University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

GSE Publications | Graduate School of Education

1-1-2006

Discursive Approaches to Understanding Teacher Collaboration: Policy into Practice

Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania, nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

Copyright Multilingual Matters. Reprinted from *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Volume 9, Issues 4, pages 495-499.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/24
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Discursive Approaches to Understanding Teacher Collaboration: Policy into Practice

Comments
Copyright Multilingual Matters. Reprinted from *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Volume 9, Issues 4, pages 495-499.

This journal article is available at ScholarlyCommons: http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/24

Afterword
Discursive Approaches to Understanding Teacher Collaboration: Policy into Practice

Nancy H. Hornberger
Language in Education Division, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania

doi: 10.2167/beb338.0

The papers herein are all about looking at actual talk by collaborating language and subject matter teachers as a way of understanding how language in education policies play out in pedagogical practices. All are about English-medium instruction in multilingual classrooms, either primary or secondary – located in Asia, Australia, or the United Kingdom. All argue and illuminate that these collaborative pedagogical relationships are interactionally and epistemologically complex, although educational policies more often than not treat them as unproblematic and straightforward.

Across national contexts, language education policies addressing the role of teaching English as a second or additional language (ESL or EAL) in relation to content (subject area, mainstream) teaching tend to speak in terms of partnership, collaboration, and support. The papers herein demonstrate however that these collegial relationships are often constituted in unequal and hierarchical ways, in terms of both the teachers' professional identities and their pedagogical knowledge.

These papers, then, take a critical look at policy into practice, using precise and detailed discursive analytical approaches to do so. In scrutinizing actual teacher discourse samples – whether from classroom interaction, teachers' planning sessions, or interviews and questionnaires – the authors variously draw from an array of conceptual and methodological resources in order to tease apart the forms, functions, and meanings that teacher-to-teacher talk takes in specific instances. These analytical resources include the socio-linguistics of Hymes, the systemic functional linguistics of Halliday, the discursive positioning theory of Harré, sociocultural learning theories of Vygotsky, Lave, and Wenger, input-interactionist language learning theories of Long and Pica, and critical discourse analysis of Fairclough. In every case, the present authors' creative and disciplined use of innovatively juxtaposed analytical tools yields rich new heuristic frameworks and conceptual insights in turn.

1367-0050/06/04 495-05 $20.00/0
The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism
© 2006 N.H. Hornberger
Vol. 9, No. 4, 2006

Common themes across the papers include the role of teachers as mediators of policy, the pervasive disempowerment of ESL teachers in partnership teaching, the interactional complexity of partnership teaching, and, implicitly, multilingual learners' response as indicator of successful language/content pedagogy. Partnership ESL/content teaching is an instance of what I have elsewhere called biliteracy – defined as communication occurring in two or more languages in or around writing (Hornberger, 1990). Even when English is the sole medium of instruction, as in the classrooms, lessons, and planning sessions analysed here, the linguistic and communicative resources multilingual learners bring to them make them by definition instances of biliteracy. It is perhaps no coincidence, then, that the themes running through these papers roughly parallel main dimensions of the continua of biliteracy framework I have proposed as heuristic for analysing and undertaking policy, research, and teaching in multilingual settings – namely the continua of contexts, content, media, and development of biliteracy, respectively (Hornberger 1989, 2003). In the following paragraphs, I briefly highlight these themes as instantiated in the cases presented here (with parallels to the continua of biliteracy noted throughout in parentheses); and close with a few unanswered questions and future directions for the lines of research so usefully charted in this volume.

