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Abstract

This study investigates the development of teacher identity in a transnational context through an analysis of the voices of sixteen preservice teachers from Hong Kong who engage in interaction with primary students in an Australian classroom. The context for this research is the school-based experience undertaken by these preservice English as a second language teachers as part of their short language immersion (SLIM) program in Brisbane, Australia. Such SLIM programs are a genre of study abroad programs which have been gaining in popularity within teacher education in Australia, attended by preservice and inservice teachers from China, Hong Kong, Korea, and other Asian countries. This research is conducted at a time when the imperative to globalise higher education provision is a strategic factor in the educational policies of both Australia and Hong Kong. In Australia, international educational services now constitute the country’s third largest export with more than 400,000 students coming to Australia to study annually. In order to maintain Australia’s current global position as the third most popular English-speaking study destination, the government is now focusing on sustainability and the quality of the study experience being offered to international students (Bradley Review, 2008). In Hong Kong, the government sponsors both preservice and inservice English as a second language (ESL) teachers to undertake SLIM programs in Australia and other English-speaking countries, as part of their policy of promoting high levels of English proficiency in Hong Kong classrooms. Transnational teacher education is an important issue to which this study contributes insights into the affordances and constraints of a school-based experience in the transnational context.

Second language teacher education has been defined as interventions designed to develop participants’ professional knowledge. In this study, it is argued that participation in a different community of practice helps to foreground tacit theories of second language pedagogy, making them visible and open to review. Questions of pedagogy are also seen as questions of teacher identity, constituting the way that one is in the classroom. I take up a sociocultural and poststructural framework, drawing on the work of James Gee and Mikhail Bakhtin, to theorise the
construction of teacher identity as emerging through dialogic relations and socially situated discursive practices. From this perspective, this study investigates whether these teachers engage with different ways of representing themselves through appropriating, adapting or rejecting Discourses prevailing in the Australian classroom. Research suggests that reflecting on dilemmas encountered as lived experiences can extend professional understandings. In this study, the participants engage in a process of dialogic reflection on their intercultural classroom interactions, examining with their peers and their lecturer/researcher selected moments of dissonance that they have faced in the unfamiliar context of an Australian primary classroom. It is argued that the recursive and multivoiced nature of this process of reflection on practice allows participants opportunities to negotiate new understandings of second language teacher identity.

Dialogic learning, based on the theories of Bakhtin and Vygotsky, provides the theoretic framing not only for the process of reflection instantiated in this study, but also features in the analysis of the participants’ second language classroom practices. The research design uses a combined discourse analytic and ethnographic approach as a logic-of-inquiry to explore the dialogic relationships which these second language teachers negotiate with their students and their peers in the transnational context. In this way, through discourse analysis of their classroom talk and reflective dialogues, assisted by the analytic tools of speech genres and discourse formats, I explore the participants’ ways of doing and being second language teachers. Thus, this analysis traces the process of ideological becoming of these beginner teachers as shifts in their understandings of teacher and student identities. This study also demonstrates the potential for a non-traditional stimulated recall interview to provide dialogic scaffolding for beginner teachers to reflect productively on their practice.
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Chapter One

The Context

This study explores the development of professional identity in a group of sixteen preservice teachers from Hong Kong as they engage in classroom interaction with primary school children in Australia. These twelve female and four male preservice teachers are in their second year of their Bachelor of Education studies at a university in Hong Kong, studying to become English as a second language teachers. As part of their teacher education program, they attend an eight week language immersion program in Brisbane, Australia, which is organised by a local university. This short language immersion (SLIM) program provides opportunities for participants to enhance their English language and intercultural competences, as well as develop their understanding of English as a second language pedagogy through engaging in professional workshops on campus and through a school-based experience. It is the transnational school-based experience within this SLIM program which constitutes the context for this study. This school-based experience is organised over a two week period in an Australian K-12 school combining both primary and secondary classes on one campus. Whilst the participants have taken part in a short field experience in Hong Kong schools in their first year of professional study, the experience of engaging as teachers in classroom interaction with Australian school children is an unfamiliar experience and offers these participants new opportunities for reflective insights into questions of pedagogy and professional identity.

This chapter is organised into four broad sections, beginning with a consideration of the context of transnational teacher education in which I explore themes of engaging with difference, development of professional identity and dialogic reflection on professional experience. The second section explores the context of higher education in Australia and Hong Kong and how the imperative to internationalise is characterised in both places. In the third section, the context of study abroad is introduced which provides the background to the short language
immersion program which is the central focus of this study. In the last section, I set out my reasons for undertaking this study and the research questions being investigated. The chapter concludes with a brief description of the overall organisation of this thesis.

### 1.1 Engaging with Difference

Engaging with difference is one of the central themes of this study and is seen as an important aspect of teacher education as classrooms nowadays in both Australia and Hong Kong are characterised by increasing linguistic and cultural diversity. Transnational flows as part of globalisation have resulted in new classroom demographics within school classrooms in both Australia and Hong Kong (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008). The myth of monolingualism in Australia is countered by the findings that either Arabic, Vietnamese or Cantonese is the language used at home by more than 100,000 Australians aged between 5 – 19 years (Clyne, 2008). In Melbourne secondary school classrooms, 27% of children speak a second language at home (RUMACC, n.d.). In Brisbane, this cultural diversity is reflected in the demographics of one state high school with a population of approximately 1,500 including “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (ATSIC) (5.7%), Asian (7.4%), European (8%), Polynesian (11.8%) and Anglo Saxon (58.3%)” (Girdwood & Gilmore, 2004, p. 112).

In Hong Kong a source of diversity in classrooms is the arrival of children from mainland China following reunification in 1997. For example, Hong Kong primary schools enrolled 17,519 New Arrival Children (NAC) from mainland China in 1999 (Hong Kong Government, 2004, p. 20). These NAC children have grown up with Putonghua as their medium of instruction (MOI), and so their Hong Kong teachers need to help these children adapt to using Cantonese as MOI and to learn English as part of the curriculum, as well as helping them acculturate to different cultural and educational processes in Hong Kong (Rao & Yuen, 2007). Teachers nowadays need to be able to work with linguistic and cultural diversity which requires empathy and flexibility and an ability to think on both a global and local basis in educational matters:

one of the key dilemmas of the New Learning, as we see it, is diversity itself - amongst learners and between the settings in which learning occurs. If we can negotiate learner
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and contextual diversity at the local level, we can do it globally; and if we can do it globally, we will be able to do it better locally. (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008, p. xvii)

Cultivating this ability to adopt a global/local viewpoint is moving towards the goal of developing teachers with cosmopolitan identities who can engage meaningfully with intercultural others as a necessary counterforce to interethnic tension and mistrust in the world post-September 11 (Goldstein, 2007; Hirst & Brown, 2008; Luke, 2004).

1.2 Developing Professional Identity

One way of sensitising beginner second language teachers to issues of cultural and linguistic difference in the classroom is by having these teachers engage in different communities of practice so that they can experience for themselves a range of ways of being a teacher and learner (Tsui & Law, 2007). The purpose of this study is to investigate in what ways preservice TESOL teachers develop their professional identities through engaging in the school-based experience component of a short term language immersion program. In particular, this study sets out to discover whether these teachers develop new understandings of themselves as TESOL teachers through engaging in and reflecting on the experience of teaching in a transnational classroom context.

The purpose in locating the teaching experience in this transnational classroom context is to problematise the common practices that preservice teachers can accept as given, making established practices and assumptions visible and hence open to question. As Bray (2004) explains, the intention is to make “familiar patterns strange, calling into question features of education systems and societies which have been taken for granted by insiders” (p. 251). The ability to stand back and question one’s own social context arises more easily as a by-product of questioning a more distinctly other social context first (Carr, 2003). As teachers-in-the-making preservice teachers are being positioned in certain ways by the tertiary institutions that teach them (both in Hong Kong and Australia) and also by the schools in which they teach during their practicums. Where identity is understood as socially-situated and arising from enactive and cognitive work within specific contexts (Gee, 2004a), the value of offering a school experience in a new context can be seen as offering exposure to alternative identities. As
legitimate peripheral participants in the transnational classroom (Lave and Wenger, 1991), these preservice teachers are able to engage with different ways of representing themselves, with the possibility of appropriating, or adapting or rejecting the new Discourses they encounter (Wenger, 1998; Gee, 2007). From this viewpoint, professional identity can be seen as engaging in processes of identifications (Hall, 1996a) and a site of struggle between conflicting Discourses (Pavlenko, 2003). In keeping with such a viewpoint, one of the central foci in this study is whether shifts in professional identity emerge in relation to engaging in interaction and confronting conflicting Discourses in the transnational classroom context. In order to explore this issue, Gee’s (2005a) concept of Discourse models is taken up as a theoretic and analytic tool framing one of the three research questions in this study, as is explained further in section 1.9. The term Discourse models is used by Gee (2005a) to explain the often unconscious explanatory frameworks or theories that people hold and which guide their values and behaviour in society. In terms of second language teaching, the way that a second language teacher acts and speaks in the classroom context can reveal their Discourse models or tacit theories of teaching and learning, thus providing insights into their conceptions of what doing second language teaching entails and therefore offering a way of exploring their teacher identity in this study.

1.3 Reflecting on Professional Experience

The value of reflecting on professional experience is a standard element in second language teacher education research (Bain, Ballantyne, Mills, & Lester, 2002; Calderhead, 1989; Wallace, 1991; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). In this study the reflective process is viewed as part of the process of identity formation framed by Bakhtin as the authoring of one’s unique voice through interanimation with the voices of others (Bakhtin, 1981). This dialogic process of shaping the self through interaction with the other, whether through speech or text, emphasises the centrality of language in the development of identity and its inevitable heteroglossic or multivoiced nature (Bakhtin, 1986). It also underlines the sociocultural nature of identity formation, where even internal speech with the self can be seen to be dialogic through the culturally situated voices that resonate in
the individual’s voice (Gudmundsdottir, 2001). This study therefore takes up a dialogic process of reflection, inviting the participants to view and review their transnational classroom interaction through the filter of a series of reflective discussions with their peers and their lecturer/researcher via focus groups and a stimulated recall interview. In this way a rich context of multiple voices can be drawn on by the participants to help frame their understandings of what second language teaching/learning is and how they as practitioners contribute to this.

1.4 Internationalisation of Higher Education in Australia

The participation of these preservice teachers from Hong Kong in a SLIM program in Brisbane has eventuated through a partnership between two institutions of higher education one in Hong Kong and the other in Australia. For more than 10 years, the university in Hong Kong has been sending cohorts of preservice teachers of English as a second language for short language immersion programs of between 6 to 8 weeks’ duration. One of the factors underlying this partnership is the imperative in both educational contexts to internationalise.

Internationalisation of higher education in Australia has developed in three phases, which can be summarised as moving from aid to trade and now to a focus on sustainability (Bradley Review, 2008; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). The first phase of internationalisation as aid scholarships began with the Colombo Plan during the 1950s – 1980s through which up to 40,000 students predominantly from Asia came to study in Australia (Cuthbert, Smith and Boey, 2008). Following the recommendations of the Jackson Committee’s Report (1984) the policy changed from an aid approach to one of trade as an unlimited provision of education services was made available to full-fee paying international students. The recommendation was taken up with enthusiasm, for while in 1986 there were 2,000 full-fee paying international students by 1991 the number had risen to 48,000 (Cuthbert, Smith and Boey, 2008). This active recruitment of large numbers of full-fee paying international has continued unabated to the present day in part as a necessary supplement to decreasing government funding of higher education (Reserve Bank of Australia, 2008). This highly successful strategy has made international education services Australia’s third largest export earning
$15.5 billion in 2008, up 23.4 per cent from 2007 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2009). The contribution of higher education institutions accounted for $8.9 billion in 2008, representing 59.4 per cent of the total on-shore education service earnings (Australian Education International, 2009b). The economic value to Australia of internationalisation in higher education is clear. However, other factors need to be considered if Australia is to maintain its current position as the third most popular English-speaking study destination after America and the United Kingdom (Reserve Bank of Australia, 2008; Marginson, 2006).

This brings us to the third phase of internationalisation: sustainable growth with a focus on the quality of the study experience for the international students involved. As the Bradley Review (2008) observes one of the key issues is “focusing more on the quality of the experience for international students on- and off-campus” (p. 95). The Australian government has taken up this recommendation and the Minister for Education, Julia Guillard, announced the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), a national agency with responsibility for accreditation, regulation and quality assurance of higher education (Gillard, 2009, 26 May). Gillard has also proposed a roundtable discussion with representatives of international students to discuss issues of welfare, safety and accommodation, noting that “with over 430,000 international students visiting Australia annually, it is important to me that their views and concerns are heard and addressed by government” (Gillard, 2009, 26 May). This roundtable discussion will take place in September 2009, giving 30 student representatives the opportunity to discuss issues affecting international students with Australian government representatives (Gillard, 2009, 27 July). Recent attacks on Indian international students in Melbourne and New South Wales in May and June 2009 confirm the need for consideration of international students’ welfare as part of the quality of their international study experience (ABC News, 2009, 13 June). Whilst Australia has a national code of practice for providers of education to overseas students (Australian Education International, 2007), some voices have raised the issue of whether an international code of practice regulating the provision of international education services would be a useful resource (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Such a code has not yet appeared but the nature of international education provision is such that there is a need to constantly review and adapt educational programs and
services to meet students’ needs and preferences, as noted in the statement issued by the Ministers of Education of twenty-seven countries in the Asia Pacific Region (Brisbane Communiqué, 2006, April). Concerns in Australia about sustainable growth in international education provision confirm the need to maintain a student-centred focus concentrating on supporting the international students’ experiences and not single-mindedly focusing on the financial rewards (Bishop & Russell, 2005).

Taking a more student-centred approach, there is a need to broaden the debate on internationalisation of higher education to highlight questions of curriculum and purpose (Knight & De Wit, 1997). Rizvi and Walsh (1998) in a seminal paper on this topic have suggested that internationalisation of the curriculum needs to be seen as:

more than just a response to emergent global conditions, it is a framework of values and practices oriented towards heightened awareness and appreciation of the politics of difference as the basis for developing the necessary skills and literacies for a changing world. International curriculum is therefore about an engagement with difference both within and beyond spaces of learning. (p. 11)

This opportunity for engagement with difference is an area that needs attention given our performance to date. In 2008 the number of international students studying within Australia reached 543,898 of which 182,770 students were engaged in Higher Education programs (Australian Education International, 2009a). Over 50 per cent of the international educational provision is to students from China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, South Korea and India (Australian Education International, 2009b). The presence of these international students in Australia offers the opportunity for developing intercultural competence and intercultural communication skills which are “arguably among the most important skills needed to equip ... students for successful interaction in the global arena” (Briguglio, 2004). However, the opportunities for such intercultural engagement have been less than successfully deployed and close interaction between Australian and international students has been generally lacking (Briguglio, 2004; Smart, Volet and Ang, 2000). A 2006 survey of international students’ satisfaction with their Australian study experience found that they wanted the opportunity to have more interaction with Australians (Australian Education International, 2007). The current study offers participants the opportunity to explore issues of difference
and professional identity development in relation to their engagement with Australian students in the primary classroom.

Having highlighted some of the key issues regarding internationalisation of higher education in Australia which are pertinent to the current study, attention now turns to the Hong Kong context and how pressures to internationalise are characterised there.

1.5 Internationalisation and Medium of Instruction in Hong Kong

In Hong Kong internationalisation is first and foremost understood in terms of international trade, which is the reason that Hong Kong came into being as a British colony in 1841. Hand in hand with this concentration on international trade has been governmental concern about the languages in which to conduct this trade, initially English and more recently Putonghua. During colonial rule, from 1841 to 1997, English was the official language of Hong Kong, although a 1993 survey noted that the majority of Hong Kong people spoke Cantonese as their mother tongue (81.6%) and only 1.3% of the population were native speakers of English (Bacon-Shone and Bolton, 1998, p. 73). It was not until 1974 that Chinese was also instituted as the official language, publicly confirming Hong Kong as a bilingual society. At that time there was no specification of which particular Chinese language was being referred to by this term Chinese and hence Cantonese filled this role. Since 1997, with Hong Kong’s reunification with mainland China, the question of whether official Chinese is Cantonese or Putonghua continues to be actively debated. The government’s language policy now advocates that Hong Kong people become biliterate in written Chinese and English whilst able to communicate verbally in three languages: English, Cantonese and Putonghua.

Changing government policy towards official languages has found its expression in different perspectives on the appropriate language(s) for the medium of instruction (MOI) in government schooling in Hong Kong (Ho & Ho, 2004). As regards language use in education, during the colonial period, English was generally the official medium of instruction in secondary schools. Tsui (2004, p. 8
98) notes that 94% of secondary students were studying in English-medium (EMI) secondary schools, only 6% in Chinese-medium (CMI) schools. In 1997 the government produced the “Medium of Instruction Guidance for Secondary Schools (the Guidance)”, which set out that schools should take up Chinese as the medium of instruction for all academic subjects commencing with the new Secondary 1 cohort in 1998. Under the Guidance, just over 25% of the governments’ 421 secondary schools have been designated English-medium schools. There has been continued debate about this division into CMI and EMI schools (Hong Kong Education Commission, 2005). The 112 schools teaching through English are viewed by parents as offering students an elite education, as the following extract from South China Morning Post, one of the local newspapers, makes plain:

Critics of the system say the rigid segregation between schools has created the public perception that English-medium means a good school and Chinese-medium equals poor quality. Although not entirely true, the overwhelming parental preference for English, coupled with a Form One allocations process that gives priority to bright children, means it tends to look that way when the exam results come in. (Clem, 2008, 14 June, para. 13)

The labelling effect of this segregation is clear in this quotation, with the Chinese medium schools being negatively labelled as in some way inferior to English medium schools. This viewpoint is perhaps most insidiously demonstrated in the weak attempt at qualifying these public perceptions by stating “Although not entirely true...”. The Minister for Education, Michael Suen, cited the “serious labelling problems” (Clem, 2007, November 17, para. 4) as the reason for re-opening the MOI debate in November 2007. The Minister’s decision to “fine-tune” the MOI policy in Hong Kong, has led to the recent policy decision to allow Chinese medium of instruction schools to provide up to 25 per cent of their lessons in English if the majority of the students in that class are “in the top 40 per cent of their age group academically” (Yau, 2009, 27 May). This will take effect in September 2010. In the press release explaining this change in the MOI policy, Suen noted: "This will enhance students’ ability to learn in English, prepare them to embrace new challenges from globalisation and enhance Hong Kong’s status as an international city." (Suen, 2009, 29 May, para. 5)

The Hong Kong government’s desire to maintain high levels of language achievement among its school children has led them to mandate that language teachers have either a Bachelor of Education degree majoring in their language
subject or a postgraduate Diploma or Certificate in Education with a major in their language subject (SCOLAR, 2003). As further support, the government sponsors overseas language immersion (SLIM) programs for both preservice and experienced teachers of English and Putonghua. For English language teachers, the programs are held in a country where English is the dominant language, for example Australia and U.K. The current study focuses on one such SLIM program offered in Brisbane.

1.6 The Context of Study Abroad

SLIM programs are a particular genre of study abroad which have emerged recently in response to the internationalisation of education and expanded views of second language teacher education (Bodycott & Crew, 2001). Study abroad is characterised by an interest in cultural and linguistic diversity and a desire to learn about this through personal experience. In previous centuries, from a European perspective, study abroad took the form of grand tours of personal discovery by wealthy individuals, such as Isabella Bird who left U.K., to explore China and Korea along the Yangtze and Han Rivers, in 1897, recording her findings in her book “The Yangtze Valley and Beyond” (1899). Women participants in study abroad were often motivated by the limitations of formal education at home (Birkett, 2004), for example Gertrude Bell (1868 – 1926) obtained the rare opportunity of a place at Oxford University, U.K, achieving First Class Honours, yet was not awarded a degree. Instead she engaged in study abroad, travelling to the Middle East where she became a leading expert on Arabic affairs (Wallach, 2005).

The depiction of these women travellers raises the pertinent issue of the writer’s point of view, which is also a consideration in my study. These tales of individual exploration as study abroad are cast within the narrative genre of grand adventure stories. Lapierre and Mouchard (2007) with broad brush strokes portray affluent travellers overseeing an entourage of servants and luxurious goods who were also individual women of great resolve, panache and competence “able to hack their way through a jungle and also to dance a waltz” (p. 27). This heroic view sets these women apart as interesting eccentrics, however, as Mills (2004) has noted a different and productive reading can come from instead trying to understand the
writings of these women in relation to their sociocultural contexts and the prevailing discourses of the day. In a similar vein it is intended that the focus on study abroad in this current study can be seen productively from a sociocultural perspective considering issues of voice and power and how this enables or restrains second language teaching/learning and development of teacher identity.

In a more recent evolution, from an Asian perspective of “Chinese Women Traversing Diaspora” (Hom, 1999), one aspect of study abroad has been the personal encounters not with other cultures but of one’s own cultural roots. Margaret Woo (1999), who was born in Hong Kong and then migrated with her family to America at the age of seven, exemplifies this type of study abroad. Woo, a professor of law in East Coast, U.S., writes of her year’s sojourn in 1987 to the South Central Institute of Politics and Law in Wuhan. There she explored the streets of Hankou: “looking for traces of my mother’s memories” in an attempt to relate to her Chinese heritage (Woo, 1999, p.41). This particular experience of study abroad contributed to Woo locating her identity as a “unique position of transit” between Chinese and American culture (ibid., p.45). Woo’s confrontations with cultural hybridity, and her identification of being located in “a marginality that is empowering” (ibid.) addresses issues of identity in a globalizing world that remain central to research into study abroad programs (Lam, 2006; Papatsiba, 2006; Tarp, 2006; Ujitani & Volet, 2008).

1.7 Study Abroad in Higher Education

Nowadays, in the contemporary context of higher education, this term study abroad denotes educational programs in which the participants travel outside their home country to be immersed in the first language speech community and engage in classes for language learning or other content learning there. There is inevitably a range of program provision covered by the term as Freed (1995a) observes:

> In some instances, the language learning experience is designed specifically for the visiting students; in others, the schooling is part of the exchange program and identical to that provided for native residents. (p. 5)
Study abroad has been a standard component of second/foreign language learning programs in Europe and America for many decades (Coleman, 2001). In Britain and France, for example, the exchange of foreign language assistants can be traced back to 1904 (Coleman, 1997, p. 3). In Europe such programs are covered by the term residence abroad. Despite some operational differences between study abroad and residence abroad programs (Coleman, 1997, p. 1), these terms will be treated as synonymous for the purposes of this research and be subsumed under the term study abroad. In Europe a large part of higher education study abroad is organised through the ERASMUS program which was established in 1987, and which is now part of the European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Program. The achievements of the ERASMUS program are vividly captured in the comments of the organisers:

Few, if any, programmes launched by the European Union have had a similar Europe-wide reach. Around 90% of European universities take part in Erasmus and 1.9 million students have participated since it started in 1987. The annual budget is in excess of €400 million, more than 3,100 higher education institutions in 31 countries participate, and even more are waiting to join. (European Commission Education and Training, n.d.)

The high level of interest in study abroad in Europe which is outlined in these words from the European Commission is further confirmed with reference to the numbers of students moving between European Union countries to take up study abroad, which in 2004 involved approximately 250,000 students, constituting about 10 per cent of global students studying abroad in that year (Bashir, 2007).

In America, where students of foreign languages have spent from one semester to one year or more studying the chosen language in a first language context, references to study abroad programs have appeared since the 1950s (Desruisseaux, 1993). The continued popularity of such programs is clear from the fact that in 2003/04 the number of American students choosing to study abroad rose 9.6% from the previous year to a record level of 191,321 (Institute of International Education, 2005).

Clearly, to both university students and staff there are assumptions about the value of a study abroad element within the framework of Higher Education degree programs to justify the professional and administrative services and costs involved in setting this up. Yet, surprisingly, given the length of time that study abroad
programs have been in operation, there is relatively little actual research and evidence demonstrating the particular benefits to be derived from a period of language immersion in a first language environment, as will be discussed further in Chapter Two (Bodycott & Crew, 2001; Coleman, 1997).

The Hong Kong government, as part of its campaign to maintain high standards in language teacher education, sponsors second language teachers to attend study abroad programs in the form of short language immersion (SLIM) programs. Engaging in such SLIM programs is a compulsory element in postgraduate and undergraduate courses for English language teachers (University of Hong Kong, n.d.). Practising language teachers are also sponsored to undertake overseas immersion programs by the Hong Kong Standing Committee on Language Education and Research (SCOLAR) which has made HK$70 million available for this and has sponsored 233 primary English teachers to attend SLIM programs in Australia, Canada and New Zealand between 2006 – 2008 (SCOLAR, n.d.). The Minister for Education, Michael Suen, noted the objectives of such programs are for Hong Kong English language teachers “to improve their English proficiency and widen their perspectives in teaching the language” (Suen, 2008, 16 March, para. 10). Part of the focus of this study is to investigate in what ways teaching perspectives are widened through engagement in the transnational classroom experience offered by a SLIM program.

1.8 The Nature and Goals of SLIM Programs

Most SLIM programs are organised over periods from four weeks up to ten weeks and generally include five elements:

- second language development activities, both campus and community based
- professional studies
- homestay and social outings designed to develop cultural understandings and intercultural competence
- a range of outward bound activities promoting personal development
- a school-based experience
Engagement in these activities is designed to offer participants the opportunities to:

- Enhance English language skills, particularly oral communication
- Extend professional development in teaching English as a Second Language
- Develop cultural understandings and intercultural competence
- Develop personal strengths and leadership skills
- Encounter and reflect on different educational contexts and practices

The SLIM program that is the context for the current study follows this general format. The program is organised over an eight week period with development of English language communication skills through a range of campus-based activities and also a community-based mini-action research project. Professional studies focus on second language pedagogy such as genre approaches to ESL teaching as well as sociocultural studies which develop comparative discussions around dominant discourses in home and host social and educational contexts. Homestay in two locations, one metropolitan and one rural, encourages further sociocultural comparisons to be made, as well as maximising opportunities for intercultural conversations. The outward bound activities integrated into this SLIM program, include two days organised camping on Fraser Island, near the Great Barrier Reef in Queensland, where participants have orienteering and other outdoor activities designed to promote self-reliance and leadership skills.

The school-based experience is carried out over a two week period in a K-12 coeducational private school situated in the north of Queensland. This school experience comprises a focus on both primary and secondary schooling, and includes class observation and tutoring, participation in school functions, mentoring and reflection workshops, leadership training activities both on and off campus, and social and leisure activities. As part of this school experience, the participants engage in classroom interaction with small groups of primary school children, teaching them some aspect of Chinese culture and/or language. It is this teaching of the cultural/language activity and the accompanying series of reflective tasks that constitute the central focus of the current study, as explained in detail in chapter five. It is argued in this study that it is through reflection on this
intercultural interaction in the transnational classroom, that participants’ tacit theories of second language teaching/learning are made visible and opened to questioning. These issues are explored in the analysis of the data in chapters six to eight.

1.9 The Reasons for this Study

My purpose in conducting this study is to find answers to questions that have interested me for many years. These questions have arisen directly from my work as an ESL teacher educator in institutions in both Hong Kong and Australia.

After a number of years of teaching English as a second language in different countries, I moved into second language teacher education in Hong Kong, preparing preservice teachers to teach English in government secondary and primary schools. Ten years later I found myself in Australia again teaching Hong Kong preservice teachers who were participating in short language immersion (SLIM) programs at a university in Brisbane. Having been involved in the organisation and teaching of these SLIM programs since 2000, I have wanted to explore how they contribute to the professional development of these language teachers, in particular the impact of the transnational school-based experience.

This study centres on second language teaching/learning interactions in an unfamiliar context and the power of reflective practice to develop professional identity. Practical engagement in teaching/learning interactions was the catalyst for my own entry into the teaching profession, as a young university graduate. I had not intended becoming a teacher prior to this, however a friend’s invitation to help run a summer school for traveller (gypsy) children changed my mind. I became fascinated by the unexpected responses and initiatives of this group of children, aged from 5 to 15, who had experienced very little prior schooling. Seated on the grass outside their trailers, we handed out crayons and paints and invited the children to draw pictures of their homes. In response the children produced three-dimensional pop-up constructions rather than the usual two-dimensional brush and paint representations. This unexpected outcome made me aware of my own socially-conditioned expectations and by contrast the huge creative potential of these young learners. I decided to become a teacher.
In this study I take up a sociocultural and poststructuralist perspective, in part deriving from growing up in a bilingual household with two sets of customs and expectations, and then as an adult living and teaching in different cultural contexts and viewing different sociocultural processes of education from an outsider’s perspective. The work of Gee exploring Discourses in education (1996, 1999, 2002, 2004a) and Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism (1981, 1986, 1990) have been central in extending my understanding of the reflexive relation between language and culture and how these in turn shape educational processes in different contexts.

The broad questions that I started with in the pilot study have over time become narrower and focused down to the current three questions that shape this study. An interest in how preservice teachers make sense professionally of their classroom experiences when teaching in unfamiliar cultural contexts is now phrased as:

- What Discourse models of second language teaching/learning are shaping the participants’ classroom practices?

This question draws on Gee’s concept of Discourse models as being shared story-lines or accepted ways of doing things which are distributed among the group as generally agreed professional practice (Gee, 2005a). Analysing the classroom discourse of the participants will allow identification of any salient patterns of features that constitute a shared second language pedagogy and thus a common understanding of the ESL teaching/learning processes and the teacher’s role in such processes.

- What voices do preservice ESL teachers draw on to construct professional identity in a transnational classroom context?

Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism encapsulates an epistemology that each person derives their own individual voice/identity through the social process of engaging in multiple dialogues with others via speech, text or other semiotic forms (Bakhtin 1981, 1986; Holquist, 2002). In the classroom discourse how do the teacher’s and students’ voices interanimate? Whose voices are
privileged and what patterning of power relations are in evidence influencing the teaching/learning process (Hirst & Brown, 2008)?

- **How does engaging in a process of dialogic reflection on their classroom interaction enable and constrain the ideological becoming of preservice ESL teachers?**

This research question investigates in what ways the process of guided reflection established in this study facilitates or restricts the development of teacher identity. Bakhtin envisages this process of ideological becoming, or achieving greater consciousness and understanding, as deriving from dialogic interanimation so that in the place of the authoritative voice of others one’s own internally persuasive voice emerges instead. Group discussions and a non-traditional stimulated recall interview are being deployed to promote dialogic investigation into participants’ classroom interaction from multiple viewpoints. Do the participants demonstrate shifts in their professional understandings through engaging in dialogic reflection, suggesting changes in their teacher identities?

### 1.10 Organisation of this Study

This chapter has located the study within the context of transnational teacher education and the imperatives for internationalisation of Higher Education in both Australia and Hong Kong. Some background historical details outlined the study abroad tradition of transnational education provision. The general features of one recent genre of study abroad, SLIM programs for preservice teachers, were discussed. It was noted that SLIM programs have emerged as an expanding field providing specialised in-country professional development for preservice second language teachers. One element of such SLIM programs is the transnational school-based experience, which is the focus of the current study. This chapter has introduced the purpose underlying this research, which is to explore whether reflection on engagement in this transnational school-based experience contributes to the development of professional identity in the Hong Kong preservice teachers who are the participants in this study.
The remainder of this study is organised into eight chapters which are structured as follows:

Chapter two places the current study within the context of transnational education and study abroad programs, in particular the recently emerging genre of short language immersion (SLIM) programs for second language teachers. It offers a review of the research literature tracing how understandings of professional knowledge have been investigated from different theoretical perspectives. The affordances of engaging in communities of practice outside the local are explored, in particular in relation to the literature researching SLIM programs and their contribution to the development of second language teacher identity.

Chapter three explicates the sociocultural and poststructural theoretical perspectives that frame this study. Teacher identity is considered as constituted with Discourses, raising questions of subjectivity and agency. Within the context of transnational teacher education, issues of cultural identity and the potential for teachers to develop a cosmopolitan identity are discussed. Bakhtin’s (1981, 1986) concepts of dialogic voice and ideological becoming provide a framework for understanding learning as socially constituted within a continually evolving process.

Chapter four introduces the methodological background to the current study, explaining the choice of a qualitative methodology and the suitability of a combined Discourse analytic and ethnographic approach. My positionality as both lecturer/researcher is discussed here, along with the advantages of participant observation. Details from the pilot study are given which show the decision-making process that has led to the particular research design of the current study.

Chapter five details the research design of the main study, in which the data collection proceeds in two phases. Having generated the data, the system of data analysis using Gee’s (2005a) seven building tasks is explained. In this chapter, the analytical toolkit assembled for this study is described and the suitability of the individual constructs is explored.
Chapters six, seven and eight analyse the data from this study, each from a different perspective, which has been conceived as linking together to explore beginner teachers’ understandings of their professional identity in terms of *doing, being* and *becoming* second language teachers. Chapter six investigates the participants’ classroom practices as second language teachers to discern what they understand as appropriate ways of enabling second language learning. Chapter seven shifts the focus to consider how the participants negotiate teacher/student identities in the second language classroom through the classroom discourse. Chapter eight examines the participants’ dialogic reflections in which they explore issues of professional identity arising from their transnational classroom experience, and traces any shifts in their situated identities.

Chapter nine draws together the themes regarding negotiation of teacher identity that have emerged from the data analysis, offering conclusions and recommendations regarding the contribution of dialogic reflection on a transnational classroom-based experience to the development of teacher identity. This chapter details the original contribution to research which is offered in this study by distinguishing different pedagogical formats for teaching language and culture in the context of the second language classroom. By linking discourse formats and teacher identity, this study provides a new way of examining the interplay of identity and pedagogy. This study also demonstrates how dialogic reflection can engage participants in productive learning about the interface of culture and learning.
Chapter Two

Reviewing the Literature: Second Language Teacher Education in the Transnational Context

The first part of this review of the literature places this study within the context of transnational education, defining the field and examining the historical development of study abroad programs which are the precursors to the current short language immersion program in this study. In the next section, the three key themes of professional knowledge, teacher identity and reflective practice are considered through a discussion of the second language education literature. The closing section of this chapter, considers the contribution of research into transnational classroom experience as part of short language immersion programs to our understandings of professional knowledge, reflective practice and teacher identity.

2.1 Transnational Education – Defining the Field

Transnational education is an umbrella term which covers a vast range of types of higher educational provision that have arisen as a result of the globalisation of education. The diversity of educational services encompassed by the term led the writers of a report into transnational education in Europe in 2001 to note that “currently, transnational education is an under-researched and often misunderstood area, with no common understanding, definition or approach” (Adam, 2001, p. 4). The need for some agreement on what is meant by the synonymous terms cross-border, borderless or transnational education has led UNESCO and OECD to take the unusual step of producing a joint definition:

cross-border higher education includes higher education that takes place in situations where the teacher, student, programme, institution/provider or course materials cross national jurisdictional borders. Cross-border higher education may include higher education by public/private and not-for-profit/for-profit providers. It encompasses a wide range of modalities, in a continuum from face-to-face (taking various forms such as students travelling abroad and campuses abroad) to distance learning (using a range of technologies and including e-learning). (UNESCO/OECD, 2005, p. 9)
At the heart of this definition is the notion of movement across national boundaries, which in the case of the current study refers to student mobility as the participants move temporarily from Hong Kong to Australia to take part in a short language immersion program.

Student mobility may seem an obvious feature of transnational education as a very visible and well-documented aspect of the globalisation of education (van der Pol, 2009). However, in their description of transnational education, McBurnie and Ziguras (2007) refer to the OECD’s (2004) categories of institutional mobility, program mobility and student mobility, and suggest that only the first two categories are examples of transnational education, whilst ignoring the third category of student mobility. I detail these factors here because within transnational education there are “definitional debates” (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007, p. 8) which stem in this instance from the narrow focus of some published texts to perceive the locus of the awarding or exporting institution to be a western one, focused for example on “the two major players” of U.K. and Australia (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007, p. 24). Hence such research literature focuses on Australia’s off-shore provision of educational programs as one of the leading providers to students located in Asia (DEST, 2005). However, this study takes a broader and less western-centric understanding of transnational education and defines the Hong Kong institution as the awarding institution and therefore includes the category of student mobility as a factor in the particular features of this transnational program. With definitions there is a need to maintain flexibility of viewpoint and keep in mind that taking a global viewpoint involves understanding transnational education as “all kinds of world-wide interconnectedness” (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999, p. 14).

Transnational education is discussed here in relation to globalisation processes. Globalisation is understood as “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). The investment of global capital in knowledge industries has given rise to the knowledge society resulting in the commodification of higher education as a service industry fuelling substantial economic growth. In 2007, Australia was one of the top six countries who between them hosted 62 per cent of
the world’s mobile students (UNESCO-UIS, 2009). Such global flows give rise to concerns of comparative university rankings as part of prestige, visibility and perceptions of quality thereby focusing on competition, the market and the commercial transfer of knowledge (Sadlak, Merisotis & Liu, 2008). Teichler (2004) has termed this current focus on managerial and operational issues associated with marketisation: “turbo-capitalism”. Teichler concludes his research by suggesting that this recent fixation on the marketisation of higher education could instead be focused on more “substantive questions” such as “global learning” and “global understanding” (Teichler, 2004, p. 23). This study takes up this suggestion, in alignment with other research studies exploring globalisation in higher education in terms of cultural processes and issues of teacher identity and pedagogy (Luke, 2004; Singh & Doherty, 2004).

2.1.1 Study Abroad Programs

The transnational education program that is the focus of this study is a higher education study abroad program lasting eight weeks. In the U.S., Dwyer’s (2004a) longitudinal survey of more than 4,000 study abroad participants revealed that in the 1990s triple the percentage of students studied abroad for less than 10 weeks compared to the percentage in the 1950s and 1960s. However, Dwyer confirms that despite shorter periods abroad: “participants are still benefiting significantly from the academic, language, and intercultural results of an education abroad experience” (p. 14). Particular examples of such benefits are increased regular use of a language other than English and continued foreign language study. Whilst acknowledging that “more is better” in terms of program duration (Dwyer, 2004b) Dwyer’s findings show very positive outcomes in terms of intercultural development for participants in semester long study abroad as well as year long programs. For example, responses to the statement that study abroad “helped me better understand own cultural values and biases” registered 99% agreement from participants in full year programs, 97% from fall semester programs, 97% from spring semester programs and 95% from summer semester programs (Dwyer, 2004b, Table 3 p. 158). Whilst reporting the findings of her survey, Dwyer (2004a) also commented on “a dearth” of longitudinal research into changes in education abroad.
In U.K., it was not until as recently as 1997 that the Higher Education Funding Council for England commissioned three major projects to define and promote best practice in study abroad programs within UK universities. Under the organisation of Oxford Brookes University, a consortium of U.K. universities began a project entitled “Learning and Study abroad in Practice” to discover more about the organisation and effectiveness of the study abroad period (LARA, 2000). The Intercultural Project and the Residence Abroad Matters Project were the two other initiatives to provide information and support to those engaging in study abroad. The outcomes of these projects, alongside his own work in the field, led Coleman (2001) to suggest that the objectives of study abroad programs fall into six areas: intercultural competence, linguistic, cultural, academic, personal and professional objectives. Coleman (2001) supports his claim with the results of a number of large-scale surveys into study abroad issues, carried out during the 1990s. The intercultural objective, which he considers in more depth is described as:

The amalgam of knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours which together allow an individual to derive maximum benefit from an extended stay abroad ... a long-term process during which the student must understand the relativity of all beliefs, values and behaviours – including his or her own. (p. 137)

The importance of intercultural competence has an established place in the study abroad literature (Byram, 1997, 2001; Byram & Fleming, 1998; Carr 2003; Kramsch, 2002; Liddicoat, 2003). As Jordan (2002) notes:

Current emphases in modern language teaching and learning highlight interculturality and reconceptualise goals in terms of producing ‘intercultural speakers’ who will be capable, adaptable actors and mediators in globalised contexts ... It is acknowledged that language proficiency alone is inadequate; communication is holistic and also requires knowledge of the ways culture and language interlock and an understanding of how interaction across cultures operates. (para. 1)

However, one of the key findings from the three large-scale U.K. research projects and Coleman’s study abroad surveys is that merely residing in a different culture does not provide a direct pathway to intercultural understanding (Coleman, 1996, 1997, 1998, 2001; The Intercultural Project (1997-2000). For study abroad programs to foster intercultural competence in their participants requires a focused orientation before departure and scaffolding within the program to cope with the dilemmas that can arise from studying within the target-language country (Bodycott & Crew, 2001; Jordan, 2002).
The assumption underlying study abroad programs is that the best way of learning another language and culture is to immerse oneself in the target-language community. In the U.S., Freed (1990, 1995b, 2004) has been one of the main researchers to investigate the attributes of second language learning in study abroad contexts. Her studies into second language acquisition and study abroad have included focusing on acquisition of formal linguistic accuracy in the second language (Freed, 1990, 1995a) and more recently exploring issues of fluency gain and developing communicative strategies (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Collentine & Freed, 2004; Lafford, 2004).

However, one of her recent research studies appears to throw doubt on the alleged supremacy of the study abroad setting to promote second language fluency gains (Freed, Segalowitz & Dewey, 2004). This study compares the acquisition of fluency in French of 28 American students studying in three different language learning contexts; study abroad in Paris (SA), a short intensive immersion language course at home (IM), and a traditional language course at home (AH). Contrary to expectations, the Domestic Immersion group (IM) made the most gains in oral performance, showing increased fluency in French in all six fluency variables, whereas the Study Abroad (SA) group registered gains on only four of the six fluency variables. What were possible factors influencing these outcomes? The study noted that the IM students reported speaking and writing French more hours per week than the other two groups. The researchers also commented that the short intensive nature of the IM course, compacting the learning into a 7 week span of both day and evening language activities, promoted language learning. By contrast, the SA group reported using more English than French in out of class hours. These outcomes suggest that:

it is not the context per se that promotes various types of learning but rather, as some have always believed, ... the nature of the interactions, the quality of the experiences, and the efforts made to use the L2 that render one context superior to another. (Freed, Segalowitz and Dewey, 2004, p. 298)

What is required is, as Freed et al. (2004) suggest, a more detailed analysis of the context of learning than has been supplied to date. These findings highlight the importance of the nature and intensity of the program and the quality of the language immersion experience, rather than just the physical setting in which it
takens place. It is now appropriate to look in more detail into the short language immersion (SLIM) programs that provide the context for my study.

