Method

Participatory action research (PAR) engaged the mentors and myself in examining our own knowledge and the interpretative categories we held about mentoring and critical friendship. Through critical reflection we examined our understanding, skills and values as well as the ways in which we interpreted ourselves (our reflexivity) and our actions within the context of the school and our mentor or critical friend practice (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). In my inquiry I referred to these two areas as “knowledge” and “interpretative categories (reflexivity)”. To organise my inquiry I utilised a PAR reflective model inspired by Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) and Kemmis (2009) (see Figure 12. PAR reflective model inspired by Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Kemmis, 2009). The mentors and I worked in what I called a participatory learning team (PLT). A PLT is a small group of people who work together collaboratively. Thus my use of PLT and group are interchangeable throughout my report.

A multi-method approach was used to collect data allowing for flexibility and triangulation (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, pp. 141-142) of the data. This allowed my inquiry to be “conducted from more than one standpoint” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 141) and gave a fuller explanation of our knowledge and interpretative categories (reflectivity) as mentor and critical friend in the PAR. There were three types of data collection: (1) Semi-structured interviews; (2) Video-tape recording of PLTs and (3) My Reflective Journal.
The information is presented in a visual/verbal format where I have used visuals accompanied by annotations, interspersed with text.

*Figure 12.* PAR reflective model inspired by Kemmis & McTaggart; 2005; Kemmis, 2009.
METHOD

Participatory Action Research
Utilised as a methodology within two independent Catholic schools to bring together, in a collaborative process, the mentors from each school and myself as critical friend.

Participants

Mentors
Had a general interest in mentoring colleagues (beginning or experienced teachers) they worked with during the course of their practice (see Step 1 Section 2 for details).

Critical friend
Had an extensive and varied career in education (see Step 1 section 2 for details).

Worked in Participatory Learning Teams
Established at two schools

Picasso Catholic High
- Two mentors
- 8 PLT sessions
- Each session 45 minutes
- Utilised lesson within school timetable
- Met fortnightly for two and a half terms

Maisee Catholic High
- Two mentors
- 9 PLT sessions
- Sessions varied between 60 - 90 minutes each
- Loosely organised occurred at two week or three week intervals for three terms.
This structure was "fluid, open and responsive" (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 563) which allowed for flexibility in meeting the needs of the mentors.

Mentors were the driving force of the participatory action research

Supported by myself as critical friend
## Participatory Action Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors’ PAR</th>
<th>My PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentors conducted their own PAR on an aspect of their mentoring practice they wished to explore and improve. This was supported by myself as a critical friend.</td>
<td>I conducted my own PAR collecting and analysing data which examined my role as a critical friend and informed future directions of the PAR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ran concurrently

**Participatory Learning Team - Mentors**

- Planning PAR
- Acting
- Observing
- Reflecting

**Critical friend / Researcher**

- Plan role through reconnaissance
- Acting - Work in PLT 1
- Observing - video & Journal
- Acting - Work in PLT 2
- Observing - video & Journal
- Reflecting
- Analysis - video & Journal
- Re-planning of role
- Analysis - video & Journal
- ... and so on

---

Kemmis & McTaggart, 2003, p.363
Data Collection Method

Multi-method approach used to collect data. Allowed for flexibility and triangulation (Cohen et al., 2007, pp. 141 - 142)

Allowed me to conduct and explore my research from more than one perspective. Gave a fuller explanation of the knowledge and interpretative categories (reflexivity) of the mentors and myself in the PAR.

1. Interviewed before the first and after the last PLT session.

2. Video recorded the PLT sessions.

3. My Reflective Journal

Conceptualised into themes:
1. Process
2. Relationships
3. Learning
Semi-structured Interviews

The semi-structured interviews gathered information about the mentors’ past and current experiences, through their memories, feelings, beliefs, ideals, assumptions and understanding about the process and relationship aspects of their mentor practice. The interviews also functioned as a comparative tool which determined the mentors’ prior knowledge and experiences of mentoring, the critical friend role in PAR and the process of PAR and to later identify their transformative changes as mentors from having worked together within a PAR.