In a policy and professional development context promoting the integration of English language and content area teaching in English-medium international schools in the Asia-Pacific region, Chris Davison examines the situational (biliteracy) contexts of language/content teachers' collaborations in one such K-12 school in Taiwan. Drawing on Hallidayan components of field, tenor, and mode in analysing the register and social positioning of teachers as evidenced in questionnaire and interview data, Davison proposes five stages of collaboration, from pseudo-compliance to creative co-construction. She argues that these stages of development in partnership teaching also line up quite closely with observable patterns in teachers' attitudes, effort, achievement and expectations of support. Taken together, these demonstrate the considerable variation across partnerships and the need for institutional structures and professional development efforts to take into account that teachers' mediation of policy through such partnerships is neither easy nor unproblematic, but rather situated in multiply complex (micro-to-macro) layers of (biliteracy) contexts.

Within a similar policy context of ESL mainstreaming, adopted by the Victoria Department of Education in Australia, Sophie Arkoudis elucidates the dynamics of professional collaboration between an ESL teacher and a science teacher in a secondary school. By focusing precisely on their planning conversations and the pedagogic tensions that arise therein, she is able to uncover the teachers' differing epistemological assumptions and the subject hierarchy which places the specialized (biliteracy) content knowledge of ESL below that of science. Using an analytical framework that draws on notions of appraisal (Martin) and positioning (Harré), Arkoudis shows how the ESL teacher deploys considerable interactional skill in manipulating the linguistic resources (biliteracy media) available to her, to position herself in a supportive role [rather than the collaborative relationship assumed by the policy] thereby

'gain[ing] some epistemological authority within the conversation that is not afforded to her within the institutional practices of the hierarchy of the education system.' In other words, by deferring to the science teacher's knowledge of subject area (biliteracy) content, the ESL teacher manages to negotiate more ideological and implementational space for ESL (biliteracy) content (see also Hornberger, 2002).

In contrast to the unequal positioning salient in Arkoudis' analysis of partner teachers' planning conversations, Sheena Gardner's analysis highlights equal participation in partner teachers' classroom talk. She examines a social studies lesson in a primary classroom in the UK, a (biliteracy) context where both government guidelines and school policies call for full partnership teaching, as distinct from collaborative or support teaching. With the caveat that this instance is exceptional among the dozens of partnerships observed in her six years observing in UK classrooms, Gardner shows how in this lesson the language teacher comes to participate fully with the content teacher, rather than remaining in a primarily supportive and less powerful role on the margins of classroom interaction. Using a framework that draws from Christie's differentiation between regulative and instructional registers in classroom talk according to Hallidayan textual, experiential, and interpersonal metafunctions, the analysis here tracks how the language teacher 'moves into sharing with the class teacher first the regulative register, then a convergence of both registers, and finally the instructional register'. In full recognition that there is no direct one-to-one relationship between type of teacher–teacher talk and type of team teaching along the continuum from support to collaboration to partnership, and furthermore, that the kind of partnership talk analysed here may not be the goal *per se* for all partner teachers, Gardner nevertheless provides us with a richly complex picture of how it is possible for partner teachers to successfully negotiate (the media of biliteracy) in classroom interaction to achieve fully collaborative teacher–teacher talk.

While learners are rather invisibly and implicitly present in the above three papers, they become more visible in Angela Creese's exploration of how two partner teachers' discourses differ in their interaction with two individual bilingual students. As with the other papers, the (biliteracy) policy context here is one of partnership teaching where English as an additional language (EAL) teachers are paired with subject teachers (ST) in mainstream settings, specifically here an EAL teacher and a geography ST in a London secondary school. Similarly to the other authors, too, Creese acknowledges the unequal epistemological authorities attached to ESL versus subject area (biliteracy) content in the schools, going on to suggest that 'whereas subject teachers are linked to the transmission of subject knowledge to the many, EAL teachers are constructed as delivering support and facilitation for the few.' She analyses the two teachers' interaction and negotiation with two students, arguing that the teachers complement [rather than supplement as policy suggests] one another. Using notions of teacher responsiveness from sociocultural theories of learning, negotiation for understanding from input-interactionist approaches to second language acquisition, and referential and other language functions from sociolinguistics, Creese analyses both interview and classroom interaction data to depict the facilitation of learning vs. transmission of knowledge

roles constructed for the EALT and ST, respectively. Thus for example, the ST's responsiveness consists in developing opportunities for the student to display the right answer, while the EAL teacher's responsiveness includes discursive moves intended to encourage the student to extend or build on what was said. Creese concludes by emphasizing that for bilingual students learning a new curriculum in a new language, such opportunities to negotiate meaning (along the continua of biliterate development) are equal in importance to the discourse of knowledge transmission.

