let’s just re-hash it quickly.
P3: Yes, definitely I feel it works in practice mainly also because of the reflections you made us do on the Wednesdays and the Fridays ... I think, more and more that reflection is a very important part of learning I always thought that you keep a diary because ... I don't know, you go back and you read a bit about the past or ... you wouldn't want to forget some experiences, and that is why you write them down ... but actually I am realizing, and I am not a person who writes a lot, I don't even like writing, I would much rather paint or draw ... but I am realizing that by writing it down by reflecting it gives you clarity ... on certain issues ... so as I was reflecting every time, it became clear that the issues we discussed, the themes so to speak, came up more and more and more ... so actually looking at my feelings, how I felt, dismayed at a student being disrespectful or whatever ... helped me to narrow it down and to find the proper descriptive language and to actually, come to the point where I realised – it's about respect ... every time. (respect as central to the model)

R: So ... it clarifies your experience?

P3: It clarifies it ... sometimes it feels like you are upset and other times you feel another feeling ... but in the end all those feelings actually describe the relationship as being respectful or disrespectful ... it comes down to that ... and that actually got quite clear when I had to write it down.

R: So respect as a concept, actually for you featured very strongly?

P3: That is the central point to the model for me. Yes.

R: And, beyond the model ... because the model is just something that is in reality ... so in the end it is not about the model but about the reality of teaching.

P3: Yes, absolutely ... I would say that respect is absolutely the centre and key for me because if there is a lack of respect in any part ... or even if there is a feeling of lack of respect ... if a student feels like you don't respect them for some or other reason.

R: So even if it wasn't intended ... but the message got received like that.

P3: Yes ... if respect is not there then the whole relationship just crumbles.

R: Deteriorates back to ... a, one dimensional ... All right, that is a very very interesting take on ... so for you, how it works ... is around this central idea of respect ... and the experience of respect.

P3: Yes. ... and, that is how the model worked for me ... was to clarify that to, to show me very clearly that ... all these different feelings and reactions that I had,
actually all boils down to that central point ...and that actually gives you something to work towards, next year.

R: For me, it's a double edged sword as well ...calling it respect because now it seems simple, isn't it? It's just about respect ...simple.

(Laughter)

P3: Yes, but we know that it isn't.

R: Because it is so overarching it becomes a very difficult thing to analyse ...into it's parts. Um ...so ...that is very, very interesting, thanks for that. Um ...so maybe can you share or explain a few events where the model played a role in your thinking? Just talk thru one two or three things that happened ...where distinctly you went aha ...and then you thought of the model ...and then, it had an impact.

P3: Well ....I actually thought about the video that we watched in the ...course and I, thought of it in class when I was reaching my breaking point the other day ... I just started screaming at them ...and I thought no, no, no ...and I stopped, stopped right there, and I left the classroom and I walked ...I didn't actually know where I was walking I just walked and I thought ok whatever they do, even if they break down the class I am going to leave now because I am not going to lose it in front of them ...so that was a very clear indication of where I stopped in my tracks because of what I have seen on the DVD (referring to a video clip)

R: So, do you think the video is a good representation of the model?

P3: That is exactly how I felt ...grabbing the student by the ...

R: And like screaming ...

P3: I felt like screaming ...and I felt like ...but actually it helped a lot, just take a moment even if it is just for a minute or two minutes ...it rely helps a lot just to blow off steam ...walk around the classroom and come back. So, that is one instance and other instances umm with my good students who really want to become designers and who are really committed to the subject ...the model would come up in my thoughts ...and I would think about how far we have come, the types of conversations we have had and how I can explain some concepts and ideas to them and how they just seem to get it and they
understand it …but they work really hard and they listen, and they really care about the subject.

R: To acquire this …vocabulary?

P3: Yes, because there is a certain vocabulary in that specific field of study that you can not, you know if you talk about scale …in the music room it means and with us it means …

R: Ja …there is subtle differences that are important.