The interviews were audio-taped and although audio-taping may have constrained the respondent somewhat, it kept an accurate record of the conversation (Cohen et al., 2007). Audio-taping freed me from note making and it allowed for a more natural conversation to take place between the mentor and myself as the interviewer/researcher (Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2005).

First Interview

A schedule of open-ended questions set out under topics were developed to guide me during the first interviews (Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2005) The questions were organised under the headings; Demographics, Relationship, Process, Relationship with Beginning Teacher / Mentee, Reflection, Perception of PAR and Critical friend and catered for those who were already a mentor and those starting out as mentors. The length of first interview was approximately 30 minutes which allowed me to work in the usual lesson time within the voluntary schools.
Second Interview

At the end of the PAR a second interview was conducted, revisiting some of questions from the first interview. However this interview was more flexible permitting me to “probe for more in-depth responses” (Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2005, p. 52) from the mentors. I explored their experiences from their mentoring practice through their strengths and challenges as revealed during the PAR. This interview also explored the mentors’ understanding of PAR as a process and it allowed them to evaluate their participation within a PAR as a model of contextualised PD. Feedback from the mentors on my role as a critical friend as part of my practice was an important component of this interview.

Transformative changes of interview schedules

Participatory action research as a method was fluid, open and responsive to the changes (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 563) I experienced in constructing the interview schedules for my inquiry. The planned interview schedules evolved as a result of my ongoing reflection in the planning stage, while conducting the interviews and after the completion of the earlier interviews. Their transformation is explained in Figure 13 (Self reflective cycle illustrating development of interview schedules) and is supported by appendices (Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D). In addition my growing experience as a researcher of PAR also contributed to their transformation as I learnt from working within the PAR. Table 2 (Examples of transformed questions) provides examples to illustrate how the transformed questions in the right column looked compare to their original in the left column.
“Reflection in action” (Schon, 1995, p. 30) while conducting initial interviews with mentors from Picasso CH.

Assumptions had been made and were realised. Questions were reframed and further questions developed, during the course of the interview.

**Planning**
Original interview schedules approved by Ethics (Appendix A).

**Acting**
Interview schedule used.

**Observing**
Reviewed audio-taped recording of interview.

**Re-Acting**
Used the new interview schedules in second PAR.

**Reflecting**
On the outcomes of the interview and I took into the consideration the developing PAR and its context.

**Re-planning**
Re-planned the interview schedules. Developed to include more open ended questions to enrich the responses of schedules for use in PAR with Second interview Picasso CH (Appendix C) and with First and Second interviews Matisse CH (Appendix D).

*Figure 13.* Self reflective cycle illustrating development of interview schedules.
Table 2. Examples of transformed questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Question changed to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>Question changed to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First interview</td>
<td>Is your previous/current process mentoring formal or informal? How often did/do you meet with the Beginning Teacher? What was/is the procedure for your mentor session?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you describe a typical mentoring session? How would you describe a typical mentoring session to someone who knew nothing about them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumed previous experience with critical friend role: What would you like my role as critical friend to be in your PAR? And what do you as a mentor expect from the relationship with a critical friend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you a person in mind who you consider to be an excellent teacher? Can you describe a typical lesson that this person would give?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To focus on the presentation style rather than the role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second interview</td>
<td>Allowed for the different contexts of the two schools I worked:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picasso Catholic High - questions about mentoring were not asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matisse Catholic High - specific questions about the participants mentor practice were asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When you think about your coordinator or teacher mentoring role, what are you most proud of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As time has gone on, what has become easier, what has become more challenging?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Video recording of Participatory Learning Teams

Video recordings of the PLT sessions were conducted at the two schools, these were utilised on two different levels. The first as a data collection tool, the video recordings were an indirect observer (Rosenstein & Israel, 2002; Spiers, 2004) of my role as a critical friend. The video recordings gave me the opportunity to observe and reflect from a different perspective the mentor teachers and myself working and learning together in the PAR. It allowed for a more transparent process (Weber, 2008) where I could see what we did and said during the PLT sessions and how we related to each other (Kemmis, 2009). Video recordings of each PLT allowed me to make multiple viewings of the PLT sessions.

On a second level the video recordings were a record of the mentors own PAR process which was shared with them at a later time.

