

https://dspace.org/

Examining revoicing practices of two Johannesburg teachers.

Sherman, Jessica

2012-09-21
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/11973

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The copyright of this research report vests in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, in accordance with the University's Intellectual Property Policy.

No portion of the text may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including analogue and digital media, without prior written permission from the University. Extracts of or quotations from this research report may, however, be made in terms of sections 12 and 13 of the south African copyright Act No. 98 of 1978 (as amended), for non-commercial or educational purposes. Full acknowledgement must be made to the author and the University.

An electronic version of this research report is available on the Library webpage (www.wits.ac.za/library) under "Research Resources".

For permission requests, please contact the University Legal Office or the University Research Office (www.wits.ac.za).

ABSTRACT

This study aims to address the need to support the improvement of teaching practices of South African mathematics teachers. Both international and South African literature suggest that orchestrating whole class discussion by using the practice of revoicing, can support learner appropriation of mathematical discourse, and that it is particularly suited to multilingual environments. Given the staying power of traditional style teaching, this study explores revoicing as a feedback practice within this style of Initiate, Respond, Evaluate/ Feedback (IRE/F) format. Two grade 6 mathematics teachers in Johannesburg were interviewed and their lessons were observed, filmed and analysed using a detailed coding instrument. The teachers were found to be giving as much revoicing as non-revoicing feedback to their learners and that revoicing was used in limited ways, mostly different to those suggested in the literature and not always productively. Key categories of revoicing seen in this study were repeating to affirm learners as well as rephrasing into mathematical language and funnelling learners towards correct answers. The contribution of this research to the field has been to expose the different ways in which two South African teachers are already using the practice of revoicing, in order to see the potential for further research and improved practice.

Keywords: revoicing, orchestration, mathematics, multilingual

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the Degree of Master of Education in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

.....

Signature

15th day of August 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would firstly like to acknowledge my friend Ingrid Sapire who recognised my interest in engaging with ideas and encouraged me to take this path.

To my lecturers and colleagues over the past two years for sharing the process.

I am most grateful to the teachers and learners who participated so generously in this study, allowing me to observe their teaching and learning practices.

A special thanks to my daughter, Zandi for being my critical reader and giving me such insightful feedback.

Lastly to my supervisor, Hamsa Venkatakrishnan, a huge thank you for going on this journey with me, taking on the role of expert and supporting my attempts at appropriating the required academic discourse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Introducing my study.....4

My sample.....4

Research question.....5

Outline of the rest of the report.....6

CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW..... 7

Introduction.....7

Theoretical framework/s for this study.....7

Mathematical learning as Discourse appropriation.....10

My analytic framework/coding model.....25

CHAPTER 3:RESEARCH DESIGN.....34

Introduction.....34

Data collection.....37

Rigour – reliability and validity.....38

Practical issues:.....41

Theoretical issues 41

Ethics.....42

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....43

Teacher interview comments.....43

Moving from teachers views to my observations.....50

Revoicing and non-revoicing feedback practices.....52

Most commonly used feedback moves 60

What other revoicing feedback moves do the teachers use?.....66

Staying with an idea or moving the lesson on.....86

Conclusion of chapter 89

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION..... 95

Introduction.....95

.

Research question.....96

Key arguments in the literature.....96

Key findings and analysis.....97

How findings contribute.....99

The way forward..... 100

APPENDICES.....102

REFERENCE LIST.....173

Figure	Page number	Heading
1	19	Pimm's model
2	19	Setati & Adler's model
3	20	Three options model
4	24	Non-revoicing and revoicing feedback
5	25	Subcategories of repeating and rephrasing
6	26	Whole class discussion within IRE/F
7	29	How the categories link together
8	32	Coding framework
9	53	Table giving a description of each feedback move
10	56	Table showing extent of the use of different feedback moves
11	58	Coding framework showing the raw data for each teacher per lesson
12	60	Feedback moves in relation to total teacher moves of 986
13	60	Each teachers use of non revoicing and revoicing moves
14	66	Bongani: % teacher moves of total teacher moves per lesson
15	78	Refiloe: % teacher moves of total teacher moves per lesson