P3: Yes …so obviously if you share that kind of communication with the student you feel that you have gone to that level where …you can just build on it. The model would just come up in my mind and I would be thinking, with student I have nailed it …and I know it’s there we’ve got that communication …

R: So, language teaching in a subject …so one would think design …how does language now, it’s not English, it’s design …but it seems, thinking of this that, it’s important?

P3: Yes, and it is important to clarify the differences between, for instance the meaning of scale in the music class and the meaning of scale in art …it’s important, we spend a lot of time trying to define and working on language skills …because you do need to talk in a certain way …to describe certain aspects and if a student don’t understand that he will never…

R: So …to a certain extend as a design and arts and technology teacher you are …a language teacher?

P3: Absolutely I am first of all a language teacher…we would spend about .Possibly four to five  lessons in the beginning of each term just on language.

R: And how does this whole language thing relate back to the model? Or does it.

P3: Umm…yes it does relate …

R: Ok …how would you relate it?

P3: We cannot communicate if I cannot understand the student and they cannot understand me …and proper vocabulary is part of communication so…

R: Mmm…

P3: So …absolutely we do cross word puzzles and we do games at the beginning of the term …and for instance we do a model house where they had to draw a floor plan and build a house we spend a whole week doing words like – low cost, indigenous, scale floor plan …all those kinds of words which without them …and that would help me then in the rest of the term because if we speak
about, isometric drawing or floor plan...then they immediately know the meaning of that, otherwise ...I don’t think it is possible

R: So you think that plays a role in this shared life-world?

P3: Absolutely ...yes, because ...

R: The life world you are sharing is ...around the subject?

P3: Yes ...indigenous doesn't mean the same thing to all people.

R: Yes.

P3: So clarifying it ...saying exactly what we mean when we use this word ...from now on, for the rest of the term is a very, very important part of it ... like there was a theory question in the exam on indigenous materials ...they have to know what exactly that means.

R: Mmm ...I am more and more fascinated by it, because obviously the model is under the banner of Educational Psychology and healthy relationships and all of that is important and it is central and that is what the model is ...but now, more and more I am also tempted to think of it as a model that can also guide ...teaching ...not just in the sense of how we interact with students, it is very much that, but ...how you think of a lesson?

P3: Absolutely ...I was thinking that exact same thing. I was thinking that next year when I do my lesson planning, I am gone look at the model while I do my lesson planning ...and think, how can I incorporate this?

R: Some aspects of it.

P3: Some aspects of it in my lesson. How can I also create some us time, some share time ...what is their experiences of a certain aspect of the lesson ...I was really thinking of doing that in my lesson plan.

R: Ok, so that shared vocabulary, shared space, shared us ...how do you build as part of the lesson build in time for that ...

P3: Exactly.

R: It is interesting ...and it is something that really hasn’t crossed my mind much before we actually started this process ...so I am fascinated with how it seems to dovetail nicely with the rest of the more, let’s say technical aspects of the lesson or subject or, didactics if you will.

(Laughter)
Ok …so those are some interesting events and it is also interesting that you would say umm …so if I didn't create the expectation that you would reflect you really think that you wouldn't have because there is no expectation …and you usually don't do that kind of thing often …so you don't think you would have and so don't you think you would have lost out a bit?

P3: Yes, but I don't think it is a question of not reflecting maybe I would have but at the moment with my department with the way it is and the time constraints I can tell you that I definitely would not have.

R: Ja, it would just not be on the priority list

P3: Any other time of the year maybe …possibly but ja I think the expectation really does force you to do it and I think it is a good thing and I am glad for it.

R: Ok, it is interesting because other's have also said or commented on it …on the fact that they were actually glad for it at the end and that it seems like agg, now I have to do another thing.

P3: It does feel like homework when you have to start and I thought to myself, I better do it now, I better not put it off or anything because your mind tends to be fresh when you do it and if you leave it for a day or two you forget and it becomes blurry. So I thought to myself I should force myself to do this and it is like homework in the beginning but in the end it really does have a positive effect.