The video cameras were located in the room to ensure that the three PLT members were within a frontal view of the camera lens (see Figure 14. Video camera placement). Camera angles would vary depending on the available space. The video cameras “recorded all that was within its view” (Rosenstein & Israel, 2002, p. 24) as they were left stationary. They were turned on at the beginning of the PLT session and stopped at the end of the session by myself.

My Reflective Journal

I used a reflective journal in order to observe myself (Schön, 1995) as a critical friend within PAR. The emphasis of my journal was to describe and reflect on my
developing role as a critical friend as part of my practice. To explore the strategies I employed supporting the mentors with their mentoring practice and recorded my understanding of the PAR practice while working in a PAR.

**Organisation of my journal**

The journal layout followed a similar arrangement for each PLT session, starting on the left page of the journal for each new reflection (see Figure 15. Sample page from My Reflective Journal) I commenced with a copy of my Plan of action for the PLT session. Then a diagram that identified where the members of the group were sitting within the room in relationship to the cameras.

---

*Fig 14. Video camera placement.*
Next, was my initial reflection, that I brought close to the event by using a digital voice recorder to tape it directly after the PLT session. This recording was transcribed and corrected for written expression. This initial reflection was a rich description of the events that occurred between the mentors and myself during the PLT session. It included observations such as: the experiences and issues discussed; the rapport, mood and atmosphere between the mentors and myself as critical friend and how I responded or reacted to situations, questions or conversations. This reflection also included interpretations based on my tacit understandings (Schön, 1995) of what was communicated or done by the mentors during the PLT session. Further reflections were added, after I watched the video recording of the PLT session. This allowed me to clarify my observations and beliefs made during my initial reflection. Interwoven throughout my reflective writing were ideas for the next PLT session that directed my reading of relevant literature before I planned the next PLT session. I also included in my reflective journal copies of the “objects” (Wenger, 1998, p. 58) that reified the work done by the mentors and/or myself as part of our practice during the PAR.

To add greater depth to my reflective writing, a critical reflection was entered into the journal after each PLT session. This critical reflection allowed me to begin to analyse the proceedings and concerns raised during the PLT sessions. It also allowed me to document any changes in my perceptions regarding my practice as a critical friend. The following questions were used to guide my thinking (Baskerville & Goldbatt, 2009 p. 214; Holly, 1984):

What were the important elements of the PLT session?

In what way was I a critical friend?

How did I stimulate other’s thinking?
What did I learn? What insights did I gain? How or why was this significant for me?

What aspect of my practice as a critical friend do I wish to focus on?

Have my assumptions and perspectives changed? How?

How can I apply theoretical knowledge to the situations described?

How will I apply what I have learnt to the next PLT session?

Figure 15. Sample page from My Reflective Journal.
The collection of data and subsequent analysis of those data followed the action research model of planning, acting and observing, reflecting and then re-planning. This allowed for constant analysis followed by feedback to stimulate reflection by the mentors and myself as critical friend. Each data collection and analysis cycle informed our future directions within the PAR.

Participants produced ‘objects’ which:

Reified our practice “in a congealed form” (Wenger, 1998, p. 59). The objects were a representation of our experience of what we do (activities and work produced) Think and Say (talk) and Relate (verbal and non-verbal interactions) (Kemmis, 2009) about our mentoring practice during the PAR.

Are evidenced in the data items collected

Resulted from our practice of mentoring and the practice of PAR, for example:

- Planning and holding meetings.
- The talk that resulted.
- Stories told.
- Drawings completed.
- Mentor plans developed.
- Visual tools constructed.

General Pattern Coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994)

used to analyse the data items

Read and coded to identify statements and/or actions that fell into pre-determined themes and categories.

Inferences made about the knowledge and interpretative categories (reflexivity) of the mentors and critical friend’s mentoring practice and their understanding of doing PAR.

Organised into three themes:
1. Process
2. Relationships
3. Learning

Alphabetical and colour codes
Extensively used throughout the study.

Additional codes were added when appropriate.