Taken together, these papers remind us of partner teachers' mediation of language education policy in (biliterate) context, of epistemological tensions inherent in language teaching vs. subject area (biliterate) content in our educational systems, of the range and diversity of linguistic and interactional (biliterate media) resources exploited by collaborating teachers in accomplishing their pedagogical purposes, and of the potential opportunities for (biliterate) development afforded learners through collaborative language/content teaching. Is it in their very strengths along these lines that the papers also chart out unanswered questions and future directions in research.

All of the papers explore the considerable mediating that teachers can and must do within the constraints of what policy mandates. Very helpful in that regard are the conceptualizations of teachers' relationships in terms not just of roles, but of positionings, with all the dynamic maneuvering that entails. Davison's 5 stages of collaboration, Arkoudis' interpretation of two partner teachers' appraisal choices, Gardner's typology of the continuum from support to collaborative to partnership talk, and Creese's characterisation of two partner teachers' complementary interactional roles, are all useful ways of describing and analysing the dynamic and diverse positionings by which partner teachers negotiate the interactional and epistemological (biliteracy) contexts in which they work.

All of the papers acknowledge and assert the unequal hierarchy assigned to subject area and ESL content in the schools. Valuably, they argue for a more equal place for the facilitative and metalinguistically-oriented ESL teaching vis-à-vis referentially-oriented content teaching. The papers also shed valuable light on the ways the teachers perform their professional identities, and in particular how the ESL teacher is constructed into lower status. Less attended to here are the identity constructions being negotiated for students in these classrooms and their possible meanings and consequences for those students. Striking in Gardner's classroom extracts, for example, is that the social studies lesson content is about WWII evacuation and air raids in London, in a classroom where students appear to be Indian immigrant children whose families would most likely not have experienced these historical events. Further research could explore more explicitly what kinds of meanings and identities are included in both ESL and subject area (biliteracy) curricular contents for teachers and students in language/content partnership situations and what implications these have for the teaching and learning going on.

Methodologically, all these papers draw on a rich repertoire of constructs in analysing actual teacher discourse. Juxtaposing concepts and methods from linguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural approaches to analysing language and learning, the authors create new heuristic frameworks which shed light on

exactly what curricular meanings, professional identities, interactional positionings, and epistemological knowledge are being constructed in the teachers' discourse and how. These heuristics invite additional research on the linguistic forms and functions (biliteracy media) expressed in teacher and student oral and written discourse across a wide variety of educational settings, in order to confirm or refine the tendencies proposed here.

Indeed, more actual classroom data on partnership teaching is needed in general. Creese points out that, while there is by now a substantial body of research on teacher–pupil classroom interaction, almost none of it looks at instances where there is more than one teacher present, and what the consequences might be for pupil learning. By the same token, there is even less attention, even in the papers herein, to pupils' interactions with their partner teachers. The same kind of close scrutiny that has been applied in the present papers to partnership teacher–teacher talk needs to be brought to bear also on learners' talk in partner teaching situations. Only in that way can we gain a better understanding of what works and doesn't work for learners' (biliterate) development in collaborative language/content teaching, moving beyond policy and into practice for the benefit of those for whom it is intended – multilingual learners in classrooms.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Prof. Nancy Hornberger, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6216, USA (nancyh@gse.upenn.edu).

References

Hornberger, N.H. (1989) Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research* 59 (3), 271–296.

Hornberger, N.H. (1990) Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record* 92 (2), 212–229.

Hornberger, N.H. (2002) Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy* 1 (1), 27–51.

Hornberger, N.H. (ed.) (2003) *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.