R: Ok, so that was just an interesting …because obviously it was done for research purposes but now I am thinking …and we will talk a little bit about the workshop itself later, and the experience of it, but it seems it was part of the workshop as much as it is part of the research …not really a separate thing …ok so…you have already spoken about - do you think the model might play a role in the future? And so you said you will definitely keep it close and when you plan a lesson at the end of it you will take a look at it and go ok, does this model feature in my planning and How am I thinking about it and what am I going to do.

P3: It’s right up there with blooms taxonomy and all the other things.

R: So you will just have it there as a guide. So it will be interesting to come back mid next year and as is it still there …has it disappeared was it just a temporary thing and sometimes we use these things for a while and then it sort of becomes part of us …so it will definitely be interesting to do a bit of a follow up
...so we will see how that goes. Umm...ok Did the model make you aware of areas you can work on in your own communication with learners?

P3: Yes...yes.

R: Ok.

P3: It is something that I ... in the beginning of the year found quite difficult to do because of where I come from and the types of students I taught before ... I come from a completely different space with completely different learners and of course here we have a variety of different learners with different backgrounds and it made me more and more aware of where a particular student comes from and why they are behaving in a certain way ...um it does help to talk to some of the other teachers about how they experience a certain student to analyse behaviour and find reasons for, why they are behaving like that in my class but now in another teacher's class that teacher finds the learner completely cooperative ...or something like that. So ... then it forces you to reflect on your class practice.

R: Mmm... so in thinking about them you start thinking about yourself ...

P3: Absolutely and, I am more and more thinking about ...well my main issue is I don't think I come across as ...or ... I come across as to soft, most of the time and they think they can get away with murder, so that is the main thing I am working on to ...

R: So, posture tone ...that kind of thing?

P3: Yes, ja ...and to be consistent ... rules are rules and that is the way it's going to be like today tomorrow and for the rest of the year so ja.

R: So ... the consistency is now something you highlighted for yourself as an important thing?

P3: Yes.

R: That is an interesting thing ... because I am thinking of previous research and stuff I have come across and it seems to be a very important thing for students as well ... they relate it to ... so this idea of authenticity ... it is in the written description of the model?

P3: And trustworthiness

R: And trustworthiness?

P3: Yes because if I say to a student ... they do practical and in the beginning of the module they request their materials, and if student has a good reason for using,
for instance glitter and if I say to a student I will acquire the materials for you, then I deliver on my promise, then I can't go back on my promise and break trust there ...so, whatever is within reason that they request or expect from me I will ...provide.

R: Especially of you have agreed, that you will ...provide it.

P3: Yes, and that is a big part of building that relationship, if they see that they can trust me, it's a good building block to start on to build a good relationship. (trust / trustworthiness/ respect)

R: To build towards the shared ...and the dialogue, and the ...

P3: Yes.

R: And in that authenticity from your side and, consistency?

P3: Consistency yes.

R: And trust ...which builds the trust?

P3: Yes!

R: Which brings respect?

P3: Yes exactly!

(Laughter)

R: So ...I'm thinking if I am trustworthy ...can I respect someone, but I don't trust them?

P3: No. I don't think so. For me, the two go together.

R: I respect you so much, but I don't trust you.

P3: No, it doesn't work.

R: It doesn't work does it...it just feels wrong.

P3: It is wrong.

R: So ...of there is trust, respect would follow?

P3: Naturally yes?

R: Mmm...so are we back to respect being this sort of umbrella term where other smaller things are also important and it leads up to respect ...interesting. OK ...so, you have become aware of the fact that you need to come across a little bit more assertively? Umm...that you mean business and that you are serious about work and when you say homework is due it is due ...and you have also become aware of the fact that you need to be consistent in that ...and you feel
that will go a long way towards building this respect and trust …and might lead up to …where you have a very nice sharing dialogue. Does a dialogue always need to be pleasant …can a dialogue be unpleasant but still a dialogue? And still …good?

P3: Yes…yes.

R: Can you think of. Sort of examples of that or…something you have experienced?