1. Transcripts from Interviews
2. PLT observation sheet for video recording of PLT session
3. Reflective Journal entries
### Themes

#### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Knowledge that the participant has of the mentor process (Blue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Own impact on the mentor process (reflexivity) (Purple).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Knowledge of the PAR as a process (Mauve).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Facilitation of learning by the Critical Friend during the PAR (Green).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Knowledge that the participant has of building relationships. (Red)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Own impact on (their mentor) relationships (reflexivity) (Yellow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Own impact on the PAR (reflexivity) (Orange).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Other reflective statements related to ________________ (Pink).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Moments of learning by participants (Gold).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Sharing (Silver).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each category was assigned an alphabetical code along with colour coding to visually separate the alphabetised codes. Process was coded in cool colours, blue, purple, mauve and green and Relationships in warm colours, red, yellow and orange. Learning was coded in pink, gold and silver.

**Transformative changes of the Categories**

As experienced with the interview schedules, PAR as a method, was fluid, open and responsive to change (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 563). The planned themes and categories evolved as a result of my ongoing analysis and subsequent reflection during the first PAR as illustrated in Figure 16 (Self reflective cycle illustrating development of themes and categories for analysis of data collected). My growing experience as a researcher of PAR also contributed to the transformation as I learnt from working within the PAR.
Figure 16. Self reflective cycle illustrating development of themes and categories for analysis of data collected.
Two stages of analysis

There were two stages of analysis, the first stage informed and fed back into the PLT sessions as part of the PAR process. It formed the basis of reflection by myself for my role as the critical friend before further action was planned and acted upon in the next PLT session. This stage also allowed me to reveal trends in the emerging themes, patterns and regularities of our knowledge and interpretative categories (reflexivity) of how we Do, Think and Say and Relate (Kemmis, 2009) in our practice as mentor or critical friend while working in the PAR. The second stage was a comparative analysis to reveal possible transformative changes in our knowledge and interpretative categories (reflexivity) of mentoring and/or critical friendship as well as our understanding of PAR as a practice.

First stage analysis

To explain the procedure I undertook to do my initial analysis of the data I continued my approach of using visuals accompanied by annotations. The snapshots of text (pages 83 – 88) came from the transcribed first and second interviews and their subsequent summary tables. For consistency, I used examples of interview data from the same mentor. The transcriptions of the interviews were out-sourced (Brown, 2001; Segal & Schuck, 2001). They included: what was being said; who was doing the speaking; emphasis placed by the speaker; pauses (in time) and any long silences (in time) and interruptions to the conversation e.g. school announcements (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 367 - 368). These are followed by annotated examples of the “PLT observation sheet for video recording of PLT session” (pages 88 – 91) and last, My Reflective Journal (page 92).
1. Listened to interview and read transcript to:
   * correct errors
   * identify broad themes
   * Process, Relationship, or Learning

2. Re-read the interview to categorise the statements.
   Used highlighters to apply the intended colour code.

First Interview

Example 1 from Interview Julianne - transcript

No and we had a teacher development day on Wednesday and at some stage I thought I really should do that, I knew one, all of the Yr 10 coordinators does once a cycle so that's once a fortnight and they have coffee and muffins together. Yeah I might do that with my lot.

It's something you might explore, working together cos that was my first thought, what can you do as a group and to build up relationships in the group? I was going to ask you next do you meeting regularly so?

No, in year group we do, its once a month.

So you meet with the kids.
**Identified statements were transferred to a summary table**

**Emerging Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Mentor's have of mentoring process:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The kids and the staff, the whole Yr 9 whatever, and that's usually and I kind of organize the structure of what we're going to do and I send that out to everyone and invite does anybody have anything they want to talk about or whatever p8/9...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes were identified and reduced to key words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm more than happy if people want to be involved but they seem to be a little reluctant and then at the end of the meeting I ask if there are any comments from the teachers as well, I think it's important to keep asking. p9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges: Being a bit scattered with what I do p9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Mentor's have of building relationships:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm more than happy if people want to be involved but they seem to be a little reluctant and then at the end of the meeting I ask if there are any comments from the teachers as well, I think it's important to keep asking. p8...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to keep asking for involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judgemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can we do something with this as a goal?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emerging Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regularly annotated ideas (typed in red or hand wrote)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2C, from Summary Table for Interview of Juliane – Analysis, p. 3

Mentors’ reflexivity on mentor process:

*a regular meeting*? No and we had a teacher development day on Wednesday and at some stage I thought I really should do that. I know one, Karen, she’s the Yr10 coordinator she does once a cycle so that’s once a fortnight, and they have coffee and muffins together. Yeah I might do that with my lot p8 ...