2.1.2 Short Language Immersion Programs

Short language immersion (SLIM) programs have their origins not only in the larger context of study abroad programs but also immersion education. The term immersion program is associated with educational innovations in second language teaching commencing in the 1960s in Canada, where either a part or all of the school curriculum is taught through the medium of the second language (de Courcy, 2002; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). Immersion programs similar to the Canadian model are now found world-wide, either as part of the national education system, as in Hong Kong, or as an optional possibility within the national education system, as with the Swedish immersion programs in Finland. Here in Australia, optional immersion programs exist within state education as with the French immersion program at Benowa State High School in Queensland, which has been running since 1985 (de Courcy, 1997).

Johnson and Swain (1997) identify three types of language immersion programs, each created to serve different goals:

a) immersion for majority-language students in a minority language with the aim of enhancing second language learning and promoting additive bilingualism, as for English-speaking students in Quebec.

b) immersion for language support and language revival, as with instruction through Welsh for English-speaking students in Wales and programs to promote Catalan among Spanish-speaking children in Spain.

c) immersion in a language of power to facilitate English-medium education, for example the context for Cantonese speakers in Hong Kong. (p. xi)

In the context of the current research project, it is the third category, immersion in a language of power which is the medium of instruction in the home educational institutions, which is of central relevance. Indeed, Johnson and Swain use the example of the educational context in Hong Kong as an exemplar of this type of immersion program. It is unfortunate therefore that these authors then specifically exclude SLIM programs, where “language learners ... go to live and study in the target community, thus immersing themselves in the target language and culture” (ibid, p. 12), from the scope of their definition of immersion program. This exclusion is explained on the grounds of perceived differences in the
curriculum (“the curriculum is entirely language-based rather than content-based” (ibid., p.12). While the curriculum may be solely language-based in the case of recreational tourist-type general language programs, this comment is not applicable to the SLIM programs specially developed for second language teachers which are content-based. Another point of difference highlighted by Johnson and Swain is the fact that use of the second language is not confined to the classroom but informs every aspect of society and culture, noting that for this reason “immersion in the target culture and community is the antithesis of the classroom-based learning of the immersion programs we are focusing on” (ibid).

It is the viewpoint in this study that immersion in the target culture and community via a SLIM program is not “the antithesis” of classroom-based immersion but, in the case of ESL teachers from Hong Kong and other parts of Asia, it is a logical extension of the immersion program offered by the home education system. Whilst Johnson and Swain’s definition aims to justify the scope of the articles within their book, it is in fact important to counter this definition and argue that short language immersion programs for preservice second language teachers should be understood as situated within the broad context of “immersion education” as a particular resource of this type of bilingual education. This is not a semantic nicety but a conscious call for recognition of the substantial role such SLIM programs can play not only in terms of additive bilingualism by extending the second language learning of the participant teachers, but also in providing opportunities for an immersed teaching experience in the second language context. Erben (2004) argues a strong case for preservice immersion teachers themselves learning and teaching in a range of immersion settings. The contribution of SLIM programs to second language teacher education is explored in detail later in this chapter after a general consideration of the literature researching second language teacher education.

2.2 Second Language Teacher Education

2.2.1 Developing the Knowledge Base

Second language teacher education has been defined as “the sum of various interventions that are used to develop professional knowledge among practitioners”
(Freeman and Johnson 1998, p. 398, my emphasis). What is meant by professional knowledge in second language teacher education has been interpreted differently by researchers. Traditionally, issues relating to professional knowledge have been concerned with theories, such as theories of second language acquisition, needed by language teachers to take into their practice (Yates & Muchisky 2003). However, rather than viewing second language teaching theory and practice as a dichotomy, an understanding of the reflexive interaction between theory and practice as praxis is needed (Freire, 1970; Johnson, 2006). Freeman and Johnson (1998, 2005) argue that professional knowledge resides with the practitioner in the field (‘grounded’ knowledge) rather than just with theory from the discipline (‘a priori’ knowledge). This view of professional knowledge places the practical knowledge of the teacher at centre stage and has given rise to a growing body of research into practitioner knowledge based on what second language teachers know, believe, and think (Borg 2006).

Within the second language learning literature, professional theories and beliefs have been conceptualised as one of three key categories of teacher thought processes, in addition to teacher planning and teachers’ interactive thoughts and decisions (Clark & Peterson, 1986). However, the literature about teacher knowledge and beliefs contains a variety of definitions of these constructs including: ‘teaching maxims’ (Richards, 1996), ‘personal practical knowledge’ (Golombek, 1998), ‘pedagogical knowledge’ (Gatbonton, 1999, 2008; Mullock, 2006), ‘teacher cognition’ (Borg, 2006) and discussions of ‘teacher knowledge’ (Freeman, 2002; Freeman & Johnson, 2005).

One way in which the constructs of professional knowledge and beliefs have been examined is from an educational psychology perspective. Shulman’s (1986, 1987) research into teacher knowledge yielded analysis of the categories of the knowledge base as including: content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of learners and their characteristics, knowledge of educational contexts, and knowledge of educational purposes (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). His influential research guided Gatbonton’s two studies (1999, 2008) in which she investigated ESL teachers’ pedagogical knowledge. Gatbonton (2008) acknowledges Shulman’s framework as
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the basis for her analysis of ESL teachers’ pedagogical understandings, noting that: “Pedagogical knowledge is used here in its broadest definition (Shulman, 1986, 1987) to refer to any knowledge, theory, and belief about the act of teaching and the process of learning that inform teachers’ behaviour in the classroom” (p. 168). Gatbonton (1999) discerned twenty-one variables constituting pedagogical knowledge, including language management through to time check and note behaviour, and she then analysed the relative emphasis given to these various elements in terms of their noted frequency of occurrence. Gatbonton’s (1999) study focused on experienced teachers, whilst her later (2008) study compared experienced with novice teachers to find similarities and differences in their pedagogical thoughts. Other research, by contrast, has aimed to isolate teacher beliefs from teacher knowledge relying on definitions such as that supplied by Murphy & Mason (2006), suggesting that teaching beliefs are:

all that one accepts as or wants to be true. Beliefs do not require verification and often cannot be verified (e.g., opinions). A special characteristic of beliefs is that individuals attribute a valence of importance to them and therefore, individuals are prepared to act on beliefs and to hold to them in the face of conflicting evidence. (pp. 306-307)

This definition confirms features noted by Pajares (1992) who has provided one of the most insightful discussions on this topic. Pajares (1992) described teacher beliefs as a “messy construct” in which he discerned sixteen fundamental assumptions including an acknowledgement that teacher beliefs are culturally transmitted, that they can act as a filter to a teacher’s understandings of educational contexts and that the earlier beliefs are acquired the more resistant they are to change (p.325). Pajares’ work is distinguished by noting that teachers’ beliefs must be inferred and that they are revealed through what teachers “say, intend and do” in particular settings (Pajares 1992, p. 316). He also emphasises that teachers’ beliefs arise through enculturation, the process of acquiring cultural values through growing up in a particular society and education system (p.325). This process of enculturation is what Lortie (1975, 2002) has termed the apprenticeship of observation. Ellis’ (2006) study exploring the beliefs of bilingual and monolingual ESL teachers vividly demonstrates how early language learning experiences can impact on the later professional practices of second language teachers, in the reflective narratives of the bilingual teachers explaining how their personal experiences of language learning continues to inform their teaching in
later years. Despite efforts to distinguish teacher knowledge from teacher beliefs, a number of researchers suggest that there is inevitable overlap and interlinking between the two (Ho & Toh, 2000; Pajares, 1992; Verloop, Van Driel & Meijer, 2001).

Rather than commencing research with a predefined construct of teacher’s knowledge, much research in this area is characterized by seeking to understand the meanings that their work holds for the teachers themselves. Such research aims to generate theory from iterative analysis of data comprising the teachers’ own accounts of their practice (Golombek, 1998; Richards, 1996). A pioneering study into this concept of ‘practical knowledge’ was carried out by Elbaz (1983). In this case study of one teacher, Elbaz used both classroom observation and detailed interviews in an attempt to uncover the teacher’s conceptions of her work. Taking a holistic approach, Elbaz (1983) claimed that teachers’ classroom practices are guided by a combination of their beliefs, feelings, and values in conjunction with their theoretical and commonsense understandings and experience. Burns (1992) continued to explore the relationship between teacher beliefs and classroom practices, challenging the dichotomy that ‘theory’ is only what researchers do, whereas teachers are assumed to be engaged in untheorised practice. She investigated the ‘hidden pedagogy’ of the classroom, seeking to understand the interplay between teacher beliefs and decision-making underlying more observable elements such as classroom language and behaviour. Burns noted from her data that teacher beliefs “usually remain hidden and implicit” (Burns, 1992, p.63) and concluded that this has implications for teacher education programs which should be “providing opportunities for teachers to raise to consciousness the nature of the personalized theories which inform their practice” (Burns, 1992, p.64).

Research into the construct of personal practical knowledge was extended by Clandinin and Connelly (1987,1996) who highlighted how a teacher’s theories about teaching are contextualized in experience: “personal practical knowledge: knowledge which is experiential, embodied, and reconstructed out of the narratives of a teacher’s life” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987, p. 490). Among other aspects, this research highlights how metaphors in narratives shape and reflect the
way that teachers conceptualise and carry out their teaching. Ten years later, Connelly, Clandinin and He (1997) note that teacher knowledge research has “exploded” to become “part of a revolution in how educators think about classroom practice” (Connelly, Clandinin & He, 1997, p.666). In explaining their experiential perspective and methodology they highlight the importance of collaborative research, with teachers and researchers working closely together so that “research results have a strongly authentic, insider, feel to them”, with research questions having arisen from observed teacher practices or from the teachers themselves (Connelly, Clandinin & He, 1997, p.667). Their metaphor of the ‘landscape’ of professional knowledge acknowledges the complexity of the teacher’s environment as not just the classroom but “the exceedingly complex intellectual, personal and physical environment for teachers’ work” which extends outside the classroom, including their personal lives (ibid., p. 673).

Narrative-based research such as Connelly, Clandinin and He’s (1997) study into teacher’s personal practical knowledge places a strong emphasis on the teacher’s conscious reflections on their pedagogy. Breen, Milton, Oliver and Thwaite (2001) in their study of 18 ESL teachers also made use of the teachers’ own descriptions and reflections on their teaching, but noted the need to supplement this methodology with observation of the participants’ classroom practice because teachers’ professional knowledge “becomes embedded in their action and this ‘knowledge in action’ is not always directly accessible to them … Teachers may find it hard to articulate the principles underlying their practice” (p. 476). Their field notes made during classroom observations therefore offered the researchers insights into particular aspects of pedagogy to probe further during reflective discussion with the individual participants.

In addition to the educational psychology and narrative enquiry approaches to examining teachers’ professional knowledge there is the potential offered by a sociocultural perspective. From the sociocultural perspective, teachers’ theories of appropriate ways of being a language teacher and doing language teaching are seen as socially constituted within particular cultural and historical settings that reflexively frame each other (Velez-Rendon, 2002). At this point it is important to distinguish between the term pedagogy rather than the narrower concept of
methodology to acknowledge that teaching is both action and discourse (Adamson, 2004; Alexander, 2008a). Whereas ELT methodology is sometimes (erroneously) conceptualised as culturally neutral (Baxter, 2003) pedagogy is understood as social and discursive practices saturated with particular political and ideological values (Alexander, 2001, 2008b; Canagarajah, 1999, 2005; Gee, 1996, 2004b; Rogoff, 2008a). In this study, as the participants enact their pedagogy in the institutional setting they are also enacting particular teacher identities. As Watson (2006) clarifies: “Who we think we are influences what we do, i.e. there is a link between professional identity and professional action (in a sense, professional action is doing professional identity)” (p.10).

We are socialised into these ways of understanding our professional selves and our practices through engagement in particular communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). These communities of practice include our experiences of growing up within a particular educational system or systems characterised by a particular epistemology and ontology where we have served our apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975, 2002). They also include our lived experience of second language learning in monolingual or multilingual contexts (Ellis, 2006; Johnson & Swain, 1997) In addition, engagement in programs of professional education constitute further influential communities of practice which contribute to professional learning and participants’ identities as language teachers (Norton & Toohey, 2004; Singh & Richards, 2006). Affiliations in the sociocultural conventions of these different communities of practice constitute “meaning-making work” which guides members’ practices and beliefs (Gee, 2005c, p. 592). These theories are often unconscious and through familiarity are held to be self-evident universal truths, however as Levy (2007) notes they are in fact “a manifestation of a particular cultural orientation, reflecting a particular system of beliefs and values” (p. 106).

Therefore, in order to develop teachers’ professional knowledge there must first be exploration of the sociocultural assumptions underpinning teachers’ existing understandings of second language teaching/learning processes and of their role within such processes. However, such deep-seated beliefs are often maintained at an unconscious level (Burns, 1992; Gee, 1999; Santoro, 2009). One way that
teachers can become aware of these cultural assumptions is through confronting alternative ways of doing and being in a different community of professional practice. This is demonstrated, for example, in the study of how an American language teacher working in Japan dynamically reconstructs her identity in relation to her lived experiences and daily interactions with colleagues, students and other professional staff (Johnston, Pawan & Mahan-Taylor, 2005). In another study of professional boundary-crossing, Tsui and Law (2007) investigate the learning experiences provided to Hong Kong student teachers of Putonghua as a second language through engaging in the practice of “Study Lessons” in China. Tsui and Law (2007) suggest that negotiating shared knowledge through engaging in communities of practice outside the local sphere, offers a way of meeting some of the challenges posed by globalisation and the rapid proliferation of knowledge in teacher education. To address the complexities of contemporary educational contexts they advocate dialogue across different communities of practice:

Knowing, as Wenger (1998) observes, is a living process in which knowledge is generated in the course of acting, thinking and conversing with fellow practitioners. One has to engage with members of other communities of practice; one has to move between multiple parallel contexts. These contexts demand and afford different, and sometimes conflicting, mediating tools and patterns of social interaction … One is challenged to negotiate and integrate elements from different contexts to provide solutions to problems. (Tsui & Law, 2007, p. 1289)

Studies such as this create a cogent argument for including a transnational school experience as part of second language teacher education (Bodycott & Crew, 2001; Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Tang & Choi, 2004).

Participation in multiple communities of practice is seen as offering teachers and preservice teachers productive contexts to create and reframe personal theories of teaching/learning (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). In the current study, the unfamiliar cultural context of the Australian classroom can foreground the Hong Kong preservice teachers’ differing professional assumptions/expectations, making their established routines and beliefs more visible and hence open to question. The ability to stand back and question one’s own professional and social context arises more easily as a by-product of questioning a more distinctly other social context first (Carr, 2003). In the struggle to find a fit and to make meaning in this new environment, the participants are confronting their own personal
assumptions as well as the different values and practices they encounter in the foreign educational context (Singh & Guo, 2008).

Such is the potential of engaging in different communities of practice, but as Wenger (1998) explicitly states: “Communities of practice are about content – about learning as a living experience of negotiating meaning” (p. 229). One cannot therefore prescribe or anticipate what meanings will be negotiated and what learning will be achieved by engaging in interaction as legitimate peripheral participants in a transnational classroom: “Learning cannot be designed: it can only be designed for – that is, facilitated or frustrated” (Wenger, 1998, p. 229). It is suggested that the process of dialogic reflection instituted in this study is a means of facilitating the learning process.

### 2.2.2 Developing through Dialogic Learning

The process of dialogic reflection that is part of the design of this study is based on theories of learning encompassing a history stretching back to Socrates and more recently the writings of Vygotsky and Bakhtin (Renshaw, 2004). Vygotsky’s writings have importantly foregrounded the social nature of learning and that cognitive development is mediated by socially constructed physical and symbolic tools among which language is of particular importance (Vygotsky, 1978). Learning is understood as a process of internalization, whereby children move from external socially mediated activity and a reliance on other people to assist them in engaging with activities, to a more self-regulated appropriation of resources to be able to carry out activities more independently. For example, the child initially uses language to ask for help from an adult for processes that they cannot achieve on their own. However, over time the child changes the focus of such questions, no longer directing them outwards to the adult but inwards to ask themselves how to attain their goal. This sociocultural nature of learning is underscored through this realization that: “the history of the process of the internalization of social speech is also the history of the socialization of children’s practical intellect” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 27). Humans learn through engaging in social activities which are situated in specific cultural and historical contexts from which they derive meaning. Within these social activities, the less proficient participants are assisted by more competent participants thus allowing them to
develop their skills and knowledge to undertake more and more complex tasks.
This distance between the child’s actual developmental level (demonstrated by their ability to conduct tasks independently) and their potential development level (demonstrated by what the child can achieve when problem-solving under guidance) has been termed the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87). Vygotsky proposes that an:

> essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. (p. 90)

Vygotsky’s theory of learning as arising through meditational means in situated social interaction is not only important for children’s development of higher order thinking but is pertinent to our understanding of human learning generally acknowledging “that mental functioning in the individual originates in social, communicative processes” (Wertsch, 1985, p. 13). Vygotsky’s work has contributed significantly to the social turn in theories of second language learning and teacher education (Block, 2003; Cesar & Kumpulainen, 2009; Johnson, 2006; Hall, 2000; Lantolf, 2000; Smagorinsky, 1998, 2001; Swain, 2006). One particular understanding that has arisen is that teachers’ lived experiences as schoolchildren themselves, then as teacher learners in teacher education programs and later as practitioners in their own classrooms have provided the social contexts reflexively shaping teachers’ thinking about teaching/learning processes and which in turn are shaped by the teacher.

However, an understanding of sociocultural theory implies more than just a view of meanings and knowledge being co-constructed in social interaction, as such interaction also socialises participants into the cultural practices embedded within the context of culture (Halliday, 1985). School children come to school already with social identities appropriated from their socialisation within certain communities of practice associated with their home and neighbourhood, as Ten Dam, Volman and Wardekker (2004) observe:

> The cultured practices that are brought into the school are ‘gendered’ and ‘classed’. This element does not remain at the school gate, but enters the classroom. The way in which
it is taken up in classroom dialogue partly determines what meaning students give to what they learn. (p. 80)

When learners are invited to participate in new communities of practice, this is not just a matter of engaging with new knowledge or skills but this also directly involves learners in identity work as they choose whether to take up new ways of positioning themselves as the types of people who have these skills and who make use of this kind of knowledge. A useful example of these issues is provided in Ten Dam, Voman and Wardekker (2004) who discuss the apparent failure of three subject offerings in a common curriculum to effect change in gendered participation patterns within these subjects in Dutch secondary schools. Although the three subjects: Care, Technology, and Information and Computer Literacy (ICL) were made compulsory for both girls and boys, the traditional attitudes towards these subjects still prevailed. The researchers noted that it was insufficient motivation to change viewpoints simply by being introduced to certain new practices.

Belonging, however, ultimately cannot be reached by just ‘going through the motions’; it requires a person to see herself as a member, taking responsibility for her own actions (including the use of knowledge and skills) from that position. The learning process thus implies a change in personal identity, in the way one represents oneself for others and for oneself … Learning to participate is at the same time learning to become a specific person. (Ten Dam, Volman & Wardekker, 2004, pp. 68-69)

Their suggestion is that classroom dialogue can be used as a means of discussing tensions arising from identity conflicts and as a means of questioning familiar gendered positions. The researchers’ conclude that participation and critical reflection are the tools to begin digging pathways into new terrain for identity work.

2.2.3 Developing through Reflective Practice

Whilst the literature into teacher's personal practical knowledge takes up a number of different perspectives, they share in common a focus on the participants’ reflective commentaries to provide insight into their professional understandings (Borg, 2003, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2002). This focus on reflection on practice is also seen as fundamental to teacher development both for preservice and inservice teachers (Calderhead, 1989; Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005;
Schoen, 1987; Wallace, 1991; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). As Richards (1998) notes, inexperienced teachers need to engage in reflection to develop their pedagogy through self-inquiry which “can help teachers move beyond a level where they are guided largely by impulse, intuition, or routine” (p.21).

Schoen’s work (1983, 1987) continues to be influential in defining reflection, which he construes as inextricably tied to our actions. He describes knowing-in-action which is the largely unconscious enactment of previously acquired knowledge which “we reveal by our spontaneous, skilful execution of the performance: and we are characteristically unable to make it verbally explicit” (Schoen, 1987, p. 25). An example of this type of knowledge would be our speedy reactions to situations when driving a car. However, when our usual routine is punctuated by a surprising or unexpected outcome, Schoen suggests that we may respond by reflecting on this while the action is still in process (reflection in action) in which case our thinking may change the nature of the action while we are engaged in it. We may later continue to reflect on the new circumstance and this type of retrospective reflection he termed reflection on action (Schoen, 1987). Schoen’s definitions provide an understanding of reflection as part of a dynamic decision-making process which underlies professional practice characterising the practitioner as actively deriving new knowledge from practical experience. As Schoen (1987) explains, an individual:

responds to the unexpected or anomalous by restructuring some of her strategies of action, theories of phenomena, or ways of framing the problem; and she invents on-the-spot experiments to put her new understandings to the test. She behaves more like a researcher trying to model an expert system than like the ‘expert’ whose behaviour is modeled. (p.35)

In Schoen’s (1983, 1987) approach, thinking and doing are reflexively intertwined and knowing arises experientially from reflective practice rather than being the result of an abstracted cognitive process. The benefits of reflection are seen particularly as allowing teachers to draw insights from their practice which can then guide their future teaching. As Boud, Keogh and Walker (1985) have noted: “It is this working with experience that is important in learning ... It is only when we bring our ideas to our consciousness that we can evaluate them and begin to make choices about what we will and will not do” (p.19). These words rather
reassuringly suggest that, given space for reflection, experienced teachers and pre-service teachers alike will undertake deep analysis of their classroom experiences in order to inform their current teaching practice. However, for pre-service teachers in particular this is not an easy undertaking.

As Klapper (2001) notes, inexperienced practitioners are unlikely to have produced any explicit personal theories about language teaching yet and have difficulty engaging in critical reflection to any deep extent. For beginner teachers how is such reflective practice most effectively achieved?

Korthagen and Vasalos (2005) suggest that what is required to encourage reflective practice is a model of reflection which systematically structures the reflection and offers initial guidance from a supervisor or mentor on how to activate these different stages of reflection. The cyclical model of reflection suggested by Korthagen and Vasalos (2005) is termed ALACT, an acronym for the five stages of reflection:

- Action
- Looking back on the action
- Awareness of essential aspects
- Creating alternative methods of action
- Trial

These steps are then repeated in an on-going recursive process. Their reflective model is notable for trying to move beyond purely rational conceptions of reflection to incorporate consideration of the feelings and emotions of the participants also (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999). This approach aligns them with the findings of researchers such as Clandinin and Connelly (1987) who argue that teacher’s professional knowledge encompasses more than just cognition but also “involves aesthetic, moral and emotional states of mind about that thing” (Clandinin and Connelly, 1987, p. 499). Whilst Korthagen and Vasalos’ (2005) study offers a very comprehensive model of reflective practice detailing what they term ‘core reflection which addresses reflection at these more personal affective levels of identity (self conception) and mission (a sense of personal meaning or calling), it faces the problem of complexity through trying to embrace such a wide
range of considerations. There is also the question that the researchers themselves posit: “Where lies the boundary between professional supervision and therapy?” (p.51).

Instead of the complexity of the ALACT model, another group of researchers offer a structured approach to reflection which is more accessible by beginner teachers and which in fact arose out of the researchers’ work with preservice teachers (Bain, Ballantyne, Mills & Lester, 2002). These researchers suggest that “the reflective process to encourage is one that includes the description, analysis and reconstruction of professional issues” (Bain et al., 2002, p. 11).

Bain et al., (2002) have identified a useful five-tiered framework of reflective processing which moves through reporting, responding, relating, reasoning, to reconstructing. Reporting remains at the level of a descriptive report of an event or issue. Responding adds a personal or emotional dimension to the description. Relating is where connections are made between this incident and the practitioner’s own abilities, experience, education or knowledge. Reasoning is where salient factors are highlighted and their significance in understanding the incident is clarified. In the reconstructing stage the new understandings achieved through processing the other four stages are used to reframe or reshape future practice or professional knowledge. Bain et al., (2002) acknowledge the fact that inexperienced teachers are unlikely of their own accord to produce a reflective analysis that moves beyond the level of a descriptive account of events. However, they demonstrate through their study that with appropriate guidance and feedback preservice teachers are in fact able to operationalise all levels of the reflective process which in turn leads to transformative practice. The crucial element is the dialogic nature of the reflective process the preservice teachers are engaged in with their university tutors, their school-based mentors and their peers (Bain et al., 2002). The key aspect of dialogic reflection is that it engages preservice teachers in discussion, analysis and interpretation of classroom events and interaction with a number of different voices rather than just their own voice in self-reflection. The potential of dialogic reflection in which insights are discussed with a critical friend is seen as a powerful strategy by Hatton and Smith
(1995) who identify this as an effective and safe way for students to discuss and analyse their actions, theories and beliefs in a supportively critical manner.

Miller’s study (2007) of a diverse group of ESL preservice teachers negotiating their identities during their practicum in Australian high schools demonstrates the power of the dialogic reflective process for one of the participants Julia a Chinese preservice ESL teacher. Julia faced problems in her practicum establishing herself as a legitimate ESL teacher, which she ascribed to her being Chinese and speaking Chinese as her first language rather than being a native speaker of English. Through the dialogic reflective process of emailed discussions with her teacher educator/mentor Miller, Julia was able to probe more deeply into difficult issues and thereby found “a powerful way of teacher knowing and learning ... [which] allowed her to process her lived experience in classrooms in a very sophisticated way” (Miller, 2007, p. 162).

Such ideas about the value of dialogic reflection have been extended and explored in more depth in educational studies taking up a Bakhtinian perspective (Brettschneider, 2004; Delp, 2004; Matusov, 2007; Valdes, 2004). Delp (2004) describes how enlightening she found the process of dialogic interanimation with the authors of manuscripts on Bakhtinian approaches to education. Through these extended written dialogues in which she questioned the authors about the meanings of their texts, she comments:

We have each journeyed, farther than before our correspondence, to think about ideas, to understand the intentions of others and, in responding to the ideological positioning of those others, to construct new understandings and perspectives for ourselves. (p. 210)

An understanding of the empowering and productive nature of dialogic reflection underpins both the theory and the methodology of this study and is explored in more detail in chapter three.

2.2.4 Developing Teacher Identity

So far the discussion around second language teacher education has focused on learning as transformation of knowledge. It is now time to link teacher knowledge to teacher identity, because “teacher-learning involves not only discovering more about the skills and knowledge of language teaching but also what it means to be a
language teacher” (Singh & Richards, 2006, p. 155). Questioning one's assumptions about teaching/learning as part of the process of transforming knowledge arises through addressing dilemmas and is a complex and unsettling process involving personal struggles often around deeply held beliefs. Such questioning therefore impacts on the teachers’ understandings not only of what they might be doing professionally but of who they are – their identity - as a language teacher (Geijsela & Meijersb, 2005). The educational goal of transforming preservice teachers' professional knowledge held as taken-for-granted theories necessarily involves negotiations around teacher identity. However the significance of the identity construction work that is involved in second language teacher education has been rarely addressed by the research literature:

What is often missing from this literature is an acknowledgement of the internal struggles and dilemmas teachers are confronted with when challenged to take on new practices, which may require the teacher to assume new identities and a changed mindset. (Singh & Richards, 2006, p.156)

Before considering the challenges to a teacher's identity that are inherent in the goal of transforming professional knowledge, it is necessary to first step back and consider the broader issue of identity in relation to second language education.

Norton (2000) defines identity as “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 5). This definition of identity highlights the relational and sociocultural nature of identity rather than suggesting that identity comprises some essential individualistic inner-core of being which would be a viewpoint from the humanist tradition. Norton’s definition accords with poststructural perspectives on identity as fluid, changing and hybrid (Bhabha, 1996). By emphasising that identities are “constructed across time and space”, Norton argues that identities are situated in socio-historical contexts and that within these contexts people are continually shaping themselves and being shaped as particular identities. Identities then can be understood as situated within discourses in which particular subject positions are made salient (Gee, 1996, 2005a). It therefore requires continual enactive and recognitive work to establish and maintain the identity a person deems appropriate within a particular discourse (Gee, 2004a). In the classroom, teacher and student identities
are continuously being negotiated within and through the classroom discourse (Toohey, 2000).

The second language teachers who are the participants in the current study are both second language teachers and learners of English. Hence it is appropriate to extend the discussion of identity in second language education to consider second language identity from both the learner’s and teacher’s perspectives.

Norton (2000) emphasises the central role of language in establishing identity, and is supported in her claims by the work of a large number of sociocultural researchers (Fairclough, 1989, 1995; Gee, 1999, 2004b; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2003; Rogers, 2004; Scollon & Scollon, 2003; Weiss & Wodak, 2003;). Language is the medium in which and through which we represent ourselves to others. It is language which offers a central means of gaining access to powerful social groups as a legitimate speaker who has a right to be heard (Norton, 2000). Through her diary study research meetings with five women from non-English speaking backgrounds who had recently migrated to Ontario, Canada, Norton demonstrates how investment in second language learning and identity are intertwined, noting that the term investment:

Conceives of the language learner as having a complex social history and multiple desires. The notion presupposes that when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. Thus an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own identity. (Norton, 2000, pp. 10-11)

Taking a poststructural view, Norton explores the language encounters of these migrant women as sites of struggle as they resist positioning as marginalised migrant voices. Her research foregrounds language as a social practice tied to considerations of status and power where “linguistic communities are heterogeneous arenas characterised by conflicting claims to truth and power” (Norton & Toohey, 2002, p. 117). Norton’s (2000) study is one well-known and influential example of research into identity and language learning of migrant communities. De Courcy, Yates and Nicholas (2004) also explore the interplay between identity, language learning and social adaptation to a new community in their study of a group of Iraqi refugees living in a country town in Victoria,
Australia, noting how former participants' social and educational experiences influence learners’ conceptions of self and their current language learning.

Transnational flows are not confined to migration and include more temporary periods of living in other cultures which nonetheless impact on participants’ identities. Vertovec (2009) explains that social research into transnational migration movements has “proposed that transnationalism has changed people’s relations to space particularly by creating transnational ‘social fields’ or ‘social spaces’ that connect and position some actors in more than one country” (p.12). Within the field of transnational education such social spaces can be understood as *global contact zones* - points of intersection - where different and differing imagined worlds collide and interanimate (Clifford, 1997). One area of research into identity in transnational second language education focuses on the flow of international students to western institutions of higher education to study within mainstream or ESL programs, exploring how student identities are shaped through resistance to and appropriation of dominant discourses within these global contact zones (Doherty & Singh, 2005; Han & Singh, 2007; Kettle, 2005; Lin, 2008; Singh & Doherty, 2004). Studies such as these confirm that the experience of undertaking transnational education engages learners in very unsettling processes of identity (re)construction. Lin (2008) explores the narratives of two international students as they navigate their degree studies in an Australian university. One of the students, Donna, is a medical doctor from China now studying an undergraduate nursing degree, the other is Sandra a postgraduate student attending a Masters educational program. Despite the welcoming institutional discourses at the outset of their studies, both students experience their ensuing classroom interactions as “very uncomfortable” (p. 12) and “like moving backward” (p. 9) as they confront exclusion in group work because of their limited linguistic resources. Lin (2008) notes their difficulty in establishing themselves as legitimate students within the classroom context and suggests that tutors/lecturers need to reappraise pedagogical practices so as to “create a space for students, domestic or international alike, to feel comfortable in participation of group work” (p. 12). The onus is shifting to the institutions to adapt their educational practices as part of their internationalisation processes (Rizvi, 2000; Rizvi & Walsh, 1998).
Such studies are helping to change the view of the international student from one
characterised as a deficient and problematic learner to instead recognise their
agentive role as investing in new identities:

Students seeking the cultural capital of global cultural forms and practices are not
victims to be protected, but rather are proactive agents purposefully and advantageously
imagining and positioning themselves in global flows, just as teachers and higher
education institutions are also engaging in the global exchange of ideas and finance to
their advantage. (Singh & Doherty, 2004, p. 36)

Singh and Doherty’s (2004) research notes that identity work is not just the
domain of the international student who confronts the need to take up western
academic discourse patterns and conventions in order to achieve successful
outcomes in their study programs. The teachers engaging with transnational
learners also need to question and reappraise their own conceptions of their
practice and the identities they take up: “practitioners need to engage with new
theories of culture and cultural processes of globalisation and write themselves
into these scripts as both active agents and subjects of the transculturation effect
as much as the students sharing the contact zone” (p. 36). Singh and Doherty
(2004) make a strong argument for both learners and teachers in global
educational contact zones to engage in identity work.

For English as a second language teachers who are also learners of English,
establishing their teaching identity is a particularly complex undertaking. Miller’s
(2007) study, introduced earlier in section 2.2.3, describes some of these
difficulties as experienced by a preservice ESL teacher, Julia, who is a first language
speaker of Chinese. In her emailed dialogues with Miller, Julia shared her troubling
experiences of trying to construct her teaching identity commenting: “sometimes, I
just feel myself hard to be in the context, of the text, of the classroom, since stuff
that I need to be in the situation are beyond me. I’m learning, not only ESL
teaching but the language as well” (p. 157). This question of legitimacy of the
second language learner/teacher is more than the struggle with making meanings
using the second language, it is also the question of having one’s professional
identity recognised by the students and other teachers. As Hirst, Renshaw and
Brown (2009) delineate in their study of Pak Asheed, a teacher of Indonesian in
Australia, it is the non-Australian repertoires of practice taken up by Pak Asheed
from his socialization into teaching in Indonesia that inscribed him as an outsider and not a legitimate teacher in the eyes of the children and school staff of this Australian school. Pak Asheed’s determination to hold to his familiar classroom discourse and teacher identity as shaped by his education in Indonesia was actively resisted in different ways by the students who parodied and mocked his words and actions thereby “assisting to develop their peer friendships and simultaneously constructing the teacher as different and other – interestingly, the very quality that he was employed for” (p. 334). The mocking behaviour of many of the children and Pak Asheed’s refusal to acknowledge any students in class other than the small group of compliant learners shows how powerfully teachers and students identify with the discourses that they have been socialised into. As Foucault states: “discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle” (Foucault, 1981, p. 53).

Nevertheless, identities are not fixed and can be constantly reframed as is demonstrated in the research study carried out by Pavlenko (2003). The context for this study is a Second Language Acquisition course that Pavlenko was teaching as part of the Masters TESOL program. Pavlenko (2003) notes the empowering effects of theories questioning the validity of the native speaker construct, which when taken up by one of her students, a speaker of Japanese as her first language, allows this teacher to reframe her professional identity from one of deficient non-native speaker of English to competent bilingual ESL teacher. The identity transformation that follows this appropriation of a different discourse is profound, as is movingly explained by Pavlenko (2003). This rewording of old scripts and the ability of second language users to negotiate multiple identities so as to belong both to their place of birth and their subsequent chosen or imagined worlds is described by Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) as an act of agency:

While the first language and subjectivities are an indisputable given, the new ones are arrived at by choice. Agency is crucial at the point where the individuals must not just start memorizing a dozen new words and expressions but have to decide on whether to initiate a long, painful, inexhaustive and, for some, never-ending process of self-translation.” (p. 170)
By framing second language learning as a process of self-translation, Pavlenko and Lantolf’s words underline the significance of second language learning within the process of identity construction, which is taken up in more detail in Chapter Three.

2.3 Contributions to the Field: SLIM programs

The examination of the research context of second language teacher education has so far focused broadly on three themes: developing the professional knowledge base, reflective practice, and negotiation of identity. Attention now focuses in particular on the transnational context for second language teacher education, and in particular the contribution to the field offered by research into short language immersion (SLIM) programs, in terms of developing these three areas of teacher knowledge, reflective practice and teacher identity.

The starting point for a discussion of existing research into SLIM programs is to first acknowledge that there is relatively little research in this field and even less in the area of teachers’ engagement in transnational classroom-based experience. This omission has been highlighted by Bodycott and Crew (2001) in one of the few books that discuss this type of second language learning experience, as they point out the “dearth of research into the nature and effects of short term programmes” (p. 2).

An overview of existing research suggests that the particular contribution that SLIM programs offer is in “providing sociocultural, language learning and pedagogical experiences for participants” (Barkhuizen & Feryok, 2006, p. 117). Much research has focused on gains in terms of second language learning, such as mastery of particular grammatical items or enhanced performance on language skills proficiency ratings (Brecht, Davidson & Ginsberg, 1995; Collentine & Freed, 2004; Huebner, 1995) and tracking changes in second language fluency and communicative competence (Freed, 1995b; Lafford, 2004; Murdoch & Adamson, 2001; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004). However, the focus in the current study is on the less researched sociocultural and pedagogical dimensions of SLIM programs. These two dimensions are often the locus of dilemmas faced by the participants while in the second language community, rather than linguistic problems (Crew & Bodycott, 2002; Connelly, 2001). In this regard, SLIM programs are noted as
contributing to professional knowledge in terms of participants’ greater awareness of cultural diversity and increased empathy for second language learners (Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Tang & Choi, 2004; Willard-Holt, 2001).

Pence and Macgillivray (2008) explore the impact of a short international field experience on 15 preservice teachers from the US. These preservice teachers completed a 4 week practicum, working with teachers and students in a private American international school in Rome, Italy. Pence and Macgillivray (2008) look at the benefits of this international field experience in terms of personal gains such as “increased confidence” and professional changes such as “a better appreciation and respect for differences of others and other cultures” (p. 14). The affluent school setting in Italy provides a marked contrast to the participants’ usual teaching context in Virginia and gives rise to new educational insights. For example, one participant Andrea reassesses her negative perceptions of the academic abilities of her bilingual learners in the US realising how “her judgment and stereotyping of children from families of lower socioeconomic level may affect her image of their abilities” (p. 21).

These preservice teachers did not have any Italian language skills before undertaking the field experience and this leads to new sensitivity to the plight of second language learners in the U.S. In her reflective journal one of the participants, Katherine, comments: “I now have respect for those who don’t speak English and come to the States because I know what it feels like not to be able to understand what is going on” (p. 21). The two researchers, who were also the faculty supervisors during the practicum, noted that apart from new appreciations regarding cultural and linguistic diversity, participants also demonstrated “an awareness of the importance that feedback and reflection play in professional and personal growth” (p. 23). One of the participants Lisa commented:

Something happened to me in Italy. I stopped worrying about all the little things I couldn’t control, and instead learned how to deal with the problems as they arose ... the entire experience allowed me to reflect not only on how I would alter the schools, but how I want to change myself. I am not who I was when I left, and I want to keep on growing as I expose myself to new experiences. (p.21)
Comments such as these confirm the power of lived experiences, such as this short practicum, to offer productive professional insights. Such comments also raise questions about how these shifts in understanding might occur, but within the scope of Pence and Macgillivray’s paper this is not pursued.

The impact of a transnational classroom–based immersion experience is not necessarily dependent on its duration. Willard-Holt (2001) describes the one-week immersion experience of 27 preservice teachers from Pennsylvania who travelled to Pachuca, Mexico in two groups one year apart to engage in elementary classroom teaching. In order to gauge the impact of the experience, pre- and post-experience questionnaires were completed, with a further follow-up questionnaire four months later. Eight participants also gave feedback one year after the experience. Such a longitudinal research focus is unusual in studies of SLIM program impact. Willard-Holt's (2001) study begins by noting that before undertaking the immersion experience the preservice teachers’ comments “reveal ethnocentric perceptions that methods, pedagogical training, and conditions are superior in the US” (p. 509). After the experience, some participants’ reflections evidence a change in viewpoints, particularly in seeing education as interconnected globally: “I felt that we were part of a world of teachers” (Ben, interview, p. 511). Participants record increased levels of empathy and flexibility in working with culturally and linguistically diverse children, drawing on their own experience of being unable to communicate in the majority language in Mexico:

> As a teacher I want to remember what it was like to be the oddball and be clueless about what was going on around me. I want to have a classroom where no student has to go through that. All students need to be respected and have a right to learn while in school. (p. 512)

The collection of the feedback data over a longer term distinguishes Willard-Holt’s study from most research into short immersion programs. However, in presenting her findings, she draws on comments from all data sources without particularly noting any change in participant viewpoints over time in relation to the immersion experience. Interestingly, the four comments quoted under the topic heading of “broadened perspective” all came from the eight phone interviews conducted one year after the experience (p. 511). Although the immersion experience was
completed in 6 days, Willard-Holt includes extracts from participant comments showing that the experience has made a deep impression:

An experience such as this truly makes a person reflect upon their own teaching. The way in which you address the class or even speak to the class or give directions is all changed when you complete teaching in another culture (Terri’s comment, p. 513)

In the case of preservice teachers this points to the educational significance of the immersion field experience as an opportunity to achieve new understandings through engaging in classroom processes and then reflecting on those processes. The importance of participants reflecting on their immersion experiences is particularly emphasised in the research, usually taking the form of completing a reflective journal (Barkhuizen & Feryok, 2006; Brownlee & Chak, 2007; Connelly, 2001; Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Willard-Holt, 2001).