P3: Yes, for instance with one of my students that does not particularly like to work hard …and she is a very talented student but she is very lazy …and you don’t have to be mean, you can just be honest …and I would just say to her, now you are being lazy and I know that you can do better, I have seen better work from you and I believe that this is not your best …so a dialogue can be unpleasant, I think …but it can still be respectful. It doesn’t have to be mean or destructive or anything like that. (dialogue – hard/unpleasant)

R: So …it can be constructive …even though it’s not “nice” as such?

P3: Yes, very much so.

R: So, the model is not really about being nice? It is not saying – you must be nice.

P3: No.

R: It can be very pleasant …but it can also be fairly unpleasant?

P3: Yes.

R: But still be a dialogue and still be respectful?

P3: Yes.

R: Interesting …ok, ummm …What would you change …about the model? If I was to say, I am giving it to you, you can just switch stuff around and …make triangles instead of circles, or…squares or whatever …how would you do that or would you do that?

P3: No …I think it is nice just as it is.

R: So …you like the sort of graphics of it?

P3: Yes it works.

R: So you like the graphics of it and you think it speaks clearly?

P3: Yes

R: So …one of the things I have looked at …in looking at it, it looks fairly busy…there is a lot going on …
P3: Well, for me …when I looked at it the first time it was difficult for me to understand …what it is all about, and as you explained it looks to me like a Christmas tree shape and I think it is important to realise that it is a work in progress …you are in there somewhere and you can follow different pathways. At any given day and at any given time you can go up or you can even go down …in different was so I think the important thing to realise is that you remain in there in constant …changing relationships so it can go up and it can do down or any which way so it is never, just a hard and fast – this is how it has to be, type of model …or you tick of A and now it’s done and now you go on to B. It is not that type of a model …for me it’s a very fluid thing. It’s the type of thing that is bound to change and with some relationships it might get better and in some relationships it might deteriorate.

R: So …it is not linear?

P3: Yes.

R: I like what you said in your reflection - I fell of the model?

P3: Ja…

(Laughter)

R: Ja …that was an interesting turn of phrase …speak about that just a little bit, unpack it it a bit …it was fascinating the way you drew the picture of the person falling of the model …splat! – and now you have to get back on the horse again …so I get the sense of it…but I would love to hear you just unpack it a bit…

P3: Well it is with a student I have a very good relationship with for a long time and he has taken my elective twice. (elective classes - students can pick from a list)

R: So, the dialogue was there and the respect was there?

P3: Yes and I feel I know him very well his strengths and weaknesses and I know which buttons to push to get him to work harder and I know what I can expect from him if I don't push those buttons …you know I know him fairly well and I trust him …and he cut up my chart (a laminated copy of the model) , so I felt extremely angry about that afterwards and …it felt to me like a big let-down and, I felt but, I know you…how could you do this how could you be so disrespectful …so that is what made me feel like we were right at the top and
we fell right to the bottom and we have to start from the very beginning now I have to get to know you again because ...the trust that I thought was there, seemingly is not there because, if I trusted toy and you trusted me, you would not have done that in my class...you would not have disrespected me in my class (trust /respect)

R:  Mmm...to take something that doesn't belong to you and just abused it.

P3:  Yes something that is valuable to me ...I was using it in front of the class and I was looking at it every now and again to remind myself so I really wanted to get into this model I really wanted to delve deeper into it and see where I am with it with different students ...and then of course I felt very angry after the class when I discovered what he had done ...it was prettily cut into shapes.

(Laughter)

R:  Yes ...is a fascinating thing ...whether he will now put the same meaning to his actions than you did, because clearly you felt disrespected for all sorts of reasons but it is interesting ...did he do that to be disrespectful ...to communicate disrespect to you? Or is the intention just ...it seemed like a fun thing at the time?

P3:  He is just in grade 7 and playing with his scissors and I do believe ...and he said that he is very sorry afterwards and I could see that he was ...so I don't think his intention, at all was disrespect or even to be mean or ...what do you call it, vandalistic or ...I think he was just fidgeting and, ja.

R:  Ok. So he was just being creative.

