

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Using a community of practice lens
to examine interaction
in inclusive early intervention programmes in
New Zealand**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Educational Psychology

Massey University, Albany Campus, Auckland
New Zealand

Lesley Dunn
2011

Declaration

I declare that this thesis represents my own work except where the acknowledgement is made, and that this material has not been included in a thesis or report submitted to Massey University or any other university for a degree or other qualification.



.....

Lesley Dunn
Candidate for PhD

ABSTRACT

In New Zealand, the parent(s), teachers, early intervention specialists and education support worker, who support a child with a disability in a regular early childhood centre, decide together on the child's individual plan (IP). They are referred to throughout this thesis as an 'IP group'. This study examined the way members of three IP groups interacted during their planning process.

The quality of collaboration among professionals from diverse disciplines and parents involved in inclusive early intervention has raised concerns here and overseas. Using communities of practice to support closer understandings has been advocated, although this approach does not appear to have been applied in an inclusive early intervention context. In this study, the model of community of practice was used as a tool with which to analyse the way in which the IP groups worked together. The IP groups, while not themselves communities of practice, were conceptualised as social systems, which allowed for a holistic view to be taken of how the groups planned their interventions.

Data taken from planning meetings and interviews was analysed per group using dimensions from a community of practice model. Common themes relating to the ways participants in each group interacted with one another were identified and discussed. These issues comprised the effects of an uneven knowledge base on power within the groups, the influence of beliefs about inclusion and the teaching process on what the groups chose to do, the groups' communication repertoires, evidence of situated learning for individuals through participation in the groups, and limitations to the way the groups evaluated their work.

The use of the model of community of practice as a tool for analysis not only drew attention to these interactions within the IP groups, but demonstrated the interdependence of the elements that supported or hindered those interactions. The use of the model in this way is a contribution of this study, as are the insights into the complex and interdependent issues affecting the successful delivery of programmes by early intervention groups in New Zealand.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the many people who made this thesis possible.

Firstly, I would like to thank the people who participated in the study. They contributed their time and allowed me to be privy to their thoughts as they worked, generously and frankly. Their commitment to the child they were involved with was inspiring.

I want to thank my supervisors, Dr. Jean Annan, Professor Joy Cullen, and Dr. Roberta Hunter for their ever-present and generous encouragement, warm support, probing and rigorous questioning, and thoughtful reflection. They have guided me through this journey with their depth of knowledge, and a commitment to the value of research. It has been a privilege to have their involvement.

Also I want to thank Associate Professor Ken Ryba who brought me into his cohort of psychologist doctoral students, got me started, and with Joy, supported me through the first years as I began to develop my thesis. I must also acknowledge Professor Margaret Carr who said back in 1998, as I believe is her wont, “You could always do a doctorate.” I want to thank her for showing us how to demonstrate the active learner in every child.

I am grateful for the funding from Massey University’s Graduate Research Fund for the costs of transcribing the interviews, and the Ministry of Education’s Regional Innovations Fund for paying further costs associated with this research.

I want to thank colleagues, Peter Reid, for his very generous help with the presentation, and Sally Barry and Sue Irwin for listening to my moments of angst, and taking me out to coffee.

My family and friends have been patient and born with me when I have withdrawn to study. Thank you for your ongoing love and support.

Especially I must thank my husband, Anthony Viner, who urged me to resume study, and has read and commented with interest on everything I have written from the start. He has sat through dinners without number (which he has cooked) debating the issues, and arguing the points that I have been concerned with. His involvement with and enthusiasm for this thesis has never flagged, a gift without price.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
1 Chapter Overview	1
1.1. Rationale for examining the interactions of the IP group	2
1.2. Background to education provision for inclusive early intervention in New Zealand	4
1.2.1. The New Zealand early childhood education curriculum: <i>Te Whāriki</i> ..	4
1.2.2. Inclusive early intervention provision	6
1.2.3. Differences between New Zealand early childhood education and inclusive early intervention programmes	7
1.3. Two Field Studies	8
1.3.1. The <i>Kei Tua o te Pae</i> project and attitudes to children	9
1.3.2. A survey of groups involved with inclusive early intervention programmes	9
1.4. Overview of the Thesis Organisation	10
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
2 Chapter Overview	11
2.1. Challenges of Inclusive Early Intervention Services and the Call for Improved Collaboration	11
2.1.1. An advisory model of service delivery: different understandings of what this means	12
2.1.2. Attitudes to inclusion	13
2.1.3. Goal setting for individual plans	15
2.1.4. Parent involvement	16
2.1.5. Advocating collaboration	16