Whilst in most instances the reflections are carried out by the preservice teachers there are some interesting variations where the visiting staff member from the home institution (Hong Kong) maintains reflective notes on the Hong Kong preservice teachers’ changing perceptions of young children’s learning in the Australian context (Brownlee & Chak, 2007). In another study, Holliday (2001), it is the researcher himself who provides the reflections in his roles as tutor, program director and researcher of a newly-designed short language immersion program at an institution in U.K.

Barkhuizen and Feryok (2006) include reflective journals in their research method and ask the Hong Kong preservice teachers to write about their program goals and expectations, their school-based experiences, pedagogical considerations, and their own language development, among other things. As regards pedagogical understanding, the researchers note that the participants’ comments were focused on learning about new methods that they expected to see in the New Zealand classrooms and whether they would be suitable for the Hong Kong classroom. In their reflections some students “contrasted this eclectic approach [in New Zealand schools] with the more traditional, exam-oriented instruction with which they were familiar in Hong Kong” (p. 124). Of particular interest are the participants’ insights about differences in classroom interaction, which they saw as stemming from cultural differences between New Zealand and Hong Kong. One participant,
Anna, is quoted as observing: “students are encouraged to speak a lot in the
classroom. They can shout their answer or argue the problems with teachers. It is
quite different from Hong Kong” (p. 124). Such comments are also made by the
participants in the current study and represent a rich source of data worthy of
deeper exploration. However, it is in the nature of the methodology adopted by
Barkhuizen and Feryok (2006) that there is no avenue available for mining deeper
into these viewpoints. Indeed this is the shortcoming of much of the methodology
generally used in research into these SLIM programs. Whilst pre- and post-
program questionnaires and reflective journals can highlight areas of interest and
insight, having made these salient there is no method then available to explore
issues either at the more microlevel of the context of situation in the transnational
classrooms where the insights occurred, nor at the macrolevel of the broader
social context of culture (Halliday, 1985, 1999). The current study aims to
overcome such shortcomings by taking up a combined discourse analytic and
ethnographic approach.

In terms of taking up a methodology allowing a fine-grained analysis of
intercultural action, Wilkinson’s (2002) research is one of the exceptions. Using
conversation analysis, Wilkinson takes up a detailed investigation of intercultural
conversations in a study abroad setting between second language learners and
their homestay hosts in France. Her study reveals the surprisingly didactic nature
of these conversations in community settings. The participants in her study are
general second language learners not a cohort of second language teachers and
hence this study is mainly of interest in regards to the insights available through
taking up a more detailed analysis of the discourse than most other SLIM program
research.

Other research findings, such as Tang and Choi’s (2004) study confirm the
potential for transnational classroom experiences to offer valuable pedagogical
and intercultural insights to preservice teachers. Tang and Choi (2004) trace the
progress of four Hong Kong preservice teachers who take part in different short
transnational field experience programs. Of particular interest in this study are the
reflections into teacher identity three of the participants: Stephen, studying to be a
teacher of English as a second language and Sally and May who are both studying
to become Putonghua teachers. When undertaking his transnational classroom teaching in Toronto, Stephen faced difficulties with classroom management, as he himself observed:

the pupils there [in Canada] like to express themselves, raise their hands and ask questions, and are also more active. In contrast to pupils in Hong Kong, they do not follow the teacher’s instructions or suggestions ... they like giving opinions so it was difficult to control classroom order (p. 57).

It is clear from Stephen’s words that his perception of the Canadian students as being more active is simultaneously construed as problematic and resulting in a breakdown of classroom order because “they do not follow the teacher’s instructions or suggestions” (ibid.). However, rather than dismiss his Toronto classroom experience as something irrelevant, Stephen discusses aspects of his transnational experience during his next Hong Kong practicum, telling the researchers:

It is difficult to maintain control and order in class using the Canadian methods ... Pupils [in Canada] can simply tell the teacher they want to go to the washroom. The teacher will not say “no” to them. In Hong Kong, I’m afraid that if I permit one pupil to go to the washroom, all pupils will have the same request ... I think I need to get a balance ... It is not necessary to choose which one is better. (p. 60)

Stephen is therefore consciously processing insights from his transnational teaching experiences as well as his local knowledge of Hong Kong classrooms and is now searching for some kind of balance to the dilemma posed by these two different classroom cultures.

By contrast Sally found her transnational teaching experience in Xi’an to be satisfying and successful. She commented that “the children were nice and cooperative” (p. 58) and this allowed “the smooth implementation of her teaching plan” (p. 58). The key factor that Sally discerns as allowing her to follow her lesson plan is the predictable classroom context and also the fact that Sally and the children in this instance clearly shared similar understandings of how a lesson should proceed. The different classroom experiences of Sally in China and Stephen in Canada provide insights into different classroom cultures and hint at the significance of sociocultural assumptions and expectations that form part of the context of our teaching (Rogoff, 2008a, 2008b).
However, what sharply foregrounds this issue is the immersion experience of May, who grew up and completed her early years of education in mainland China and hence expected to find the Xi’an classroom a familiar and comfortable context to teach in. However, the researchers describe her as being "overwhelmed by the hectic realities" of excited young children in class and "shocked" (p. 58) that it was acceptable for the children to talk loudly in the classroom, when this would not have been allowed in class when she was growing up. Tang and Choi comment that “the placement in a familiar cultural setting turned out to offer ‘unfamiliar’ classroom experience to May in her learning-to-teach journey, and this engendered reflection on the issue of classroom management” (p.58). This is a rich area for further exploration, but instead the researchers move on to discuss a range of other issues relating to the immersion experiences. It is these themes of disrupted role expectations faced in the transnational classroom which are key to understanding how teachers negotiate their identities and these are explored in the current study.

In their conclusion the researchers suggest that a critical element in cross-cultural experiences is “the dissonance generated” (p. 61) and that preservice teachers need guidance to make sense of these dilemmas. Such observations foreground the importance of providing preservice teachers with the strategies to make sense of their experiences and points to the rationale for embedding a process of guided dialogic reflection as in the current study.

### 2.4 Summary

Chapter Two began by defining the field of transnational education and in particular the area of study abroad, noting that it is not simply immersion in an overseas context but “the nature of the interactions [and] the quality of the experiences” that produce successful study outcomes (Freed, Segalowitz and Dewey, 2004, p. 298). Attention then focused on the field of second language teacher education where the aim of developing professional knowledge was identified. An overview of the literature traced how understandings of professional knowledge have been investigated through educational psychology, narrative enquiry and sociocultural perspectives. This latter analysis suggested
that the ways that teachers act and speak in the classroom reflect the ideologies arising from socialisation into the discourses of their communities of practice. Research studies have suggested that offering a classroom-based experience in a different community of practice beyond the local education system, can give preservice teachers the opportunity to engage with different educational discourses, thereby making their own tacit theories of teaching/learning more visible and open to questioning (Carr, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Tsui & Law, 2007).

It was observed that the investigation into professional practice is facilitated through engaging in guided reflection on classroom experiences (Bain et al., 2002; Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). Whilst there are a number of different ways of reflecting on practice, it was argued that dialogic reflection involving discussion between a number of different voices is an effective and supportive way of achieving this (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). An examination of available research into SLIM programs found that reflection by participants on their transnational experience was a typical feature of these research studies. These studies generally confirmed that participants found their transnational experience had developed their linguistic competence, particularly speaking and listening (Crew & Bodycott, 2001) and their intercultural competence in terms of adaptability and patience (Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Willard-Holt, 2000). Studies also confirmed that participation in SLIM programs impacted positively on understandings of teaching and learning (Barkhuizen & Feryok, 2006; Willard-Holt, 2000).

A review of research methodology in SLIM programs showed a tendency for researchers to adopt a mixed mode methodology of pre- and post-course questionnaires (quantitative) and reflective commentary (qualitative). The scope of the questionnaires and reflections is generally focused very broadly so as to provide feedback on the program as a whole. This has led to a paucity of research which takes up a more in-depth analysis of any one aspect of the program. Wilkinson’s (2002) research was noted as one of the exceptions where conversation analysis is used to explore intercultural conversations between second language learners and their homestay hosts. However, in terms of a
detailed investigation of the classroom-based experience offered by SLIM programs, using discourse analysis, a search of the literature failed to unearth any existing research in this field.

In fact, the comprehensive focus of most of the existing studies into SLIM programs can be a drawback. In an attempt to record impact over a large number of objectives, such research necessarily is unable to provide more in-depth details on any one particular area, such as pedagogy. The current study by contrast has taken up a fine-grained analysis of classroom interaction and participants' reflections on their transnational classroom experiences.
Chapter Three

Identities, Discourses and Dialogic Voice

3.1 Teacher Identity as constituted within Discourses

This study explores teacher identity, by which I mean who we understand ourselves to be as teachers and how we are understood in this role by others as we participate in educational contexts. Another way of expressing this is to consider teacher identity as how we socially constitute ourselves and are constituted within educational Discourses (Maclure, 2003). For example, we may conceive of ourselves as socio-constructivist or behaviourist or cognitivist. We may view our teaching as teacher-centred or student-centred or subject-centred. We frame our understanding of teaching/learning processes and our part in these processes through the available Discourses that name our professional world and shape our interpretation of what is significant (Luke, 1995). Discourses therefore can be seen as “resources of identity construction” that are available for people to take up in their desire to recognise themselves and in turn be recognised as particular types of professional people (Block, 2007, p. 16). Discourses offer:

Ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes and social identities, as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes. A Discourse is a sort of identity kit which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk and often write so as to take on a particular social role that others will recognize. (Gee, 1996, p. 127)

This understanding of Discourse as offering “a sort of identity kit” to participants derives from Gee’s theory of ‘Big D and little d Discourses’. Gee’s theory of ‘D/d Discourses’ provides one of the main theoretical underpinnings to this study, acknowledging how language as discourse, both spoken and written, is woven into our social practices and shapes our understandings of who we are (Gee, 1996, 2000, 2002, 2005a).

Gee’s theory of ‘D/d discourses’ distinguishes ‘small ‘d’ discourse’ as a linguistic term referring to a unit of spoken or written language beyond the level of the
sentence. Small ‘d’ discourse can therefore be seen as synonymous with the
linguistic term ‘text’ and in contrast to Chomskyian linguistics which focus on
sentence and clause level linguistic analysis. As Gee (2000) himself explains:
“‘discourse’ with a lowercase d just stands for language in use” (para. 5). By
contrast the concept of Discourse (with a capital D) foregrounds language along
with our other social practices, our ways of doing and being in the world, through
which we construct multiple versions of ourselves as particular types of people in
particular settings:

Discourses ... are ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking,
and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles (or
‘types of people’) by specific groups of people ... Discourses are ways of being ‘people like
us’. They are ‘ways of being in the world’; they are ‘forms of life’. they are, thus, always
and everywhere social and products of social histories. (Gee, 1996, p. viii)

Our identity, who we are in specific situations, is thus seen to be shaped by our
understanding of what are appropriate ways of acting, speaking, dressing, valuing
items and attitudes, and so forth, within particular social contexts. Knowing what
is appropriate is socially, culturally and historically defined and arises through our
being situated within Discourses. Discourses are dynamic and change over time as
social and cultural practices change over time. For example, the Discourse of being
a competent school teacher was understood differently in Australia in 1890 as
opposed to conceptions of a competent school teacher in 2009. In Hong Kong the
question of the appropriate medium of instruction for the teaching of school
subjects, whether Chinese (which dialect of Chinese? Tsui, 2007, p. 135-136) or
English, is a factor which has been defined differently at different historical
moments and which contributes directly to understandings of the identity of the
competent teacher, impacting on teachers’ ways of doing and being in the
classroom.

Identity within Discourses is understood as not one fixed essentialised inner self as
psychological constructs would suggest, but rather the enactment and recognition
of a number of identities across different contexts. Within a theory of Discourse,
individual experiences and sensations are not denied but it is the reflexive
relationship between sociocultural factors and identity that is foregrounded,
because as Gee (1996) comments "the individual is the meeting point of many,
sometimes conflicting, socially and historically defined Discourses” (p. 132). Identity is not just one identity but a repertoire of identities that we take up across the variety of Discourses in which we engage (Hirst & Brown, 2008). These multiple identities are fluid, hybrid, often in conflict, and dynamically evolving and changing as we carry out our daily lives (Danielewicz, 2001). How we are able to achieve a member identity in a given context is socioculturally established over time through normed practices mediated by language “that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). These Discourses are contingent and dynamic, arising at certain historical moments within particular cultures and yet open to change. Rather than seeing historical processes of knowledge development as continually evolving in a steady progression, discourses are characterised as discontinuities and disruptions - “a tangled plurality”, emphasising the differentiated and differentiating nature of these culturally and historically specific knowledge formations (Foucault, 1972, p. 53).

In moving between different Discourses we may experience conflict as we find ourselves being inducted into new work or school practices that run counter to our familiar and valued home Discourse. In this study, I will be investigating how participants respond to the conflicting Discourses they encounter in the transnational classroom which unsettle their existing expectations about appropriate teacher/student roles (see Chapter Seven). To be able to explore such conflicts in more depth, Gee offers us a distinction between primary and secondary Discourses.

Our primary Discourse is the one we are born and socialised into during our early years – the 'home' discourse, which establishes for us the unquestioned routines of life (Gee, 1996). The primary Discourse may hybridise with other Discourses or even disappear altogether, but generally continues to exert a powerful influence throughout a person's life. The primary Discourse can act somewhat as a default Discourse, a “life world Discourse” (Gee 2002, p. 161) which we take up for everyday situations in later life where we do not need to be any of our more specialist identities. For the preservice teachers who are participating in this study, their primary Discourse consists of growing up in Hong Kong with Cantonese as the language of daily interaction. On entering school, they encounter
new Discourses relating to the learning of school subjects including another language, English, along with the Discourse of how to fit in as a good student and so forth. All of these Discourses relating to schooling are examples of secondary Discourses (Gee, 1996, 2002, 2005).

Secondary Discourses are those in which we are socialized into more public domains at local, state, and national level, such as the Discourses of schooling, church groups, the business world and governments. Engaging in these different Discourses involves us in negotiating multiple identities, because to be recognized appropriately as one of the group we have to fit the expectations about how people in that kind of group or institution typically operate. This involves more than appropriate words and actions it also involves attitudes, values and beliefs, in short ideology. Ideology in a Discourse is expressed through the shared values and beliefs distinguishing a member from an outsider, and defining how socially valued goods such as status, power, control, wealth are distributed within the group. The social power of these ideologies is explained by Gee (1996):

> Ideologies are important because, since theories ground beliefs, and beliefs lead to actions, and actions create social worlds ('reality'), ideologies simultaneously explain, often exonerate, and always partially create, in interaction with history and the material bases of society, the distribution of goods … ideologies are what construct not only human worlds, but humans. (p. 21)

I have quoted Gee’s explanation of ideologies here because it very effectively clarifies the indissoluble tie between power and knowledge and reminds us that whilst Discourses are the contexts in which we can appropriate chosen identities, not all identities are available to everyone nor are they all of equal status (Norton & Toohey, 2004). For example, in the process of establishing valued ways of being a good student and a good language teacher, the dominant Discourses operating in the mainstream state schooling system in Australia serve to marginalise those whose behaviours do not conform to these standards (Miller, 2003, 2007). Discourses then serve to recognise and reward approved identities and therefore simultaneously constrain and exclude those who do not fit the mould. Discourses therefore exert strong pressure on individuals to conform to gain membership of desired groups to enjoy the social capital that accrues. Discourses constitute “the power which is to be seized” (Foucault, 1981, p. 53).
This discussion of power in relation to identity raises the next issue to be examined: the question of subjectivity and the extent to which we are agentive individuals or rather subjects determined by our discursive contexts. This is an important question which has material effects on our teaching. If I perceive myself as a teacher educator and the preservice teachers with whom I work to be determined by the social and discursive processes in which we engage then this will affect my expectations of what we can and should be doing and achieving. If, however, I understand that I and the preservice teachers have agentive positions then I will see Discourses as resources and not constraints on identity development. It is therefore necessary to consider this subject/agent aspect of identity.

3.2 Teacher Identity and Agency

Are the participants in the research that I am conducting to be seen as subjects or agents or both? The term subject has been delineated as a position inscribed by both external and internal factors of power:

There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to. (Foucault, 2003a, p. 130)

Through this interpretation people are seen as subject to both internal constraints which they impose upon themselves and external constraints which are normed and distributed through discursive and material practices and hence adopted by people as just the way things are done which require no further analysis. People are perceived as engaging in social processes of subjectification: “the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 2003a, p. 126). He rejects the term individualization claiming this is a method by which the modern state is able to accommodate and constrain individuals via the exercising of pastoral power: As O’Farrell (2007) notes:

Although Foucault’s work is often hailed as one of the inspirations for various identity movements, Foucault himself favours the dissolution of identity, rather than its creation or maintenance. He sees identity as a form of subjugation and a way of exercising power over people and preventing them from moving outside fixed boundaries. (O’Farrell, 2007, Key concepts section)
How deterministic is this subject identity? There are more positive ways of interpreting the term subject. It can also imply the subject of an action – as in the agentive position in a grammatical sentence, where the subject performs or instigates the verb or action. This interest in the active subject can be found in Foucault’s Ethics phase in his later works where he investigates whether the subject, as self-aware, is able to choose ways of being and to engage in active resistance (Foucault, 2003a, 2003b, 1988). While acknowledging the omnipresence of power, Foucault suggests this does not mean one cannot act: “It is true, it seems to me, that power is “always already there”, that one is never “outside”, that there are no “margins” in which those in rupture with the system may gambol. But ... that one can never be “outside of power” does not mean that one is in every way trapped ... there are no relations of power without resistances” (Foucault, 1977, p. 55).

How much agency does this concept of resistance offer people? Sawicki (1994, p. 288) interprets this in a positive way suggesting that “Foucault brings to our attention historical transformations in practices of self-formation in order to reveal their contingency and to free us for new possibilities of self-understanding, new modes of experience, new forms of subjectivity, authority, and political identity.” Walshaw (2007) concurs with this viewpoint, reminding the reader that the subject is not a fixed entity but “a transient fold in the order of discourse” and one that can therefore produce new identities (p. 18). These two viewpoints acknowledge some freedom of movement within fixed boundaries. However, I question how much flexibility is contained within a framing of identity as “new forms of subjectivity” suggesting new ways of being subject to external constraints.

Whilst such interpretations acknowledge the possibilities of resisting the positioning of the subject there is no sense of what one might be seeking in its place. The inconsistencies in Foucault’s evolving theory have been noted as:

leaving untheorized the problem of how technologies of the self can flourish in our present era which, as he claims, is saturated with power relations ... [and] Foucault’s continued refusal to ... develop a normative standpoint from which to criticize domination ... prevents him from clarifying what our freedom should be from and for. (Best & Kellner, 1991, pp. 67-68)
There is also a lack of focus on why the subject should choose to take up certain positions out of the range of positions available. This is a point taken up convincingly by Hall (1996a) who argues instead that in terms of identity what we need to explore is:

> a theory of what the mechanisms are by which individuals as subjects identify (or do not identify) with the ‘positions’ to which they are summoned; as well as how they fashion, stylize, produce and ‘perform’ these positions, and why they never do so completely, for once and all time, and some never do. (p. 14)

This process of negotiating identities, the process which Hall terms ‘identifications’ offers a particularly productive reading of individuals as subjects. Identity then can be seen in terms of identifications towards or against available discursive positions and practices, rather than as subjugation to them. Hall (1996a) terms this a constant process of articulation between the subject and the Discourses encountered, which encompasses all the possibilities of no correspondence, contestation, acceptance or rejection, reshaping and renegotiation. This understanding of identity recognises the agency of the individual in taking up or refusing these positions. It is a continuous and demanding process, which involves us in creating and recreating our identities anew in the social contexts within which we live. Identity is therefore acknowledged as:

> Complex, confusing and, above all, an ongoing struggle. Although subjectivities are formed within discourses, people are not simply passive recipients of their ‘identity papers’. On the contrary, identity is a constant process of becoming – an endlessly revised accomplishment that depends on very subtle interactional judgements, and is always risky. (Maclure, 2003, p. 19)

I further consider this understanding of identity as a constant process of becoming when discussing Bakhtinian concepts of identity later in this chapter. For the moment I wish to foreground another issue that is raised by Maclure’s words quoted above, that whilst acknowledging that identity is achieved within Discourses yet we need to avoid discursive constructs of identity that seek to stereotype people as particular cultural types.

### 3.3 Cultural Identity

As the current study focuses on teacher identity in a transnational context it is necessary to briefly consider cultural identity, in so far as this is sometimes
construed in terms of ‘the Chinese Teacher’ and/or ‘the Chinese Learner’ in the research literature. Such discursive constructs draw on a few features and ignore the great range of other features that demonstrate the inevitable pluralism within any educational system. It is necessary to briefly outline such viewpoints in order to make it clear that the current study does not subscribe to such broad-based type-casting. These cultural identities are often represented as differences between taking up a teacher-centred (Chinese) or learner-centred (Western) approach. This dichotomy is demonstrated in the following extract from Jin and Cortazzi (1998) who note that the Chinese culture of learning a language centres on the teacher and textbook "as authoritative sources of knowledge: of grammar rules, of explanations of meanings, of what to learn ... This is largely a transmission model of learning ...” (Jin and Cortazzi 1998, p. 102). In contrast to this approach, they note that current western cultures of learning "are influenced by learner-centred notions and a task-based or problem-solving approach, for both linguistic and cultural learning” (ibid). Jin and Cortazzi acknowledge that such comments are generalisations and that “these generalisations do not, of course, mean that all individuals will conform to the cultural norms, though they will probably recognise how others do so in their group” (ibid). This paints a very confident picture of what the cultural norms are and of how these differ between East and West – and yet when discussing western cultures the authors note underlying differences:

Still, Chinese learners share some common cultural background, including language and clear long-standing cultural perceptions of what it means to be Chinese and of how to learn. In contrast, 'Western' cultures of learning share a different set of norms, perceptions and ideals - at least, they do so in the eyes of very many Chinese, whatever the actual differences between, say, British, American or Australian cultures. (p. 102)

The hesitation in ascribing one set of norms to the three western cultures identified is understandable and should also be extended to the depiction of Chinese learners also. It is not credible to assume that all Chinese learners share “clear long-standing cultural perceptions of what it means to be Chinese and of how to learn”, as the researchers stated above (Biggs 2001; Biggs & Watkins 2001, Watkins & Biggs, 2001). Such broad characterisations inevitably do not capture the complexity and diversity of teaching/learning identities and instead offer stereotypes that confirm supposed dichotomies (Chan, 2002; Tsui, 2004, 2007).
I refer to Jin and Cortazzi’s comments as representative of a larger selection of literature that uses such stereotypical constructs (Ballard & Clancy, 1991; Harris, 1997). Traditionally Confucian Heritage Cultures (CHC), including Hong Kong, have been described as using more teacher-centred pedagogy, as opposed to Western more student-centred approaches (Jin and Cortazzi, 2006). However, this apparent polarization between Asian and Western approaches is acknowledged in reality to be far more complex and pluralistic (Ryan and Louie, 2007). Mok and Morris (2001) note that whilst teacher-centred features predominate in Hong Kong, group work activities which suggest more student-centred approaches, are now usual in classrooms following curriculum reforms. Likewise, Ho (2001) notes that what can be construed as the teacher-centred nature of the classroom, is balanced by a student-centred focus outside the classroom:

Confucian classes are mostly quite formal (a situation for students to receive knowledge from the teacher), where teachers could be highly authoritarian if necessary in order to keep absolute control over the situation. Personal needs are not addressed in the classroom and both teachers and students share these expectations. However, once out of the formal class situation, where the demand for orderliness is no longer relevant, teachers may interact with students on more friendly terms, attending to their personal needs on a more student-centred basis. (p. 112)

In her study of a Shanghai classroom, Mok (2006) notes that the teacher’s role is more student-oriented than envisaged in a traditional transmission model:

His lesson was supported by a student-oriented rationale [and] ... gave serious consideration to the students’ abilities, thinking and participation. In this sense, the teacher’s design of the lesson is “student centered” ... [although] his practice remains different from Western models, where the teacher’s role is that of a facilitator and students are encouraged to express a diversity of meanings during lessons. (p.139)

Mok’s study makes the point that student-centredness can be interpreted in different ways and underlines the need to view such pedagogic terms from multiple viewpoints thus avoiding the constant use of Western definitions as the default perspective.

Holliday (1999) notes the limitations of taking an essentialising *large culture* approach which ignores variety and agency and instead “falsely fixes the boundaries between groups in an absolute way” (Holliday, 1999, p. 245). This study tries to avoid this by adopting a *small culture* approach which locates “a discernible set of behaviours and understandings connected with group cohesion”
(Holliday, 1999, p. 248) which emerge through the data (see chapters six, seven and eight). The aim is to avoid commencing the analysis with pre-existing discursive constructs of the Chinese learner or Chinese teacher which are based on assumptions of “being determined by their Confucian heritage” or which offer a “restrictive social identity as a homogenised representative of a national culture” (Clark & Gieve 2006, pp. 55-56).

### 3.4 Cosmopolitan Identity

Having argued against a view of identity as culturally fixed, there are instead notable advantages to understanding identity much more flexibly in terms of constituting a local and global perspective at the same time. Such an identity acknowledges difference as the base point of relations (Hall, 1996b) and is aware that we can learn from each other rather than just about each other. Interacting with others in a transnational classroom offers opportunities to experience difference and thus to unsettle established notions of identity through exploring cultural and linguistic diversity. There are affordances here of taking up transcultural or cosmopolitan identities which step outside a local view of education and culture to give us “a way of thinking about the wider occurrence of local relations and the mobile space of cultural relations” (Pennycook, 2007, p. 44). This transcultural identity has been characterised by hybridity and the creating of new spaces or 'third space' where “difference is neither One nor the Other but something else besides, in-between” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 219). Kramsch (1993) envisions this third space arising from cultural exchange as a “third culture in its own right” (p. 9). Pennycook (2007) delineates “alternative spaces of cultural production” which foreground “the constant processes of borrowing, bending and blending” (p. 47) of cultures and languages and which reframe notions of centre-periphery relation.

This cosmopolitan teacher identity has been envisaged as emerging within:

A new community of teachers that could and would work, communicate, and exchange – physically and virtually – across national and regional boundaries with each other, with educational researchers, teacher educators, curriculum developers ... whose very stock and trade is to deal educationally with cultural 'others', with the kinds of transnational and local diversity that are now a matter of course. (Luke, 2004, p. 1439)
This involves a re-envisioning of teacher education beyond the narrow confines of preparing teachers to be qualified to take up practice in their local setting, in addition acknowledging the necessity of fostering intercultural competencies and global connections also.

Tierney (2006) gives further substance to this cosmopolitan teacher identity as an educator “who develops an understanding of the cultural worlds of students and their communities and who also has the ability to help improvise within and across these spaces for the betterment of individuals and groups” (p. 78). Such a local/global perspective can be fostered through drama, for example, through the lived experience of engaging in performed ethnographies which explore intercultural misunderstandings and dilemmas. One such performance ethnography is *Satellite Kids*, which draws on the stories of three high school students in Toronto whose parents are living and working in Hong Kong (Goldstein, 2007). From her work in teacher education in Canada, Goldstein (2007) also notes how preservice teachers’ reflections on their rehearsed participation in the performance of the ethnographic play “Hong Kong, Canada” allowed these participants to develop dual affect which “involves knowing two worlds at the same time, both as oneself and as another” (p. 153) and may offer a way in which to develop the kind of intercultural competences associated with a cosmopolitan teacher identity.

My study is also premised on the importance of the lived experience to offer new understandings but contextualises this as engaging in a cultural teaching activity within the transnational classroom. In this study, the preservice teachers from Hong Kong engage with difference as they interact with young Australian students and teach them aspects of Chinese language and culture. The dilemmas that these preservice teachers encounter as part of these intercultural interactions are productive moments offering shifts in their understanding of themselves as language teachers and the possibilities of alternative pedagogies. As Byram (1997) notes, “It is this function of establishing relationships, managing dysfunctions and mediating which distinguishes an ‘intercultural speaker’ and makes them different from a native speaker” (p. 38).
3.5 Dialogic Voice

The complex interrelations with the other’s word in all spheres of culture and activity fill all of man’s life. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 143)

Dialogism is a theory of relation between the self and other, where the self is also in dialogic relation and hence there is no absolute unique or essential individual identity (Moen, 2006). Part of the outstanding contribution of Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism to our understanding of identity, is to accept as a condition of life the tension between the individual and the social hence he “insists on differences that cannot be overcome: separateness and simultaneity are basic conditions of existence” (Holquist, 2002, p. 20). Existence is relational and we are engaged in continually creating and recreating our identity in a range of settings through an unending process of struggling to align with or differentiate ourselves from other people in our social worlds (Gee, 1999). These conflicting elements are conceptualised as centripetal and centrifugal forces which in language, as in life, are working against each other on the one side to draw elements towards a uniting centre whilst simultaneously a counterforce is trying to disperse and differentiate elements (Bakhtin, 1981).

It is clear from these comments that dialogism is more than is encompassed by the term dialogue. Dialogue generally refers to the conversational exchange of two speakers, whereas dialogism encapsulates an epistemology, a theory of knowledge, which suggests that each person derives their own individual discourse through the social processes of engaging in multiple dialogues with others, with text, semiotic signs and so forth (Bakhtin, 1981; Garrod, 2005). This heteroglossia, “a necessary multiplicity in human perception” (Holquist, 2002, p. 22), is integral to dialogism as part of life’s cultural and historical processes.

Each individual creates their own identity through this dialogic interaction. Rather than seeing individuals as subjects from a Foucauldian perspective, Bakhtin offers a metaphor of self as author conceptualising existence as:

the kind of book we call a novel, or more accurately as many novels. ... or all of us write our own such text, a text that is then called our life. Bakhtin uses the literary genre of the novel as an allegory for representing existence as the condition of authoring. (Holquist, 2002, p. 30)
In our daily interactions then as parent, teacher, researcher and so forth we are therefore authoring our own particular voice or identity. Voice as conceptualised by Bakhtin is “concerned with the broader issues of a speaking subject’s perspective, conceptual horizon, intention and world view” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 51). We create our own voice through wrestling with the voices and viewpoints of other people who are physically present or through representation of their voices in books, media, artwork and so forth. For this reason, voice is simultaneously individually inflected and also representative of the sociocultural discourses being taken up. Within this heteroglossic framework, we are constantly seeking to move from a reliance on authoritative discourse to our own internally persuasive discourse as part of ideological becoming: “One’s own discourse and one’s own voice, although born of another or dynamically stimulated by another, will sooner or later begin to liberate themselves from the authority of the other’s discourse” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 348).

3.6 Ideological Becoming

In dialogic interaction we are both expressing ourselves and also linking in with “the chain of speech communication ... with respect to other, related utterances” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 93). Although expressing our own wishes or beliefs we are simultaneously revisiting speech that has been already spoken by others:

a given speaker is not the first to speak about it. The object, as it were, has already been articulated, disputed, elucidated, and evaluated in various ways. Various viewpoints, world views, and trends cross, converge, and diverge in it. (ibid.)

Bakhtin is here arguing that there are no neutral words and that it is not meaningful to take a structural linguistics view of language as a system of linguistic signs taken out of their social context. Language is socially constituted and “ideologically saturated” (1981, p. 271) containing individual, local and world views all interacting – sometimes harmoniously and sometimes in competition. The individual navigates their path through these competing viewpoints by appropriating or resisting the utterances of others to weave a voice that is distinctly their own. The concept of voice is therefore always necessarily a consideration of two voices. A speaker’s utterances are always produced with a listener in mind as Wertsch (1991) notes: “any utterance entails the idea of
addressivity, utterances are inherently associated with at least two voices” (p. 53). The speaker selects their topic of speech and their framing of relevant aspects with the anticipated response of the listener in mind. In this sense, as Bakhtin points out, the word is only half-owned and the power of framing the discussion rests with the listener rather than is often assumed with the speaker:

To some extent, primacy belongs to the response, as the activating principle: it creates the ground for understanding, it prepares the ground for an active and engaged understanding. Understanding comes to fruition only in the response. Understanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other; one is impossible without the other. (p. 282)

Another way of expressing this is to suggest that when we engage with different conversational partners we will be taking up different stances in anticipation of the listener’s different orientations. All of these encounters with different voices therefore allow us to reframe our theories and understandings from different perspectives and hence promote new knowledge and insights.

Engagement in this dialogic process of identity formation is continuous and never concludes, but is always “becoming”:

Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values ... in each of the new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal ever newer ways to mean (p. 346)

It is one of the foci of this study to investigate whether the experience of engaging in dialogic reflection on their transnational school experience offers the preservice teacher participants “newer ways to mean”.

To be able to find our own voice we need to be aware of the way that Discourses and social practices are socialising us into accepting as commonsense the dominant discursive ideologies. As Fairclough (1995) explains:

since any set of discursive norms entails a certain knowledge base, and since any knowledge base includes an ideological component, in acquiring the discursive norms one simultaneously acquires the associated ideological norms.” (p. 42)

We need to be able to view these Discourses from a position of outsideness (Bakhtin, 1990) thus making visible the values and beliefs that currently are so familiar that we cannot imagine another perspective existing.
3.7  Power and the Privileging of Voice

In the classroom, as a microcosm of society generally, it is not just a matter of what is said, but who is the person saying it. This point is raised by Norton and Toohey (2002) who note that language is “a complex social practice in which the value and meaning ascribed to an utterance are determined in part by the value and meaning ascribed to the person who speaks” (p. 115). Certain voices are more audible and speak with more authority because they take up discourses of power, whilst other voices are marginalised and silenced (Hirst, Renshaw & Brown, 2009; Miller, 2003). It is not a simple matter of power in the classroom residing with the teacher. Whilst Miller’s (2003) research describes the marginalised voices of ESL students, Hirst, Renshaw & Brown’s (2009) study explores the undermining of the LOTE (Language Other Than English) teacher’s voice by powerful mainstream discourses. As Foucault (1981) has noted: “Any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledges and powers which they carry” (p. 64). However, whilst Foucault emphasises the “ritualisation of speech, a qualification and a fixing of the roles for speaking subjects” (ibid), a dialogic approach accords participants more agency in whether and how they take up these roles or positions. Rather than a notion of fixity there is the acknowledgement of fluidity in the assigning of positions in discourse, as these positions can be appropriated or resisted and contested (Harre & Langenhove, 1999) Whether the teacher takes up a monologic voice of privileged authority, or a more dialogic voice that incorporates student voices into the unfolding classroom discourse is a matter negotiated in the classroom context between the teacher and the students, as the discourse analysis in chapter seven demonstrates.

To explore whether second language learning is enacted dialogically as a sharing of knowledge or monologically as a telling/receiving process requires an analysis of the privileging of voices within the classroom interaction. The privileging of voice is a process which indicates the distribution of power within classroom discourses (Hirst, 2003, 2007). In the classroom, this power is mediated and legitimated through the pedagogic discourse which is a mix of both instructional and regulative practices sanctioned by the culture of the institution and the society.
in which it is embedded (Bernstein, 2000). Power “establishes legitimate relations of order” and it is the variations in the relative privileging of the teacher’s and students’ voices which signals the different power relations in the data in this study (Bernstein, 2000, p. 5). There is a need then to explore the patterning of voices to understand how the power relations are being played out within the classroom context. As Pennycook (2001) has noted:

If we take power as already sociologically defined and we see our task as using linguistic analysis of texts to show how that power is used, our task is never one of exploration only of revelation. If, on the other hand, we are prepared to see power as that which is to be explained, then our analyses of discourse aim to explore how power may operate, rather than to demonstrate its existence. (p. 93)

By analysing the moment to moment weaving of words and actions within the classroom discourse of the Hong Kong preservice teachers and their groups of Australian schoolchildren in this study, I seek to explore how identities are negotiated and power taken up, agreed or contested within the context of the transnational classroom.

3.8 Summary

In this chapter I have drawn on Gee’s theory of D/discourse to explore how identity is socially constituted within Discourses operating within the sociocultural context (Gee, 1996, 1999, 2005). Identity is understood as fluid, hybrid and in a constant process of creation and recreation as individuals seek to establish themselves as particular kinds of people within the social contexts that constitute their particular social worlds (Hall, 1996a; Bhabha, 1996). I take up Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic voice in order to explore the authoring of identity through the selective appropriation of and resistance to the voices or viewpoints of others. From this perspective, negotiating identity is seen as moving from a reliance on authoritative discourses to shaping one’s own internally persuasive discourse (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 348).

In order to meet the demands of teaching in the more culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms that characterise contemporary education, it was suggested that teachers need to develop a more cosmopolitan identity, appropriating a local/global outlook and cultivating ‘dual affect’ which allows a more empathetic
and flexible approach to engaging with difference in the classroom (Goldstein, 2007; Luke, 2004; Tierney, 2006). Discussion of identity sought to avoid cultural stereotypes of 'The Chinese learner' or 'The Chinese Teacher', instead taking up a small culture approach where description derives from the data itself rather than the adoption of large-scale discursive constructs (Holliday, 1999).
Chapter Four

Framing the Study

4.1 Introduction

This chapter combines with chapter five to provide a detailed description and rationale of the methodology in this study. In this chapter I focus on the framing of the study, explaining my selection of a qualitative methodology and a discursive ethnographic approach. I then outline my preliminary investigation and how the outcomes of the pilot study influenced my organisation of the research design in the main study. Chapter five describes in detail the research design of the main study, discussing key issues relating to my data collection and data analysis procedures.

This chapter is organised into four parts, beginning with an explanation of my choice of a qualitative methodology as the most appropriate for my research purpose. Secondly I discuss the selection of a combined discourse analytic and ethnographic approach. Thirdly, I define what is meant by ethnography and the basic principles of ethnographic research, including discussion of my positionality. In the fourth section I describe my framework for data analysis based on Gee's seven building tasks. I also discuss problematic research elements such as the 'frame of reference' issue (Gee, 2005).

4.2 Selection of a Qualitative Methodology

I have selected a qualitative methodology as the best fit for my purposes of exploring the professional understandings that emerge for participants during their transnational school experience. Qualitative methodology acknowledges the explanatory power of the participants’ utterances to themselves identify what is significant in the context of the study (Mason, 2002). Realities are understood to be local and specific co-constructions between participants (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) and the purpose of the data generation is to obtain “an in-depth understanding of
the meanings and ‘definitions of the situation’ presented by informants” (Wainwright, 1997, para 5). Such multiple meanings and definitions arise from individual accounts and experiences, which themselves manifest the historical and cultural influences which permeate these viewpoints (Creswell, 2003).

Using a qualitative methodology therefore allows me to explore the participants’ multiple interpretations of their reality within a specific context and specific time (Merriam, 2002). Such a methodology links well with the theoretical framing of this study as a sociocultural investigation of teacher identities constituted as particular voices within a context of dialogic heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986).

Another important feature of a qualitative methodology is that it highlights the subjective nature of research, not only in terms of the data which comprises the participants’ interpretations of their experiences, but also because it highlights the subjectivity of the researcher as the interpreter and instrument of data collection. The researcher is acknowledged as an involved person and hence necessarily influences the study in various ways. What is required is a careful and sensitive account of the particular ways the researcher impacts upon the study as a factor within the research (Smith, 1990, p. 12). As the researcher, I analyse my own positionality within this study in a later section of this chapter.

The purpose of adopting a qualitative methodology is to generate rich data in order to build up a detailed and complex picture of the research phenomenon. Having generated such rich data, their significance needs to be clearly identified and accounted for. Holliday (2007) explains that the salient characteristic of rich description is “not its exhaustiveness of coverage, but the way in which it scans the different facets of the social matrix or culture within which it is found, and comes up with good analysis” (Holliday, 2007, p. 75).

4.3 Selection of a Discourse Analytic and Ethnographic Approach

With the goals of generating rich data which can yield good analysis I designed my current study as a combined discourse analytic and ethnographic approach so as to better be able to investigate how identity is negotiated within a classroom context.
and to discern “how discourse processes and practices shape what counts as knowing, doing, and being within and across events in classrooms” (Gee, 1998, p. 120) amongst a particular community of preservice teachers. My pilot study in 2005 and the main data collection in 2006 are structured around this combined discursive and ethnographic approach which constitutes the qualitative methodology framing this study.

The rationale for combining the sociocultural perspective of discourse analysis with an ethnographic approach is to examine how preservice teachers construct their second language pedagogy and negotiate professional identities within the transnational classroom. Such a combined approach is now well established through the work of Duff (1995, 2002), Miller (2003), Norton (2000), Toohey (2000) who have explored issues of learner identity and the positioning of the self as legitimate within educational and broader community discourses. This combined approach allows me to study how discourse practices define what counts as second language teaching/learning from an insider *emic* perspective (Lazaraton, 2003). Gee and Green (1998, p. 120) suggest that the value of this combined approach lies in the ability of each to provide a particular *logic-of-inquiry* which shapes the ways that teaching/learning identities and processes can be investigated. Discourse analysis offers an understanding of language as sociocultural practices constituting what counts as appropriate ways of doing and being in the classroom and other educational contexts. There is a long history of discourse analysis research into classroom interaction (Cazden, 1988, 2001; Hirst, 2003, 2007, 2009; Mehan, 1979; Mercer, 1985, 2001; Renshaw & Brown, 2000; Van Lier, 2001). The ethnographic approach fits well with a focus on particular communities of practice. In this study the preservice teachers from Hong Kong constitute the community of practice which is being investigated in the unfamiliar context of the Australian classroom.