P3: Or bored maybe.

R:  Ja, maybe one of those student that get's side tracked and then get busy with something and ...you know, go off-task ...onto another task I might add ...if they go off this tasks normally they go on-to another one so ...it is interesting this speak we have sometimes – when students go off-task ...and then we have to get them back on-task ...which I do appreciate, I mean it is frustrating to a teacher if people go of task but then why are they going on-to another task ...what is it that is pulling them towards that task?

P3:  Ja ...I saw them the other day ...I said - track me...and all the eyes were on me but something exciting was happening outside the class and I could see
their faces still facing me and not turning their heads ...but the eyes all going to
the side ...to try and peak out the window to try and see what is happening
outside ...I kept them on me but their focus definitely was off.

(Laughter)

R: Interesting ...So ...change, you wouldn’t change much ...
P3: I pretty much like where it is going yes.
R: Ok ...What would you definitely keep? All of it?
P3: Yes.

R: And you feel in terms of ...Speak about facilitation. Did that feature at all in
your thinking at all ...because we spoke a lot about respect and ...you have
mentioned dialogue? It seems like quite an ideal thing but it can also be umm
...it doesn’t always have to be nice one can sometimes have difficult
conversations ... but now the facilitation aspect of it or the idea of facilitation?
P3: Facilitation for me ...I think you can be facilitated by a computer, you can
facilitated by a robot ...but, being facilitated by a teacher means that there is
going to be personal interaction. Also ...I thought about facilitation a lot
because I am the type of person that is very much ...umm, I like to be in
control. I like to help students when they struggle. Sometimes so much so that
I help to much...and I am very aware of that fact, that I need to step back a little
bit and just facilitate. So, when it came about that the gr. 8’s made a model of
the x (school) values. Umm...in the beginning they had to do experiments
about joining plastics, so after the beginning part where they had to do
experiments...when they came to me and said - mam how do we join these two
pieces of plastic, I told them ...that is what the experiments where fore, I am
just your facilitator but you have to go and do the work so, I am very much
aware of the fact that I need to work on the balance ...not helping to much, in
the past I would have just said yes, use tape or to solve the problem as quickly
as possible ...this is my knowledge and I am passing it on but – they learn
better if they learn it thru their own experiences and their own gathering of
knowledge.

R: To ...struggle a bit?
P3: Struggle a bit, absolutely and I have a tendency to take something out of someone’s hands if they struggle and I help to much so I’m certainly aware that I need to facilitate more and not help so much …but also not to the point where you become like a computer where there is no personal …maybe sometimes just a little nudge or a little …push.

R: Mmm …reinforcement

P3: Yes!

R: Mmm…mmm…so you can’t disconnect and, ok now I facilitated now …make it happen? Because that in fact is then …non facilitative?

P3: Yes …yes absolutely.

R: But to know how much…

P3: Because the next experience or the next solution or, the next experiment is going to lead to another answer or another question …and then again you need to facilitate some more …so there will always be this continuum of …growth

R: Mmm…ja, and I can think of all sorts of things, that we will not go into now, like the zone of proximal development and …pitching it at the right level, all of those things will come in there …ok, umm… All right so, a slightly different question, umm …along the same lines but I think a slightly different angle on it  - How was taking part in the workshop for you? On the day, how was that

P3: Great fun!

R: Great fun?

P3: Yes, I really enjoyed it …I enjoyed, especially the games we had outside and that was really playful and fun.

R: Ok …so, you liked the fun element …umm, ja …I was thinking that we spent 7 hours …6/6 and a half hours so …would you say that was really necessary?

P3: Yes. I think also …the teachers who took part in it bonded …and we are greeting each other and talking about experiences that we haven’t before so …I really think what happened there was a really positive effect for the whole group in my opinion.

R: Ok …so, the sharing is the part that you liked?

P3: Yes.

R: So you liked the activities …the fact that some of it was physical and some of it was different
P3: Yes …and especially also the shared life world with the other teachers …you know …thank goodness I am not the only one who struggles with this or with that (additional unintended workshop effect)

R: Yes.