Mentors’ reflexivity on mentor relationship:

and I don’t know why that is and I’m nervous to ask them, I don’t know if it’s a thing of trust or respect, I just feel they don’t respect me p6 ...

Q’s whether she has the team’s trust or respect. How can trust be developed?

Aims / sees herself as an equal and being more cooperative.

Example 2D, from Summary Table for Interview of Juliane – Analysis, p. 4

Knowledge the Mentors have of PAR process:

*research study at all?*

I don’t think I have, the only thing I’m doing at the moment is with the McGrath Foundation they’re apparently creating units of work suitable of PDHPE lessons and they p10

Mentors’ reflexivity on PAR as a practice:


Example 2E, from Summary Table for Interview of Juliane – Analysis, p. 4

Expectations of the Critical Friends role in the PAR by the mentors.

Well one is really engaging and funny and just so encouraging of the kids, like she’s a bit wacky and you think how does she get away with that but she does because its genuine and honest and not malicious she’s never like that. The other one is really calm you could just listen to her all day, ...

Engaging
Funny
Encouraging
Genuine
Honest...
Example 2F, from Summary Table for Interview of Julianne – Analysis, p 5

Other statements/opinions related to own practice or issues raised.

One, I think she’s quite hostile and shequite covert about that, um... and she’s very right within her thinking box, um... and I just don’t think that she thinks I have any p4...

I just feel that she doesn’t value any, she’s an English teacher and I’m a PE teacher so therefore my status is, I’m not worthy.
P4

No she is, she’s new, she been at another school before, a boys private school for quite a while and I thought things might be beneficial for our relationship when we took the students away for a basketball competition and I said ‘what made you come to this school?’ when you change schools, and then off we went for a whole hour’s bus trip. ‘I this and I that and I, I, I, I, I, I, I, I’
P4

I don’t know why that is and I’m nervous to ask them, I don’t know if it’s a thing of trust or respect, I just feel they don’t respect me p6

Trust and respected wanted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mentoring Experience</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julianne</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>J. is a PE/PE teacher and has been teaching in total close to twenty years, with a nine year break to raise a family. J. has been in this school for ten years and recently became a year coordinator. She has had this permanent position for 6 months after acting in the role last year for one term. The job requires her to act as a mentor to those that are the main (pastoral care) teachers of the students.</td>
<td>J. works with the mentor teachers in the grade assigned to her. She will “touch base with them casually”. I tend not to hear anything from them unless it’s something negative, even then a couple of them have tried, chosen not to include me in that but have gone over my head, and those in particular they are my biggest challenge in term of my connection with and making it meaningful for them.</td>
<td>School context we’ve had one principal, people out of year coordinator roles. I’ve never been able to think of anything else that I’d really rather be doing. I love high school kids, I’ve taught at a pre-school before I got a bit over wiping tables, wiping bottoms and wiping noses. I feel very grateful to be working here and my children started school here, the oldest was at college here before I started part-time work, then the part...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context of the mentor was summarized within a table. This information was added to when more was revealed about the mentor’s context during PLT sessions.

Summary of interview was given to participants for verification before the follow-up interview took place. Anonymity was difficult to maintain and this allowed the participants the opportunity to verify and/or alter the summary of their interview so that they could identify information that may threaten their interests (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

86
Second Interview

Example 3A Second Interview transcription - Julanne, p 3

Followed the same procedure as the first interview - transcriptions were listened to and read to correct errors and identify the broad themes. Followed by a second reading to categorize the statements.

Further refinement of my coding system. A broad stroke with the highlighter over the writing means the statement had a strong connection to the category, whereas a thin line under the writing had a more tenuous link to the category. This was also represented by a line down the side of the paragraph.

NOTE: The colour coding allowed me to quickly identify statements that were rich in content. The rich statement about process of mentoring. Example 3A from Second Interview transcription - Julanne, p 3 was easily identified by the blue and purple. As was the rich statement about relationship in example 3B from Second Interview transcription - Julanne, p 7) which is in yellow. Both have learning identified by gold.