I have already set out in some detail in chapter three the fundamental features of Discourse analysis using Gee’s concept of ‘D/d discourses’ and I will discuss Discourse analysis further in the forthcoming section discussing methods of data analysis. Now I will explain the reasons for choosing an ethnographic approach as appropriate for this study.
4.4 The Suitability of an Ethnographic Approach

My study takes an educational ethnographic approach using situated discourse as the focus of theoretical analysis. As Duranti (2005) notes, such an ethnography is concerned with:

... the relationship between language use and local systems of knowledge and social conduct. [It] views discourse as one of the main loci for the (re)creation and transmission of cultural patterns of knowledge and social action...what is accomplished through speaking and how speech is related to and is constructed by particular aspects of social organization and speakers’ assumptions, values, and beliefs about the world. (p. 17)

The word "ethnos" derives from Greek and refers to a race or a cultural group. An ethnography, as the name itself suggests, is a study of the culture of a specific social group. Lazaraton (2003) notes that ethnography focuses on both “descriptions and interpretations of cultural behaviour ... it entails a set of techniques for data collection, data analysis and report writing for giving a comprehensive description of the people who make up a cultural unit and the social practices in which they engage” (Lazaraton, 2003, p. 3). Historically, this approach has derived from methodologies in anthropology where features of other cultures were observed in detail over time, described and analysed. However, nowadays the scope of the term is much broader ranging from studies of groups within the researcher’s own culture, through to the development of formal theories based on analysis of cultural texts and talk (Silverman, 2001). Indeed, ethnographies take so many different forms in different disciplines these days that defining an ethnography is a highly complex task. As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) note, there is not a standard, all-encompassing definition. However, these researchers do not see the lack of a unitary standard meaning as problematic, suggesting that we can utilise a core definition instead while accepting that this does not cover all meanings in all contexts.

For a core definition Hammersley and Atkinson look at typical ethnographic practices in the selection of contexts, data sources, data collection and analysis practices, participant samples and research focus and outcomes (2007, p. 3). They observe that ethnographic research takes place in everyday settings in the field rather than in experimental contexts. Data are gathered from a range of sources.
which typically include participant observation, documentary evidence and informal speech. Procedures for data analysis tend not to be rigidly defined at the outset of the research, rather emerging as appropriate during the research process itself. The categories for interpreting the data are generated through the process of analysing the data, rather than shaping the collection of data beforehand. Ethnographic studies usually comprise a small number of participants or a single context, to suit an in-depth focus. Data analysis explores and interprets "the meanings, functions, and consequences of human actions and institutional practices" in relation to local and broader contexts (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p. 3). Hence, verbal accounts, descriptions and theories are the typical outcomes, rather than statistical information. These central features of the ethnographic method recommended this methodology for the purposes of the current study.

Framing this research study as a combined discourse analytic and ethnographic approach allows the generation and collection of rich data in the form of situated discourse within a professional context. By then analysing this data using Gee's approach to Discourse analysis, it is hoped to investigate whether the participants use the process of dialogic reflection to negotiate and reframe their teacher identities. Whilst it is understood that experience is local and situated, there is also an appreciation that such experience and interpretations can resonate by analogy to other related educational contexts and their participants. Hence the findings from this study may also have insights to add to the accumulation of knowledge underpinning transnational teacher education (Block & Cameron, 2002; Bodycott & Crew, 2001; Dunn & Wallace, 2008; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007).

4.4.1 Issues raised by Educational Ethnographies

In selecting an ethnographic approach I situate my study within a long tradition of educational research into classroom discourse and different pedagogic practices deriving from three scholarly communities: cultural anthropology and sociology; linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics; and educational studies of teaching and learning (Harklau, 2005). My study draws particularly on research traditions from sociolinguistics (ethnographies of communication) and educational studies exploring social practices within and outside schools. Heath’s (1983) study of
three communities in the Southeastern United States makes it clear that the different linguistic traditions and the range of ways of knowing that children bring to school from their home environments may not accord with white mainstream cultural educational values. In her study, Heath explores how children from non-mainstream backgrounds may consider the labelling and descriptive commentaries required by the school as “talk about nothing”, while teachers in turn are liable not to recognise or value the rich narratives and personal opinions which these children voice. Heath’s study was able to provide feedback to teachers to redefine their understandings to be more inclusive. It also led to teachers and researcher working together to familiarise non-mainstream students with school-valued discourses in a way that empowered these students’ voices without devaluing their home discourses (Heath, 1983). Weinstein (2002, p. 114) noted from Heath’s research, the power of the class teacher of the 19 first grade African American black children to create an alternative classroom culture that fostered their literacy success refuting the low expectations that had previously been established for these students. Heath’s (1983) landmark study has shown how ethnographic study into community and classroom discourses can inform pedagogic practices.

Another ethnography exploring classroom talk was conducted by Hammersley (1990). This “Classroom Ethnography” explored how pupils are socialized into the conventions of obtaining knowledge from the teacher as the authority (Hammersley 1990, pp. 27-52). Through his detailed study of classroom discourse in an inner-city secondary school in U.K., he demonstrated how pupils’ access to knowledge was controlled pedagogically by the teacher via the set pathways of information clues that the teacher offered and the teacher’s structuring of the lesson. Alternate pathways were not legitimated as they failed to acknowledge the teacher’s authority (p. 51). Such classroom practices indicative of a transmission model of teaching remain in evidence in current educational contexts and are discussed later in relation to my current study.

Other ethnographies have explored the assumptions underlying social practices in English language teaching (ELT) courses. Baxter (2003) provides a detailed ethnography of short English language teacher training courses in three different
teacher training institutions. Her study investigates discursive practices within these institutions which mainly offer ELT training via short certificate and diploma courses in U.K. These short ELT training courses narrowly concentrate on supposedly neutral teaching practices which are in fact culturally-bound to their Western origins and ignore the particularities of the cultural contexts of the preservice teachers who will apply these practices in non-Western classrooms. Whilst it is intended that such teacher training courses will promote reflection among ELT practitioners, particularly the Diploma level courses, Baxter points out that the reflection remains at the level of reproduction of the existing culturally-bound practice and fails to take account of broader educational issues. Baxter concludes her ethnographic study, with a quotation which notes that “the technical training orientation of much teacher education needs to be replaced with a critical-interpretive pedagogy in which critical competences, and pedagogical knowledge, are developed within the context of dialogical communication” (Kayon de Miller and Bannell 1998, in Baxter 2003, p.200). My current study takes up this focus on pedagogical knowledge being developed through engagement in dialogically reflective communication.

In conclusion, my current study aims to extend existing knowledge in areas of transnational school experience and teacher education, building on previous ethnographies exploring patterns of classroom discourse, highlighting Discourse models of English as a second language teaching and investigating the affordances of dialogic reflection. The emic (insider) ethnographic approach was discerned as the most appropriate for this research purpose.

4.4.2 Understanding Context

Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 3) characterise ethnographic research as taking place “in everyday contexts”, “in the field”, rather than in experimental contrived contexts. Brewer (2000, p. 35) clarifies this point further, stating that “people live in a bounded social context, and are best studied in, and their meanings are best revealed in, the natural settings of the real world in which they live.” These references to participants’ “everyday contexts” and their “real world” need to be interpreted on a broad basis. In my research I am studying Hong Kong preservice teachers performing second language teacher within the Australian
primary classroom context. From a very narrow perspective it might be argued that the Australian classroom is not the everyday context of these preservice teachers’– which would actually be the Hong Kong classroom. However, this transnational school experience is very much part of the real world in which they live in terms of the globalisation of education and the intercultural realities of contemporary life.

It is important in research not to mistake place for context; the research context is the setting in which the participants construct their meanings – it is not immutably tied to one particular physical location. My research focuses on these preservice teachers’ conceptions of what is appropriate teacher-student interaction to foster learning, therefore the appropriate research context is instructional engagement with students in a classroom context. The different cultural ecology of the Australian classroom serves, by juxtaposition, to foreground the cultural assumptions underpinning the Hong Kong classroom (Kramsch, 2002; Mok & Morris, 2001). It is clear then that a broad understanding of the concept of a natural setting is needed, which can encompass the study of participants in different communities of practice undertaking legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger, 1991), rather than just their usual community of practice.

4.4.3 Participants

Ethnographies usually comprise a small number of participants or a single context in order to able to provide an in-depth study (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Whilst a quantitative methodology would require a large number of participants in order to be able to discern trends or generalisable features, a qualitative approach such as an ethnography concentrates on the particular attributes of a small number of participants with the intention to understand “how this historical moment universalizes itself in the lives of interesting individuals.” (Denzin, 1989, p. 189 quoted in Vidich and Lyman, 2003, p. 94).

It is contended that these preservice teachers from Hong Kong constitute such a group of “interesting individuals”. On one level, these participants are preservice teachers in their second year of their Bachelor of Education studies at a university in Hong Kong. They are representative of the groups of preservice teachers that
are sent to the university in Brisbane each year by their university in Hong Kong to undertake a short language immersion (SLIM) program under an arrangement that has prevailed for more than ten years. On another level, these participants are also representative of the broader grouping of preservice ESL teachers in Hong Kong who have been sponsored by the Hong Kong government to undertake SLIM programs overseas such as Australia, U.K., Canada and New Zealand. This sponsorship has been established as part of the Hong Kong government’s initiatives for promoting high standards of second language teaching in Hong Kong. This sponsorship exists for both English and Putonghua as second languages in Hong Kong as part of the government’s language policy of having Hong Kong as a trilingual, biliterate society (Tsui, 2004; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

By investigating the tacit theories of this group of preservice teachers we can gain insight into professional discourses at play in ELT in Hong Kong and Australia and how these individual preservice teachers deal with the conflicts inherent in these competing professional discourses.

4.4.4 Researcher’s Position in the Current Study

In order to understand interaction from the inside, I have a dual role in this study: I am both the researcher and also the lecturer organising the transnational school experience for these participants. Indeed, it is my professional involvement in establishing transnational school experiences which first prompted my interest in this area of research. I am taking on the role of participant observer in order to observe social practices and interactions in context, and by doing so I can fulfil the goal of uncovering an insider cultural perspective. My role as lecturer has allowed me to be a natural participant in the transnational school experience, and has allowed me to become a familiar, and hopefully trustworthy, figure within the school experience for the preservice teachers. Having this opportunity to establish rapport with these preservice teachers, has the added benefit that they are more likely to express their thoughts and feelings more freely during the data generation process.

Within this frame of participant-observer, four different approaches are possible: complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant and
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complete observer (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p. 82). Different roles in the field are implied in each of these categories. For example, as a complete observer I would have an outsider's clear perceptions of events but I might fail to understand the implications of these or misrepresent the orientations of the participants. As a complete participant one does not inform the other participants of the research project: "the ethnographer's activities are wholly concealed" (ibid). Ethically this is not an option I would have sought, as participants' informed consent to my research study is both a personal as well as institutional ethical requirement. I selected the role of participant-as-observer, acknowledging my central involvement in the study as the lecturer and extending this into the research role of observer. From our first meeting, the preservice teachers were aware of my dual participant-observer role, and I found that this added an extra depth to our interactions during the school experience. This blending of roles allowed me flexibility with regard to establishing lively focus group discussions and my questions in the interview were met with more detailed responses than if this was just for coursework purposes. From informal comments from the preservice teachers, it seems that they realized that more comments and information would allow more insightful research and hence they expressed themselves more fully. I regard this aspect as a positive feature of my particular positioning within the research project.

My participant role, therefore, has advantages for the research, however the possible drawbacks must also be acknowledged. One of the first possible problems relates to ethical issues, such as concerns about the awarding of student grades being affected by their participation – or non-participation – in this study. Such concerns have been addressed through the ethical review system before the data collection was authorised and undertaken. As noted in the ethical protocol, there are no grades or course credits associated with the transnational school experience awarded either by the host university in Australia nor the parent university in Hong Kong. The role of the transnational school experience is purely developmental, not for assessment purposes. As with all contemporary Australian educational research, participation in this study was voluntary and based on the principle of informed consent. The participants were presented with an information sheet and a response sheet to sign confirming their
willingness/unwillingness to participate in the project. Ethical clearance was obtained before the study could commence (Ethical Protocol Number CAL/03/03/HREC, a copy is provided in Appendix II).

Another potential problem relating to my participant-observer role could be that my position as their lecturer would influence the preservice teachers to construct their responses to the transnational school experience in such a way as to please the lecturer, rather than giving their opinions and discussing their feelings freely. This is a potential problem in any interview situation, as interviewees will adjust their response in relation to their interlocutor, whether that person is known or a stranger. In ethnographic research in poststructuralist times, it is understood that the speaker’s perception of the listener will inevitably influence the form and content of the speaker’s words (Smagorinsky, 2001). This raises the issue of addressivity within the dialogic process and is essentially a feature of any conversational exchange (Bakhtin, 1981). Bakhtin describes this “responsive understanding” upon which dialogue is based, noting that the speaker’s choice of words and content are never neutral, they are always directed “toward the specific world of the listener” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282). In this way, every utterance is tailored to fit that particular listener, foreshadowing the anticipated response that it will provoke in the listener, whether positive or negative.

It is not, then, a question of finding a neutral researcher role to avoid ‘contamination’ of the research setting. Instead the intent is to design research in a way that invites a balance of conversational partners with whom to develop a number of different viewpoints. The constructivist approach to research design assumes that new understandings are created through dialogic interaction, that new knowledge is created in conversation in the interweaving of different voices, the collision of contesting viewpoints (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Wertsch, 1991). Rather than trying to minimize or keep track of reactivity, I agree with Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 16) that we should “exploit it ... rather than engaging in futile attempts to eliminate the effects of the researcher completely, we should set about understanding them.” With this awareness I took careful note of addressivity in designing the dialogic process of reflection so that participants
had different conversational partners with whom to discuss and contest ideas and viewpoints (Bakhtin, 1981).

4.4.5 **Participant Observation**

Historically, because of the strong ties with anthropological studies, participant observation has been the preferred method in ethnographical research. Indeed, Chapelle and Duff (2003, p. 174) characterise participant observation as “a hallmark of ethnography”. The benefits of this research method are that they allow the researcher to build up a detailed insider’s view of the research phenomenon. Even Eisenhart (2001), whilst advocating for researchers to adopt new ethnographic methods to address contestations within groups and flexibility across multiple sites, confirms the continued significance of traditional ethnographic methods such as participant observation:

> To be sure, participant observation and ethnographic interviewing remain at the methodological core of all the studies described above. To be involved directly in the activities of people still seems to be the best method we have for learning about the meaning of things to the people we hope to understand. Only by watching carefully what people do and say, following their example, and slowly becoming a part of their groups, activities, conversations, and connections do we stand some chance of grasping what is meaningful to them. Conventional ethnography, it turns out, is still a good methodological choice in many situations. (p. 23)

Eisenhart (2001) further notes how the use of video-taping can “extend the reach of the researcher-as-instrument” (p. 19) and this is the method used to record observations of the preservice teachers’ performances in my pilot and main studies. Rather than just taking researcher’s field notes, to which only I would have access, I wanted to video record the participants performing their cultural teaching task so that the resulting data would be available both for the researcher and the participants themselves to comment on. This desire to incorporate reflexivity into the research process has informed all aspects of the research design. In addition to having participants analyse their own performances as part of the interpretive process, the participants also were the collectors of this data in the first place. It was the participants, rather than the researcher, who actually recorded the classroom teaching performance, which is the main data source in
this study. It was the decision of the performer’s partner therefore as to which aspects of the interaction were worthy of video recording, and what should be foregrounded visually for later analysis. This is a point which is discussed in the data analysis section.

One of the tenets of participant observation and ethnography as a whole is the expectation that data collection will result from lengthy immersion in the culture or the cultural event, or as Lazaraton terms it “prolonged engagement” (Lazaraton, 2003, p. 3). Inevitably a definition of “prolonged” has to be understood in relation to the specifics of the study. My study focuses on a school experience which lasts for two weeks, as part of a language immersion program consisting of a total of eight weeks overseas. I have aimed to address the requirement of an extensive involvement by utilising the fact that these programs are held regularly each year. Hence the initial framing of the research was carried out through a pilot study in 2005. The outcomes of the pilot study were analysed in order to review the research design. As a result I refined the methodology informing the main data collection, which then took place in 2006. In addition, although the school experience is carried out over a relatively short period, as a participant observer I have a prolonged engagement in contexts relevant to this research totalling fifteen years; through my nine years of experience in Australia organising and teaching within these transnational school experiences, as well as six years in teacher education in Hong Kong, teaching preservice ESL teachers.

4.4.6 Methods to Supplement Participant Observation

In my current study, participant observation as a research method has been supplemented by focus group discussions and a stimulated recall interview with participants. The traditional claim for participant observation is that it provides authentic insights into cultural practices because it makes it possible for the researcher “to check descriptions against fact and, noting discrepancies, become aware of systematic distortions made by the person under study” (Becker and Geer, 1957/1970, p.139 quoted in Atkinson et al., 2003, p. 101). This perspective on observation has suggested that, whereas the participant’s account may distort the facts, the researcher can discern what really is happening in a given situation, implying that there are objective facts to benchmark this against. Atkinson, et al.
(2003) argue that such a view rests on a failure to understand that both events and narratives are kinds of social actions and neither is superior to the other. As Baker (1997) has noted: "Talk ... is not simply expressive of interior states or contents. Talk is social action: people achieve identities, realities, social order and social relationships through talk" (p. 132). Both actions and people's accounts of those actions constitute the performance of social life and hence both offer equally valid research insights. In methodological terms, Atkinson et al. (2003, p.108) suggest that, "by treating both the observed and the narrated as kinds of social action we ... reassert a methodological principle of symmetry." This symmetry in research methods is one of the principles which guides the choice of research methods in this thesis.

The inclusion of focus group discussions and a stimulated recall interview in this study constitutes the process of dialogic reflection which has been referred to earlier in this study. The rationale for deploying these two particular methods is provided after the analysis of the pilot study in the next section. The reason for this organisation of my text is that the need for these research methods to be included in my study only emerged as a result of conducting the pilot study, as I now explain.

4.5 The Pilot Study

In the early stages of the current study I had some very broad questions regarding the purpose and value of a transnational school experience. Over time these questions were refined into the three research questions that underpin the current study. This process of refining the focus was assisted by organising a pilot study which took place in 2005. I now discuss aspects of the pilot study which helped me shape and define the current research. Only those features of the pilot study which directly impacted on the research design of the current study are discussed.

4.5.1 Background to the Pilot Study

Under an arrangement that has existed for more than ten years, a cohort of preservice ESL high school teachers in their second year of B.Ed studies at a university in Hong Kong come annually to a university in Brisbane, Australia to
participate in a short language immersion (SLIM) program. The SLIM program is carried out over an eight week period and comprises five strands: professional studies, leadership training, social and cultural outings, homestay, and a local school experience. The broad goals of the program are to:

- Enhance English language skills, particularly oral communication
- Extend professional development in teaching English as a Second Language
- Develop cultural understandings and intercultural competence
- Develop personal strengths and leadership skills
- Encounter and reflect on different educational contexts and practices

The school experience which is part of the program is carried out over a two week period in a K-12 coeducational private school situated in the north of Queensland, near Fraser Island. This school experience comprises a focus on both primary and secondary schooling, and includes class observation and tutoring, participation in school functions, mentoring and reflection workshops, outward-bound leadership training activities, homestay, and social and leisure activities.

### 4.5.2 Research Questions

From this overview it can be seen that the transnational school experience comprises a wide array of elements. The first research question of the pilot study therefore aimed at understanding which of these elements the participants themselves felt to be of most professional value. The second question focused on the participants’ conceptions of their role as second language teachers in the unfamiliar context of an Australian classroom. The third question investigated the contribution of a range of reflective tasks to the professional development of these ESL teachers:

**Pilot Study Research Questions**

- **a.** *What is the role and value of the transnational school experience for teachers of ESL attending a study abroad English language program?*
- **b.** *What voices do preservice teachers draw on as language teachers in a transnational classroom context?*
c. What part does the process of guided reflection on the transnational school experience play in the professional development of ESL teachers?

4.5.3 Participants

The participant pool for this pilot research project consisted of 13 B.Ed preservice teachers attending the short language immersion (SLIM) program at a university in Brisbane. There were 8 females and 5 males, aged in their twenties. All the participants were in their second year of their B.Ed studies in a university in Hong Kong. They had already had one short school experience in Hong Kong prior to coming to Australia. The preservice teachers completed two weeks of their language immersion program in Brisbane and then spent the next two weeks engaging in the school experience near Fraser Island, Queensland. After the school experience they returned to Brisbane for the remaining four weeks of their immersion program.

4.5.4 Data Collection

Before commencing the pilot study data collection I obtained ethical clearance from my research institution, and also gained the informed consent of all 13 ESL preservice teachers. Special permission was also sought and obtained from the school principal of the host school, along with parental permission for the involvement of all the primary students who participated in the small group cultural tasks as these were videoed.

The core element of the data collection was the videoing of the preservice teachers in pairs teaching their cultural task to small groups of three or four primary year 4 students. The cultural teaching task was taught on two separate occasions to two different groups. On each occasion, the task was designed to be completed within one lesson of thirty-five minutes duration. The classroom teaching was activity-based and on the theme of introducing the pupils to an aspect of Chinese culture/language, for example one group talked about the Lantern Festival in Hong Kong and then organised the students to construct paper lanterns. Another pair talked about the cultural features which were portrayed on a set of Hong Kong coins, with accompanying activities for the children.
Whilst the preservice teachers are studying to become secondary school ESL specialists in Hong Kong, in the transnational context I organised for them to interact with primary rather than secondary level students during their brief experience in the Australian classroom, for a number of reasons. Firstly, my prior experience of organising such classroom interaction had confirmed that middle years schoolchildren welcomed the novelty of these cultural teaching activities and were enthusiastic and positive interactants. As the Hong Kong preservice teachers do not have the benefit of working with the schoolchildren for a prolonged period during which they can gradually establish a rapport, I felt it to be an important factor that the audience should have the open-mindedness and ready acceptance evidenced by the middle years children.

Secondly, in terms of the range of classroom English skills required for many ESL schoolchildren in lower secondary classrooms in Hong Kong, the preservice teachers often need practice in the skills of adapting and simplifying their English language usage (Tsui, 1995) and hence working with younger native-speaker children rather than older ones would give them more opportunities to do so. In addition, the preservice teachers themselves found organising more interactive materials for younger children to be a more challenging and creative activity as they felt the need to keep the students physically involved rather than taking a more exclusively intellectual approach to culture and language. This led to more focus by the participants on the interactive nature of the activities they designed for their groups.

The pilot study data were collected in three phases as summarised in the table below:
Phase One: Before the school experience

a) **Semi-structured interview** between the researcher and individual participants, to ascertain participants' expectations and goals for the school experience.

Phase Two: During the school experience

b) **Video-recording participant pairs teaching** their cultural task to primary students, to then be able to analyse participants' pedagogy in action.

c) **Three individual written reflections** provided by participants at different stages of the school experience - one at commencement, another at the mid-point and the last one towards the end of their two weeks in school. The purpose of the reflections was to track any changes in participants' professional awareness during the school experience.

Phase Three: After the school experience

d) **Reflective Analysis Task** in which participants individually:
   - view a DVD of themselves teaching the cultural task
   - select and transcribe a 3 minute extract of their classroom interaction
   - give a written reflection on their use of English as the medium of instruction, to help participants focus on their use of classroom English and develop their reflective and analytic skills.

e) **Semi-structured interview** between the researcher and individual participants, to find out whether participants' initial expectations and goals for the school experience had been met, or whether their goals had changed as a result of the school experience.

Table 4-1  Pilot Study Data Collection Summary

4.5.5  **Data Analysis**

The pilot study produced significant data which influenced the framing of the research questions for the main study and revealed the suitability or unsuitability of the data collection methods to elucidate the research questions. The value of the pilot study was therefore in trying out a range of data collection methods in order to see what would be most useful for the main study. It is only this key aspect of the pilot study that I will be referring to here. Using the data collection table as a frame, I will now discuss the strong and weak points of the pilot study research design as initially construed.

4.5.6  **Findings from Data Analysis**

Phase One: Before the school experience

a) **Semi-structured interview**
Analysis of these interviews showed that the participants had no particular expectations about the school experience and their goal was generally to see different teaching methods in operation. The interview focused on expectations about the school experience as a whole (Research Question One). This was not effective as the students had no clear idea of what, for example, the leadership activities would contain in advance and therefore offered very general unfocused comments. This made me realize that Research Question One itself was too broadly based and needed re-focusing.

**Phase Two: During the school experience**

**b) Video-recording participant pairs teaching**

- The videos of classroom interaction proved very valuable, allowing the participants and the researcher to re-view and analyse how participants enact being the language teacher in the transnational classroom. This activity became the core element for data generation in the main study.

- In this video data participants’ assumptions about teaching and learning are demonstrated. The teacher is portrayed as provider of knowledge with pupils invited to *guess* vocabulary items at set points in the cultural task, in a rather choreographed manner which is worth exploring in detail in the main study. (This has become one of the three key genres of second language pedagogy discussed in chapter six of this study).

- Arranging for participants to teach the cultural task to two different groups, but at the same year level, allowed participants to learn from reflecting on the first experience. They then received further preparation time to conduct any adjustments to the task before the second teaching experience. Some pairs did make adjustments in their second teaching of the task. This may provide useful data for analysis in the main study and will therefore remain a feature of the research design.

- Reviewing these videos made me aware that I need to have some mechanism for recording participants’ own rationale for their particular orchestration of the cultural teaching task. This would ensure participants themselves have a voice in constructing the analysis of the data, rather than the researcher taking
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a privileged and isolated role in this regard. A stimulated recall protocol could be used to generate this reflexive teaching data in the main study.

c) Written reflections

- The written comments were useful in that they showed what features of classroom life caught the students’ attention, such as the teachers’ use of praise and the resources in the classroom. However, they generally remained at the level of descriptive accounts rather than engaging in critical reflection. It was decided therefore to replace this activity with another that would engender more reflective analysis, focusing particularly on the teaching of the cultural task.
- Rather than an individual written reflective task, a spoken task would be better for the main study. This focus on speech aligns with sociocultural theories of second language acquisition through collaborative learning, which I encountered at this time (Swain, 2006).
- While conducting this pilot study task I noticed the participants consulting each other on possible points for analysis. It appeared that working dialogically was more effective than working individually, which also fitted the theoretical framework of my study (Bakhtin 1981, 1986). I decided to frame the main study data collection as dialogically as possible (Hatton and Smith 1995). Hence the main study uses focus group discussion to promote analysis and reflection on the cultural teaching task.

Phase Three: After the school experience

d) Reflective Video Analysis Task

The outcomes of this task were disappointing but illuminating at the same time:
- The participants were very willing to review their video and transcribe an extract from their teaching episode. However, it became clear that far more guidance was needed to a) clarify what makes an extract of classroom interaction worth analysing and b) how they could frame an analysis of their use of English as the medium of instruction.
- The individual reflective transcription task did not provide the kind of rationale that elucidated the participants’ use of classroom English nor the teaching of
the cultural task. I decided instead to use a stimulated recall interview in the main study

- The ‘written reflection’ in all cases remained at the level of a description providing contextual details about the speech extract. I realised that participants’ needed more guidance and practice in conducting reflective analysis. By organising dialogic reflection through stimulated recall it would be possible for the participants and the researcher to discuss elements in the videos together and take the reflection beyond the level of reporting events (Bain et al., 2002).

e) Semi-structured interview

The data from these interviews were too broadly based to offer rich analysis. The feedback was enough to indicate which program components were deemed valuable by the participants, which gave useful pointers in terms of future program design. (For example, the participants mentioned gaining insights from the phonics/spelling workshop, but not from the lecture overviewing the local education system.) However, there was not enough specific detail in the responses to open up in-depth research. The solution seemed to lie in narrowing the focus of the interview onto just the teaching of the cultural task during the school experience, rather than trying to cover all aspects.

- Organisation of the interview needed improvement. By talking one-on-one with each participant I had hoped to create an air of relaxed confidentiality to allow them to express personal insights without inhibition. However, the quieter students appeared more inhibited by the power differential of me as their lecturer and were only giving short responses, monitoring the grammaticality of their utterances, etc. A potential solution to this for the main study was to organise interviews around the teaching dyads, so as to diffuse any such concerns. Each participant would then have the support of a colleague and they could then feel they were sharing insights with each other rather than directly informing the lecturer/researcher.
4.5.7 *Summary of Pilot Study Outcomes*

The pilot research project provided much useful feedback which impacted on the research design of the main study, as explained in Table 2 above. The outcomes from this pilot study in terms of the research design for the main study can be summarised as follows:

**a) Semi-structured interviews – (pre- and post-experience):**

- Research question one needed to be changed so that it focused only on the teaching of the cultural task, not the whole transnational school experience.

- The semi-structured interview between the researcher and participants would be linked to stimulated recall of teaching the cultural task. There would only therefore be one interview after the teaching experience.

- Participants would be interviewed by the researcher in their teaching dyads, rather than individually.

**b) Video-recording participant pairs teaching:**

- This would be the core data for the main study providing insights into participants’ professional theories in action.

- As in the pilot study, the participants would teach the cultural task on two occasions to different students at the same year level, receiving preparation time to make adjustments to the task before the second teaching experience, if desired. A comparison of the two teaching episodes would then be a feature of the stimulated recall interview.

- The teaching video would be supplemented by recording participants’ comments on this teaching experience. A stimulated recall interview would provide the prompt for this.

**c) Written reflections:**

- The scope of the written reflections too broadly encompassed the whole transnational school experience. It would be more useful for the reflection to focus in detail only on the teaching of the cultural task.
• It was decided to replace this written task by focus group discussions to promote dialogic reflection on the teaching of the cultural task.

d) Reflective Video Analysis Task

• This written reflective task will not be used in the main study. Instead participants’ reflection on their teaching of the cultural task will be prompted through a stimulated recall protocol.

• The stimulated recall interview will be held between the researcher and the teaching pair to encourage more interaction and reflection.

The data gathering possibilities of stimulated recall came to my attention just after the conclusion of the pilot study data collection, through the work of Merrill Swain. Professor Swain presented her research into ‘languaging’ at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia (ALAA) conference in September, 2005. Professor Swain kindly sent me further details about other research she was conducting into the affordances of verbal protocols and collaborative dialogue in second language learning. This research was subsequently published in Swain (2006).

As a result of the pilot study outcomes and my introduction to sociocultural perspectives on the uses of stimulated recall research, I therefore reshaped the research design for the main data collection procedure, in particular the process of dialogic reflection which is central to this study. I now outline the rationale for this method of guiding participants’ reflections.

4.6 Promoting Dialogic Reflection

4.6.1 Focus Group Discussions

In my study, in addition to video recordings of participants’ teaching, the participants’ own accounts of their actions and beliefs are included as data for analysis. Insider viewpoints have been obtained by recording focus group discussions in which the participants’ discuss and review their teaching experiences in the Australian primary classroom. This ensures that the participants’ voices are integral to both data collection and analysis, rather than having the researcher’s voice predominate in interpreting events and accounts.
From a constructivist viewpoint, it is accepted that knowledge is co-constructed between interactants and hence traditional concerns about the reliability of participants’ accounts as ‘truly reflecting reality’ are seen as somewhat misplaced. As a researcher one tries to locate the shifting ground between ‘realism’ on one side and extreme relativity on the other, as is clarified by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007):

> while we must not treat the validity of people’s reports of their attitudes, feelings, behaviour, etc, as beyond all possible doubt - as a privileged source of information - there is no reason to dismiss them as of no value at all, or even to treat them as of value only as displays of perspectives or discourse strategies. (p109)

The focus group discussions were held between the preservice teachers in groups of four made up of two teaching pairs. The focus group discussions were purposefully positioned immediately after the teaching episodes, so that the preservice teachers could share their perceptions and experiences with their peers first. The use of focus groups in this research was to allow the participants to first deconstruct their teaching experiences in a supportive and ‘multivocal’ setting amongst equals rather than via the uneven power relationship existing between participants and the lecturer/researcher (Madriz, 2003).

**4.6.2 Stimulated Recall Interview**

Teacher education research has noted that the effectiveness of the reflective process can be increased through the use of stimulated recall (Henderson & Tallman 2006). In my study, the stimulated recall interview comprised myself as lecturer/researcher and the two participants who together taught their cultural task. Their talk with myself the lecturer/researcher took place one week after their teaching episodes. The purpose of delaying the stimulated recall interview was to allow participants time to reflect on their teaching experiences and possibly begin reframing those experiences. As the design of the stimulated recall interview in my study does not follow traditional lines, it is useful to provide a few more details.

Stimulated recall, also known as protocol analysis, is an introspective research method which is commonly used in an attempt to access participants’ thought processes when engaged in a specific task or activity (Ericsson & Simon, 1980, 94)
95; Gass, 2001). Using a prompt, such as a video or audio recording of engagement in the original task, the participant gives a retrospective verbal report of their thoughts and strategies during selected moments of task activity. This is an established method for collecting data to analyse for evidence of cognitive processes linked to short term memory. Such uses of this method are commonly associated with psycholinguistic research (Gass & Mackey, 2000; Mackey, 2006).

The traditional psycholinguistic approach to stimulated recall seeks to minimize the intrusive effects of the researcher’s presence in the data gathering, through strict adherence to protocol procedures aimed at maintaining an “objective” stance. Acceptable questioning techniques during the recall episode are one such example of how this apparent neutrality is maintained so as not to ‘contaminate’ the participants’ reports (Henderson and Tallman, 2006, p. 79; Gass, 2001, p. 227).

This approach seeks to minimize ‘reactivity’, that is the influence of the interviewer on the participant’s report.

However, more recently this method is being used by researchers interested in sociocultural issues and the social formation of mind (Swain, 2006; Smagorinsky, 2001). Rather than constructing cognition as processes happening inside a person’s head, sociocultural perspectives focus on ‘mind’ so that cognition is understood as socially-mediated through language, speech in particular. This different perspective has a profound effect on how one understands the data collecting process and the nature of the data generated from the stimulated recall. Smagorinsky (2001) suggests that the purpose of stimulated recall is not to build a general cognitive model, but instead “the goal would be to understand the particularity of someone’s conceptions and the cultural practices through which they have developed” (Smagorinsky, 2001, p. 237). A sociocultural approach acknowledges the power and importance of the interaction between the participants in the recall interview. It is an accepted fact that the content of the verbal protocol is partially shaped by the participant’s view of their interlocutor’s role and purpose in engaging in the stimulated recall event. Resting on notions of addressivity and dialogism, (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) it is suggested that the verbal protocol should be seen as part of a conversational turn, and the participants’ verbalizations as being constrained and enabled through their particular vision of their conversational partner. “Protocols, therefore, cannot be, to use a common
metaphor, windows that allow researchers to peer into workings of the mind. Rather, they are part of the mediational process itself, and thus contribute to the process of articulation that produces the thinking that the protocols are designed to study” (Smagorinsky, 2001, p. 240).

The stimulated recall process can be seen as not a ‘neutral’ process of identifying and verbalizing one’s thoughts, but as a process that creates new understanding because selected memories are being foregrounded and re-interpreted in the moment of utterance. This key point is effectively explained by Swain (2006, p.1): “Verbal protocols are not just "brain dumps"; rather they are a process of comprehending and reshaping experience – they are part of what constitutes development and learning”. The current study demonstrates how engaging in stimulated recall constitutes a learning process through which pre-service teachers review their prior experiences and come to new perspectives and new understandings.

The main data collection took place at the end of May 2006 and this data constitutes the basis of my current study. I outline the research design for the data generation and the assembling of my analytical toolkit to undertake my data analysis in chapter five.

4.7 Summary

This chapter has explained the methodology underpinning this study, making the case for a qualitative methodology using a combined discourse analytic and ethnographic approach. The findings of the pilot study were discussed with the purpose of explaining the revised methods of data collection which I then put into place for the main study. A detailed rationale was given for the use of focus groups and a non-traditional stimulated recall interview, as part of the process of encouraging participants to engage in dialogic reflection on their interaction within the transnational classroom.
Chapter Five

Research Design

As researchers, we have to devise for ourselves a research process that serves our purposes best, one that helps us more than any other to answer our research question ... Rather than selecting established paradigms to follow, we are using established paradigms to delineate and illustrate our own. (Crotty, 1998, p. 216)

5.1 The Research Questions

The design for this study was selected on the basis of what processes would most likely provide answers to the questions framing this research. Following the conclusion of my pilot study, I narrowed the focus of my research to investigate how a group of preservice teachers develop their understandings of their pedagogy and themselves as language teachers through reflecting dialogically on their teaching experiences in the transnational context. I express these interests as three research questions which have guided the design of this study. My first research question investigates what pedagogy the participants adopt when teaching in the unfamiliar context of the transnational classroom. I frame this question using Gee’s (1996, 1999, 2005) concept of Discourse models, which is discussed in detail later in this chapter:

- **Research Question One:** What Discourse models of second language teaching/learning are shaping the participants’ classroom practices?

My second research question explores the nature of the classroom interaction during the teaching of the cultural task by looking at the power relations and the privileging of voice in the classroom discourse. The concept of voice draws on Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism, as discussed in chapter three.

- **Research Question Two:** What voices do preservice ESL teachers draw on to construct professional identity in a transnational classroom context?
In my third question, the research seeks to uncover whether changes in teacher identity are negotiated by the participants through engaging in the process of dialogic reflection on their cultural teaching task:

- **Research Question Three:** How does engaging in a process of dialogic reflection on their classroom interaction enable and constrain the ideological becoming of preservice ESL teachers?

### 5.2 Participants

The participants in this study are a cohort of 16 Preservice ESL teachers from Hong Kong, comprising 4 males and 12 females. The preservice teachers are in their second year of a 4 year Bachelor of Education program at a university in Hong Kong. The majority of the group are aged between 20-24, with one male aged 29. Prior to their stay in Australia, they had had a short field experience in a Hong Kong school during their first year of tertiary study. Inevitably their practical experience of classrooms as teachers is limited as they are still at an early phase of training to become second language teachers in secondary schools in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong, these preservice teachers will need to use English as the language of instruction during their lessons, whether they teach in a Chinese-medium or English-medium secondary school. Hence the preservice teachers need to be proficient in English both in terms of being able to teach it as a subject and also to maintain classroom interaction using English.

In providing details of their linguistic backgrounds, these preservice teachers explained that they had been studying English for between 16 to 22 years, or as several of them described it, “from kindergarten to now”. Whilst 15 of the 16 gave Cantonese as the language they speak at home, only 7 participants said that Cantonese is the sole language used at home, while another 8 described Cantonese as the main language with English also being spoken “occasionally” and with brothers and sisters. Four students named English as their first language, one of whom did not have Cantonese as one of her other home languages as she is a speaker of English and Tagalog.
These second language teachers themselves show an interest in gaining competence in a range of languages including Putonghua, Japanese, Korean, Italian, French and Spanish. Over half of the participants have been studying Putonghua for 10 years and five of them have in addition been studying French for between 5 to 9 years. By providing these details from the personal histories of these young second language teachers, I wish to draw attention to their own lived experience of linguistic diversity. These are preservice teachers with an awareness of linguistic variation and a global perspective. It is to be noted that their norm is at the minimum bilingualism although for the majority it is multilingualism. Also, in terms of their intercultural experiences, these are young teachers who have all travelled abroad before. China and Thailand were the most visited places, with Japan next, closely followed by U.K. and the U.S. Two students had visited Australia before, indeed one of them had completed several years of fulltime post-secondary study in Queensland prior to this immersion program. Other places visited included Korea, Singapore, Philippines, Taiwan and Africa. Two of the participants, although studying in Hong Kong also have Canadian nationality, coming from “satellite” families who have migrated to Canada but keep their connection with Hong Kong, often through work or through schooling. Another participant had completed her two final years of secondary schooling in U.K., studying for her ‘A’ level secondary school completion exams there.

From this overview it is clear that the 16 individuals taking part in this study have engaged with linguistic and cultural diversity to varying extents, culminating in the experiences of one of the male preservice teachers whose fascination with languages is expressed in his active study of five languages in addition to his daily use of Cantonese and English.

5.3 School Experience

As was the case in the pilot study, the school experience is carried out over a two-week period, as part of the participants’ engagement in a short language immersion (SLIM) program lasting eight weeks. The school-based experience comprises both primary and secondary classroom experience within one institution, including classroom observation and tutoring; participation in school
functions; mentoring and reflection workshops; outward-bound leadership training activities; and social and leisure activities.

As part of this immersion school experience, the 16 Preservice ESL teachers each engaged in a reflective cultural teaching task. This involved a number of different elements commencing with the preservice teachers, in pairs, teaching an aspect of Chinese culture to a small group of Australian year 4 school children. Several pairs chose to teach some Cantonese, such as simple phrases “jo san/ good morning”, or counting from one to ten. Other pairs elected to introduce an aspect of culture, such as “Chinese New Year Festival” and Chinese vegetarian food.

In general, each pair elected to include some combination of explanation or description with a related hands-on activity or game. For example, Oi-Yan and Wan-Yee first explained four Fai Chun (Wall hangings displaying Chinese New blessings) and the giving of gifts at Chinese New Year (CNY). Then the children made and decorated their own CNY “red packets” in which traditionally children receive money gifts. Man-Wai and Wing-See, on the other hand, were engaged in teaching six everyday Cantonese phrases to their group and their activity was a matching game, where the children matched cards containing the English translation to those showing the Cantonese phrase.