P3: That x or whoever is also struggling with also having the same type of problems in her class day to day …

R: So you feel less alone?

P3: Ja, absolutely! Because …you tend to only share with your department and your HOD and only with your group in nuts and bolts …and it tends to be the same people and the same group…and you realise that right across the school, even in intermediate phase, we have some similar issues

R: They look very different sometimes but in essence it is the same issue.

P3: It’s the same issue …ja.

R: That’s interesting …so, fair to say you enjoyed the experience of being part of it …and you definitely feel it was necessary …because in the end it boiled down to one picture and one page. So, 7 hours to get to one picture and one page?

P3: Yes …yes, because I don’t think …sometimes you can put the page in someone’s hands and tell them, this is how it works …but then again it is better if you learn it for yourself. And the only way you learn that is thru questioning and reflecting and sharing. (NB – Dialogue /reflection/ experiential learning)

R: Ok …so you think the questioning, reflecting, sharing needs to be there …and we call that “the workshop”

P3: Yes …

R: The questioning, the reflection and the sharing that happened via certain tasks.

P3: Yes.

R: Ok.

P3: Because it became clear…when I started the first task, and then the second one and then the third…and then I thought …ok, there is an emerging theme here …I can see that this is repetitive and this is going somewhere, and it is thru that, that you really learn and …how do I put this, really realise that something is really important, which if you had just told me, I would have forgotten it by tomorrow. (2 factors – designed learning experience / sharing of that experience)

R: So would you say that the concepts did emerge throughout the workshop?
R: Ok …it goes to my next question which is a little bit more distinct and clear … so would you say that the workshop helped you understand the model?
P3: Yes …
R: …and How…in what way?
P3: Like I said …in the beginning when I saw it for the first time, it was a bit confusing until you explained it a little bit more…and then as I got to my own classroom and started to work with the model it became even clearer.
R: Ok …so, you reflected back to the workshop events …
P3: Yes definitely several times …
R: Even while you were teaching and doing other things?
P3: Yes …I was thinking back about the clips that we saw and the conversations we had.
R: Ok …right, interesting umm…do you think this model can play a role outside the classroom?
P3: Yes, definitely in a marriage …well, all relationships actually.
R: Mmm…
P3: Whether it is very intimate …like in a marriage or, just with your own children it can actually apply to any …if I think for instance, of my own daughter, it is really important for me to share her life world…and I struggle sometimes to realise she is only eleven and I expect too much of her and then I have to think that, at eleven she is only now developing a sense of humour and she is you know …thinking back to how I was when I was eleven …so …so yes it can work in many relationships that I can think of, outside of the classroom.
R: Between colleagues?
P3: Yes! …absolutely …because it is thru…if I communicate with a teacher on …on the first level, where there is parallel communication …we are still just getting to know each other …
R: Sending each other e mails?
P3: Yes …like in a group somewhere discussing an issue …but if you really share that life world …like – I have experienced this in my classroom with this particular student …have you also experienced that? And, you rely start to share that, that similar experience …then it feels like you really know a person and it feels like you can really communicate.
R: To get to better synergy or …
P3: Yes.
R: Better energy?
P3: Yes.
R: So you believe that definitely between colleagues it would feature?
P3: Yes, I believe so.
R: And it is not distinctly only for when there is a teacher and a learner?
P3: No.
R: And so the power relation between teacher and student …some have mentioned that? How do you feel, how does it feature in here …does the model speak to that, cater for that or …could it be hooked onto it somehow? Does it influence it?
P3: I am not sure of how that would feature …umm, all I can say at this point is that …thinking about the question we just answered before …about different relationships in and out of the classroom, whether it is really personal like your husband and your children or …fellow colleagues or students umm …whether there is the feature of power or not …the respect still needs to be there.
(Power / respect) 45:10
R: So …you wouldn’t make much of power, in there you would focus more on, the respect element
P3: I would focus on the respect element …but at this stage I really have to think about that question some more.
R: Mmm…I have also found it fascinating so, respect and power…
P3: I think power comes thru respect.
R: Ok.
P3: I think it comes thru the belief …it is like an image that you project
R: Mmm…
P3: And …if they believe that …power is not an actual thing, it is not something that you can just acquire and you have it, it is something you have got to work for and if they respect you I think power will follow.
R: Ok …the positive elements of power?
P3: A person can be really powerful without being…
R: Respectful?
P3: Ja, no …
R: Not...can they be really powerful without respect?