2.2. Extending and improving ways of working together.....	18
2.2.1. Programmes designed to facilitate collaboration	18
2.2.2. Establishing communities of practice to aid interactive work among early intervention teams	21
2.3. Communities of Practice	22
2.3.1. Overview of the model of community of practice	22
2.3.2. Key understandings	24
<i>a. Definitions of community of practice</i>	24
<i>b. Situated learning</i>	26
<i>c. Legitimate peripheral participation</i>	27
<i>d. Identity</i>	28
<i>e. Shared domain</i>	29
<i>f. Practice and participation</i>	29
<i>g. Connectivity of the dimensions</i>	30
2.3.3. The relationship of the model of community of practice to collaborative interaction	31
<i>a. Collaboration between researchers and practitioners using the model of a community of practice.....</i>	31
<i>b. Collusion rather than collaboration.....</i>	32
<i>c. Reflective Practice as an essential process in collaboration.....</i>	34
<i>d. The place of conflict in the collaborative experience of working within a community of practice</i>	35
2.3.4. Community of practice as a lens through which to conceptualise group interactions	37
2.4. How this study relates to the ways that other writers have considered collaboration in communities of practice	38
2.4.1. Use of the reified model of community of practice	38
2.4.2. Approaches to the conceptual model of community of practice	39
2.4.3. The use of a model of community of practice as an analytical tool ..	40
2.4.4. The rationale for the use of the model of community of practice as an analytical tool in this study	40
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	43
3 Chapter Overview	43
3.1 The Theoretical Approach to this Study	44
3.1.1. A socio-cultural paradigm	44
3.1.2. Case study descriptors	45

3.1.3. Methodologies used with other education studies involving communities of practice	47
3.1.4. The study's epistemology	48
3.1.5. Validity and Reliability	50
3.2. Procedures used in this Study	52
3.2.1. Background for the study	53
<i>a. Inclusive early intervention programmes</i>	53
<i>b. The IP group</i>	53
3.2.2. Selection and engagement of participants and centres	56
3.2.3. Project planning meetings	58
3.2.4. Ethical considerations	59
3.2.5. Data collection	62
<i>a. Meeting minutes</i>	62
<i>b. Interviews</i>	62
<i>c. Written documentation</i>	63
3.2.6. Data analysis	64
CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION:	
GROUP 1	66
4. Chapter Overview	66
4.1. Reference System and Abbreviations	68
4.2. Background Information for Group 1	68
4.3. Community	70
4.3.1. The extent to which group members knew each other prior to the start of the project	70
4.3.2. The knowledge that the different members brought to the group ...	70
4.3.3. 'Core' members of the group and 'newcomers'	72
4.3.4. The relationships among members and the impact of knowledge differences on these relationships	73
4.3.5. Community: Summary	74
4.4. Domain	74
4.4.1. The stated rationales and underpinning belief systems for selecting the shared activities	74
<i>a. Moving away from pre-set goals in favour of following the child's lead</i>	74
<i>b. Using a home-school book</i>	76

<i>c. Preparing the child for transition to school by teaching him to remain within boundaries</i>	78
4.4.2. Selecting the areas to work on – The decision making process	79
4.4.3. The extent to which the reasons for the decisions were shared by the group	80
4.4.4. New learning for group members that affected the way they thought about their work	81
4.4.5. Domain: Summary	82
4.5. Practice	82
4.5.1. Changes to practice	82
<i>a. Moving away from pre-set IP goals in favour of following the child's lead</i>	82
<i>b. Using a home-school book</i>	84
<i>c. Transition to school</i>	86
<i>d. Professional development: SCERTS</i>	87
4.5.2. The way the group dealt with disagreements among themselves ...	88
4.5.3. Evidence of increased learning during shared assessment	89
4.5.4. Suggestions for ongoing changes to practice	91
4.5.5. Practice: Summary	92
CHAPTER 5: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: GROUP 2	93
5. Chapter Overview	93
5.1. Background Information	93
5.2. Community	94
5.2.1. The extent to which group members knew each other prior to the start of the project, and who were the 'core' members of the group and who were the 'newcomers'	95
5.2.2. The knowledge that the different members brought to the group, and the way their roles were perceived	96
5.2.3. The relationships among members	97
5.2.4. Community: summary	99
5.3. Domain	99
5.3.1. The stated rationales and underpinning belief systems for selecting the shared activities	100
<i>a. Setting goals differently</i>	100
<i>b. Transition to school</i>	101
<i>c. Benchmarks as a discussion area</i>	102