Example 3B from Second Interview transcription - Julanne, p 7

Evident here are examples of the category codes I added during the course of my study. R4, Gold for learning.
Like the first interview the identified statements were transferred into a summary table, however this table had two additional sections.

### Example 4A, from Summary Table for Second Interview of Julianne – Analysis, p. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About going to PD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing by Mentor:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thinking) um... Some PD thing, something where it's not really... I find going to PD things or whatever, the fees are ridiculous you know $300 or whatever and your kind of being talked at, like it's a lecture which is fine. But then some of them are smaller so they might ask you, for what do you think or whatever. And then people are so... sensitive, you know if you say one thing, somebody will take it the wrong way and you never get a chance to like... um... really explain the whole scenario or go into things in any depth and then you get people, who just go on and on about themselves and how fabulous they are and there's never, like even if there's a group thing or time for discussion, you never really, it's hard to get over those kind of initial hurts if you like, I feel too sensitive. Is that because it's the one off type sessions? Yeah or I don't know if its PE teachers and they are pretty competitive so you say one thing and then off they go redoing each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah. So and I think on my god this is revolting get me out of here. It takes time to develop trust between people. Yes. And that's the advantage of this type of group. I think so yeah. pp11 -12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example 4B, from Summary Table for Second Interview of Julianne – Analysis, p. 7.

| Discussing how she sees students now compared to earlier in the year. |
| **Learning /change made by Mentor:** |
| (Thinking) I would probably have the I actually find the students are closer to me in many ways than mentor teachers, it's a different relationship but I do have a closer relationship with the students, a more formal relationship, like, it's quite interesting but as the year's gone on, umm yeah be more equal I think around. p.7 |
| I don't know I think I'm probably kinesthetic to be honest. p.9 |
| ...you poked me, you made me look at myself quite objectively or tried to look at myself objectively, what I needed to own and what other people needed to own and not lie (noise) people in, be more clear in my communication and to follow up on things. p.10 |
| But it (PAR) has changed things. p. 12 |

Statements that illustrated learning were added to a new section at the end of the summary sheet.
Video recording of Participatory Learning Team
A PLT observation sheet for video recording of PLT session was used to record observations and first stage analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>CF Critical Friend</th>
<th>M Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Knowledge that the participant has of the mentor process. (Blue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Own impact on the mentor process (reflectivity). (Purple)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Knowledge of the PAR as a process. (Mauve)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Knowledge that the participant has of building relationships. (Red)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Own impact on their mentor relationships (reflectivity). (Yellow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Own impact on the PAR (reflectivity). (Orange)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Facilitation of learning by the Critical Friend during the PAR. (Green)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Other reflective statements related to ________________ (Pink)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Moments of learning by participants. (Gold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Sharing (Silver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-determined themes and categories were assigned alphabetical and colour codes.

Alphabetical code assigned to Critical friend and Mentors.

Timeline layout allowed me to relocate identified statements and actions on the video recording with speed and accuracy.

Maximum Time of PLT session

I conducted two viewings of the video recorded PLT session. To identify statements and actions that fell into the categories of the three themes: Process, Relationship and Learning. To check my initial findings and to note down any “actions” of interest that took place during the PLT session. For example, body language, active listening and work produced during the PLT session.
Above each participant’s timeline I noted key words as memory triggers such as: “questions”, asked by the mentors or myself often represented by a “Q”; “redirect” when I was re-focusing the discussion; “ideas” or “issues” raised by the mentors or myself.

Codes were placed into the relevant participant’s column which corresponded with the time on the video recording for when the statement or action took place. For example, M2 made a couple of statements regarding the mentor process being discussed, 30 minutes into the PLT session.

Salient points raised during the discussion were summaries here.
NOTE: As with the interview transcription, the colour coding allowed me to quickly identify rich content and critical incidents during the PLT session that required further analysis. They represented, for example, participants asking stimulating questions, consolidating a discussion or demonstrated learning.

This example illustrates a number of critical incidents, indicated by colour coded boxed sections on the timeline. For example the two mentors were working collaboratively to produce their Individual Mentor Plans from 6 - 12 minutes into the PLT session and at 19 - 22 minutes we had some reflective discussion about allocating the time needed to do PAR within the school context and I suggested that it could be used to organise faculty PD (E. C Betlem, personal communication, November 30, 2010).