P3: What I wanted to say is without being angry or shouting or...

R: Mmm...

P3: You can be a really quiet person but you can still be really powerful.

R: Mmm...

P3: It is really the image that you project and the respect I can say demand from others?

R: Mm...I was just wondering, it come up in some conversations and I thought...it is an interesting aspect that I have really considered that much...in this, because some might say that it is an unequal power relationship, between the student and the teacher...the teacher has the power because they know...and the student don't have any power because they don't know. Whether that now needs to be power...I don't know...it is certainly true that the teacher do know certain things that the student don't know...

P3: But, why are you there then, because you want to give that power to the children, you want to teach them how to do it, you want to give that power away. You want to share, don't you? Because why do you become a teacher at all? If power is an issue - because then you should become a politician.

Educational intention/power)

R: Well...

P3: If you want to be a teacher, that is what you are there for...you want to give your knowledge away to the next generation and to give that power to them so...so I don't think power features into it, the way I think about power is really...not umm...in the classroom no, it doesn't feature...but I do think it can become a subject for more investigation...it is very interesting.

R: So, the notion of...of a power struggle...between students and a teacher, or between students amongst themselves. Umm...whether it should or shouldn't, maybe it shouldn't...there could be strong arguments that it shouldn't...but the question though is – does it? Is it there...does it exist?

P3: There is a power struggle amongst the students because of their age and you know the place they are at,...there certainly is power struggles...I don't think there should be one between a teacher and a student, I don't think so.

R: So...you are saying that the teacher must model the fact that it is not about power? And that if it is about power...in the end it's about sharing.
P3: Exactly.
R: Mmm, mm… interesting, I was just thinking about that, it is a bit of a “side-bar”
P3: Yes.
R: But an interesting aspect … umm, ok so, you definitely think that the model can play a role outside the classroom.
P3: Yes definitely
R: Peers amongst themselves
P3: Yes.
R: Would you say that students need to be exposed to aspects of the model in some way, shape or form?
P3: Absolutely …I think it can only be positive.
R: Ok …so as much as it is a model for teachers …it can translate to a model for students amongst themselves?
P3: I think so …absolutely.
R: Ok, ok I think that is basically it …all I am left with is - what is the most important thing you feel you have learnt by being part of this process?
P3: Shoe …in a nutshell, the most important thing …I would say, thinking to next year and what I want to implement in my class, I would say it is to be assertive or, more assertive …and, to incorporate the model as part of my planning …and umm, also to realise that you can’t win them all, you try and you aim for that but don’t beat yourself up it you don’t get to that level …for each and every student, I do believe that for each and every student that I don’t get along with there is another teacher that …will understand their specific needs and things.
R: And …maybe for some it goes quickly and for other’s …
P3: It takes time …you have to be patient.
R: Ok, that is an interesting thing to learn …alright, is there anything more you would like to add about the experience…that you feel we haven’t really covered but it needs to be said? It needs to be shared.
P3: Not really that I can think of now …but I am thinking of, talking about power and power struggles …as we were… I am thinking that, in the beginning of your marriage, you do struggle a lot with that concept …until you come to a point where actually you realise that …giving up, for the good of another, is better and beneficial for the relationship and by giving more, you actually do receive more and it is not the other way around and …I think …students are really
selfish, because of where they are at …in life, they haven’t learnt about …um, they are not at that emotional level of …so you, as a teacher have to understand that …that you are going to be the one that gives, more of yourself to your learners …and to the relationship. And to be understanding …certainly in the case that we mentioned, it wasn’t purposely that the student intended to be disrespectful but, it happened