The range of cultural teaching tasks is set out in the table below, next to the names of the teaching pairs for reference.
Table 5-1  Reference List: The Participants and their Teaching Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Pair</th>
<th>Teaching Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Wai &amp; Ka-Man</td>
<td>Counting in Cantonese 0 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok-Wing &amp; Hong-Ming</td>
<td>Counting in Mandarin 1 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai-Shan &amp; Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Cantonese names for food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai-Tai &amp; Ching-Yee</td>
<td>Discussing Chinese New Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man-Wai &amp; Wing-See</td>
<td>6 Everyday Cantonese phrases e.g. Jo san/ Good morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei-Kei &amp; Tak-Wah</td>
<td>5 Pictographs giving Cantonese words for ear, door, people, moon, water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oi-Yan &amp; Wan-Yee</td>
<td>Gift-giving at Chinese New Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei-Li &amp; Mei-Ling</td>
<td>Making Fai Chun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Research Design

The data collection was carried out in two phases. The first phase was comprised of the teaching experience and focus group discussions, covering steps 1 to 6 in the research design. The research began with the participants preparing their cultural teaching task (CT1) and then video-recording their partner teaching this to a small group of between five to twelve Year 4 primary pupils. This was followed by focus group discussions (FG1) about the teaching experience. This procedure was then repeated the next day. The participants were given preparation time the next day to make any adjustments to their planned second teaching of the cultural task (CT2). That afternoon, the participants then taught their cultural task again to a different group of Year 4 primary students. The teaching was again followed immediately by focus group discussion (FG2). The use of focus groups in this research was to allow the participants to first deconstruct their teaching experiences in a supportive and multi-vocal setting amongst equals, rather than via the uneven power relationship existing between participants and the lecturer/researcher (Madriz, 2003). The steps in the research design are now set out in more detail.
5.4.1 Phase One: Data Collection (Steps 1 - 6)

Step 1 Preparation for Cultural Teaching Task

Preparation for the teaching of the cultural task had begun in Hong Kong a few weeks before the participants took up their language immersion program in Australia in May 2006. Whilst still in Hong Kong, participants selected their teaching partner and their topic for teaching, so that they could gather any necessary materials from Hong Kong to bring to the Australian classroom. Two weeks after arriving in Brisbane, the participants began their school experience at a private K-12 school situated near Fraser Island in Queensland. Participants were given a number of preparation sessions focusing on the cultural teaching task before commencing the school experience. On the morning before their teaching activity, participants were given further preparation time for them to fine-tune the methods and/or materials for their cultural teaching task, taking account of any new circumstances they may have become aware of during their last five days of classroom observations.

Step 2 Teaching Cultural Task One (CT1)

In pairs, participants taught their cultural task for the first time to a small group of year 4 students. This cultural teaching task was carried out during one lesson, approximately 30 minutes duration. While one of the participants was teaching, the other was videoing the interaction. In this way, the participants themselves controlled the choice of what aspects of the lesson to focus the lens on, effectively becoming co-producers of the data (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

Step 3 Focus Group Discussion One (FG1)

This first teaching of the cultural task (CT1) was followed immediately by a focus group discussion (FG1) analysing aspects of the teaching experience. Each focus group consisted of two of the teaching pairs and the discussion lasted for about 40 minutes. To provide a loose structure for these group discussions, a set of questions was given to each focus group. The questions were:
• What learning outcomes did you want for the students? (e.g. a cultural experience, a language experience?)
• What learning outcomes do you think were achieved?
• To what extent were your efforts to engage the students in the cultural task successful?
• How does the pattern of classroom interaction with these students compare to the pattern of classroom interaction with your Hong Kong students?
• Reflect on the kind of questions you used during the cultural teaching task. How effective were these?
• What insights into language teaching, if any, have you gained from this experience?

Each group’s focus group discussion was video recorded.

**Step 4 Preparation for Teaching Cultural Task Two (CT2)**

The next day, before teaching their cultural task a second time to another small group of year 4 students, the participants were given a preparation session in which they could make any adjustments to the method or content of their cultural task, if wanted. The purpose of this preparation session was to allow participants to act upon any insights or feedback gained from the focus group discussion and/or the teaching of the cultural task for the first time the day before.

**Step 5 Teaching Cultural Task Two (CT2)**

The participants taught their cultural task for a second time to a different group of year 4 students. The procedure was the same as in the first teaching task, the participants worked in pairs with one person teaching and the other operating the video camera. The second teaching of the cultural task lasted approximately 30 minutes.

**Step 6 Focus Group Discussion 2 (FG2)**

A focus group discussion (FG2) was held immediately after the second teaching of the cultural task. Each focus group consisted of two teaching pairs, but not the same two pairs as the first focus group discussion. This arrangement was to afford participants the opportunity of interacting with different peers. The discussion
lasted for about 40 minutes. The purpose was to explore any particular incidents arising from the teaching experience as well as discussing a set of general questions focusing on aspects of learner and teacher interaction. The questions as in the first focus group discussion (FG1) were:

- What learning outcomes did you want for the students? (e.g. a cultural experience, a language experience?)
- What learning outcomes do you think were achieved?
- To what extent were your efforts to engage the students in the cultural task successful?
- How does the pattern of classroom interaction with these students compare to the pattern of classroom interaction with your Hong Kong students?
- Reflect on the kind of questions you used during the cultural teaching task. How effective were these?
- What insights into language teaching, if any, have you gained from this experience?

Each group’s focus group discussion was video recorded.

5.4.2 Phase Two: Stimulated Recall Interview (Steps 7 - 9)

The second phase of data generation comprised video-recording of the stimulated recall interview between each teaching pair and the lecturer/researcher, back at the university campus one week later. The timing of the stimulated recall interview is a significant feature of this research design. The intention is not to try and recapture the participants’ exact thoughts while they were teaching, but to allow the participants to re-view and reflect on their lived teaching experiences from different perspectives. Hence the stimulated recall was purposefully delayed, rather than carrying it out immediately following the teaching experience, as would traditionally be the case. The rationale for this design has been explained in chapter four.

Step 7 Production of DVDs from video recordings

Before the stimulated recall interview, the videotapes of the participants teaching their cultural tasks were copied onto individual DVDs, so that each participant could have their own copy of their transnational teaching episode. This was a
necessary step to ensure that each participant could easily view their teaching episode on the laptop computers they had with them.

**Step 8  Participants review their DVDs**

On their return to Brisbane, the participants were given the DVD recording of their teaching and an accompanying question sheet to review their teaching episode the day before their stimulated recall interview. The participants were asked to review the DVDs together in their particular teaching pair. The purpose of this was to encourage dialogic reflection. The question sheet asked them to select four notable events from their teaching of the cultural task, in response to four guiding questions. Two questions focused on the teacher and two questions focused on the learners. The directions were to choose an extract demonstrating:

- successful teaching
- some difficulty experienced in teaching
- successful learning
- a student initiating the interaction and your response to this

**Step 9  Stimulated Recall Interviews**

Stimulated Recall Interviews were held with each teaching pair the day after they had reviewed their teaching DVD. The interviews lasted for approximately 40 minutes and were video-recorded. In each interview I started by handing the remote control of the DVD player to one of the teaching pair, saying that they were to take the lead and choose where and when to stop the DVD to discuss a point. There was not time to replay and discuss both performances of the cultural task (CT1 and CT2) in their entirety during this interview, hence the participants were asked to fast forward to selected moments that they wanted to talk about. Whilst the four questions on the reviewing sheet provided a general frame, the participants were encouraged to stop the DVD and give their comments at any time and for any point they wished to make. Each of the teaching pairs did this, stopping the action wherever they wished to.
5.5 Exploring the Data

The data analysis procedures used in this study emerged during the research process rather than having been predefined at the outset as would be usual with quantitative approaches (Creswell, 1998, 2003; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007; Holliday, 2007). By adopting this more flexible approach, I was able to be responsive to the themes arising from the data and could allow them to shape the study, rather than having formulated expected outcomes at the beginning of the project. This approach is in keeping with the focus of ethnographic data analysis which Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 3) characterise as exploring and interpreting "the meanings, functions, and consequences of human actions and institutional practices" in relation to local and broader contexts.

My approach to coding follows in the grounded tradition which was first suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967). A grounded approach waits until data have been collected, transcribed and repeatedly read/viewed before beginning to generate initial codes. In order to allow the themes for analysis to arise from the data, rather than be externally manufactured by myself as the researcher, I engaged in a recursive process of viewing and reviewing the data over a period of more than one year following the original data collection. Initial data analysis consisted of multiple viewings of all the recorded materials: 16 DVDs of the preservice teachers’ classroom teaching; 8 DVDs of focus group discussions and 8 stimulated recall interviews. During these viewings, I noted the key issues that the participants themselves focus on, whilst also making margin notes of other emergent themes that the participants may not have consciously signalled (Freeman, 1994).

I carried out the viewings in two stages, beginning by watching each pairs’ teaching activities and making a note of any individual dilemmas and also any common features they shared. The notable themes at this stage were:

Shared approaches to second language learning pedagogy as:
- playing games and winning prizes
- Learning new vocabulary via choral repetition
- Active engagement of students in a number of teacher-led activities
• The use of “props” – ranging from cultural artefacts like candy boxes from Hong Kong to flashcards with numbers or words on them

Dilemmas:
• The teachers trying to elicit unknown cultural knowledge from students
• Difficulties in explaining cultural processes and artefacts
• Managing students who quickly finished the activities

The second stage of coding consisted of repeated viewings of the 8 DVDs of focus group discussions and 8 stimulated recall interviews. In these viewings I was noticing the themes that the participants themselves selected as significant enough to discuss at some length with their peers in the focus group discussions or with me/the researcher in the stimulated recall interview. The central themes to emerge were:
• The roles of the teacher/students: who has the right to ask questions?
• The role of the teacher as lecturer/“Giver of knowledge” or facilitator?
• What does student-centred mean?
• The function of the cultural teaching task as a language learning experience or a cultural sharing with the students
• Coping with students’ different language proficiency levels arising from previous learning of Mandarin
• The participants’ experience of teaching their first language (Cantonese) through the second language (English)
• The difference between teaching Australian students and Hong Kong students
  o The difficulty of interacting with active children
  o The benefits of interacting with active children
  o Australian students being willing to say they don’t understand
  o Different behavioural expectations in Australia/Hong Kong

During this process of initial coding, I was selecting the particular sections of the DVD materials that I wanted to transcribe and carrying this out over the next few months (in between my full-time work). Producing the transcripts and reviewing the DVD data, allowed me to take a more holistic perspective and to relate actions
and words from the teaching activities to the participants’ comments in their focus group and stimulated recall interview reflections. I began to discern certain themes running like threads through the actions and commentaries of a number of different teaching pairs. These major theme-clusters coalesced around three key issues which raised questions that I wanted to investigate further:

- Different participants’ perceptions of the role of the second language teacher as an authority figure are being played out in the classroom discourse – to what effect?
- The term student-centred is generating a lot of productive discussion – what can be revealed through exploring these perceptions further?
- Certain patterns of shared second language pedagogy are emerging from the data – why are they in operation?

With continued reviewing of the transcriptions and DVDs, combined with further reading of sociocultural theories of Discourse and voice (Gee, 1996, 1999, 2005; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Wertsch, 1991) I framed these issues as my first two research questions:

**Research Question One:**

- What Discourse models of second language teaching/learning are shaping the participants’ classroom practices?

**Research Question Two:**

- What voices do preservice ESL teachers draw on to construct professional identity in a transnational classroom context?

On a personal level, as a teacher educator who has spent many years trying to foster reflective practice in myself and my student teachers, I was also very interested to explore whether the reflective process established for this study was generating productive outcomes. I therefore made this the focus of my third research question for this study:

**Research Question Three:**
• How does engaging in a process of dialogic reflection on their classroom interaction enable and constrain the ideological becoming of preservice ESL teachers?

In investigating my data via these research questions I am exploring the tacit theories and teacher identities of the participants in this study. My purpose in conducting this discourse analysis accords with MacLure’s (2003) recommendation that: “a discourse-based educational research would set itself the work of taking that which offers itself as common-sensical, obvious, natural, given or unquestionable, and trying to unravel it a bit – to open it up to further questioning” (p. 9).

5.6 Applying Gee’s Seven Building Tasks

In this study I adopt Gee’s analytic device of seven building tasks (Gee, 2005). Using these building tasks assists me in investigating the ways that language is being used to:

1. make certain things significant
2. create an activity
3. get recognised as having a particular identity or role
4. build particular social relationships
5. distribute social goods affecting status and power
6. establish connections and relevance between things
7. privilege certain forms of knowledge over other forms

The procedure I adopt in working with these building tasks involves moving like a weaving “shuttle back and forth between the structure (form, design) of a piece of language and the situated meanings it is attempting to build” (Gee, 2005, p. 118). I take up these seven analytic tools when analysing my data in chapters six to eight, to illuminate my investigations into issues of pedagogy and identity. Whilst in reality all of these building tasks are simultaneously active in creating situated meanings and identities, when providing a written analysis of these interanimations the researcher cannot be referring to all elements simultaneously. Instead, I am aiming to build up a layered textured analysis in a more holistic way
over the three chapters. In chapter six, I explore how language is being used in the classroom talk to achieve four of the building tasks: *building an activity, making certain things significant, establishing connections and relevance between things, and privileging certain forms of knowledge over other forms*. These aspects are the focus of building tasks 1, 2, 6 and 7 (Gee, 2005). In chapter seven I analyse the extracts of classroom discourse to highlight issues of identity, relationships and power, examining how the participants achieve building tasks 3-5: *getting recognised as having a particular identity or role, how they build particular social relationships and how they distribute social goods affecting status and power*. In chapter eight, I apply the building tasks on a more holistic basis with particular attention to show connections between the situated meanings identified in chapters six and seven.

Whilst I acknowledge that all seven tasks overlap and interplay within discourses, I have organised the analysis in this way to allow me to make a coherent and cohesive analysis with a manageable structure that can still link together to provide a detailed and insightful interpretation of the data. Gee himself cautions against treating his discourse analysis approach as a set recipe to be applied uniformly, noting that any analytic method whilst observing conventions that have developed also needs to be applied with “adaptation, innovation, and creativity” (Gee, 2005, p. 9). Thus, as a researcher, I am constructing my own identity by taking up the voices of other researchers and shaping them to serve my intentions.

5.7 Tools for Data Analysis

5.7.1 Discourse Models

I take up Gee’s concept of Discourse models as a tool for understanding the tacit theories or “storylines, images, explanatory frameworks” (Gee, 2005, p. 61) that the participants use to make sense of what they are doing as second language teachers. Their Discourse models of second language teaching/learning are made up of the various normed social practices that they have been exposed to through their own educational and language learning experiences as well as through the curriculum of teacher education institutions and so forth. Their second language
teaching/learning discourse models are not individual private concepts but sociocultural "assemblies" of situated meanings that are “often shared across people, books, other media, and various social practices” (Gee, 2005, p. 67). Certain of these assemblies or “patterns of features” (p. 65) are associated with particular contexts of use.

A Discourse model is distributed across different members of that Discourse which makes it possible for members to have a shared understanding of what constitutes appropriate meanings, actions, values and knowledge. To exemplify the working of such Discourse models, Gee (1999) draws on Fillmore’s (1975) research investigating shared understandings of the term bachelor. Fillmore’s findings indicate how Discourse models work to produce prototypical meanings – the archetypal or core meaning associated with a word. In the case of bachelor the prototypical meaning is not just an unmarried man but one who wishes or is eligible to marry a female, thus excluding gay men and priests. Discourse models then work to establish what constitutes typical or normal examples and what are marginal non-typical examples.

Extrapolating from this example, we could consider what the typical second language school teacher is generally considered to be in Australia. There is a general assumption that the person, male or more likely female, will hold a professional teaching qualification and specialist skills and knowledge in the second language being taught. The person may or may not be a first language speaker of the target language, but regardless they will probably be expected to teach this target language through English as the medium of instruction at least at elementary and intermediate levels if this is a general rather than immersion language classroom. They will also be expected to take up the usual classroom routines and behaviour management practices that loosely constitute the child-centred approach prevalent in Australia. When such unconscious expectations are flouted by the second language teacher there can be resistance leading almost to mayhem from students and other staff (Hirst, Renshaw & Brown, 2009). In Australia, when the second language context is specifically English as a second language then there can be the additional assumption that the teacher will be white, a native-speaker of English and have an Australian sounding surname.
(Miller, 2007), despite the difficulty in establishing exactly what the term native-speaker actually encompasses and the validity of such a construct (Braine, 1999; Davies, 2003; Llurda, 2005). Such expectations are sociocultural constructions and examples of Discourse models.

In order to be able to discern a Discourse model of second language teaching/learning, it is necessary to be able to identify some key discursive practices that are recognised as constituting second language teaching. For example, if we go into a school classroom how can we identify that language teaching rather than science teaching is taking place? In the science classroom the teacher might be demonstrating an experiment while the students are observing the process and taking notes. Or the students themselves may be engaged in heating up some liquid in a glass tube over a Bunsen burner in order to note if the colour of the liquid changes or something else happens. The students may then be expected to produce hypotheses suggesting why such changes occurred. To accompany the specialised practices of science teaching, there are particular hypotheses to delineate the Discourse. In the science classroom, however, students would not be expected to sing, orally repeat the teacher’s utterances multiple times, construct a role-play containing some newly learnt words or make lists of irregular verb forms. Such discursive practices are the domain of second language teaching. Because as teachers we are familiar with the discursive practices of our own subject areas it is difficult to see them as anything other than the obvious and necessary routines of teaching in our discipline. However, if instead we can stand back and adopt a position of outsiderness (Marchenkova, 2004), we can first seek to identify these taken-for-granted practices and open them up to questioning and review.

Because these Discourse models derive from normed understandings and practices they are often held unconsciously and taken for granted as simply being the way things are. In chapter six, the participants’ pedagogy is explored to discern common patterns in the classroom discourse that might evidence elements of a shared Discourse model in operation. In order to look for such patterns, the concept of speech genres is taken up in analysing the data. I discuss the theory of speech genre here and why this is a useful analytic tool for this study.
5.7.2 **Speech Genres**

Speech genres are patterns of language which are “relatively stable and normative forms of the utterance” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 81). Speech genres are culture-specific habitual patternings of utterances into larger grouping of communication which make our daily verbal interactions largely predictable and hence manageable. We acquire these genres as part of our socialization from early childhood so that:

> when hearing others’ speech, we guess its genre form the very first words: we predict a certain compositional structure ... If speech genres did not exist and we had not mastered them, if we had to originate them during the speech process and construct each utterance at will for the first time, speech communication would be almost impossible (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 78-79)

In the school setting, genres provide habitual ways of responding to communicative situations which recur within the classroom thus allowing educational processes to move along smoothly. Genres have been defined as “a staged, goal-oriented social process” (Martin & Rose, 2003, p. 7). They are social because we create them in interaction with other people and they are ‘staged’ because it usually requires several steps to complete them. The reason that we use genres in our speech is to achieve a particular purpose. One particularly well-known genre of classroom discourse is the *initiate-respond-evaluate* (IRE) or *initiate-respond-follow up* (IRF) pattern (Breen, 2001; Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Van Lier, 2001).

Having said that genres are predictable and normative forms, they are not fixed or final, we can disrupt the usual patterns and reshape them for our own ends. The significance of genres in both enabling and constraining communication through culturally shared conventions has been investigated in detail by other researchers (Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Halliday and Martin, 1993; Kress & Hodge, 1979; Painter, 2001; Paltridge, 2001).

Genres can be analysed within a systemic functional linguistic framework associated with Hallidayian linguistics, however in this study I select instead to follow the type of linguistic analysis offered by Swales (1990) using a rhetorical structural approach, which is more commensurate with Gee’s approach to grammatical and textual discourse analysis (Gee, 2004, p. 20).
Using genre as a tool allows me to focus on certain notable patterns of language use in the classroom discourse as social action and to explore the purposes that they serve. As Hirst (2002) observes:

> These genres are socially recognized patterns of language use ... [which] can be examined not only for the generic regularities they display and the conventions they flout, but also for the ideologies that inform them – how they function as discursive practices. (p. 85)

Through iterative grounded theorizing of the data in this study (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007) three notable speech genres of second language pedagogy have emerged: *elicitation, repetition* and *matching*. I have selected these genres for analysis because one or more of these genres feature strongly in the classroom discourse of each teaching pair in both the pilot study and the main study. I analyse these three genres using Gee’s (2005) sets of “thinking devices” or “seven building tasks”, in order to investigate how they have been socially constituted in stages by the teacher and students in their interaction, and for what purposes.

Exploration of these three genres offers the opportunity of discerning shared Discourse models of second language teaching/learning in operation in the transnational context.

### 5.7.3 Discourse Formats

Whilst genres allow me to explore the participants’ pedagogy, I take up the analytic tool of discourse formats to investigate the interplay of teachers and students voices within the classroom discourse (Brown, 1997; Brown & Hirst, 2004; Brown & Renshaw, 1995; Brown & Renshaw, 2004; Renshaw & Brown, 2000; Renshaw & Brown, 2007). These formats are patterns of classroom talk occurring between teacher and students and also between students in which children’s everyday thinking is intertwined with more scientific and mathematical conceptual processes. Renshaw and Brown (2007) have identified four particular formats of classroom talk: *replacement, interweaving, contextual privileging* and *pastiche*. Using Vygotsky, they explore the pedagogical process within each of these formats in order to “identify the characteristics of classroom talk that engage students in coreasoning about complex concepts and that build connections between students’ life-worlds and that of the school curriculum” (Renshaw & Brown, 2007,
As part of their analysis of these formats they consider the relative dominance of the teacher’s voice and the ability of the students to populate scientific and mathematics discourse with their own voices (Brown & Renshaw, 2004, Renshaw & Brown, 2000). The focus in their study is on student learning processes and the potential of these formats of classroom talk to offer productive examples of exploratory classroom talk which could more usefully replace the standard initiate-respond-evaluate (IRE) format (Brown & Renshaw, 2004).

Renshaw and Brown (2007) explain their goal in conducting their research, which parallels my own impetus for conducting this study:

By describing different formats of classroom talk in some detail and comparing the role of the teacher across the four formats, we hope to enhance the effectiveness of educators in deploying classroom talk for deeper learning across curriculum domains. (p. 544)

My research is also interested in exploring the relative privileging of the teachers and students’ voices in classroom talk, but my purpose is to explore how identities are negotiated in the second language classroom and how different conceptions of the role of the teacher are operationalised.

5.7.4 Applying Transcription Tools in Discourse Analysis

In carrying out the analysis in this study I use Gee’s approach to discourse analysis (1999, 2005), applying a range of analytical tools that he makes available. One of these tools is in the presentation of the transcribed speech as lines of text. Different methods of presentation allow the researcher to highlight certain features of the discourse to make it more salient. For example, the analysis of Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei’s classroom discourse (transcript 7.5) is assisted by organizing their utterances into stanzas which are “sets of lines devoted to a single topic, event, image, perspective, or theme” (Gee, 2005a, p. 127). I found that this grouping of the utterances into four stanzas clarified the key stages in the development of the collaborative format. This method of presentation allows a clear focus on the individual extracts, making links within the individual discourse extracts easy to follow through the alphabetic labelling of lines (line 1a, 1b, 1c, etc; line 2a, 2b, etc), whilst the reader is kept aware of the way these individual extracts link to the teaching activity as a whole through the sequenced stanza
numbering. These features can be seen in the following few lines taken from transcript 7.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character(s)</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>We are from – where are we from? Do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((2 boys’ politely put their hands up without calling out. They wait to be chosen to answer the question.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Mei-Kei</td>
<td>[OK, just shout out]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Mei-Kei</td>
<td>- - - (continues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Mei-Kei</td>
<td>((Mei-Kei whispers to Tak-Wah. )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speech of Tak-Wah, Mei-Kei and their students (lines 1a to 4n) is also presented here in what Gee terms ‘idealized lines’ – with most markers of speech hesitation and dysfluencies omitted in order to highlight the basic themes that emerge in the speech (Gee 2005a, p. 129).

In presenting Wei-Li’s dialogue for analysis at the end of Chapter Seven (transcript 7.6), I make use of Gee’s concept of macrostructure relating to narratives, as this shows the patterning of themes and the organization of the speech more clearly (Gee 2005a, p. 128). Gee identifies six categories comprising narrative macrostructures: Setting, Catalyst, Crisis, Evaluation, Resolution and Coda. Wei-Li’s account of her teaching episode falls naturally into the first four elements, from the setting to the evaluation. However, the remaining two categories, Resolution and Coda, are not found in this extract, which is itself a point worth noting and is discussed in the ensuing commentary in chapter seven.

An explanation of the transcription conventions which are used in this thesis, based on Jefferson’s Transcription System (2004), is provided in Appendix I. The transcription method of identifying the appropriate tone in Cantonese words is based on the Lau System as set out in Brown (1994), with examples given in Appendix I.

5.7.5 Acknowledging the Framing Problem

Any interpretation of data involves what Gee (2005) has termed the framing problem. In the case of discourse analysis, this term highlights the problem facing the researcher when deciding where to begin and end any transcription of the
data. There is also the question of how much detail to provide in the transcription – is eye gaze and voice volume of significance in understanding this particular data for example? There are no uniformly correct ways of dealing with this framing problem it is a matter for judgement by the researcher:

It is the purposes of the analyst that determine how narrow or broad the transcript must be. The validity of an analysis is not a matter of how detailed one's transcript is. It is a matter of how the transcript works together with all the other elements of the analysis to create a “trustworthy” analysis. (Gee, 2005, p. 106)

5.8 Organisation of the Data Analysis Chapters Six to Eight

In chapter five I began by detailing the steps in the research design, beginning with the preparation of the cultural teaching task and concluding with the stimulated recall interview where the teaching pairs reflect on their transnational classroom experience. I then discussed the choice of tools for data analysis, notably the concepts of speech genres (Bakhtin, 1986; Swales, 1990), Gee’s seven building tasks and the concept of Discourse models (Gee, 2005) and discourse formats (Renshaw & Brown, 2007). These analytic tools are taken up in the Discourse analysis of the data in chapters six, seven and eight.

In chapter six, discourse analysis of the classroom talk focuses on understanding the participants’ perspectives on doing second language teaching by investigating three key genres of their discursive practices. In chapter seven, discourse analysis is centred on understanding how these preservice teachers negotiate different classroom talk formats (Hirst & Brown, 2008; Renshaw & Brown, 2007) which set up particular pedagogic relations between themselves and their students through the privileging of voices within the classroom interaction. The analysis therefore centres on the participants’ ways of being in the classroom. In chapter eight, the lens focuses on teacher identity in the process of becoming with discourse analysis of the participants’ reflective dialogues evidencing shifts in their understandings of the role of the teacher in second language learning processes.
Chapter Six

Analysing Preservice Teachers’ Second Language Pedagogy

In this chapter I explore the patterns of features arising in the classroom discourse when preservice teachers from Hong Kong teach aspects of Chinese language/culture to Australian primary school children. The purpose in carrying out this analysis is to understand how and why the preservice teachers in this study construe processes of second language teaching/learning in the ways that they do.

This chapter is organised into four sections. The first three sections explore each of the three speech genres in turn: eliciting, reciting and matching. In these sections one or more extracts of classroom discourse illustrating the genre are analysed and discussed. The analysis of each speech genre is organised into three parts. Firstly, I investigate how the teacher and students create the activity of second language learning through the genre patterning of the classroom discourse (“Building the Activity”, Gee’s building block 2). Secondly, I examine the way that certain objects, behaviours and meanings are connected and made salient as part of the privileging of particular forms of knowledge by the preservice teachers through the pedagogies they are enacting (“Building Significance”, Gee’s building blocks 1, 6 & 7). Thirdly, I explore the possible purposes underlying the production of this genre in the classroom discourse, drawing on commentary from the participants and also insights from the research literature. The chapter then concludes with a summary of the key points that have emerged through the analysis of the classroom discourse.

6.1 Elicitation Genre: “Look at this. Do you know what is it?”

Elicitation has been defined by Nunan (1999) as “a procedure by which teachers stimulate students to produce samples of the structure, function, or vocabulary
item being taught” (p. 306). There are two types of elicitation: direct and cued. Direct elicitation takes the form of a straightforward request by the teacher for the desired sample, whilst cued elicitation “is a way of drawing out from learners the information they are seeking – the right answers to their questions – by providing visual clues and verbal hints as to what answer is required” (Mercer, 2001, p. 246). Being able to elicit successfully from students requires that the students already have some knowledge of the required phenomenon that they can talk about, or in the case of cued elicitation that they can pick up on the clues that the teacher offers as a scaffold.

Elicitation is a notable genre in the classroom discourse of participants in both the pilot study and the main study. In addition to trying to elicit known information, the preservice teachers try to elicit guesses from the students about Chinese language items or cultural artefacts. For example, in the main study Chi-Wai and Ka-Man make extensive use of eliciting guesses in their teaching episode by showing cards containing the English transliterations of Cantonese numbers and inviting their students to guess what numbers from 0-10 these words represent. Another pair, Lai-Shan and Pik-Wah, ask their students to guess the English names of fruit and vegetables found in Hong Kong, from pictures shown on a board. Yet another pair, Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei invite their students to guess the number of tones in Cantonese and the meaning of selected Chinese pictographs displayed on their worksheets and some flashcards.

It is this particular form of the elicitation genre – eliciting guesses - that is the focus of my analysis in this study. As eliciting guesses is a salient feature of the pedagogy in both the pilot and main study, it is important to ask what are the purposes of eliciting guesses as evidenced within the participants’ classroom talk? I address this question through an analysis of an extract of Lai-Tai’s classroom discourse from the pilot study, as a representative sample of the discourse generated in this study.

In the following extract of classroom discourse Lai-Tai, a Hong Kong preservice teacher, is introducing the topic of Chinese New Year to a group of four Year 4 Australian primary students: Ellen, Thomas, Mandy and Carol. She begins by
showing the students some objects associated with Chinese New Year. The first object is a Fai Chun a wall-hanging containing a blessing for Chinese New Year. The second object is a paper decoration made to look like the string of firecrackers used as part of the Chinese New Year celebrations. This is the orientation phase of her activity where she is building students’ interest in her topic. She has not yet mentioned the topic of Chinese New Year to her students. After discussion of the Fai Chun and the firecrackers, Lai-Tai goes on to show the students a PowerPoint presentation on her laptop, containing colourful pictures and text to inform the students about different aspects of Chinese New Year. The extract opens with Lai-Tai beginning her activity. She is sitting on a chair, with the four students sitting on the floor in a semi-circle in front of her. In her efforts to establish the identity of the various artefacts the classroom discourse unfolds in elicitation genre with the students supplying guesses in response to Lai-Tai's prompts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>So let's start our activity today right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Yeh, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>OK. So first I'm going to show you something ((reaches into bag))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>something you may have seen before or no? OK so OK. Look at this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Do you know what is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Uh uh ((shaking heads))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>((hand up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>No idea eh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>((nod and eye exchange)) Yeh, Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>A Chinese calendar eh very creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>((looks around the group for more offerings)) How about you Thomas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Have you seen this before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Nope ((shakes his head))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>((hand up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Yeh Mandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>A dreamcatcher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>A dreamcatcher um – yeh very good guess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>OK. I'll tell you later what is the answer, alright? ((puts Fai Chun down))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>And then how about this? Dedum!((showing the firecracker))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>You put fire on it and it pops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Oh very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Did you hear what Thomas said? ((children nod their heads)) Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>OK. You put fire and then what will happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>It pops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>It pops. It’s called a firecracker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Do you know this is real ((shakes firecracker))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Do you know this is real?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>No it’s fake. You can touch it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>((children reach out immediately to touch it)). Yeh touch it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>It’s weird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Yeh, actually it is made of paper and this is - Mandy no Thomas is correct - this is a firecracker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>OK I’ll put it on the floor and you can touch it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>And then have a look at these envelopes ((holds one up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it beautiful?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 6-1  Lai Tai introducing Chinese New Year

6.1.1  Building the Activity

Lai-Tai opens by announcing that an instructional activity is about to begin and invites the students to join in: “So let’s start our activity today right?” Ending her invitation with “right?” alerts the students that Lai-Tai requires confirmation from them that they are ready to proceed. The students confirm their willingness (“Yeh, mm”, line 2). Lai-Tai then reveals the Fai Chun (the Chinese New Year Blessing)
and asks the students if they can identify it (line 5). However the students respond negatively (“uh ↓ uh ↓”, line 6) and offer no suggestions. Lai-Tai has the choice here to simply tell them what it is and explain its purpose. However she persists instead with trying to elicit an answer from the students. As the students do not recognise the object and Lai-Tai offers no clues other than the Fai Chun itself, the patterning of this elicitation becomes one of *eliciting guesses*. The interaction noted in lines 5 – 19 is dedicated to having the students try to guess the identity of the Fai Chun. The stages of this process are made clear in the ensuing analysis.

Having presented the Fai Chun to the students, Lai-Tai notes their puzzlement and summarises their response as “No idea eh ↑?” (line 7). However, she continues to hold the Fai Chun up for view, and indicates by her rising intonation on “eh ↑?” that she is questioning whether they could not in fact offer an idea or make a guess. Lai-Tai’s comment prompts Ellen to offer the suggestion of “Maybe a Chinese calendar?” (line 10). Lai-Tai’s response to this suggestion is to evaluate it as “very creative” (line 11).

The interaction is unfolding following a typical “initiate-respond-evaluate” (IRE) pattern:

(5) Lai-Tai: Look at this. Do you know what is it? [initiate]
---
(8) Ellen: ((hand up)) [bid to speak]
(9) Lai-Tai: ((nod and eye exchange)) Yeh, Ellen [accepts bid]
(10) Ellen: Maybe a Chinese calendar? [responds]
(11) Lai-Tai: A Chinese calendar eh very creative ... [evaluates]

This IRE pattern typifies the transmission model of classroom interaction, which has been termed the “default option” of the traditional lesson (Cazden, 2001, p. 31). The teacher opens by asking a question (initiate) to which Ellen responds and Lai-Tai concludes by evaluating her response. It is noteworthy that the third step in the IRE exchange above is framed as an evaluation (“very creative” line 11). This could have been taken as an opportunity for elaboration instead, where the student’s response is opened up by the teacher for further discussion (Mercer, 1995, p. 33). The significance of the follow-up move as the opportunity to promote
learning through classroom talk has been noted in the literature (Mercer, 2001; Richards, 2006; Wells, 1993). For example, Wells (1993) shows how follow-up moves are used for planning and review in a science lesson. Van Lier (2001) observed four different possibilities for the follow-up move: recitation, display, cognition and precision. As part of the process of scaffolding learning in this discourse extract, Lai-Tai could have used the follow-up move to ask the student to explain the reasoning behind her comment (a cognition move), or to ask another student to comment on this idea (a cognition move) both of which would invite further student participation and thought. As the purpose in this orientation phase is to build interest in the object and the ensuing topic of Chinese New Year such follow up moves would have been helpful. However, Lai-Tai instead adopts the traditional triadic pattern, evaluating the student’s contribution. She uses this discourse pattern with confidence and ease which suggests a comfortable familiarity with this approach (Lemke, 1990). It is also notable how easily the Australian children fit into this discourse, so clearly this is a familiar routine to them also. The question is whether it is the most productive way to proceed at this point in the lesson, whether these “established, habitual ways of talking provide, in the circumstances, the best kinds of guidance?” (Mercer, 1995, p. 24).

Whilst the students are invited to give their input into the learning process, if their responses do not match the answer the teacher is seeking then their responses are not incorporated into the unfolding of the lesson. For example, Ellen’s suggestion of the calendar is not explored further (line 11) and instead the teacher asks Thomas a Chinese heritage student for his idea: “How about you, Thomas?” (line 12). Even when Thomas answers with a flat “no”, Lai-Tai asks him again “Have you seen this before?” (line 14). It appears that Lai-Tai is hoping to draw on some shared cultural experience here, assuming from Thomas’ Chinese background that he may have celebrated Chinese New Year with his family and hence recognize the Fai Chun. It is clear from Lai-Tai’s decision not to explore Ellen’s suggestion of the Chinese calendar, and her prompting of Thomas to reconsider whether he has seen the object before, that she is only interested in receiving the correct identification of the Fai Chun.
When Thomas declines to guess, Mandy then offers her suggestion of “a dreamcatcher” (line 18). Although this is an incorrect response, it is an opportunity to connect to previous learning by exploring what associations this student has made to come up with this possibility. Lai-Tai could have used this as a chance to ask Mandy a genuine question in order to find out why the student suggested a dreamcatcher. Lai-Tai does not do this. It would appear that her desire to introduce her teaching topic overrides discussion of the Fai Chun or exploration of the children’s responses. Lai-Tai’s unwillingness to deviate from the lesson plan in order to explore either Ellen’s or Mandy’s unexpected responses may well be a feature of her inexperience as a beginner teacher, as noted frequently in the literature (Freeman & Richards, 1996; Richards, 1994; Bain et al., 2002). It seems that as she had not anticipated the unusual suggestion of a dreamcatcher, Lai-Tai ignores it.

It is already becoming apparent that there is a mismatch between the teacher’s expectations and the students’ abilities to provide an appropriate answer. The elicitation genre is being co-constructed between the teacher and three of the students, but while the teacher is expecting a correct answer, the children are only able to make creative guesses because they do not already possess the cultural knowledge in order to provide a correct answer. Lai-Tai appears to recognise that her strategy is proving problematic. Firstly she acknowledges that Mandy’s suggestion of a dreamcatcher was a “very good guess” (line 19). This is notably the first time that the word guess has been directly mentioned. As three of the children have not recognized the Fai Chun, she now discards this item without asking the other student Carol for her suggestion. Having spent the opening minutes of her activity focusing the students’ attention on the Fai Chun she now treats this object as unimportant (“OK. I’ll tell you later what is the answer, alright?” line 20) and moves straight on to another artefact associated with New Year, Chinese firecrackers (line 21).

This short scenario offers a rich insight into how the expectations of shared cultural knowledge shape the teacher’s use of instructional strategies and how without this common ground Lai-Tai’s efforts to introduce her topic via identification of the Fai Chun are unsuccessful. One could conjecture that a more
experienced teacher might have tried to ameliorate the problem by making use of cued elicitation strategies or indeed have decided to tell the students herself about the Fai Chun and its purpose. However, on this occasion the teacher did not decide to take up those options and the children remain unaware of the identity of the Fai Chun and likewise unaware of the topic of Chinese New Year that these props are alluding to.

Whilst Lai-Tai chooses not to explore incorrect answers further, by contrast when she receives a response that she discerns as productive (the recognition of the firecracker by Thomas in line 22) Lai-Tai halts the interaction and highlights the students’ contribution by asking “did you hear what Thomas said?” (line 24). Once the students have confirmed by nodding heads that they heard, Lai-Tai then repeats the important description of the firecracker (Line 25). In the context of a Hong Kong classroom, where a class may consist of 40 or more students, it is helpful to check that everyone has heard and to repeat the important words. However, in the context of this teaching activity, where Lai-Tai is interacting with only four children who are sitting next to her, such a comment was unnecessary and was possibly made out of habit to underline that this was a significant point. As the object has now been recognized, Lai-Tai provides the correct name for it: “It’s called a firecracker” (line 27). The firecracker is now taken up as a legitimate focus of attention. Lai-Tai invites the students to touch it, talks about what it is made from, and once again praises Thomas for being correct in his identification “Thomas is correct – this is a firecracker” (line 34).

6.1.2 Building Significance

In this opening phase of the interaction, the learning process consists of correctly naming the objects that the teacher displays: “It’s called a firecracker” (line 27). In an attempt to produce the required identification, the classroom talk takes on the patterning of the elicitation genre. Broadly the stages of this genre can be discerned as: Teacher shows a language prompt (Fai Chun/Firecracker) ^ Teacher invites students to guess the identity ^ students guess ^ teacher evaluates ^ if guess is incorrect the teacher asks again ^ if guess is correct the student is praised and the language prompt is discussed. (^ indicates a new stage. Johns, 2002). The interaction appears to be working on two levels. Lai-Tai’s words apparently
characterise her questions as enquiring whether the students recognize the object or not, as discussed in the table below in which I analyse the four questions that Lai-Tai asks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Do you know what is it?”</td>
<td>The choice of know suggests a fact already acquired. This is not phrased as “Can you guess …?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No idea eh↑?” (said with rising intonation and an enquiring look at each student in turn)</td>
<td>The declarative No idea is turned into a question through the rising intonation, and becomes conversely a request for “Do you have any ideas?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How about you, Thomas?”</td>
<td>Whether Lai-Tai expects Thomas to know or guess is left ambiguous because she uses no verb here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Have you seen this before?”</td>
<td>In this second question to Thomas, she specifies that she is asking him to recognize this object as part of his sociocultural experience by her choice of seen and before.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6-2  Lai-Tai’s Elicitation Questions**

However, if her intent is only to enquire whether the students recognize the object then the students’ first negative response (line 6) would have brought the questions to an end. Instead she continues to ask the students, hence the students understand that some other information is required. Whilst the illocutionary force of her questions suggests the act of recognition, the repeated nature of the questions has the perlocutionary effect on the hearers such that the students understand they are being asked to offer guesses about the nature of this unknown object, so Ellen and Mandy dutifully offer suggestions (Austin, 1975). Whilst both parties are clearly engaged positively in trying to reach a successful outcome to this exchange, this interlude concludes with the Fai Chun being put aside unexplained and the topic of Chinese New Year remains unannounced. Communication has not been achieved at this point.

During this interaction it is clear that the teacher is seeking one particular correct answer and any other possibility is deemed irrelevant. As Edwards & Westgate (1994) note: “to be asked by someone who already knows, and wants to know if
you know, is to have your answer accepted, rejected or otherwise evaluated according to the questioner’s belief about what is relevant and true.” (p. 48). Lai-Tai knows the name and the purpose of the Fai Chun, the children do not. Lai-Tai is therefore the holder of knowledge and the children are placed in the position of having to guess what it is that Lai-Tai already knows. Whilst Thomas refuses to make a “shot in the dark” guess (lines 13 & 15), Mandy is willing to offer the suggestion of a dreamcatcher. This suggestion meets the same fate as the earlier guess of the calendar, by being praised and then ignored. The implicit message in this exchange is that only correct factual information is valued and the children’s guesses – although creative – are not worthy of further exploration. Indeed as three students have now had an opportunity to guess and no correct answer has been forthcoming, Lai-Tai changes focus. She discards the Fai Chun and moves on to the firecracker.