5.3.2. Selecting the areas to work on – The decision making process	103
5.3.3. Extent to which the reasons for the decisions were shared by the group	104
5.3.4. New learning for group members that affected the way they thought about their work	104
5.3.5. Domain: Summary	105
5.4. Practice	105
5.4.1. Extent of change in the way the group worked	105
<i>a. Setting goals for the child's IP differently</i>	105
<i>b. Transition to school</i>	109
<i>c. Benchmarks</i>	111
5.4.2. The way the group dealt with disagreements among themselves ...	111
5.4.3. Evidence of successful interactions	113
<i>a. Transition to School</i>	113
<i>b. Assessment</i>	113
5.4.4. Suggestions for ongoing changes to practice	116
5.4.5. Practice: Summary	116
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: GROUP 3	117
6. Chapter Overview	117
6.1. Background Information	117
6.2. Community	119
6.2.1. The extent to which group members knew each other prior to the start of the project, and who were the 'core' members of the group and who were the 'newcomers'	119
6.2.2. The knowledge that the different members brought to the group, and the way their roles were perceived	120
6.2.3. The relationships among members and the impact of knowledge differences on these relationships	121
6.2.4. Community: Summary	123
6.3. Domain	123
6.3.1. The stated rationales and underpinning belief systems for selecting the shared activities	124
6.3.2. Selecting the areas to work on – The decision making process	125
6.3.3. Extent to which the reasons for the decisions were shared by the group	127
6.3.4. New learning for individual participants that affected the way they thought about their work	128

6.3.5. Domain: Summary	129
6.4. Practice	129
6.4.1. Extent of change in the way the group worked	129
<i>a. The ROCK routine</i>	129
<i>b. Learning Stories</i>	132
6.4.2. The way the group dealt with disagreements among themselves ...	132
6.4.3. Response to interactions and evidence of collaborative work	134
6.4.4. Suggestions for ongoing changes to practice	135
6.4.5. Practice: Summary	136
CHAPTER 7: THEMATIC PATTERNS ACROSS THE THREE IP	
GROUPS	137
7. Chapter Introduction and Overview	137
7.1. Dimension-related themes across the IP groups	137
7.1.1 Professional influence in the three IP groups	138
<i>a. The context of the inclusive early intervention programmes</i>	140
<i>b. Comparative advocacy strengths</i>	140
7.1.2. The way beliefs about inclusion and Te Whāriki affected decision making	141
7.1.3. Authenticity of the IP groups' communication repertoire	142
<i>a. An avoidance of disagreement</i>	142
<i>b. A reluctance to talk directly about issues where this might be construed as criticism</i>	143
<i>c. Individuals working alone</i>	144
<i>d. Lack of follow-through on maintaining communication with the whole group</i>	145
<i>e. Vague terminology</i>	145
7.1.4. The influence of joint work on new learning for group members	145
a. Shared assessment processes	146
b. Identity development	147
c. Generalising to other situations	147
7.1.5 Group wide learning and development	148
<i>a. Programme evaluation</i>	148
<i>b. A shared plan</i>	149

7.2 The interdependence of the issues impacting on the IP groups' operations ...	149
CHAPTER 8 : CONCLUSIONS	153
8 Chapter Overview	153
8.1. Implications for Practice	154
8.1.1. Professional roles in inclusive early intervention programmes in New Zealand	156
8.1.2. Programme evaluation	156
8.1.3. Professional development regarding communication	156
8.2. The Contribution that this Research has made to Theory and the Field	157
8.3. The Limitations of the Study	158
8.4. Future Directions for Research and Debate	159
9.5. Conclusion	160
REFERENCES	162
APPENDICES	174
Appendix A. Make-up of the Three IP Groups	174
Appendix B. Time Frame	175
Appendix C. Interview Questions	176
Appendix D. NVivo Nodes	177
Appendix E. Examples of Stage 1 and 2 data sorting (Group 1 belief systems)	178
Appendix F. Data headings (Group 1)	187
Appendix G. Comparison table across the three groups: headings	189
LIST OF TABLES	
Table 1: Process of selecting an IP group	58
Table 2: A comparative description of the make-up of the three IP groups	174
Table 3: Study dates	175

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The interactive nature of community of practice 37

Figure 2: Focus of interest in a case study of interaction in inclusive early
intervention 46

Figure 3: Researcher / participant / data relationship 49

Figure 4: The interdependency of issues affecting the IP groups' operation ... 151