R: Mmm…that was, the feeling.
P3: Mm, ja.
R: And …if you are to be authentic …you have to acknowledge that, that is how you are feeling.
P3: Yes so all and all I would say it is a good thing to reflect, a good thing to analyse every now and again, and I think it certainly would be great to have this conversation again in six months time. Or three months time or whatever and just to reflect on …
R: How it’s gone?
P3: How it’s gone yes.
R: Mmm …I am more and more toying with that idea …how it would feature into the whole design is gone be interesting …but they do say, you know that is what I like about qualitative research …that they describe the process as iterative …meaning it feeds back and forth, back and forth …so to predict the whole thing from beginning to end and just following it slavishly …is basically not the way it works …so you have to remain flexible, so I am very much toying with that idea of um extending it a bit, for lack of a better term. Because I am very happy with what is there …but then again, there is always room for improvement.
P3: I think so, I certainly think that if you could get the whole group together…in a few months time there would be new insights …into it.
R: That would be very very interesting …so, I am more and more leaning towards it …but for now …is there anything more you would still like to ask me or any questions that I can clarify for you …I think it only remains for me to share that we will get together and have a group conversation pretty soon in about a weeks time …I am of two minds at the moment I am leaning to extend it slightly to …we said the second but I think maybe the fourth, which is the Wednesday …which is the latest possible time because we are going to be very busy with
the reports and some people are going to go away to mark and all of that …so I have to see how that goes but I will send an e-mail invitation and then if every person could be there it would be great …but then again we might have eight or nine as the focus group or maybe seven, but I am hoping that every single person can make it …and then the follow up, like I said I am thinking about it …maybe January slash March next year which I do believe will be valuable …but we will keep it voluntary… whoever wants to follow up can follow up whoever feels no, it’s done for them …I think I will also be fine with that.

P3: OK.
R: So thank you for your time and your efforts.
P3: It’s a pleasure.
Researcher Field-notes on interview

**Observational notes – Atmosphere during and body language**

Very positive and wanting the share experience. Interview reached quite a good level of depth - very good open dialogue.

**Methodological notes – Reflection on method**

Both the naïve sketch and the interview protocol worked very well to mediate reflection and open conversation.

**Personal notes – My own experience during interview**

It is day three of the individual interview process and I can feel that I am tired – but I am very excited about the data and I feel that I shared quite a bit of my own perspective with this participant.

**Theoretical notes – Possible perspectives on the Model**

A lot of good ideas about the level of communication attained by teacher and each of the individual learners they teach. Also ideas about how this level changes over time - and that for some students it might take a very long time - role of trust / authenticity / consistency and respect.

After transcription I believe that the ideas in this interview is very clear and covers a very wide range of issues related to the model and how it works.
ANNEXURE D
Example of Protocols for Focus Groups
Please read the following question and take 10 minute to answer:

What have been the outcomes of taking part in this process for you?

- Please share some of your thinking with the focus group in a 15 minute discussion.
Model Evaluation

Please evaluate the - *Model for the facilitation of constructive communication between teachers and learners in a Secondary School* - based on the following criteria.

- First have a 5 minute discussion on each of the 4 criteria – then take 15 minute to complete the written evaluation of the model (35 minute)

**Evaluation criteria from Chinn and Kramer (2008:234-247)**

- **Simplicity** – How simple is this model, for you?
  
  Simplicity means that the number of elements within each descriptive category, particularly concepts and their interrelationships, are minimal.
- **Clarity** – How clear is this model, for you?
  Clarity is described by considering the semantic clarity, semantic consistency, structural clarity and the structural consistency of the model. How accessible or understandable is the language and structure of the model.

- **Applicability** – How applicable is this model to the purpose it was designed for?
  Applicability can be described as how well the model fits its purpose.
- **Generalizability** - How general is this model?
  This question addresses the scope of experiences covered by the model. Can this model be applied in other situations outside the original context it was designed for?

Overall comment on the value of the model for you.
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