6.1.3 **Purposes of Eliciting Guesses**

The question arises, that if the correct naming of objects is the intended activity, why does the teacher elicit guesses? Why is Lai-Tai asking the students to guess what the object is, if the teacher then does not take up any of these guesses unless they are correct? If no guesses are correct, the object itself is put aside and is not explained, as with the Fai Chun. Eliciting guesses then is not being seen as a process of making associations and building on existing knowledge, rather it is the act of immediately correctly identifying something.

Of what value is eliciting guesses in the learning process? Jerome Bruner (1960) discusses the role of guessing in terms of ‘intuitive thinking’ and suggests that there may be some value in encouraging our students to make educated guesses and to recognize features of plausible guesses. He sees promoting the creative linking of ideas through such intuitive means as guessing might help to build learners’self-confidence. However, Bruner is quick to point out that such eliciting guesses without some basis of foundational knowledge from which to derive a reasonable guess is dangerous as it encourages “self-confident fools” (Bruner, 1960, p.65). However, in this extract of classroom discourse, the encouragement of intuitive thought does not appear to be a reason for eliciting guesses here – as the students receive no feedback which asks them to revisit their guess and adapt
it in any way. There is no sense of eliciting guesses in order to develop this
cognitive skill. Indeed, the guessing does not result in a teacher-provided answer
of any sort. The question still remains as to the purpose of eliciting guesses in this
context?

Reading through the extract of Lai-Tai’s teaching episode there is a sense in which
she seems to be offering these different items (the Fai Chun and the firecracker) in
the expectation or hope that they will produce some identified common ground for
a discussion of Chinese New Year to commence. What may be in operation here is
what Gee (1996) refers to as the ‘guessing principle’, which he describes as one of
the ways in which people try to work out, through considering the contexts of use,
precisely what meaning of a word is being intended by another speaker. Gee notes
that: “Of course, people who belong to the same or similar social groups, who
speak the same or similar social languages, make better guesses about each other”
(Gee, 1996, p. 74). Lai-Tai’s initial lack of success is that she is expecting the
children to draw on cultural knowledge that they do not yet possess and she is
perhaps not confident enough in her teaching skills to explain and supply the
missing cultural knowledge for them. Her attempts at engaging the children in the
discussion leading into a focus on Chinese New Year hit early difficulties precisely
because the students do not already share the same discourse as Lai-Tai their
teacher, hence the familiar routine of calling on prior knowledge proves initially
unsuccessful. This genre presumably works well in a context of shared cultural
knowledge and hence would be a standard feature of the Hong Kong classrooms
which Lai-Tai has experienced both as a learner and a preservice teacher. In the
context of the transnational classroom different discourses are in play, and
becoming aware of this intercultural gap and having to try to bridge it is one of the
benefits of engaging in this kind of transnational field experience. This is a point
made by one of the teaching pairs themselves in their stimulated recall interview
(see Wan-Yee’s reflection in chapter eight, section 8.2.1).

Another potential insight into the predominance of eliciting guesses as a genre is
provided by Kwok-Wing, another Hong Kong preservice teacher who took part in
the main data collection, the year following Lai-Tai’s teaching episode. Kwok-Wing
and his partner worked together to teach their group of six Year 4 children to write
some characters in Mandarin. They chose Mandarin, rather than Cantonese, so that they could use simplified written forms. In their first focus group discussion, Kwok-Wing is explaining the rationale for introducing Mandarin and also discussing the value of eliciting guesses as an instructional strategy during their teaching of the cultural teaching activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kwok-Wing</td>
<td>Yes [we taught] in Mandarin because some of the words come from pictures like the sun. It looks like the sun and we simplified. So we let them guess and just have fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>For sure they can't guess, having a guess we can draw their attention and we can get their attention and just have fun together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6.3  Kwok-Wing, Focus Group 1**

Kwok-Wing’s comment suggests that the educational purpose of eliciting guesses is to attract the students’ attention and keep them focused on the task in hand. The importance of keeping the students’ attention and therefore keeping them on task is attested to later in the discussion within this same focus group. In response to Kwok-wing’s enquiry: “Do you consider the teaching successful..?” Ka-Man, another preservice Hong Kong teacher answered, “Yes cos we didn’t have any disruptive or out of task students” (Ka-Man, focus group 1). For this participant, successful teaching is keeping the students’ attention on the task and maintaining good discipline. Inviting the students to guess names of items or meanings of words is one of the main strategies used by these preservice teachers to achieve these outcomes.

### 6.1.4 Summary of Eliciting Guesses

To summarise, elicitation in the form of *eliciting guesses* is a genre that is evident in the pedagogy of each of the participant teaching pairs in this study. Its purpose appears to lie in offering a means of engaging students’ participation and of keeping their attention on the task in hand. This does not appear to be part of a cognitive learning approach as there is no further exploration of student responses by the teacher other than a confirmation if correct. There appears to be the assumption that either students know or do not know the salient information as students’ thought processes are not explored as a useful way of linking to their
existing knowledge. Eliciting guesses then is a process that allows students’ voices to be heard, but they do not actually contribute materially to the learning process. In Lai-Tai and Kwok-Wing’s teaching episodes, the students’ endeavours are based on trying to guess what it is that the teacher already knows. The students’ utterances are only endorsed if they supply this correct information.

During this process of the showing of objects, the children sit attentively or raise their hands to contribute and patiently await the unfolding of events. Learning in this scenario is finding out new names of things from the teacher. It is about a world of objects which need to be recognized and language is needed to correctly name these objects. Learning a new language or learning about another culture is therefore about naming things correctly not about exploring possible meanings underlying students’ perception of some point of connection between a calendar, a dreamcatcher and a Fai Chun. What is being missed here is the opportunity to understand that classroom talk can be more than the transmission of facts or knowledge about things, it can also be used to explore students’ cultural understandings. As Bakhtin (1981) expresses this: "Language, no longer conceived as a sacrosanct and solitary embodiment of meaning and truth, becomes merely one of many possible ways to hypothesize meaning" (p.370). Whilst Lai-Tai is focused on achieving the correct names of objects, the opportunity for engaging in exploratory talk with the children about the possible nature and function of these cultural artefacts is not being taken up. There is no encouragement to "hypothesize meaning", even though the construction of the classroom talk has made this a possibility. The opportunities of exploring the meanings that the children bring to their classroom learning are being overlooked, when Lai-Tai chooses to evaluate their suggestions of the Chinese calendar and the dreamcatcher, instead of taking this as a chance for dialogue with the students in which they can explain their meanings and contribute to the lesson. A discussion of the students’ incorrect choices might have led to a fruitful discussion about the actual purpose of the Fai Chun and hence the topic of Chinese New Year, which is the goal that Lai-Tai was seeking.

The difficulties that arose during Lai-Tai’s teaching activity in trying to reach a point of shared knowledge about the Fai Chun is indicative of the kind of dilemmas that intercultural classroom encounters can give rise to where different
sociocultural assumptions are in play. Such dilemmas offer productive moments for further reflection which can lead the teacher to new understandings about the nature and potential of second language teaching/learning. The failure to achieve her desired outcome in this situation, could have led Lai-Tai to become more aware of the sociocultural basis of knowledge, as Mercer (2001) notes:

Everyday human activity depends heavily on participants being able to draw on a considerable body of shared knowledge and understanding, based on their past shared experience or similar histories of experience. The conventions or ‘ground rules’ which ensure that speakers and listeners, writers and readers are operating within the same genres of language are rarely made explicit, but so long as participants can safely assume shared knowledge, the language of everyday interaction follows its conventional patterns. (p. 255)

When the expected unfolding of classroom events does not take place, as in this extract, this offers the possibility of observing the conventions from the viewpoint of outsideness – which is part of the value of the transnational context and part of the competence of a cosmopolitan teacher (Bakhtin, 1986; Marchenkova, 2004; Luke, 2004). Whilst outsideness and the concept of the cosmopolitan teacher are explored in some detail in chapter three, it is useful to remind ourselves how these ideas are linked through the concept of creative understanding which I take to be one of the potential benefits that can come from intercultural encounters in the transnational context (Bakhtin, 1986). As Bakhtin has explained:

In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding – in time, in space, in culture ... It is only in the eyes of another culture that foreign culture reveals itself fully and profoundly ... a meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. (p. 7)

It is when there are disjunctures in the pedagogical flow that “the suppressed contradictions, cleavages and dilemmas” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 7) emerge and permit such moments of insight as creative intercultural understanding. Such moments have the potential to give insight into the relativity of cultural experiences and the understanding that there are a variety of ways of viewing the world or of being in the world. They can contribute to a teacher’s cosmopolitan transnational identity.
Further reflection on this particular dilemma regarding the Fai Chun, may have offered Lai-Tai the opportunity to consider the value of approaching second language pedagogy as a process of meaning creation rather than predominantly the acquisition of new words for things (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979; Mercer, 2001). As this classroom interaction arose as part of the pilot study in this research, Lai-Tai did not engage in the follow-up process of dialogic reflection which I instituted in the main study. Hence any further insights to be gained from engaging in this activity are purely conjecture. However the other extracts of classroom discourse provided in this study come from the main study and hence have further data showing outcomes after engaging in dialogic reflection during the focus group discussions and stimulated recall interview.

6.2 Repetition Genre: “Can you say it with me?”

Apart from eliciting guesses, another genre of second language teaching discourse that emerged from this data was repetition. Repetition involved both teacher and student voices in particular patterns of interaction which are present in the data from each of the eight teaching pairs in the main study. The repetition genre in particular highlighted the importance of physical tools in orchestrating the language learning activity in the classroom. Freeman & Johnson (2005) note the importance of such physical tools in the learning process:

Because although teaching does not cause learning, neither is it entirely irrelevant to or disconnected from it … the challenge is to uncover how this relationship of influence between teaching and learning unfolds. We contend that the relationship is organized primarily by means of physical and conceptual tools. These tools enable the activity of the language classroom; they are how the work gets done. (p79)

These two researchers detail the way in which an experienced teacher uses the overhead projector to create the language work of the classroom. In my study, the following extract from Man-Wai’s teaching activity evidences a strong reliance on her flashcards as physical tools to help her conduct the lesson almost as a choreographed series of steps in a dance (Gee, 2000). In order to capture this interweaving of words, objects and movement in Man-Wai’s performance, I have added detailed stage notes within the speaker’s turn to which they relate to provide a sense of this within the conventions of a written transcription.
This data extract is from the opening of Man-Wai’s teaching activity, in which she focuses on introducing some everyday Cantonese phrases (such as “good morning”, “good evening” and “my name is ...”) to a group of twelve Year 4 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Well today I’m going to teach you some new words in Cantonese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Cantonese and Mandarin are very different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good morning. OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>What’s this say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good morning in Cantonese is ? (turns over flashcard to show Jo san)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Jo san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>[Jo san]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good morning. OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Jo san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Jo san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Now can you say Jo san?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Jo san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>So what was that? That was ? (turns over flashcard to show Good morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>That was ‘good morning’. Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>OK the next one. (holds up a new flashcard showing Good evening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>What’s this say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good evening. Now ‘good evening’ is sort of the same as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>‘good morning’. Let’s see it’s ? (turns over flashcard to show Jo tao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Good! (teacher smiles and looks pleasantly surprised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Jo tao (hesitant, quieter, using mixed falling/rising tones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Jo tao Can you say it with me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>[Jo tao]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>[Jo tao]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 6-4 ManWai Practices Cantonese Phrases

6.2.1 Building the Activity

Man-Wai opens by telling the students that she is going to teach them some “new words” in Cantonese (line 1). She makes the comment that Mandarin and Cantonese are “very different” (line 2) because the students are currently learning Mandarin at school. Man-Wai then takes up the repetition genre straight away, instituting this as a three stage process.
**Stage One:** The beginning of the first phase is signalled by holding up a flashcard and saying “OK” to get the students’ attention. The teacher then asks the students “What’s this say?” and the students read aloud the phrase on the flashcard, which is in English. The teacher then repeats the same phrase and confirms the students’ words as correct “Good morning. OK.” (line 5).

**Stage Two:** The teacher turns the flashcard over and as she reveals the Cantonese words on the other side, Man-Wai simultaneously says the phrase aloud “Jo² san⁵” (line 7) and the students immediately echo her model (line 8). This repetition of “Jo² san⁵” is carried out once more (lines 9 & 10). Although the students have already repeated the phrase twice without any overt instruction to do so, Man-Wai now formally asks them to repeat the phrase (“Now can you say Jo² san⁵?” line 11). This stage concludes with the teacher praising the students’ efforts: “Very good” (line 13).

**Stage Three:** Having had the children repeat the Cantonese phrase three times, the teacher now turns the flashcard over again to show the English phrase “Good morning” again. By using rising intonation on the words “that was?” as she pauses and turns the card over, Man-Wai signals her desire for the students to read aloud the English phrase again. The students oblige by saying “Good morning” (line 15). This stage is now brought to a conclusion by Man-Wai, who again repeats the phrase ‘Good morning’ and declares her satisfaction with the process by saying “Good.”

This three stage process is then repeated with the next pair of English/Cantonese flashcards showing “Good evening” and “Jo² tao⁵”. Man-Wai says “OK” to signal the start of the next instructional step and asks “What’s this say?” showing the new flashcard. In this way the process is again repeated.

Both children and teacher cooperate smoothly to create this familiar vocal patterning of the choral chant. In line 4, Man-Wai asks the students to read the English phrase “Good morning” which they do in a range of different individual normal voices with intonation that they would use to say the phrase meaningfully to someone. The same card is shown to them again in line 13 and this time they voice this in a mix of their normal and their chanting voice. By line 16 when the
second prompt card (“Good evening”) is introduced, the children have recognized
the pattern and are now using only their chanting voice which distorts the phrase
into: “Good eeev –en – ing.” The pattern of the choral chant has been recognized
and taken up by the children. From the analysis of this extract, it is clear that Man-
Wai has successfully established the use of the repetition genre with her students.

6.2.2 Building Significance

In this extract the teacher’s voice leads the students’ voices in an orchestrated
repetition of matched pairs of English and Cantonese phrases. The steps of this
particular dance are managed by the teacher through the displaying of the
different flash cards, some questions and the use of a particular intonation pattern.
The students provide eight instances of reading aloud from the flashcards,
although they are only asked to do so directly by the teacher on four occasions
(lines 3, 11, 17, 24). On three occasions the students recite from the flashcard
following the non-verbal prompt of an exaggerated rising intonation followed by a
pause and the showing of a flashcard (lines 6, 14, 21).

Man-Wai introduces all of this repetition activity with the explanation that she will
“teach you some new words in Cantonese” (line 1). All of the repetition from
flashcards is therefore being characterized as the teaching of new words.
Repetition is therefore the staple of vocabulary learning. Whilst she gives positive
feedback “Good” and “Very Good” she does not explain any aspects of the
vocabulary she is teaching, nor does she further elaborate on her statement that
Cantonese and Mandarin are “very different” (line 2). At one point, Man-Wai does
invite the students to step outside the routine of repeat after me, as she turns over
the card introducing “Good Evening” in Cantonese (line 20) and she then says
“Let’s see it’s  (. )?” uttering these words with a rising intonation and then
pausing whilst looking directly at the children. The children understand this
invitation to supply the rest of the utterance and they bravely offer “Jo² tao². 3. 5” in
a disarray of quiet voices using a mix of high and low tones. Man-Wai responds by
saying “Good” while smiling and showing by her facial expression and intonation
that she is pleasantly surprised by the children’s efforts. Having given this
encouragement, she then provides the correct model and asks them to accompany
her in saying the phrase. Although the children clearly were uncertain about the
appropriate tones to use, this information was left implicit in the repetition of the Cantonese phrase.

There is a moment in the building up of this repetition genre, when Man-Wai does hint at more conceptual tools of trying to discern patterns and make connections between new vocabulary items. In line 19, she suggests that “good evening is sort of the same as good morning”, which invites the students to find points of similarity, but Man-Wai does not go on to elucidate in what regard these two phrases are “sort of the same”. As with the pronunciation of items, the students are left to work out such features for themselves.

Bakhtin notes that: “When verbal disciplines are taught in school, two basic modes are recognized for the appropriation and transmission – simultaneously – of another’s words (a text, a rule, a model): “reciting by heart” and “retelling in one’s own words” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 341). The examples here are all of reciting by heart, where the teacher’s words are repeated verbatim by the children. There is no attempt to have the children make connections between the language examples being offered and how that language is operating. Making such connections, for example by exploring the constituents of *ngoh giu* to see that *ngoh* means “I” and can be used by the children to generate their own utterances, is not investigated.

### 6.2.3 Further Instances of Repetition Genre

Oral repetition was a central feature of the cultural teaching task in each of the 8 teaching pairs in the main study. For example, Chi-Wai and Ka-Man used extensive repetition during their teaching episode, as an instructional strategy to assist the children in learning Cantonese numbers from zero to ten. A brief extract from Ka-Man’s teaching episode demonstrates the use of repetition to review the pronunciation of the numbers from 0-10 in Cantonese before she then teaches the students to write these numbers.
### Transcript 6-5  Ka-Man reviews Cantonese Numbers

It is apparent in this discourse extract that Ka-Man is offering the opportunity to the students to call out the correct Cantonese number before she herself provides the model. However she leaves the students only a short time in which to answer – on average 2 seconds or less. She uses the same structure to review each number “Number two is ? so that the students’ can easily recognise the request and quickly supply the desired number. However, the combination of 7 voices calling out at different times makes most of the students’ answers unintelligible, hence the effect is that Ka-Man’s pronunciation of the numbers is the only audible one. The students then repeat her model several times before Ka-Man calls for the next number to be identified. As the review progresses Ka-Man introduces little mnemonics to try to help the students remember the different Cantonese sounds (lines 11 & 14). Oral drilling of new vocabulary items, with attempts to establish memorable associations for new lexis, appear to be the focus here.

Chi-Wai and Ka-Man themselves explain the staging of their activity and the rationale behind their use of repetition in the first focus group discussion:
### Transcript 6-6 Chi-Wai and Ka-Man Explain their Pedagogy

This transcript traces the way in which these two preservice teachers negotiate the framing of their respective teaching roles and how they then present this to their peers in an authoritative manner. Notably, Ka-Man’s use of the verb construction ‘historic would’ as in “he would introduce everything …” (line 4) presents the teachers’ actions as a settled and established routine built up over time rather than the first teaching of their cultural task to Australian primary students. This verb construction is used twelve times by Ka-Man in this short exchange. In each case she uses action verbs, such as “introduce, go give”, or causative verb forms “we’d have them matching” (line 10), which emphasise the powerful leadership role of the teacher. Her speech is punctuated by the use of so a connective linking...
causes to effects, and as she outlines the stages of their teaching she establishes that their teaching actions result in positive outcomes “So it was OK.” (line 12). So is used by Ka-Man on six occasions during this speech as a discourse marker to establish the stages of her rationale for their teaching approach. She begins her description with so and starts to outline the building of their activity: “so we actually did like the way we taught the class was ...” (Line 4). She then outlines how Chi-Wai opened the activity and then her part in setting up the matching game. She then says so again (line 9) but hesitates a moment and instead of continuing by giving an explanatory rationale, she instead gives details about the matching game. It is not until line 12 that Ka-Man picks up so again as she concludes the activity was successful. Her next use of so in line 19 prefaces the explanation that the use of rewards ensured students kept on-task: “so throughout the whole task you had to pay attention” (line 19-20). The change from talking about the students as ‘they’ to ‘you’ in lines 18-21 marks an increased confidence in Ka-Man’s speech as she recalls the power of the prize to attract students’ attention. Her utterances here are framed around three uses of so in quick succession, as a kind of crescendo culminating in: “so that was the way we tried to get them to pay attention” (line 21–22).

The strategic use of so as a contextualisation cue by teachers within classroom talk has been noted by Cazden (1988, p. 48). In the examples that Cazden provides, the teacher uses so with her student to introduce a sequence of questions designed to lead the student to make a connection between analogous situations. As a variation of this, in Ka-Man’s speech the strategic use of so helps to frame her rationale for their teaching activity as one of connecting the teachers’ actions with desired student outcomes of paying attention in order to remember the Cantonese numbers.

It is clear from their own description, that Chi-Wai and Ka-Man made extensive use of repetition in order to help the students say and identify numbers 0-10 in Cantonese. Repetition is being presented by these two participants as a way of learning new language items and this is then “reinforced” (line 2) through games and rewards. Their equation of learning with reciting is stated explicitly by
Chi-Wai: “They learnt the same lesson by reciting, doing the same thing. Reading and speaking, reading and speaking, reading and speaking” (lines 16-17). Chi-Wai’s comment connects learning not just with oral repetition, but with oral repetition in conjunction with reading also. Hence the use of the flashcards as a prompt. This is also a feature of Man-Wai’s use of repetition accompanied by reading of phrases in English and transliterated Cantonese (transcript 6.4).

6.2.4 Purposes of Repetition:

Why is repetition the core activity in the opening stages of Man-Wai’s and Chi-Wai’s teaching activities? The pattern of prompt ^ read aloud ^ repeat ^ confirm^ in Man-Wai’s activity (transcript 6.4) bears the hallmark of a language learning oral drill. It is interesting to note that this pattern is so well-established that even where the students are saying aloud a phrase in English, their native language, Man-Wai repeats the students’ utterance and confirms it as correct (transcript 6.4 lines 5 & 18), before moving on to the next step.

Second language learning research suggests that there are different types of repetition that differ qualitatively in terms of the levels of learning they promote. Repetition of language items, without any accompanying explanation or analysis (other than an evaluative as in “good”) constitutes a mechanical drill as it permits only one correct response and can be undertaken without any understanding of what is being practiced (De Keyser 2007, p. 11). Such repetitive drilling is distinguished from meaningful drills which require structural and semantic understanding of what is being uttered, and communicative drills which incorporate new information about the real world within the repetitive activity (De Keyser 2007, p. 11). Mechanical drilling of this type is a feature of an audio-lingual method of language teaching which favours modelling and repetition of language items based on behaviourist conceptions of language learning (Rodgers, 2001). Chi-Wai’s use of the word reinforced (line 1) and Ka-Man’s talk of rewards (line 4) are further indicators of a behaviourist approach. In their appropriation of this repetition genre as a mechanical drill these three preservice teachers clearly feel this is a productive strategy for language learning. Chi-Wai states confidently
“I taught them to say the words” (line 1) and “they learnt the same lesson by reciting ...” (line 3).

The audio-lingual method of language teaching fell into disfavour with the advent of the communicative approach in the late 70s and early 80s. Indeed, nowadays it is acknowledged that we are in a “post-method” moment in second language teaching where no one particular method offers the best route to language development and instead “principled eclecticism” is the order of the day (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). At the same time, other second language research literature notes the significance that adult learners themselves attach to being able to hear and repeat new language items many times although this does not necessarily have to take the form of an oral drill (Duff & Uchida, 1997).

From these extracts it appears that the main use of repetition genre by the participants in this study was as an aid to memorisation of new language items. This is not however, the only possible purpose in using repetition.

Duff (2000) suggests that nowadays the advantages of repetition are understood in a broader light in terms of scaffolding and instructional feedback via recasts, clarification requests, and so forth. Repetition in the form of instructional feedback such as recasts and other reformulations has a large research literature noting how this can assist language learning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Mackey et al., 2006; Ohta 2000).

It is notable in the data generated by this study, that the few moments of instructional feedback have been occasioned by the teacher stepping outside the traditional pattern of first modelling the language for the students and then having the students repeat this. In the extract below, Chi-Wai asks the students to guess the pronunciation and meaning of the Cantonese number which results in one of the few occasions when explicit attention is given to pronunciation features of Cantonese.

This example of instructional feedback arises through an interesting combination of eliciting guesses and repetition. Chi-Wai is introducing English transliterations of the Cantonese numbers from 0-10 to his group of seven Australian primary
schoolchildren. He has all the cards in sequential order. He has just introduced and practiced *ling/zero*. Now he shows the second card showing *Yat (Number one)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chi-Wai</td>
<td>And this one (shows Yat on flashcard). What do you think? Yes? Hands up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Number one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chi-Wai</td>
<td>Number one and how do you pronounce this word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>YaT ((strongly pronounced final /t/))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chi-Wai</td>
<td>Yat¹. Yes that’s very good but we don’t pronounce that “t” sound so <em>Yagh¹</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td><em>Yagh¹</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td><em>Yagh¹</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td><em>Yagh¹</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6-7  Chi Wai’s Instructional Feedback**

Chi-Wai reverses the usual privileged teacher role so instead of the teacher modelling the new vocabulary item, he enquires “How do you pronounce this word?” (line 3) which asks the students to guess the Cantonese sounds from the English transliteration on the card, without the benefit of first hearing the teacher produce it. When the student then offers a guess at the pronunciation which happens to be incorrect this proves to be an opportunity for the teacher to provide instructional feedback that the final ‘t’ is not sounded in Cantonese. A number of different student voices then repeat the revised pronunciation, before the teacher then moves on to the next number in Cantonese.

Examples of instructional feedback are quite rare in the data for this study, except for the classroom discourse produced by one particular teaching pair Mei-Kei and Tak-Wah. This pair are introducing five Chinese pictographs to their group of six Year Four boys. Mei-Kei first practices the writing of the pictographs representing: ear, people, door, water and moon. Then Tak-Wah takes over the teaching in order to focus on the pronunciation of these five Chinese words.
Chapter Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yun. Yes. People or person. OK, so what is the other word you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ear. Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>((Mei-Kei holds up the card showing 'Yee'))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Yee⁵, Yee⁵ ((low rising tone))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yes that's really very near but this is Yee³ ((mid-level tone))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Yee³, Yee³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>OK Jay you are very good so try and say that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Yee³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yes. Sam you try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Yee³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yeah I heard something correct. Now repeat after me Yee³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6-8  Tak-Wah teaching pronunciation**

The patterning of the language repetition is different in this extract when compared to that of Chi-Wai’s discourse in transcript 6.7 in which all initiations emanate from the teacher. Here is transcript 6.8, it is a distinguishing feature that the boys initiate the repetition of the word for *ear* as soon as they see the card with ‘Yee’ on it. They do not wait to be asked. Tak-Wah then gives them feedback on the quality of their pronunciation and provides the model for them (line 14). The students now repeat the modelled pronunciation. Tak-Wah then invites individual repetition of the modelled pronunciation, calling on individual students by name. There is a fluidity in the turntaking here which allows both students and teacher to initiate the action to develop the lesson.

The main use of repetition in both Chi-Wai’s and Tak-Wah’s discourse is to model pronunciation and to correct individual student’s pronunciation. I have included the two extracts to show the different approach used to achieve this goal. It is a point worth noting that, in the data for this study, the possibilities of instructional feedback are represented by just this one type of explicit corrective feedback. This restricted range of exemplars can possibly be accounted for by the relative inexperience of the participants who are beginner teachers not yet engaged in teaching fulltime. Likewise the short time available for classroom interaction may not have provided opportunities for deploying a wider range of feedback possibilities.
Repetition can also help to consolidate learning as is stated by Duff quoting Skehan (1998, p. 33 in Duff, 2000, p. 110) who notes that “in acquisitional terms, repetition in conversation can serve to consolidate what is being learned, since the conversation may act as an unobtrusive but effective scaffold for what is causing learning difficulty.” Repetition as language learning scaffolding also occurs as part of negotiation of meaning between interlocutors where communication problems are being clarified (Long, 1985, 1996). Repetition as scaffolding is also part of collaborative dialogue or “languaging” in which students work together in pairs or groups to solve language problems and build knowledge of the target language (Swain, 2005). This dialogic approach through peer collaboration has been found to play a significant role in language learning, as the students repeat and question language forms and meanings together therefore considering both the structural and semantic features of the second language items they are trying to produce (Donato, 1994; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Watanabe & Swain, 2007).

The affordances of repetition in language learning have been shown to be different in different contexts. The least productive type of repetition has been noted as other-repetition in the classroom context, consisting of students following the teacher in “recurrent use of obligatory, mechanical and often reductionist repetitions” (Silva & Santos, 2006, p. 18). By contrast, in conversations and interviews the language learner in Silva and Santos’ (2006) study “chooses when to use these repetitions, and she also decides what should be repeated: she develops ownership of her learning process and uses repetitions as an important learning tool as well as a productive strategy to assist her in her interactional work” (p. 18).

6.2.5 **Summary of Repetition Genre**

To summarise, this brief overview of some of the research literature indicates that repetition in second language teaching/learning has a range of applications beyond the choral repetition and opportunities for explicit correctional feedback which are the key features of repetition arising from the teaching activities in this study. The stated purpose of repetition was to help students to memorise new vocabulary items. To assist in this process of memorisation, both Man-Wai and
Chi-Wai followed up their use of repetition patterns by playing a matching game with their students. The details of these matching games form the content for the next section of data analysis.

6.3 The Matching Genre: “Put it where you think it goes.”

I begin this section by analysing an extract from Chi-Wai and Ka-Man’s teaching activity, where Ka-Man is organising a pairwork matching game. Each student pair is required to match one set of cards containing Arabic numerals 0 – 10 to another set displaying 0-10 in Chinese characters. On completing the task correctly, each student receives a lolly as a reward for their participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ka-Man</td>
<td>So right now find yourself a partner – or you can work as a three here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>((Tim shakes his head))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ka-Man</td>
<td>Oh you want to work alone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>((Tim nods and smiles))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ka-Man</td>
<td>That’s fine. OK. ( . )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>So now I have two cards for you. One is green and the other’s blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK. So on the green card there are Chinese characters and on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>these cards ((holding up blue cards)) there are numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>So exactly you have to match them. So the group who gets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>them correctly (. ) the fastest (. ) gets them all right gets the prize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((inaudible))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ka-Man</td>
<td>What’s the prize? OK. Right now ((starts handing cards to student pairs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’ll give the cards to you but you have to put them face down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not turn them over because if you do that means you’re cheating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>((teacher distributes remaining card packs)) OK. 3 ( . ) 2 ( . ) Now, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>can turn them over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((children turn over the cards and begin to match them))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6-9  Ka-Man sets up the Matching Game**

**6.3.1 Building the Activity: Ka-Man’s Matching Game**

The first striking feature of this extract of classroom discourse is how it is dominated by Ka-Man. In nineteen lines of text only three brief moments are punctuated by student input. The first two of these moments are negotiated by body language by Tim who indicates by facial gesture and head movement that he does not wish to work as a threesome with the two girls next to him. The only other student contribution results from Ka-Man’s mention of forthcoming prizes for completing the matching game (line 11). Although the students’ exact words are not audible on the sound recording, Ka-Man’s next utterance sounds like a repetition of the students’ words: “What’s the prize?” (line 12), but strategically Ka-Man does not provide an answer at this stage. The instructions are clear cut, carefully staged and brook no negotiation. The authority of the teacher is affirmed in the verbs she uses which emphasise her power as holder and distributor of the desired goods:

“I have two cards for you” (line 6)

“I’ll give the cards to you” *(line 13)*

By contrast, the students are positioned as subject to her will:
The phrasing of these instructions frames them as non-negotiable commands which the students must follow. The use of the imperative “Do not turn them over” (line 14) continues the strong tone. In case the authority behind these commands is still in doubt, Ka-Man explicitly states the moral requirement to follow the rules or else “you’re cheating” (line 14).

The matching game is organised with precision and characterised as a race with an actual countdown to a synchronised start so that no pair has a time advantage over another: “OK. 3 – 2 – Now ...” (line 15). All that the students are required to do is to place the appropriate green and blue cards together. They do not need to write anything, nor do they need to say anything, but as they are working in pairs the possibility of negotiating answers within the pair is being indirectly encouraged. Being able to do this involves recognising the Chinese characters for 0-10. There are no extra clues anywhere, no reference sheet to refer to for examples. The students are being asked to do this from memory based on the teaching during the last twenty minutes.

### 6.3.2 Building the Activity: Man-Wai’s Matching Game

Another example of the matching genre is found in Man-Wai’s teaching task, which consists of matching six everyday phrases of Cantonese to their English equivalents: Good morning/Jo² san⁵; good evening/Jo² tao⁵; goodbye/Jo⁵ geen³; my name is -/Ngoh² giu³; how are you?/Lay⁵ ho⁵ ma³?; thank you/ Ng⁴ goi¹. Prior to the matching activity, Man-Wai has already introduced the six Cantonese phrases and their equivalent English meanings to the students and had the students repeat the pronunciation of each. She now places each of the English phrase cards on the floor facing towards the students, who are sitting behind a semi-circle of desks. Man-Wai has the Cantonese phrase cards in her hands as she explains the matching activity to the students:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>So we’re gonna play a little game right now … OK. What I’m gonna do is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m gonna put these words down here ((spreads flashcards with English phrase uppermost over the floor facing the semi-circle of desks)) and hopefully you remember the words in Cantonese. OK? So I’m gonna ask ((counts number of students in group, under her breath)) Eight … OK, Who can do “Lay5 ho5 ma3”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>Oh I can … ((many student hands go up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Yes ((nominates a student to come and match cards))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>((moves from her seat and takes the flashcard from the teacher))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>OK put it where you think it goes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>((girl puts Cantonese phrase on top of English phrase “How are you?”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Who wants the next one “Jo2 san5”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((many student hands go up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>Yes ((signals to one student to come and take the card))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>((Student places Cantonese phrase on top of one of the English phrases))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Man-Wai</td>
<td>How about “Jo2 tau5”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((standing up with arm raised)) Oh I know I know pick me!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 6-10  Man-Wai Negotiates the Matching Genre**

From their enthusiastic bids to carry out the card matching task it can be seen that the students are enjoying the matching activity and are eager to participate. It is interesting how Man-Wai and the students negotiate the framework of this matching game with very few verbal instructions from Man-Wai:

What I’m gonna do is I’m gonna put these words down here (line 2) and hopefully you remember the words in Cantonese. OK? (line 4) So I’m gonna ask … Who can do “Lay5 ho5 ma3”? (lines 5 – 6)

The students respond immediately to her question, sitting up in their seats with one arm raised bidding to be chosen. The girl who is selected moves into the semi-circle of space, collects the flashcard from Man-Wai and it is only at this point that Man-Wai gives the instruction “OK put it where you think it goes” (line 10). The girl places the Cantonese transliteration on top of the appropriate English flashcard on the floor, without hesitation, and returns to her seat. Establishing the matching genre has been a very loosely negotiated affair, with the physical use of space - Man-Wai’s placing of the English cards in separate spaces on the floor – being one of the implicit indicators to the children of what would be required of them. The weaving together of Man-Wai’s actions and brief words along with the
use of the flashcards as props has provided sufficient contextual clues for the matching genre to be understood by the students. References to matching the cards are all implicit: “Who can do “Lay⁵ ho⁵ ma³?” (line 6), where the verb do is immediately understood as match the cards rather than say aloud or translate the phrase. Her next question asks: "Who wants the next one “Jo² san⁵”?", which in a less elided form would be “Who wants to match the next one...?”. By the third invitation, Man Wai only needs to ask “How about “Jo² tau⁵”?" (line 17).

6.3.3 Building Significance: Exploring Matching Genre

Gee (2005a) makes the point that the mind is a “pattern recognizer” and that it is our engagement in sociocultural practices and social contexts which provide the patterns or norms guiding our social actions, our values and the way we think and talk. Within the sociocultural context of this transnational classroom, what kind of learner values, behaviour and talk are being promoted through Ka-Man and Chi-Wai’s number matching activity and Man-Wai’s phrase matching activity?

In Ka-Man’s lead-in to the number matching game (transcript 6.9) she gives very clear instructions designating exactly what the students are to do. For the learners to do well in this context they need to carry out the teacher’s instructions exactly and achieve the goal of matching all the cards quickly and correctly. Negotiating options or asking for further information – as with wanting to have details of the prize (line 11-12) is not acceptable. The children indicate their implicit understanding of the rules of engagement here by not asking more questions or interrupting the teacher. At the beginning when the pairs are being organised and Tim wishes to be in a different arrangement, he achieves this outcome without any verbal negotiation at all.

In terms of a smoothly organised and clearly explained activity, these instructions are successfully accomplished and the children set to the activity with great enthusiasm. The learning focus of the matching game is explained by Chi-Wai to his peers in the follow-up focus group discussion as: “I showed them to read the Chinese numbers then you [Ka-Man] reinforced the idea later on by playing games” (transcript 6.6, lines 1-3). “Reinforcing the idea” suggests that Ka-Man’s matching game is providing further practice to help students memorise and retain the new
language items learnt. Ka-Man confirms this by stating that in the matching game the students “would have to ... implement their memory” (transcript 6.6, line 27).

In the other example of a matching activity, Man-Wai began this teaching episode by introducing and orally repeating the six paired English/Cantonese phrases, following this with a phrase matching game. At the beginning of the speech Man-Wai explicitly focuses the students’ attention on the need to remember the Cantonese phrases (line 4). As the majority of the matchings were correct it is reasonable to assume that the students had gained some awareness of the new phrases in Cantonese. Analysis of the participants’ data provides no further rationale for the use of matching other than its role in assisting memorisation of the target language items. This rationale is supported by the research literature in second language acquisition. The matching activity can be seen to be assisting memorisation of the new phrases by relating the Cantonese phrases to the children’s first language English phrases as *chunked items*, that is whole units of language to be stored as unanalysed chunks for later recall and retrieval. This kind of memory storage of large unanalysed units of language in early language learning is an acknowledged strategy of second language learning particularly at beginner levels where the cognitive load imposed by uptake of new vocabulary items is high (Ellis, 1985; Kormos, 1998, 2006). Ellis (1985) suggests that new language is initially taken up in larger unanalysed chunks as formulaic speech and stored in long term memory until the learner is ready to begin analysing the component elements at some later stage. Kormos (2006) cites more recent research studies confirming this learner strategy (p. 159).

It is notable that Man-Wai’s activity focuses on six socially meaningful phrases rather than on a range of decontextualised single vocabulary items which characterise the teaching focus of other teaching pairs such as Pik-Wah’s focus on food lexis or Chi-Wai’s teaching of numbers 0-10. Although Man-Wai and her partner, Wing-See, are teaching socially meaningful phrases, these were not built up into meaningful communication exchanges even though this could have been a possibility. For example, three of the six phrases could have been woven together into the beginning of a rudimentary greeting exchange using the Cantonese for:
“Good morning, my name's _____ How are you?” However, rather than develop the students' oral focus in this way, in the second part of their teaching activity Wing-See taught the students to write in Chinese characters the phrase Ngoh² giu³. Hence, having practiced pronouncing these Cantonese phrases the students were not provided with the opportunity to use the new vocabulary in any meaningful way. Such decisions indicate that teaching a second language for the purposes of spoken communication is not being identified here as a priority for the participants.

6.3.4 Summary of the Matching Genre

The matching activity has been noted as a common feature in the pedagogy of the participants in this study. Its function in terms of second language learning can be seen to be assisting memorisation of new phrases by allowing students receptive practice in linking second language lexical items to their first language equivalents. Both Ka-Man's number matching activity and Man-Wai's phrase matching activity focused the students on matching written forms of Cantonese and English lexical items. The approach to language learning appears to favour a repeat and memorise strategy to help students store new language items as formulaic speech or unanalysed chunks in long term memory awaiting later recall and retrieval (Ellis 1985; Kormos, 2006).

6.4 Summary

This chapter has explored how the participants have built language learning and cultural activities in and through their classroom Discourse. In establishing these activities, the participants drew on three notable genres of second language pedagogy: eliciting guesses, repetition and matching. Extracts of classroom talk evidencing these genres were analysed to understand how and why the participants took up these genres as part of their second language teaching activity in the transnational classroom. The analysis consisted of applying Gee’s seven building blocks of discourse analysis as tools of logical inquiry in the presentation, description, interpretation and explanation of the data (Gee, 2005).
Eliciting guesses Genre: An analysis of the literature noted that the affordances of eliciting guesses as an instructional strategy include:

- The development of cognitive skills in terms of ‘intuitive thinking’ so that students learn to make educated guesses and are able to distinguish plausible from irrelevant guesses (Bruner, 1960).

- The opportunity to find shared situated meanings through applying the eliciting guesses principle. Applying this principle would engage the student in drawing on available contextual knowledge to selectively work through a number of possible meanings to deduce which is the most appropriate or likely meaning in this particular context (Gee, 1996).

- Critical analysis of extracts of classroom discourse from the pilot and main studies revealed the following findings:
  
  - Neither the development of intuitive thinking skills or the eliciting guesses principle appear to underlie the use of the eliciting guesses genre, as the teacher provided no contextual clues as scaffolding to existing knowledge and no feedback on students’ guesses to allow refinement of their ideas.
  
  - The apparent purpose of incorporating the eliciting guesses genre in their pedagogy appeared to be to allow students some kind of interactive involvement in the staging of the lesson, although their responses did not impact on the predetermined organisation of the instructional design.
  
  - Eliciting guesses was seen as an activity to keep the students interested in the activity and therefore on-task, by making the lesson more fun. Hence it served a regulative rather than an instructional function (Bernstein, 2000).

Repetition Genre: an analysis of the classroom discourse revealed repetition being used to:
- Allow the teacher to first model the new language for the students to copy
- Give the students opportunities to practice speaking the new vocabulary
- Make links between written and spoken forms of words through visual prompts such as flashcards
- Allow instructional feedback on pronunciation to individual students

**Repetition Genre:** An analysis of the literature noted that the affordances of repetition as an instructional strategy include:

- Practice of the production of sounds, words, and phrases by reciting after the teacher. However, the quality of the learning afforded is seen as dependent upon whether the repetition requires structural and semantic understanding and also whether it incorporates some element of new information so that language use is meaningful (De Keyser, 2007).

- Provision of instructional feedback by the teacher reciting student's language in the form of recasts, clarification requests, elaborations, etc. (Lyster & Mori, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey, 2006; Ohta, 2000).

- Scaffolding language learning through *negotiation of meaning* where communication problems are identified and addressed (Gass & Varonis, 1985; Long, 1985, 1996).

- Scaffolding within collaborative dialogue where peers build their knowledge of the language by working together to solve language problems. Research shows that in their dialogues the students' use of repetition is an integral part of the process of revising and extending their understandings of language (Donato, 1994; Storch, 2002; Swain, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Watanabe & Swain, 2007).