Example 5B from PLT observation sheet for video recording of PLT session
PLT 7 Picasso Catholic High
My Reflective Journal  Analysed after each PLT

1. Photocopied the original pages of the Reflective Journal and glued each page onto an A3 piece of paper.

2. Read to identify broad themes, Process, Relationship and Learning. Used pre determined allocated alphabetically codes.

3. Re-read to categorise the statements and used colour highlighters to apply the pre-determined allocated colour codes.

4. Summary notes on the left or right of the Reflective Journal pages where done during the course of either the first or second reading.

On the left of the Reflective Journal’s page, key words where used to summarise the main ideas and emerging themes.

On the right of the Reflective Journal’s page, I wrote notes to myself or noted ideas I could utilise in the next PLT session.

Underneath or on the right of the Reflective Journal’s page, connections to theory were annotated. I found this to be useful when I later explored further the emerging themes.
Identifying themes

To identity emerging themes, the “PLT observation sheet for video recording of PLT session” and my “Reflective Journal” entries were analysed after each PLT session. I regularly summarised the salient points in order to reduce the data from each PLT session, identifying emerging themes such as: *Time, Trust, Identity or Relationship building*, as well as my use of art based activities. These ideas were linked to current literature. Thus analysis was commenced early in my inquiry which allowed for a “cycling back and forth between thinking about the existing data and generating … new … data” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 50) when necessary.

My reading of relevant literature, ongoing learning and reflection of that learning was applied to the current context of each PLT session and was fed back into the PLT sessions via reflective exercises I constructed to help stimulate the mentors’ reflection and reflexivity.

Second stage analysis - comparative

The three data items were regularly compared in order to focus separately on the emerging themes identified in the first stage analysis. For example, in order to track statements and actions linked to the theme of *Time* from each PLT session, I marked each with a “coloured sticky note” such as *Time* was bright yellow and *Art based activities* were orange (see Figure 17. Journal pages with coloured coding). The sticky note allowed me to identify and re-locate the statements and/or actions with ease in order to read them chronologically but also within context.

I revisited the data items several times, building on my understanding of each theme explored by the mentors during their PAR and to look for transformative change in the
Figure 17. Journal pages with coloured coding.

mentors and my knowledge and interpretative categories (reflexivity) of how we did, understood and related to our mentoring or critical friendship practice in relationship to the focused theme. This procedure gave a rich holistic analysis of what was actually happening and did not take away from the general “feel” of the findings.

**Narrative style of writing**

To give a full account of the mentors’ and my professional growth and learning through our lived experiences from the PAR studies, I made use of a narrative style of writing guided by a phenomenological approach to writing. This style of writing allowed me to capture the holistic essence of our lived experiences in the PAR and to give the mentors a
voice in the presentation of my inquiry. Based on what van Manen (1984) described as existential writing, my narratives were guided by the existential themes of corporeality (lived body), temporality (lived time), spatiality (lived space) and communality (lived relationship to others), (p. 67). Table 3 (Phenomenological questions that guided my writing) presents examples of the questions I constructed to help guide my writing.

During the writing process, I revisited my original description several times going back and forth between the analysed data, theory and my narrative text to add and build interpretative layers to my account.

Table 3. Phenomenological questions that guided my writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived body</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do the mentors physically react to doing the art based activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I see or hear for example enjoyment, contemplation, reflection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the mentors talk about how it felt to do the artwork or art based activity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did I feel when they were doing the art making or art based activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the artworks embody their lived experiences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What effect does doing the art based activities as part of a timed session have on the mentor’s response to the exercise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the first PAR, time as a theme was used as a basis of the exercise.... the mentors’ conceptualisation of time was explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories told by the mentors created a sense of time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived space - public/private space</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did the space we worked in, feel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the art making move the mentors to a more private reflective space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived relationships</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did the relationship between the mentors and with me, play out during the art making or art based sessions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the second PAR, relationship building was a theme. How does the art making activities reveal the mentors’ mentoring relationships? Or each other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nicol, 2010; van Manen, 1984)