- The discursive functions of repetition in promoting social cohesiveness and communities of learning by peers through repetition of each other's comments as well as by the teacher (Duff, 2000).
• Summary: Whilst SLA literature points to a wide range of language learning affordances through repetition, the participants in this study took up only two functions. The main use of repetition was to provide oral production practice at the level of mechanical drills. There was also some uptake of repetition as a tool in instructional feedback. Whilst second language acquisition research has noted six different categories of instructional feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), the data in this study demonstrated only one category: explicit corrective feedback.

Matching Genre: An analysis of the literature noted that matching as an instructional strategy was used to assist memorisation of the new second language lexical items by linking them to their first language equivalents. Use of the matching genre focused on the correct matching of written forms of the first and second language, as a comprehension activity rather than a production activity. As the Cantonese lexical items were offered for repetition and matching without any explanation other than their first language equivalents, it is suggested that they are being learnt as *formulaic speech* or unanalysed chunks for long term memory storage at this beginner language learning stage (Ellis, 1985; Kormos, 2006). It was noted that opportunities to incorporate more productive practice mirroring real-life communication exchanges were not pursued.
Chapter Seven

Constructing Second Language Teacher Identities

The previous chapter examined second language teaching through an analysis of social practices within the classroom. Three genres of classroom discourse: ‘eliciting guesses’, ‘reciting’ and ‘matching’ were investigated in detail to gain an insight into the preservice teachers’ tacit theories of language teaching/learning processes. The analysis was therefore exploring participants’ conceptions of what is involved in doing language teaching. This chapter now shifts attention to the issue of teacher identity and what is involved in being a second language teacher. In the current study, how the preservice teacher participants construe and construct the role of the teacher within the transnational context is examined through analysing the particular voices they take up within the classroom discourse. I use Bakhtin’s concept of voice to explore how the teacher’s role is shaped through dialogic relations and negotiations in the multivocal context of the classroom (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). How the preservice teachers in this study enact and negotiate particular institutional identities with their students through their pedagogy will materially affect whose voices are heard within the classroom and hence what kind of learning experiences are being offered (Gee, 1996, 1999, 2002, Hirst & Brown, 2008).

To assist me in my analysis of the data, I also take up the analytic tool of Discourse formats, which are patterns of classroom talk exploring the interplay of teacher and student voices in the classroom where the goal is to scaffold students’ existing understandings to incorporate the new knowledge or ways of thinking which are the focus of the lesson. In the current study, the new knowledge relates to the linguaculture of Hong Kong. In analysing the participants’ classroom discourse, I have found four distinctive Discourse formats. These formats I have called invitational, switching, scaffolding and collaborative, as descriptors of these different patterns of classroom discourse. Analysing the relative privileging of the
teacher’s and students’ voices within each of these four formats reveals the pre-service teachers’ different interpretations of how best to effect “the guided construction of knowledge” (Mercer, 1995). In the invitational and switching formats the teacher’s voice predominates and is vested with the power of authoritative giver of knowledge and organiser of learning. In the scaffolding and collaborative formats both the teacher’s and the students’ voices combine to work more collaboratively in the construction of knowledge.

In this chapter I also consider the lack of an expected format, the Authoritative format, which I had anticipated would emerge from the data but in fact did not. The non-appearance of this format is in itself an interesting feature arising from the transnational context of this study, which I discuss towards the end of this chapter.

This chapter is organised into five sections, with the first four sections highlighting one of the Discourse formats in turn: invitational, switching, scaffolding and collaborative. I describe and briefly discuss each of the four different formats in the following four stages:

- **Background Details**: some background details about the context in which the classroom discourse is embedded are provided
- **Discourse Extract**: one or more extracts of classroom discourse are presented and discussed as they exemplify particular features of the patterning of voices within the Discourse format
- **Participant’s Reflections**: the participants’ reflections upon their teaching episodes are given, where applicable, in their own words to show their interpretations of the classroom interaction
- **Discussion**: a brief discussion of the salient features arising from the discourse analysis is given, bringing to the foreground issues relating to teacher identity.

The chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the non-appearance of the expected authoritative format.
7.1 Invitational Format: “Have You Seen This Before?”

I begin with a description and analysis of the invitational format, which is represented in the interaction between Lai-Tai and her students. This extract appeared in chapter six as the classroom discourse representing the genre of eliciting guesses. I use the same extract here for the different purpose of investigating the privileging of teacher and student voices in order to see how these relations of power are played out within the invitational format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>So let’s start our activity today right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Yeh, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>OK. So first I’m going to show you something ((reaches into bag))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>something you may have seen before or no? OK so OK. Look at this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Do you know what is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Uh uh ((shaking heads))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>No idea eh ↑?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>((hand up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>((nod and eye exchange)) Yeh, Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Maybe a Chinese calendar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>((looks around the group for more offerings)) How about you Thomas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Have you seen this before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Nope ((shakes his head))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>((hand up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Yeh Mandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>A dreamcatcher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>A dreamcatcher um – yeh very good guess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK. I’ll tell you later what is the answer, alright? ((puts Fai Chun down))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>And then how about this? Dedum!((showing the firecracker))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>You put fire on it and it pops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Oh very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Did you hear what Thomas said? ((children nod their heads)) Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>OK. You put fire and then what will happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>It pops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>It pops. It’s called a firecracker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Do you know this is real ((shakes firecracker))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you know this is real?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>No it’s fake. You can touch it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>((children reach out immediately to touch it)). Yeh touch it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>It’s weird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lai-Tai</td>
<td>Yeh, actually it is made of paper and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>this is - Mandy no Thomas is correct - this is a firecracker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK I’ll put it on the floor and you can touch it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>And then have a look at these envelopes ((holds one up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it beautiful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript 7.1 Invitational Format: Lai-Tai and the Dreamcatcher

7.1.1 Building Identity, Relationships and Distributing Power

The invitational format privileges the teacher’s voice so that Lai-Tai has the sole right to shape the action and interaction. She is the voice of authority, the holder of knowledge, and the person in charge of when this knowledge will be distributed (“I’ll tell you later what is the answer” line 20). The teacher has the right to ask the questions and choose whose response is worth noting and following up on. For example, Mandy’s suggestion of the dreamcatcher is not taken up beyond the acknowledgement that it constitutes a “very good guess” (line 19). However, Thomas is liberally praised for recognizing the firecracker, not only is his guess “very good” (line 23) it is also “correct” (line 34). Having acknowledged the student’s input, the teacher is back in charge, asking and then answering her own question about whether the firecracker is real (line 28-30). This is a privileged voice which “permits no play with the context framing it, no play with its borders, no gradual and flexible transitions, no spontaneously creative stylizing variants on it ... It is indissolubly fused with its authority - with political power, an institution, a person - and it stands and falls together with that authority.” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342)

A more detailed analysis of the linguistic resources that Lai-Tai takes up highlights her contribution to the instantiation of this particular format. First of all, it is immediately apparent that the majority of the talk is accomplished by Lai-Tai. Whilst student utterances are often two or three words in length, Lai-Tai often commands two or three lines of talk in each of her turns (lines 3-5, 19-21). This predominance of teacher talk time is a common feature of what Cazden terms “traditional lessons” which are developed around the IRE framework (Cazden, 2001).

The use of pronominalisation in this discourse is an indication of how what is framed initially as a joint undertaking “Let’s start our activity” (line 1) becomes immediately a teacher-led activity “I’m going to show you something ...” (line 3). The use of pronouns establishes the participants in this interaction as being “I” the teacher, “you” the students, and “it” the artefact. Gee (2005) suggests that an analysis of “I-statements” can provide insights into the way different socially
situated identities are established in language (p. 141). In this talk it is only the teacher who uses “I-statements” doing so three times in this extract to signal her intended forthcoming actions:

I’m going to show you something (line 3)
I’ll tell you later what is the answer (line 20)
I’ll put it on the floor (line 35)

This language positions the teacher in a strong agentive role. She is the active force in the classroom the one who shows and tells and puts. The students by contrast are positioned as passive observers who are asked if they “may have seen” (line 4) or whether they already “know” (line 5) or if they could “hear” (line 24). The teacher is the one who sanctions their actions: “You can touch it” (line 30). She also pre-selects their vocabulary for them, as when showing the envelope at the end of the extract she asks them: “Is it beautiful?” (line 22).

Yet, Lai-Tai also seeks spaces where the children can join in the process by verbally eliciting guesses about what the items are. Lai-Tai is also careful to verbally encourage the students to keep their involvement. For example, she praises Ellen and Mandy for their suggestions about the Fai Chun “very creative” (line 11) and “very good guess” (line 19) even though she does not explore their responses further. She is enacting this as a jointly-constructed process of learning, although the students are actually kept in a peripheral role. The pattern of classroom interaction that is in evidence here is like “a kind of socioculturally meaningful ‘dance’” (Gee, 2000), which is being choreographed by Lai-Tai as she coordinates questions and responses, objects and students as part of her pedagogy.

In this extract, the children’s voices are heard approximately one-seventh of the time that is allocated to the teacher’s voice: 24 words compared to 178 words. I use the term words, but in fact a significant part of the students’ utterances consist of non-lexical items and gestural communication: “mm” (line 2); “Uh ↓ uh ψ” (line 6); “((hand up))” (lines 8, 16); “((shakes his head))” (line 15). Non-lexical items such as “mm” and “uh ↓ uh ψ” in speech have functions which include “low-overhead control of turn-taking, negotiation of agreement, signaling of recognition and comprehension, management of interpersonal relations such as control and affiliation, and the expression of emotion, attitude, and affect” (Ward, 2006,
Both the examples from the students’ speech fit into the category of “negotiation of agreement” and are given in response to a direct question from the teacher. These two non-lexical responses serve to provide feedback to the teacher without interrupting her speaking turn and without trying to initiate a new move. By responding in this way, the students are acknowledging the teacher’s stronger claim to hold the floor and to direct the flow of events in the classroom. The fact that the children raise their hands and wait to be invited to speak is a further acknowledgement of this asymmetrical power arrangement. There is only one student-initiated turn in this extract when Mandy touches the firecracker and declares: “It’s weird” (line 32). The teacher responds by agreeing and immediately takes back the turn by explaining what the firecracker is made from.

There is an interesting focus on the students as recorders of sensory data, being invited to “look” (line 5), “hear” (line 24) and “touch” (line 31). In this extract it is only the teacher who uses “I-statements”, the children do not take up agentive positions, they are inscribed by the pronoun you which designates you as a group (line 3) or you named individually (Ellen, in line 9; Thomas, in line 11; Mandy in line 17).

To sum up, both the teacher’s and the students’ use of linguistic resources in this interaction are positioning the students as compliant listeners rather than active speakers. The invitational format privileges the teacher’s voice as the holder of knowledge and the legitimate organizer of activities. Student voices are invited to contribute to the central lesson activity only in terms of recognizing the elements that the teacher has already selected for instruction. The teacher takes up the subject position of powerful leader and invites student comment or participation at selected moments in the classroom discourse to maintain their participation in the teacher-led activity, but not to empower their voices.

7.2 The Switching Format: “You Choose”

Turning attention to a consideration of how the Switching format is constituted, we start to see a change in the privileging of the teacher’s and students’ voices. While the teacher’s voice is still accorded institutional power, there are moments when the teacher delegates this privilege and allows students the opportunity to
step into the teacher's shoes as it were, for a few moments. An example of this comes from Pik-Wah’s teaching activity which introduces the students to Cantonese names for food items.

Pik-Wah commenced the activity by giving her six primary Year Four students a sheet of paper containing pictures of different food, including some pizza, tofu, eggplant, hamburger, and so forth. In pairs the students identified and named the different items in English. Pik-Wah checked these through with the students and then she held up flash cards containing the English names for certain foods (corn, eggplant, noodles, rice and so forth). Holding up the flashcard, Pik-Wah then verbally modelled the Cantonese name for this food item. She asked the students to repeat the Cantonese pronunciation for each item twice. Pik-Wah then wrote the Chinese sounds on the flashcard using English script, for reference. When all the Cantonese names had been practiced, Pik-Wah announced she would “test” the children to see if they could remember the vocabulary. She then held up one flashcard after another, showing the English words and asked for the matching Cantonese word. The students were able to supply the correct answers. At this point, Pik-Wah invited the students to choose one of the flashcards, read out the English name and call on a friend to supply the Cantonese equivalent. The following extract tracks the change from a teacher-led activity to one in which the students’ voices are starting to shape the classroom discourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Now it’s time to test your memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Oh Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>What is corn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Dat. Mai. Mai², Suk¹ Mai²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Mushrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Oh Gu¹, Gu¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Vegetables?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Chow. Chow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Choy³, Choy³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Choy³, Choy³, Choy³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Now (.) I’ll have you, one of you, to pick this (.) pick one ((holds cards out to a student who takes one)), and choose one of your groupmates and see if they remember the pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>((reads from her card)) Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Beans is Mai²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Oh Dou⁵, Dou⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Yes, Patrick is right. Do you want to choose the next one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>((selects a card)) Mushrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((inaudible))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>It’s sticky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Goo. Gu¹, Gu¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 7.2 Switching Format: Pik-Wah Reviews Vocabulary**

### 7.2.1 Building Identity, Relationships and Distributing Power

Looking down the list of speakers in this discourse extract it is clear when Pik-Wah hands over the organizing of the activity to the students. The pattern from line 1 - 11 has consisted of alternating voices: students and then Pik-Wah. However from line 15 – 22 Pik-Wah’s voice is only one of four other voices that make themselves heard. She is still there in line 17 as the final authority on when the correct answer has been achieved. Likewise she still directs the turn taking by inviting the next student to take a card. However, at the end of the extract we start to see a student giving cued elicitation to guide his friends to the correct answer “It’s sticky” (line 20) as an association for the Cantonese sound “gu¹” (line 21).

The preservice teachers’ own views of what they have achieved by this change in organisational approach gives insight into their view of the relative positions of the teacher and the students, as discussed during their stimulated recall interview, transcript 7.3. Both Pik-Wah and her partner Lai-Shan felt they had made a
positive achievement by encouraging the students to lead the vocabulary reviewing activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 7-3  Pik-Wah & Lai-Shan, Stimulated Recall.**

In Transcript 7.3, Pik-Wah and Lai-Shan provide their own perspective on the interaction they negotiated with the students. Lai-Shan notes that this opportunity to take up a more powerful classroom role is welcomed by the students: “they feel like they are the teacher or like leader of the group. Everyone are listening to them” (lines 14-15). In Lai-Shan’s view the children savour this ability to direct events and organise the turn-taking as part of this temporary positioning as teacher.

The classroom discourse format that they negotiated with the students is one that I have termed a Switching format. Both Lai-Shan and Pik-Wah are happy to temporarily relinquish the role of teacher as event organizer and instead allow the students to direct the vocabulary pronunciation task themselves. This brief empowering of the student voice, where they are allowed to step momentarily into the teacher’s role is a kind of “ventriloquating” of the teacher’s voice. ‘Ventriloquating’ captures very well the situation where they are making use of the teacher’s linguistic resources – such as the ability to nominate for responses – but
these resources remain the teacher's privilege and are only being 'borrowed' momentarily (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 299). However, such a temporary experiencing of the teacher's role only serves to underscore the very clear divide between the power invested in the teacher's voice and the lack of this in the students' voices generally. Referring back to transcript 7.2, reveals these inequities quite clearly, as Pik-Wah reviews the food lexis she has just introduced. Informing the students that “it's time to test your memory” (line 1), she establishes a very fast paced question and answer session (lines 3 – 10). This is such a speedy verbal test that Pik-Wah dispenses with the traditional IRE genre, not bothering to provide the evaluation move unless the students’ response is wrong as in line 8 when the students say “chow” instead of “choy” for vegetable so Pik-Wah recasts this for them (line 9) and the students repeat this (line 10). Students are positioned as respondents who are required to quickly and correctly call out the names for things that the teacher has just taught them. They are displaying their ability to recall knowledge, they are not being asked to make links between those items of information, nor to extrapolate from this knowledge to new thinking.

Having checked that the students can provide the Cantonese names, Pik-Wah now hands over the organising of the activity to the students:

Now (. ) I’ll have you, one of you, to pick this ( . ) pick one ((holds cards out to a student who takes one)), and choose one of your groupmates and see if they remember the pronunciation (transcript 7.2, lines 11-13)

The language she uses to effect this change is itself the language of unquestioned command using an opening “I- Statement” rather than an invitational “would you like to...?” and moving straight into a series of imperative verb forms: “pick this” “choose one” and “see if...”. She may be delegating the leader's role, but it is clear that the students are only allowed to take up this role within very narrow and clearly delineated boundaries.

7.3 Scaffolding Format: “Can I Tell You Something?”

To provide an example of the scaffolding voice, I have here included an extract from the teaching episode of Wan-Yee and Oi-Yan which brought together a focus on four Fai Chun with a discussion of customs relating to candy giving and to
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giving money gifts in small red packets at Chinese New Year. The action in the following extract takes place about two-thirds of the way through Wan-Yee and Oi-Yan’s teaching activity as Wan-Yee discusses the contents of the candy boxes with six Primary Year 4 children, two boys and 4 girls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wan-Yee</td>
<td>((Wan-Yee has opened up a four-layered candy box containing traditional chocolates given out at Chinese New Year. She has asked the students to notice the features of these chocolates))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>So can you found any common feature among these chocolates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((3 Children’s hands go up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes! ((Wan-Yee is smiling, nodding and pointing at the girl)) Yes the colours – red and gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Can I tell you something?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wan-Yee</td>
<td>Red is a very lucky colour in Chinese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Gold is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wan-Yee</td>
<td>Yes, gold and red. Yes. Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Chinese people believe that gold and red colour can bring them good luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Yes ((children nod their heads agreeing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wan-Yee</td>
<td>And one more very traditional food ((holding up a packet of melon seeds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Very good. We call these red melon seeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 7-4  Scaffolding Format, Wan-Yee and the Melon Seeds

7.3.1  Building Identity, Relationships and Distributing Power

There is a clear sense of shared excitement in the pace and interweaving of voices as the teacher and children work together to discover what makes these foods special for Chinese New Year. Wan-Yee begins the discussion with an open-ended question inviting students to look for points of comparison, rather than requesting a display of previously taught items which characterises the classroom discourse of many of Wan-Yee’s colleagues. It is particularly interesting to see how the typical IRE format is disrupted by the children (line 12) when Kyle initiates a request to become the expert and to inform Wan-Yee about the significance of the colour. In line 14, Kyle takes up what is usually the teacher’s initiating move of
presenting a declarative statement to the class about red being a lucky colour in Chinese. This information is immediately responded to by James, who contests this point. Wan-Yee steps in (line 16) to provide the teacher’s typical evaluation “Yes. Very Good” (line 16) and then offers her own response confirming both boys’ comments as correct and that both gold and red are considered lucky colours. This is an opportunity for the children to take up the evaluation move as they confirm Wan-Yee’s statement with “Yes, Yes.” (line 19). In this exchange the usual IRE pattern is in fact taken up by a number of different voices and there is an interesting sense here of joint construction of the information.

Van Lier (2001) has noted the scaffolding potential of IRE where the goal is more than “mere repetition and display, [it] can be regarded as a way of scaffolding instruction, a way of developing cognitive structures in the zone of proximal development, or a way of assisting learners to express themselves with maximum clarity” (p. 96). For this scaffolding to be effective, he suggests that there must be the moment of “handover” when the learners can take up a more autonomous role. He posits that this will involve a “switch from IRF to more open discourse structures” (p. 96) and in the disruption to the usual IRE patterning above I believe we see this kind of movement taking place.

In the scaffolding format whilst the teacher’s voice is initially privileged as the disseminator of knowledge, her intent appears to be to co-construct the discourse about Chinese New Year customs by incorporating student voices into the evolving commentary on the candy boxes and their contents. When students are ready to voice their own knowledge and thoughts, the teacher is happy to relinquish her control of the interaction and allow their voices to be heard.

In the scaffolding format we start to see a consistent move toward collaborative learning where student voices are also able to contribute materially to the developing topic and themes. As Mercer (1995) explains,

The concept of ‘scaffolding’ is useful for describing how one person can become actively involved in another’s learning activity, in such a way that the learner has an active role and yet is able to progress further and more easily than they could have done alone. (p. 84)
It is no longer just the teacher’s voice that is privileged in the classroom. This is a markedly different dialogue to that of Lai-Tai, for example, where students’ comments had to fit into the teacher’s evolving script or not be accepted (see transcript 7.1 and the discussion of the invitational format above). This interplay of voices between Wan-Yee and the students in which insights into Chinese New Year customs are being shared and extended I have identified as an exemplar of a scaffolding format. In using this term I am drawing directly on the ideas of Vygotsky (1986) and his concept of the zone of proximal development whereby a learner is able to achieve progressive mastery of concepts or skills with the support of someone more expert than herself, as discussed in more detail in chapter three. In this extract of classroom talk it is clear that the focus is on weaving the students’ insights into the unfolding discourse, so that Kyle’s comment “I love seeds” (line 22) is taken up by Wan-Yee as introducing necessary vocabulary for a discussion of the new food item. She praises him for correctly identifying the seeds “Yes. Very good” (line 23) and then builds on his comment by drawing attention to the colour and kind of seeds they are.

In this scaffolding format, while the teacher and students are negotiating learning together, the power relations are inevitably uneven as it is the teacher’s voice that is guiding and extending the students’ contributions. Within a scaffolding framework such power relations are a feature of the expert/novice relationship and require constant dynamic and sensitive negotiation (Renshaw, 2004). This move towards a more collaborative and dialogic engagement in learning processes is taken to a stronger position in the classroom discourse of Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei which is analysed in the next section as an example of the collaborative format.

7.4 The Collaborative Format – “What do you want to know?”

Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei’s teaching activity centred on introducing 5 Chinese pictographs to the students: moon, person, ear, water, door. Tak-Wah begins the teaching activity and has some initial difficulties because he has not explained to the children that he is visually impaired and cannot see their raised hands. The teachers and students collaborate to work out an alternative way of responding.
### Stanza One:  Beginning the teaching activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>We are from – where are we from? Do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((2 boys’ politely put their hands up without calling out. They wait to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
<td>be chosen to answer the question.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Mei-Kei</td>
<td>[OK, just shout out]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>[You don’t know?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>We are from Hong Kong in China, so we are from Hong Kong. We are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g</td>
<td></td>
<td>going to talk about the culture in China. Have you ever been to China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>((Shane puts his hand up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>((Peter puts his hand up and speaks)) ( ... ?) learning Mandarin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Oh you know Mandarin! Anyone else know some Mandarin?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stanza Two:  Tak-Wah introduces a new way to respond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Mei-Kei</td>
<td>((Mei-Kei whispers to Tak-Wah suggesting that he explains his visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>impairment to the students))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>O.K. And I want to tell one more thing about myself. I am visually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
<td>impaired so that means I can’t see you. So you can understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>So when you want to answer the question you can call out your name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td></td>
<td>and I will know who you are and I can ask you to answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stanza Three:  Tak-Wah discusses tones in Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>... OK. How many tones are there in Mandarin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>((Puts up his hand)) 10?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>O.K. any more guesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>((Peter, Shane and Nick put up their hands))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Shane. 5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Nick. 3?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stanza Four:  Tak-Wah teaches pronunciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>... I'm going to teach you the words you wrote just now. OK? So, onto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>the first page. So what are the words that you want to know? What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td></td>
<td>is - water?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>People. People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>OK so listen now. I'm going to tell you the Cantonese of ‘people’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>[OK I’m ready]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>People is ‘Yun’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Yun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yun. Try to follow me: one, two, three, Yun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>[Yun Yun]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4l</td>
<td>Tak-Wah</td>
<td>Yes, yes. Very good ((3 students start clapping and smiling at their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m</td>
<td></td>
<td>success)) Very accurate - just like the Cantonese. OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4n</td>
<td></td>
<td>So what is the other word you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4o</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ear. Ear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 7-5  Tak Wah and Mei Kei Introduce Pictographs**
7.4.1 Building Identity, Relationships and Distributing Power

**Stanza One:** The speech in stanza one demonstrates the initial communication difficulty faced by Tak-Wah, where he was unable to detect the students’ bidding for the right to speak by having raised up their hands. At this point, Tak-Wah has not yet informed the students about his visual impairment. Mei-Kei realizes the problem and tries to remedy the situation by telling the boys to shout out their answer, but this is an unusual request (most class teachers discourage students from calling out) and the students remain silent. Tak-Wah continues to invite the children to share their knowledge of Hong Kong and again they respond politely by raising their hands and waiting to be chosen to speak. Both Shane and Peter raise their hands and then Peter begins telling Tak-Wah that they are learning Mandarin. Tak-Wah invites further input from the students by asking who else knows some Mandarin. The students are looking enquiringly at Tak-Wah and are noticeably uncertain how to proceed as they are not sure whether he can see them clearly. The teacher’s usual turntaking cues of eye contact and accepting the bid from one of the raised hands are not in operation here.

**Stanza Two:** The class teacher has been watching this and takes Mei-Kei aside advising her to ask Tak-Wah to explain to the children about his visual impairment. Mei-Kei whispers this advice to Tak-Wah who then informs the children (line 2b). The students confirm that they understand his situation and his request that they call out their names when they want to answer (line 2d).

**Stanza Three:** This extract picks up the classroom interaction about ten minutes later when Tak-Wah begins teaching his part of the planned activity. Mei-Kei has already introduced the five pictographs and practiced writing them with the students. Now Tak-Wah is going to teach them the pronunciation of the five words. He begins by introducing the topic of tones, building on the students’ current learning of Mandarin at school. In line 3d, Tak-Wah asks the students to tell him the number of tones in Mandarin, which he will later contrast with the number of tones in Cantonese. Rather than simply telling the students, Tak-Wah asks the students if they can tell him. When it is clear that they are unsure of the answer, he invites them to guess. What is noticeable in this interplay of voices in stanza three is how the children have taken up Tak-Wah’s earlier request for them...
to identify themselves verbally before answering (lines 3h and 3j). Whilst the students still put up their hands in the customary bidding gesture, they also call out their answers as requested earlier. Two of the boys remember to give their name first so that Tak-Wah can identify their responses. The activity proceeds at a lively pace and the students are engaged and eager to contribute as shown by their frequent raised hands and their verbal contributions.

**Stanza Four**: Whilst stanza three demonstrates the cooperative nature of the students in taking up a new system to operationalise turn-taking, stanza four shows how both teacher and student voices are working together to produce the lesson content. Tak-Wah could simply have modelled each of the five pictographs in turn and asked the students to repeat his pronunciation. Instead he asks the students to make the selection and they do so with great enthusiasm (lines 4d, 4e and 4o). These two extracts from Tak-Wah’s dialogue reveal the possibility of establishing a collaborative format both in the regulative and instructional elements of the pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 2000). In this classroom discourse both the teacher’s voice and the students’ voices are privileged as they work together to co-construct the language learning activity.

This cooperative approach, with the students rapidly adopting a new classroom communication routine (notice how Shane verbally clarifies his readiness to participate in line 4g) and actively sharing in the shaping of the lesson was something which impressed both Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei. Their comments are given in the following discourse extract from their stimulated recall interview with the researcher.

The following extract (Transcript 7-6) is from the stimulated recall interview between Tak-Wah, Mei-Kei and the researcher. Mei-Kei is holding the DVD control and replaying the recording of their first teaching activity. Tak-Wah is asking Mei-Kei to stop the DVD at the point where he is explaining to the students about his visual impairment.
Tak-Wah’s previous practicum in Hong Kong was with visually-impaired students, so this is the first time that he has had to set up this interaction routine in a mainstream classroom setting. Both he and his teaching partner Mei-Kei are impressed by the adaptability of these students to adopt a new system of classroom communication. As Tak-Wah said, “I have never thought that students can be so cooperative, and they can change their mode of communication in such a short time” (lines 9-11). For my part as researcher, I am impressed by the way these two beginner teachers were able to work with these students to establish a collaborative format so economically and effectively.

7.5 The Missing Format: No “Authoritative Format” Found

When viewing and reviewing the DVDs of classroom discourse generated by the participants and their students, I had initially expected to find examples of what could be termed an “Authoritative Format”. This “Authoritative Format” would have been an example of the most privileged teacher voice at its most monologic, according to discursive constructions of the traditional transmission mode of classroom discourse which supposedly typifies “Asian” classrooms (Ballard & Clanchy, 1991). Indeed, an expectation of negotiating such a discourse format was expressed by one of the participants in her focus group discussion following her
first teaching activity (Transcript 7.8, Wei-Li). However, contrary to Wei-Li’s expectations no authoritative format emerged instead the students took up a very assertive position, from her viewpoint. Before analysing this focus group discussion, it is first necessary to provide some background to the situation by exploring the classroom interaction between Wei-Li and her students.

Wei-Li began her teaching of the cultural activity by introducing some “Fai Chun” which are lucky messages or blessings that are traditionally given to family and friends at Chinese New Year. She was teaching a small group consisting of five boys from Primary Year 4. Having explained the Fai Chun, Wei-Li organised the students to individually copy a four-character blessing onto a sheet of red paper. The students then copied a second blessing consisting of two characters onto a sheet of coloured paper. In the closing stage of her teaching episode, Wei-Li suggested that the students write their name on the blessing. The students did so and then one student asked what his name would be in spoken Chinese. Wei-Li told him and then the other four boys asked for their names. As the boys had finished copying their “good luck” Fai Chun, Wei-Li suggested they make some small ones for their mothers and fathers and other family members. The boys copied the characters onto the small squares of paper and as they did so they asked to know the Chinese equivalents for some of the names of their family members and the names of their pets. I include here an extract from the transcript of this final part of the interaction, so that the reader can partake in this classroom interaction, almost like an onlooker from the sidelines.
### Transcript 7-7 Wei-Li's Students make Fai Chun.

**7.5.1 Negotiating Classroom Roles**

It can be seen from this transcript that unlike traditional features of classroom talk, it is the students that are taking up most of the talk time. The students have ten speaking turns, while Wei-Li takes up only five turns. The turns are all fairly short and are interspersed with the writing and inspecting of Chinese characters.

Looking at Wei-Li’s five turns we can see that she is maintaining a guiding role, keeping the students focused on their task. In line 1, she is handing out more materials to allow students to produce extra Fai Chun for their family members. Although she is not dominating the talk time, she clearly has the position of power as is evidenced in her use of modal verb forms as she opens by granting the students permission: “You can write one for your dad…” (line 1) and the use of the imperative when directing a student: “make this longer” (line 13). The student responses show that they are on task, enthusiastic and accept the teacher’s authority. Student 1 responds to Wei-Li’s provision of more paper for Fai Chun with an expression of approval (“Cool!”, line 2), and student 2 seeks the teacher’s permission to make a Fai Chun for another person (“Can I write one for my step mum?” (line 3) to which Wei-Li gives her permission “Sure” (line 5). When Wei-Li...
asks a question: “do I stick it on the wall like this?” (line 11), a student immediately provides an answer (line 12). Clearly, the activity is moving along well and the students are actively engaged. This appears to be a successful learning experience.

However, these few short exchanges also show that this is not the usual IRE pattern operating here. While the teacher initiates the action (line 1), student 1 then responds with an evaluative move (line 2). When Student 2 asks the teacher a question (line 3), this produces another response by student 1 explaining who his Fai Chun is for (line 4) and it is only after this student’s comment that the teacher’s response to the question is heard (line 5). It can be seen from this transcript that the children are not only listening to the teacher, but interacting with each other also in between. Another characteristic of this interaction is that the children are comfortable with initiating questions: “How do you say my name again?” (line 15) and another student asks “How do you say my name in Chinese?” (line 16). Whilst the students are comfortable with the activity and the interaction, it becomes evident from Wei-Li’s comments to her peers afterwards that she does not share their perspective.

In the following extract from her focus group discussion, Wei-Li describes the closing stages of this teaching episode to her friends, Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei. Wei-Li is responding to one of the guiding questions for the focus group discussion: “To what extent were your efforts to engage the students successful? What evidence do you have?”. In reviewing her teaching activity, Wei-Li raises issues regarding her expectations about student and teacher roles in the classroom. In analyzing this discourse extract I use Gee’s concept of “narrative macrostructure” as the discourse falls naturally into the first four categories of setting, catalyst, crisis and evaluation (Gee, 2005, p. 128).
Chapter 7

**Transcript 7-8  Wei-Li, “What we’re supposed to do”**

### 7.5.2 Analysing Disrupted Role Expectations

**The Setting**

To address the focus group question about engaging the students Wei-Li has elected to talk about the events in her teaching episode that happened after the students had completed their main task of copying the Fai Chun messages, and they were now making supplementary Fai Chun for their family members. The students then wanted to know the Cantonese for their names and the names of their family members.

**The Catalyst**

The setting is established very economically in less than 15 words (lines 1-2). However, Wei-Li then elaborates on the details of this teacher/student interchange, describing how the primary students requested a series of Cantonese
names for family members, including their pets. To appreciate how lines 3-8 are establishing the cause of the crisis, we need to focus attention on the way that Wei-Li delivers this account. She uses the same syntax in lines 4-6, “they ask their (family member’s) name”, to emphasise the repeated nature of the requests. These lines are delivered using the same intonation contour each time, with the stress falling on the family member’s name. This repetition of the same syntax and intonation builds up the drama and anticipation in her description. The pace quickens as she shortens the utterances to just three words implying how the student’s requests for translations were coming faster, relentlessly (lines 7-8). As another family member is added to the list, there is an accompanying raising of Wei-Li’s voice pitch, and an increase in loudness culminating in a crescendo on the inclusion of the family pet in the list of required names, “their dog’s name”.

It is clear from Wei-Li’s intonation, her rising voice pitch and increasing speaking speed during these utterances that this episode is one of high drama and emotional content. This is a drama which the other group members can share: Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei join in with their laughter at the comic turn of events which Wei-Li is describing (lines 6 and 8).

The Crisis

Having outlined the build up of events, Wei-Li now delivers the punchline in the next utterance, explaining “that is when it became student-centred” (line 9). At this point, Wei-Li now links these events back to the question that opened this discussion, equating “engaging your students” with becoming “student-centred”. Wei-Li makes it clear that her conception of “student-centred” negatively frames the student/teacher interaction as “totally off task”, where attention has been diverted to irrelevant or inappropriate things which they should not be doing: “we’re totally off task, we’re not doing what we’re supposed to do” (line 10-11). She elucidates further that things are amiss by explaining “we’re actually answering their questions”. The nature of the problem is now clear enough for Mei-Kei to cut in and provide a summary of the main point: “the students take your role,” which she utters as an authoritative statement with strong falling intonation on ‘students’ and the final word ‘role’.
The Evaluation

Mei-Kei’s understanding of the problem is immediately confirmed as correct by Wei-Li who agrees “they took my role” and continues with her own evaluation that it is because she kept responding to the students’ questions that this process continued. The implication that answering students’ questions like this is somehow “off-task” is made clear by Wei-Li’s comment that “we” [as students] are not doing what “we” [as teachers] are supposed to do (line 11) and Wei-Li and her partner should have told the students to stop because this is outside what the students needed to know and do (line 16).

So far the setting, the catalyst, the crisis and the evaluation have been identified in Wei-Li’s narrative. Gee’s (2005) macrostructure contains two further categories of narrative analysis: a ‘resolution’ and a ‘coda’. Wei-Li does not continue her narrative into these two areas and hence whether or how her dilemma was resolved remains unknown. However, what is clear is that this episode did constitute a dilemma for Wei-Li in her teaching, which her group members acknowledge as the problem of “the students take your role”. Wei-Li and Mei-Kei together construct and confirm this negative reading of the situation where the students have initiated a series of personal questions during the teaching of the cultural task. Tak-Wah notably does not contribute any utterance to this segment of the discussion, but his laughter is audible throughout and thus he is sharing the humour of this unusual situation. He also does not offer any counter interpretation during this exchange. We can therefore draw the inference that the group members understand Wei-Li’s interpretation of events, whether they share her viewpoint or not.

Analysis of the speech extract suggests that one of the features of this Discourse model appears to be the teacher’s sole right to ask the questions in classroom interaction. From the negative response to the students taking up this right and initiating questions about names in Cantonese, it would seem that there are limitations on what students’ can acceptably ask questions about. This view emphasizes that the teacher knows what is worth knowing, whilst the students’ interest in Chinese names is “off-task”. When Wei-Li finds herself caught up in answering the students’ questions, this preservice teacher interprets the situation...
as “not doing what we’re supposed to do” (line 11). By contrast, we can conjecture that Wei-Li’s view of what she should be doing is “the task” which is outlined in her lesson plan and consists of introducing and explaining ‘Fai Chun’.

Analysis of Wei-Li’s speech reveals her expectation of being able to shape the classroom discourse as an “authoritative format” in which only the teacher’s voice is privileged as the sole holder of knowledge (“stop, we only need to know ...” line 16) and the initiator of instructions and questions. This has resonance with the role expectations stated by the Indonesian LOTE teacher, Pak Asheed (Hirst & Indirawati, 2004; Hirst, Renshaw and Brown, 2009). Attempts by the students to initiate questions are seen as problematic and trying to usurp the teacher’s authority (“the students take your role”, Transcript 7.8, Mei-Kei, line13). These initiations by the students have positioned Wei-Li in a space outside the familiar patternings of her existing discourse of second language teaching. Her responses show her resisting this new positioning, adopting a tone bordering on indignation at this turn of events. We will revisit Wei-Li’s conception of the legitimate role of the teacher and student in chapter eight, where more of her speech extracts are analysed and discussed.

7.6 Summary

In this chapter I have explored the interplay of student and teacher voices and the different patterns of classroom discourse they have formed. These patterns of voices have been investigated using the conceptual tool of discourse formats which provide insights into the negotiations around identity and power relations. Analysis of the discourse generated by the participants during the classroom interaction and in ensuing reflective discussions amongst the preservice teachers has led to identification of four discourse formats, each discernible by a variation in the relative privileging of the teacher’s and students’ voices. These four discourse formats I have termed: Invitational, Switching, Scaffolding, and Collaborative. There are some areas of overlap in the discourse extracts, but for the purpose of this analysis I have highlighted the most significant aspects which characterise these formats, as summarised in the points below:
The ‘Invitational Format’ privileges the teacher’s voice and only permits students’ voices to be heard at certain times in certain allocated spaces as defined by the teacher. However, the students’ voices are not taken up into the classroom discourse and do not shape it materially. (Transcript 7.1, Lai-Tai).

The ‘Switching Format’ is characterised by the privileging of the teacher’s voice with occasional spaces in the discourse where students’ voices can momentarily step in to ventriloquate this privileged voice themselves, somewhat like playing at being a substitute teacher briefly. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 299). (Transcript 7.2, Pik-Wah).

The ‘Scaffolding Format’ uses the privileged teacher’s voice to encourage and draw in student voices as part of the unfolding action. The teacher scaffolds the students until they are ready to initiate the discourse themselves, disrupting the typical IRE pattern of classroom talk. Students are given “ample opportunities to make their voices and represent their selves” (Luk, 2005, p.261-2). (Transcript 7.3, Wan-Yee).

The ‘Collaborative Format’ privileges both the teacher’s and the students’ voices allowing a spontaneous heteroglossic flow of contributions to the co-construction of the activity. The students’ voices are not adjuncts to the teacher’s voice they are instead integral to the flow of the classroom discourse and practices (Transcript 7.4, Tak-Wah).

It was noted that an anticipated format, the authoritative format, did not emerge from the data although one of the participants Wei-Li clearly had expected to be able to negotiate this format with her students and was frustrated accordingly (Transcript 7.8, Wei-Li).

In negotiating either an invitational or switching format in the classroom, the teacher’s voice is privileged over that of the students’. However in establishing a scaffolding or collaborative format both the teacher’s and the students’ voices are empowered which allows students to co-create and contribute materially to the development of the lesson and the processes of learning. In negotiating either a
scaffolding or collaborative format these preservice teachers are making tentative steps towards what Wells (1999) terms the desirable goal of “a genuine dialogic co-construction of meaning” (p. 145).
Chapter Eight

Exploring the Process of Dialogic Reflection

This chapter investigates how a process of dialogic reflection can empower and constrain participants in their ‘ideological becoming’ as second language teachers. I argue that a process of guided reflection based on the principle of dialogic interanimation enables the participants to negotiate reframings of their identities as second language teachers. This chapter builds on the points made in the previous two chapters of data analysis. In chapter six, discourse analysis of the classroom talk focused on understanding the participants’ perspectives on doing second language teaching by investigating three key genres of their discursive practices. In chapter seven, discourse analysis centred on understanding how these preservice teachers take up different classroom talk formats (Hirst & Brown, 2008; Renshaw & Brown, 2007) which set up particular pedagogic relations between themselves and their students through the privileging of voices within the classroom interaction. The analysis therefore centred on the participants’ ways of being in the classroom. In this chapter, the lens now focuses on teacher identity in the process of becoming with discourse analysis of the participants’ reflective dialogues evidencing shifts in their understandings of the role of the teacher in second language learning processes.

8.1 Teacher Development through Dialogic Reflection

As a teacher educator my focus is on the learning of these preservice teachers and how they can develop their professional identities by becoming aware of and questioning the tacit theories of teaching and learning that they are currently performing, either consciously or unconsciously. Gee (2004) suggests that “learning is change in a socially situated identity” which comes from “changing patterns of participation in specific social practices” (Gee, 2004, p. 38). In this chapter, I trace a number of different ways in which the process of dialogic
reflection instituted in this research enables participants to experience different patterns of participation in the transnational context.

Whilst foregrounding certain aspects of teacher identity as salient, the process of dialogic reflection taken up in this study necessarily backgrounds other aspects of teacher identity and hence may be acting as a constraint in that regard.

Before discussing particular affordances, it will be helpful to briefly summarise the key elements of the dialogic reflective process devised for this study, which were set out in fuller detail in chapter five. There are four main stages in this process:

- **Stage One**: Preparation and teaching of the cultural activity by the participants in pairs to a group of Year 4 primary students
- **Stage Two**: Focus group discussion between the participants immediately following their teaching activity
- **Stage Three**: Repetition of stages one and two with the participants teaching their cultural activity to a different group of Year 4 primary students
- **Stage Four**: Stimulated recall interview in which each teaching pair play back the DVD of their two teaching activities and discuss significant points with the researcher

It can be seen from this brief overview that the research design purposefully promoted reflection as a multi-voiced dialogue based on the understanding of learning as a socially constructed practice arising through “struggling with another's discourse” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 348). This process of dialogic reflection began with the participants preparing the content of their cultural teaching activity in pairs, rather than individually, thus promoting interweaving of suggestions and viewpoints. The focus group discussions were purposefully orchestrated to ensure that participants shared their immediate teaching impressions with their peers without the possibly intrusive presence of the researcher.

The stimulated research interview was organised to offer a chance for participants to re-view both of their teaching activities through the more impersonal lens of the
video camera. This re-viewing was arranged to be distanced in space (away from the school) and distanced in time (taking place one week after the original events) so that first impressions have settled and a more considered perspective can be taken up by the participants. To encourage dialogue and to hopefully neutralise to some extent the authoritative voice invested in the researcher, the interviews were arranged with the teaching pairs rather than one-on-one with the researcher.

The recursive research design afforded multiple points of comparison and contrast within the teaching activities and the reflective discussions making this a richer experience for the participants, as is demonstrated through the analysis of the participants’ reflections in this chapter.

8.2 **Intercultural Affordances: Making the Familiar Strange**

The purpose of framing this task as a cultural activity was to begin the process of “making the familiar strange” (Bray, 2004, p. 251) and to have the preservice teachers think about explaining social practices that they take as obvious to children from another culture.

The participants generally constituted their teaching activity as a combined focus on some aspect of Cantonese language and cultural practices, for example Wei-Li and Mei-Ling’s focus on writing the individual characters in the Fai Chun and then explaining the cultural practice of reversing the character /fuk¹/ to bring good luck. In the same way, Lai-Shan and Pik-Wah began by teaching some Cantonese words for different foods which then led into a discussion of cultural practices for honouring ancestors with offerings. Evidence that the nature of the teaching activity encouraged the participants to begin to reframe taken-for-granted social practices from the viewpoint of a cultural outsider is provided by Wan-Yee in her stimulated recall interview. In this extract Wan-Yee is explaining what benefit she feels she has gained from teaching Australian students about the Fai Chun and present-giving at Chinese New Year.
Wan-Yee's opening words confirm that the teaching of the cultural task has made her consider how to present cultural items familiar in Hong Kong to children in Australia who are not familiar with them. This particular opportunity for intercultural teaching is a new experience for Wan-Yee and her partner Oi-Yan, because obviously “in Hong Kong ... the students ... already know all these thing” (lines 2-3). She notes that preparing for this teaching activity was “actually quite challenging for us ... because we haven’t got any experience on teaching on this topic” (line 5). Wan-Yee and her partner therefore had to consider their materials and techniques carefully “to arouse the students’ interest” (line 7).

Whilst Wan-Yee’s comments refer to the preparation phase of the cultural teaching activity, another group of preservice teachers offered interesting insights into the outcomes achieved through these teaching activities.

**8.3 Second Language Teachers as Intercultural Agents**

Reflections on the learning outcomes achieved by the primary schoolchildren through engaging in the cultural tasks provide an illuminating insight into three participants’ understanding of intercultural pedagogy. It was noted earlier that the participants generally chose to blend a focus on both cultural practices and language within their teaching activities. This practical acknowledgement of linguaculture (Risager, 2006, p. 114) as the natural domain for second language teaching is revealed in the focus group discussion between Hong-Ming, Chi-Wai and Kwok-Wing. An extract of this discussion is given here, where it can be seen
that the participants together construct an insightful nuanced understanding of the language and culture nexus, which has been a contested topic in second language teaching for some time (Hatoss, 2006; Liddicoat, 2004). This discussion arises from reflections on their first teaching activity and hence is expressed not as an academic debate using the authoritative voice of expert researchers and textbooks, but using their own internally persuasive voices in which they refine and rework their emerging understanding of second language teacher identity (Bakhtin, 1981). In the focus group discussion following their first teaching activity Hong-Ming, Chi-Wai and Kwok-Wing are responding to one of the guided reflection questions: “What were the learning outcomes for the students today?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Hong-Ming</td>
<td>Actually, because of the time constraint I don’t really see it as a language experience. Frankly, I don’t think they will learn or remember many of the Chinese words after our short session. I will see it more for a cultural experience, or an eye-opener that after today they will see to know that in this world there are other kinds of language that work very differently from English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanza One: Hong-Ming’s Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Chi-Wai</td>
<td>I totally agree with you because I don’t think 30 minutes is enough time for students to learn a lesson. But I think they already have a fundamental knowledge about Mandarin, and today what we taught them was the Cantonese. Which was an advantage for them to learn another type of Chinese language. Basically what my outcome was to have them to enjoy the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanza Two: Chi-Wai’s Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Kwok-Wing</td>
<td>And actually that’s true. Today I think the main purposes were not really teaching or passing knowledge to them, but to expose them to different cultures and different ideas. To let them know that there are people outside this world - this island Australia. Yes some kind of cultural sharing …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanza Three: Kwok-Wing’s Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 8-2 Focus Group Reflection on Interculturality**

This discussion opens with the preservice teachers considering one of the guiding questions: “What were the learning outcomes for the students today?”
Hong-Ming begins by suggesting that their activity has constituted a “cultural experience or eye-opener experience” for these Australian primary students to begin to appreciate the multi-lingual nature of the world. Hong-Ming is therefore framing cultural experience in terms of sampling language diversity, with the implication of enhancing these students’ intercultural understanding rather than increasing their knowledge of cultural artefacts (“to know that in this world there are other kinds of language that work very differently from English”, lines 1e -1f). Chi-Wai concurs with Hong-Ming’s assessment of the situation (“I totally agree with you”, line 2a) but then qualifies Hong-Ming’s claim by noting that the students are already learning Mandarin at school, which carries the implication that the students are to some extent already aware of language diversity as a global phenomenon. Chi-Wai goes on to suggest that in fact their activities have demonstrated to the students that language diversity exists specifically within the term Chinese language which includes not just Mandarin but Cantonese also (“I think they already have a fundamental knowledge about Mandarin and today what we taught them was the Cantonese … to learn another type of Chinese language”, lines 2b – 2e). At this point Kwok-Wing agrees and adds his view that the activities introduced “different cultures and different ideas” (lines 3b-3c) thus extending the focus from language diversity to different cultural perspectives contained within the language. Kwok-Wing’s words position the preservice teachers themselves as cultural emissaries “people outside this world, this island Australia” (line 3d) who are offering “some kind of cultural sharing” (lines 3d-3e) to the Australian students.

This short extract demonstrates the potential for group dialogue to refine and extend the reflections of the individual members. This analysis also foregrounds the strong sense of agency which characterises the voices of these preservice teachers in their shared agreement that they can and have contributed to the intercultural competence of these young Australians. These viewpoints offer a strong rebuke to much transnational literature which narrowly assumes a western-centric validation for transnational education based on “best practice” notions of “learning from the west”. This discussion between three participants clarifies their teacher identity as intercultural agents increasing the intercultural repertoire of the Australian schoolchildren they interact with (Davison, 2005).
8.4 Engaging with Difference: Explaining Intercultural Practices

As Wan-Yee mentioned earlier (section 8.1.3), the participants have not previously had to consider teaching in a classroom context where there is a lack of shared cultural knowledge. One of the dilemmas that this can give rise to is demonstrated by Lai-Tai in her classroom talk with the four Australian primary children who are unable to recognise or even guess the identity of the Fai Chun she is displaying (see Lai-Tai’s Dialogue, Chapter 7, section 7.4.1). In this case, Lai-Tai discarded the object without further explanation and tried to find some common ground with the students by displaying paper fire-crackers to them instead. Lai-Tai’s decision not to explain the name and function of the Fai Chun to the students highlights the giving of explanations or elaborations as a problematic area not just for her but for a number of these preservice teachers. The pedagogic skills of explaining and elaborating are often problematic for beginner teachers when teaching in their familiar cultural context let alone in a transnational one (Tsui, 1995). In Lai-Tai’s case there is no further follow-up to this noted difficulty. Lai-Tai’s transnational classroom experience took place as part of the pilot study of this research project and hence did not partake of the follow-up dialogic reflective process. However, participants in the main study also evidenced difficulty in offering intercultural explanations and were assisted in improving these skills by the process of dialogic reflection, as outlined in the following analysis of Wei-Li’s discussion.

Wei-Li was another participant who commented on the difficulty she faced when trying to explain Hong Kong cultural practices regarding Fai Chun to the Australian students. Wei-Li’s difficulty was in trying to explain the reversing of the character /fuk¹/ (meaning ‘happiness’) to bring good luck at Chinese New Year. This “LuckTalk” practice has been described by one of the participants in Fong’s (2000) study as the custom of placing: “on the door we put fuk¹ upside down. / fuk¹/ is happiness or blessing … put upside down, fuk¹ means dou² … /Fuk dou/ means It’s here. The blessing, happiness is coming or it is here” (Fong, 2000, p. 225).

Wei-Li commented on the difficulties she faced in trying to explain the rationale for the reversing of the character. In her teaching task on the first day she went into a lengthy explanation which at the time she felt was ineffectual. Wei-Li was able to
try out a modified explanation in her teaching of this point to another group of schoolchildren, as part of her second teaching of the cultural task the next day. Wei-Li thus had a point of comparison when she came to preview the DVD of her two teaching episodes before the stimulated recall interview one week later. During the stimulated recall interview with the researcher, Wei-Li chose to stop the DVD at the point where she was giving this explanation as she wanted to discuss this point further. It is clear from Wei-Li’s comments in the interview that this recursive process of teaching and reviewing her performance through discussion and via the DVD allowed Wei-Li to reframe her appraisal of her performance less critically than originally. The process of reviewing her initial negative evaluation in the stimulated interview allowed her to reassess her performance and take a more balanced position, which acknowledged her developing abilities to explain the good luck practice. The following extract from her stimulated recall interview traces her change of perspective.

In the following reflective dialogue during her stimulated recall interview, Wei-Li has stopped the DVD at the point where she was explaining the reversing of the character denoting happiness / fuk\(^1\)/.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>((using the DVD remote control)) It’s the part when I tried to explain that they have to turn the board around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>I had a little bit of difficulty trying to explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>((she locates the place on the DVD, replays her explanation and then pauses the DVD))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>On the second day the explanation went much better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>The first day I was just - I didn’t know how to explain it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>I need to stop a while, and actually have to reorganise what I was going to say. And I say it out again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>I just keep on repeating myself, because I just wanted to make sure that they understood. And I just keep on repeating, and repeating, and repeating. And that’s when it got repetitive and they didn’t want to understand anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>OK and you were concerned that they should understand. What were you thinking at the time? You know, I mean you even reversed the thing so it was quite clear but your concern was about what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>Now that I listen to it, if I were the student I would probably understand what I was trying to say. But I don’t know why, at that time it seems like, no matter how many times I try to say it, it didn’t come out right. I just don’t know why it sounded like that to me. I feel I was just talking crap. I was just explaining things that noone would understand what I’m trying to say. But now that I hear it, it’s actually OK. It just takes me some time to get to the point. It was good that both groups managed to do what we wanted them to do. So that’s OK. Even though the first process was a little hard and everything, but in the end they did what was Told. So it was OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>So actually the DVD has confirmed that you did much better than you thought you did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>Yeh. I was really surprised because I thought I did very bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wei-Li</td>
<td>Yeh. I was really surprised because I thought I did very bad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 8-3  Wei-Li: Reversing the Character for Good Luck

It is significant that discussion of this difficulty in establishing a shared meaning is generated by the participant herself, not the researcher. This is obviously an unsettling moment in her teaching which Wei-Li wishes to look into further. Existing literature suggests that it is exactly these ‘dilemmas’ which create moments of insight as participants address these discomfiting issues (Singh & Doherty, 2004).
Wei-Li locates and replays the episode from her first teaching experience where she has difficulty in briefly explaining the process of reversing the character /fuk¹/ as a good luck practice at Chinese New Year (line 3). Interestingly, her immediate comment is not about this particular communication sequence but an acknowledgement that she explained this much more successfully during the second teaching activity: "On the second day the explanation went much better" (line 6). Wei-Li's starting point in this discussion is therefore the comparison between the two teaching episodes. This allows her to frame her analysis of her explanatory skills as becoming "much better" with practice, rather than having only one negative experience to relate to from the first teaching activity. This is one example of how the recursive nature of the research design promotes more productive reflections in this study.

Having made the comparison between the two teaching events, Wei-Li then returns to a discussion of the particular difficulty she faced in the first teaching activity "I didn't know how to explain it, I need to stop a while and actually have to reorganise what I was going to say" (lines 7-8). Her reorganising of her explanation led to multiple repetitions about the meaning of /fuk¹/ and the reason for turning the character upside-down. She explains this repetition as a need to get her meaning across "I just keep on repeating myself because I just wanted to make sure that they understood" (line 10-11). Her sense of hopelessness at being unable to communicate her meaning to her audience of Australian primary school children is captured in her ensuing words: “and I just keep on repeating and repeating and repeating and repeating. And that’s when it got repetitive” (lines 11-12). She concludes her description with a sense of having alienated the children through her lengthy explanation: “they didn’t want to understand anymore” (line 13). However, it is at this point that the researcher (myself) stepped in to suggest taking a different reading of the event. As an observer of this event, her explanation although wordy appeared to have managed to get the nature and purpose of the good luck practice across to the students: “you even reversed the thing [the character on the flashcard] so it was quite clear” (line 16). When prompted by the researcher to explain the nature of her concern Wei-Li responded that she felt “I was just explaining things that no one would understand” (line 21). It seems that here is the kernel of the dilemma: Wei-Li is confronting the cultural
divide and is at that moment overwhelmed by the problem of communicating her meaning to others who do not share the same “LuckTalk” practices that she has grown up with (Fong, 2000). Happily, Wei-Li is able, with the insight afforded by this process of dialogic reflection, to construct a more positive and more balanced interpretation of this event: “but now that I hear it, it’s actually OK. It just take me some time to get to the point” (line 25). This initial difficulty has now been reframed as affirming her communication skills: “you did much better than you thought you did” (line 30) with Wei-Li now agreeing: “Yeh I was really surprised because I thought I did very bad” (line 32).

Revisiting this event through a process of guided reflection has allowed Wei-Li to appreciate that her teaching performance was stronger than she had experienced it as being. I would suggest that this opportunity of dialogic reflection to allow one to revisit first impressions, in order to settle on a more balanced view of the situation, is very important for beginner teachers in particular, who often lack the confidence to be more resourceful in the classroom. I would suggest that the opportunity to have a second chance at explaining this good luck practice has allowed Wei-Li to experience a more successful instructional moment and hence appreciate her skills in this area. The gaining of confidence is often a major part of performing effectively in the classroom (Richards, 1998). I therefore think it important that this preservice teacher has had this opportunity to revisit her earlier negative self-appraisal and instead note the inherent strengths of her performance.

### 8.5 Engaging with Difference: Teaching Active Students

Another opportunity of engaging with difference in the transnational classroom was identified by a number of participants as the experience of teaching more active students. Oi-Yan commented “back in Hong Kong you know students are really passive because it’s always the teacher talking talking but here it’s both sides” (transcript 8.4, line 3). Pik-Wah and Lai-Shan note that “Here obviously we have more interaction with kids than in Hong Kong” (transcript 8.5, line 3). Reactions to this phenomenon differ but clearly interacting with these Australian primary students has provided much reflective material for the participants and
some notable shifts in teacher identity. I begin by discussing Oi-Yan’s observations which she shared during her stimulated recall interview. Oi-Yan is comparing her teaching in Australia with her previous experience in Hong Kong and noting differences in terms of student participation and sharing of new knowledge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oi-Yan</td>
<td>I think the participation really helped us in our teaching. Cos back in Hong Kong you know students are really passive, because it’s always the teacher talking talking, but here it’s both sides. And I think that really helps us in our future teaching, remembering back what we did with these kids. All these experiences combine together and I think the happiest part was seeing the participation. Because it’s really what we want from our teaching. And I was surprised to see kids actually shared with other students. How they were sharing the knowledge they got was correct and they shared it. And this is what a teacher really hopes to get and we actually experienced it. Because I really never came across students like this. Like after they learnt it they will share it with the students. I mean normally in Hong Kong you have “OK, lesson’s over” and that’s it. So who knows if they actually got what we taught them? So the responses, the participation, everything, made us really enjoy teaching even more. Just seeing how they reacted just meant a lot to us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 8-4  Oi-Yan’s Reflections on Active Students

Oi-Yan begins by contrasting ‘participation’ with her experience of students in Hong Kong as “really passive” (line 2). She observes that in Australia both the students’ and teachers’ voices construct the classroom interaction and that she has had personal experience of this in her teaching (line 3). She frames participation as what she really wants from her teaching (lines 6-7). Then she mentions being impressed by the sharing between students where they discussed with each other the information they had just learnt in their teaching activity with their Hong Kong teacher (line 8). Oi-Yan is particularly referring here to her observation that, on completion of their teaching activity, the students she had been working with then went over to their friends and showed the decorated Chinese New Year red packets that they had made and explained what they had just learnt to their friends. Oi-Yan comments that having students “sharing the knowledge” (line 9) with friends is a new experience for her and she is obviously pleased by this: “the responses, the participation, everything made us really enjoy teaching even more” (line 15-16).
This topic of more lively interaction is taken up also by another teaching pair, Pik-Wah and Lai-Shan, as they summarise their transnational experience in the stimulated recall interview. In the stimulated recall interview, Pik-Wah and Lai-Shan give their viewpoint on differences they have found between teaching in Hong Kong and Australian classrooms. The main difference is the level of interaction between teacher and students as they explain below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Did you get anything different from this? You did a videoed teaching in Hong Kong also, didn't you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Here obviously we have more interaction with kids than in Hong Kong. Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>It's more activity-based, yeah. Cos in Hong Kong we will be really lecturing like having a presentation. Because I remember when I was having a class, a lecturer observation for my class, um my lecturer was saying that she feel like that she went into a presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cos she said like I would be good in the business field, but may be not in a teaching field, because I'm always giving them information, giving them knowledge. I thought it would be a good way to let them to learn more, but imagine like if I were the students I would be like ugh I'm not holding a meeting and listening all those facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>OK, so this time you've seen something different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>Yes, more activity-based and they can actually learn from their own yeah. We are more like a facilitator, yeah. ((looks enquiringly at Pik-Wah)) Did you feel like that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pik-Wah</td>
<td>Yeah ((nods her head in agreement)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 8-5  Pik-Wah and Lai Shan's Experience of Transnational Teaching**

Pik-Wah opens by noting that she has experienced more interaction with the students in Australia than would be usual in Hong Kong classrooms. Her use of “obviously” constructs this as an unsurprising statement of fact in her eyes (line 3). Lai-Shan concurs describing the learning as more “activity-based” (line 5). At this point Lai-Shan recalls a moment from her teaching practicum in Hong Kong when her supervising lecturer gave her feedback on her teaching saying it was more like a business presentation (line 6). Lai-Shan explains that from her viewpoint previously she thought this more transmissive approach (“in Hong Kong we will be really lecturing like having a presentation” line 6) would allow her to be “giving them knowledge” (line11). However, from the Hong Kong students’ viewpoint she
felt they would dislike “ugh ... listening all those facts” (line 13). In the Australian classroom Lai-Shan therefore made the effort to engage the students more, with the conclusion that “they [the students] can actually learn from their own, yeah” (line 15) and that her role as teacher shifted “more like a facilitator” (line 16). Pik-Wah, her teaching partner, agrees with this evaluation of their role (line 18).

This pair’s appraisal of their role as a move away from “lecturing” to “more like a facilitator” is made more noteworthy when one remembers that the analysis of their classroom talk was identified as representing the Switching Format, which maintained the authoritative voice of the teacher but allowed students to temporarily take up this privileged position in relation to their peers without changing or challenging the teacher’s dominant voice in any way. For Lai-Shan now to be talking about being “more like a facilitator” and wishing to encourage students’ own voices, rather than have them ventriloquating the teacher’s voice, is indeed a shift in her teacher identity.

There is a notable growing self-awareness in these conversations with Lai-Shan, where she seems to be constantly seeking to develop her professional identity through this dialogic reflection, firstly by talking to conversational partners, and then by reflecting immediately on her stated points to check their veracity, which she then confirms with an affirmatory “yeah”. Lai-Shan’s talk is notably punctuated by the use of this “Yeah/Yes” in transcript 8.5:

- It's more activity-based, yeah. (line 5)
- Yes, more activity-based (line 15)
- and they can actually learn from their own, yeah. (line 15-16)
- We are more like a facilitator, yeah. (line 16)

This shift has not occurred randomly, Lai-Shan actually set herself a target to be more interactive and to have the students “speak up first” (transcript 8.6, Lai-Shan, line 2). Lai-Shan began her teaching segment after Pik-Wah had already spent fifteen minutes discussing food and food-related Cantonese vocabulary with the students. Lai-Shan opened up her half of the teaching activity by asking the students to introduce themselves, which is something Pik-Wah had not yet done. Transcribed from the DVD of Lai-Shan’s teaching of the cultural teaching task on
the second day, here is the sequence of questions that Lai-Shan used to engage the students in dialogue at the start of her teaching:

- “First of all before we have this activity, can you introduce yourself?”
- “Do you know anything about Hong Kong?”
- “Any ideas of how Hong Kong is like?”
- “Do you guys know that Hong Kong is located in China? They have Mandarin and our mother tongue is Cantonese.”
- “Do you have any Chinese friends?”

Her questions were successful in harvesting a range of enthusiastic responses from the children. Lai-Shan then moved into introducing her topic about paper money used for offerings to ancestors: “OK so anyway I’m going to introduce some very traditional Chinese culture ...” (Lai-Shan, Teaching Task 2)

As Lai-Shan herself explained to me, the researcher, as she replayed the DVD showing these opening steps of her teaching on the second day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lai-Shan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript 8-6  Lai-Shan Reflects on Interaction**

It is interesting that Lai-Shan is pleased about the opening to her second teaching of the cultural task, because she took the time to engage the students personally in the instructional setting. Having succeeded in her intention, Lai-Shan then somewhat surprisingly dismisses some of the responses as having “nothing to do with the topic”, even whilst she acknowledges their usefulness as an entry point into her teaching (“the boy was saying ‘Oh my dad went there’ [to Hong Kong]. It’s
nothing to do with the topic but still it’s helping them to go into the mood of learning” lines 10-13). This is an unexpected pronouncement given that her topic is an aspect of Hong Kong culture and her questions were prompting the students to think about this on a personal level. This comment suggests there is still a residual concern about taking time away from a direct focus on the teaching topic. This raises again this dilemma of what the teacher should legitimately be doing in class (a question which of course is pertinent to all teachers not just those who are in the early stages of their professional life). There are softer echoes here of Wei-Li’s concern discussed earlier in this study that taking time to engage the students’ voices in the classroom talk in some way is “not doing what we’re supposed to be doing” (transcript 7.8, Wei-Li, line 11). Indeed, it is now an appropriate point to return to Wei-Li’s dialogic reflections on her teaching.

8.6 Developing Teacher Identities: Reappraising Classroom Interaction

It will be remembered that as her first teaching activity Wei-Li was showing a group of boys how to write the characters of a Fai Chun and explaining about the reversing of the Chinese character for ‘happiness’ as a good luck practice (section 7.3.2). In her focus group discussion afterwards, Wei-Li was remarking negatively on these students initiating requests to know their names in Chinese. Their actions were seen by Wei-Li and Mei-Kei as trying to take over the teacher’s role: “The students take your role” (transcript 7.8, line 13). In the analysis of Wei-Li’s discourse it was noted that her narrative lacked the usual endings of a ‘Resolution’ and ‘Coda’ (Gee, 2005, p. 128) Interestingly, the recursive nature of the dialogic reflection has allowed Wei-Li to revisit her previous teaching experience and by reflecting further on these events she provides her own ‘Resolution’ and ‘Coda’ to her narrative during the stimulated recall interview.

In the following extract from her stimulated recall interview, (transcript 8.7), Wei-Li plays the DVD of her two teaching activities and comments on the experience of teaching the same task to two different Year 4 primary groups. It will be seen that her experiences in the second teaching activity have led her to reconstruct her earlier negative experience of teaching “rowdy” boys in the first teaching task to instead see the positive benefits of “hyperactive” students. Wei-Li fast-forwards
the DVD and then pauses it towards the end of her first teaching activity, at the point where the students are asking about pronunciation of names in Chinese:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Wei-Li  | "OK and there's one part where they kept asking us what's my name in Cantonese? How do you say my name?
| 2    | Wei-Li  | and they just went on to their brother ((open hand gesture)), to their mother, |
| 3    | Wei-Li  | - to their dog! And sometimes we just give them |
| 4    | Wei-Li  | random answers because they wouldn't remember anyway. |
| 5    | Wei-Li  | ((carries on with remote control to the second teaching task the next day and watches the interaction with the second group)) |
| 6    | Wei-Li  | Yeh it was much easier to teach them, and um more |
| 7    | Wei-Li  | easy to handle, but then because sometimes it's like |
| 8    | Wei-Li  | there's disadvantages and advantages. |
| 9    | Wei-Li  | We have this quieter group but then |
| 10   | Wei-Li  | in the end we talked about it |
| 11   | Wei-Li  | and we're like oh we actually prefer the first group more, |
| 12   | Wei-Li  | even though they're more rowdy and naughty. |
| 13   | Wei-Li  | But you know they're more hyperactive, they're more talkative, |
| 14   | Wei-Li  | they're more funny, they say jokes and everything. |
| 15   | Wei-Li  | But they ((the second group)) were just really quiet |
| 16   | Wei-Li  | we were like really "on task". |
| 17   | Wei-Li  | and we were trying to like oh get some excitement going, but not |
| 18   | Wei-Li  | getting much response. |
| 19   | Wei-Li  | So even though they ((the second group)) were more quiet, |
| 20   | Wei-Li  | I think we still prefer the first group. |
| 21   | Researcher | Isn't that interesting. |
| 22   | Wei-Li  | Even though the first group gave us a headache ((smiling)). |

**Transcript 8-7  Wei-Li Reappraises Being on Task**

Wei-Li chooses to stop the DVD at the point towards the end of the first teaching activity where the students begin to ask for the pronunciation of their names in Chinese. She then provides a brief summary of events (lines 1-6). This account is a much more dispassionate retelling of events than Wei-Li provided in her focus group discussion immediately following the teaching activity (transcript 7.8). This less emotional account may be the result of the passage of time and Wei-Li has had time to come to terms with the episode. Another reading is that her account is being shaped by issues of *addressivity* and she is couching this in more measured tones because her audience is her lecturer (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 1999). For whichever reason, Wei-Li is now investing far less emotion and significance in this episode. It is noticeable that she now says in a quite off-hand way that they provided some
“random answers” to the students “because they wouldn’t remember anyway” (lines 5-6). This concludes her description of this episode and she continues straight on with fast-forwarding the DVD to the second teaching activity the next day. Wei-Li watches some of the interaction with the second teaching group which consisted of both boys and girls. Then she begins speaking again making a comparison between the two groups, noting that the second group were “easier to teach” (line 9) and “more easy to handle” (line 10). The expectation from this analysis would be a preference for teaching the second group, however Wei-Li offers a different perspective. She hints at the complexity of classroom interaction noting “there’s disadvantages and advantages” (line 11) and that in fact she and Mei-Ling discussed this and decided “we actually prefer the first group more” (line 14).

The second group is now characterised as “just really quiet” (line 17) with the implication that they were too quiet, too placid and unresponsive from the preservice teachers' viewpoint: “we were trying to like oh get some excitement going but not getting much response” (line 20). Her frustration at this lack of student vitality is captured in her words “we were like really “|on ↓ task”.” The exaggerated emphasis on being “|on ↓ task” with the strong downward intonation is an example of ironic ‘double-voicing’ (Bakhtin, 1981), where two voices are simultaneously discernible in the one utterance. In double-voicing the literal meaning is undermined and critiqued through the second voice that emerges through the exaggerated intonation. Whereas being on task is usually considered a desirable attribute, Wei-Li makes clear through the ironic double-voicing her interpretation of this state of affairs as being too constricting and lacking the excitement of more lively interaction in this instance. Her stance here is in notable contrast to her concern in their earlier focus group discussion about being “off-task” by answering the boys’ requests for Chinese names in her first teaching activity (transcript 7.8, line 10). Her later comments in this stimulated recall interview demonstrate her developing teacher identity in acknowledging the inherent complexity and fluidity of negotiating “disadvantages and advantages” in classroom interaction (transcript 8.7).
8.7 Weaving Together the Dialogic Threads: Mei-Kei’s Reflections

I conclude this analysis of the affordances of dialogic reflection by discussing an extract from the dialogue between Tak-Wah, Mei-Kei and myself during the stimulated recall interview. I have selected this dialogue as it brings together a number of themes that have emerged from the data analysis. It will be remembered that Tak-Wah represented the Collaborative Format in teaching his activity and that together he, Mei-Kei and the students successfully negotiated new classroom routines to accommodate his visual impairment. In this extract he explains his decision to use the Collaborative Format. While practicing the reading and pronunciation of some selected Chinese characters, he decided to change his teaching plan in response to the students’ actions, allowing the students to take the lead. Mei-Kei concludes by giving a summary of Tak-Wah’s points and then offering her own evaluation.

### Transcript 8-8  Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei Compare Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza One - Student-initiated learning in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tak-Wah:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a as er as what I said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b actually I <strong>changed</strong> my plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c because the student read the Cantonese words before I read to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d and actually the students themselves have initiated a way to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e instead of me er er um <strong>telling</strong> them how to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f and then I just <strong>follow</strong> as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g so it's <strong>good</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza Two - Students’ behaviour in Hong Kong classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tak-Wah:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a I mean in <strong>Hong Kong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b it's quite <strong>different</strong> because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c students tend <strong>not to</strong> er start new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d they just <strong>follow</strong> what the teacher instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza Three - Possibilities of cooperation in teaching/learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tak-Wah:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a and here we can see that if students are more <strong>active</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b actually we can <strong>cooperate</strong> to work out our lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c instead of er student er teachers planning it themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza Four - Different teacher roles in Australia and Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mei-Kei:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a it means that the teacher acts as a <strong>facilitator</strong> here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b and in Hong Kong the teacher takes the main role of <strong>speaking</strong> in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c like <strong>teacher-centred</strong> classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d as a teacher I need to spread this idea back to Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In stanza one, Tak-Wah explains that in his teaching of the pronunciation of the five Chinese pictographs, he changed his intention of modelling each Cantonese word for the students because the students stepped in first and read out the Chinese words to him. He notes that “the students themselves have initiated a way to learn” (line 1d) instead of the teacher “telling them how to learn” (line 1e). His response was to “just follow as a teacher” (1f) and he concludes that the experience of this is “good” (line 1g). Whilst he treats the students’ initiations with equanimity, he clarifies in stanza two that this is an unusual experience for him because “in Hong Kong it’s quite different” (lines 2a - 2b). Tak-Wah comments that in Hong Kong it is the students who follow the teacher and that the students “tend not to start new things” (line 2c). Tak-Wah concludes from his experience of more “active” students (line 3a) in the Australian classroom that “actually we can cooperate to work out our lesson” (line 3b) rather than this being only the teacher’s role (“instead of … teachers planning it themselves” line 3c).

At this point, Mei-Kei then steps in to summarise Tak-Wah’s words, explicating the pedagogic implications of Tak-Wah’s (and Mei-Kei’s) experience in much more formal professional ELT language: “the teacher acts as a facilitator here and in Hong Kong the teacher takes the main role of speaking in the classroom like teacher-centred classroom” (lines 4a-4c). It is almost as if Mei-Kei is taking on a ‘translator’ role, presenting Tak-Wah’s comments in a more educationally professional package, presumably for my benefit as the teacher educator/researcher. Her role as interpreter is clear in her opening words, “it means that...” (line 4a), where she is clarifying the meaning of her colleague’s utterances and appropriating the professional discourse of second language teaching (Freeman & Cazden, 1991). Mei-Kei goes on to introduce a new point, that “as a teacher I need to spread this idea back to Hong Kong”(line 4d). This comment may be offered because Mei-Kei assumes that her researcher audience, as a western lecturer, would expect such a conclusion. Or these words could indicate Mei-Kei’s actual future intention. Whilst it would indeed be interesting to see whether these insights influence the preservice teachers’ future teaching in Hong Kong, it is an issue for future research as it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate this.
The significant factor here is that Mei-Kei has understood Tak-Wah’s ideas and felt it appropriate to add her own evaluation of suitable follow-up. It is pertinent at this point to remember that Mei-Kei is the same person who participated in Wei-Li’s focus group discussion a week earlier. In that discussion, she took up the same role of ‘translator’ when she summarized Wei-Li’s concerns over the student/teacher interaction as “the students took your role” (transcript 7.8, line 13). Effectively then, in these two extracts, Mei-Kei has espoused two conflicting viewpoints on the role of the teacher. Whether this indicates a shift in her viewpoint is open to debate, but this certainly demonstrates her awareness of these different teacher identities. Such voicing of different perspectives can be seen as essentially inevitable, if one takes a dialogic view of learning. As Bakhtin (1981, 1986) points out this active struggling with diverse perspectives is part of the process of ideological becoming through which we fashion our professional identities. Mei-Kei’s words show that dialogic reflection on her and her peers’ transnational classroom interaction is actively engaging her in confronting issues of second language teacher identity.
Chapter Nine

Conclusions

I begin this chapter by looking back to the purposes underlying this research into transnational teacher education. I then discuss the key themes that have emerged through analysing the data generated by this study, drawing conclusions and offering recommendations based on my findings. I highlight the original contribution to knowledge which is offered in this study, noting how the innovative identification of different discourse formats for teaching language and culture can be linked to teacher identity, thus offering a new way of investigating the interplay of professional identity and pedagogy. Whilst existing research into SLIM programs records participants’ comments of expanding their intercultural and pedagogic knowledge through a transnational teaching experience, such research does not explore how such shifts in understanding occur. I demonstrate how a process of dialogic reflection can provide the context for productive intercultural and professional learning in the transnational context. To explore these shifts in understanding, I deploy a different methodology to the usual pre- and post- experience questionnaires and recorded interviews that typify most research methodology into SLIM programs to date. Instead I take up a discourse analytic and ethnographic methodology which allows fine-grained analysis of the participants’ discourse to track shifts in their professional understandings.

I choose, as part of my taking up a theory of dialogic teaching/learning, to present these conclusions in a heteroglossic array of voices rather than through the sole omniscient voice of the researcher. For this reason, as the different themes are discussed, I draw on the voices of the participants who have generated the insights contained in this study.
9.1 Exploring Tacit Theories of Second Language Teaching and Learning

In this study I have argued that an important part of teacher education consists of questioning our pedagogy and considering a repertoire of practices beyond the comfortable familiar patterns or Discourses that we have grown up with and been socialised into. In order to achieve this, we need first to become aware of the tacit theories of teaching and learning that underpin our words and actions in the classroom. For preservice teachers at the beginning of their teaching career, it is particularly difficult to recognise and analyse these often unconscious assumptions and beliefs that are guiding their classroom practices. I suggested that the opportunity of teaching in a transnational classroom would help to make visible these taken-for-granted pedagogies and expectations about classroom interaction, through reflecting on encounters in a foreign classroom context.

Analysing the participants’ second language classroom discourse led to the identification of three speech genres: elicitation; repetition and matching. These three speech genres emerged in the classroom discourse of the majority of the participants and I therefore suggested that they can be seen as constituting a shared Discourse model of second language pedagogy, as currently enacted by these preservice teachers. What are the features of this Discourse model? An answer to this question can be offered by reviewing the findings discussed in chapter six. With regard to the elicitation genre, this took the form of eliciting guesses from the students about aspects of Chinese culture and language with which the students were generally not familiar. Whilst the research literature suggests eliciting guesses could be developed as a cognitive skill, or as a sociocultural practice endeavouring to locate shared situated meanings, this was not found to be the focus of these preservice teachers. Instead, the participants’ purposes in eliciting guesses were found to relate to a desire to involve the students more actively in the unfolding classroom talk, to keep them engaged in the task and hence avoid any disruptive or off-task behaviour. The elicitation genre here is seen to fulfil a regulative rather than instructional purpose in the classroom.
Use of the repetition genre manifested in the classroom discourse in this study in the form of mechanical drills for the stated purpose of memorisation of new vocabulary items. Repetition was also used for instructional feedback but only in the form of explicit corrective feedback, demonstrating a concern for accurate pronunciation and some focus on accurate production of tones. These functions for repetition represent only a small range of possible functions for repetition in second language pedagogy outlined in the research literature. It is noteworthy that none of these extracts of classroom discourse demonstrate the use of repetition as a scaffolding device either in terms of negotiating meaning or as constructing new knowledge through collaborative dialogue. The focus is on transmission of the authoritative discourse here, or what the participants termed “passing knowledge” (Kwok-Wing, transcript 8.2, line3b).

The use of the matching genre was explained by participants in terms of reinforcing language learning of new vocabulary by matching written forms to spoken forms of the target language. Matching was also used to pair English phrases/words with Cantonese phrases/words. The particular use of matching games was seen to favour comprehension rather than production of language items, with the emphasis on memorisation of unanalysed chunks of language learnt as formulaic language.

Having overviewed each of the emergent genre, the question remains of how these come together as a discernible Discourse model of second language teaching/learning guiding the participants’ classroom practices? Firstly, all three speech genres are conceptualising language learning as the memorisation of vocabulary items: the learning of new sounds and written symbols for familiar items such as food, numbers and everyday phrases. Language learning is being equated with vocabulary acquisition so that second language learners add another set of referents to name things in their world. What is noticeable by its absence is any discussion or explanation about the target language vocabulary other than its equivalents in English. For example, student attention was not directed to the constituent items in phrases such as ‘Ngoh giu’ to understand that ‘ngoh’ is ‘I’ and can be used to generate
more Cantonese phrases apart from this one, and so forth. There is no emphasis on this new language as an interactive system of meanings, in which words pattern together in meaningful ways that can also generate new creative utterances.

A counter riposte here might be that the participants were only engaged in a few brief learning encounters with their Australian students and therefore there was no time to focus on the use of the second language for meaningful communication. However, a rudimentary conversation could have been assembled from Man-Wai and Wing-See’s focus on Cantonese phrases for greetings and everyday routines (Transcript 6.4). Instead of taking up that opportunity and organising the students to practice saying these newly-learnt phrases to each other as in a conversation, Wing-See instead chose to practice the written form of the phrases. It is the correspondence between written and spoken forms, rather than production of meaningful exchanges, that is given central importance by all the participants who focused on language learning activities in their cultural teaching task.

The strategy of matching one phrase of Cantonese with an English equivalent without any further explanation has the immediate advantage of providing quick general understanding of the denotation of unfamiliar words from another language but as a longterm practice this has the drawback of suggesting that language learning is nothing more than acquiring new words for things. The understanding that different languages view the world differently is not expressed in this matching practice, which suggests a comfortable homogeneity of outlook instead of the cultural relativism that surrounds us.

Learning a second language is not only a renaming but also a reframing of the world. Learning a language is also learning a way of understanding the world. We need to be conscious of the principles that underlie our practice, not just so that students can learn a second language as efficiently and successfully as possible, but in regard to questioning the kind of epistemology and ontology that these practices instantiate. In my own work in teacher education this leads to a questioning of western-centric arguments about appropriate methodologies for second language teaching and
instead a focus on pedagogy, recognising that teaching methods are not culture-free strategies but discursive constructs and socioculturally produced.

9.2 Second Language Pedagogy or Methodology?

At this point it is important to remember the distinction that was made between pedagogy and methodology earlier in chapter two. I take up the term pedagogy in this study because pedagogy acknowledges that theories of teaching/learning are sociocultural phenomenon reflecting the values and attitudes of the communities from which they derive and in which they are given meaning. As such, there is no one theory of second language teaching/learning that suits all learning contexts. By contrast, discussions involving English language teaching methodology often mistakenly describe different teaching methods as if they are context-free and universally applicable to any cultural setting.

If I had chosen to frame my discussion of the participants’ classroom discourse in terms of the second language methodologies displayed, my discussion of the repetition and matching genres could have been framed as instances of behaviourist approaches to language learning based on imitation and habit formation and positive reinforcement (Transcript 6.6, Chi-Wai and Ka-Man explain their pedagogy). The presence of the repetition and matching genres could have thus been characterised as examples of rote learning. In western terms, rote learning is viewed as requiring no higher order thinking and is considered an impoverished type of pedagogy. By contrast, those opposed to rote learning in general advocate a communicative approach to second language learning. In this example, it can be seen how taking a teaching methodology viewpoint tends to result in an either/or mentality.

I argue that we instead take up a less western-centric perspective that can be characterised as and/both. It is not a question of choosing between rote learning or communicative learning. In order to communicate one first needs a certain familiarity with lexical and structural items to be able to produce them when required in written or spoken communication. Such familiarity can come from multiple encounters with
those items which might include memorization through repetition. Desire for repetition of language items is neither unique to Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC) learners nor is it necessarily a classroom practice to be assiduously avoided. A review of the literature in relation to repetition as a pedagogic practice demonstrated a range of productive outcomes, suggesting the need to take a more pluralistic approach.

Rather than getting entangled in this either/or mentality, it is more productive to deploy an and/both perspective. Focusing on pedagogy rather than teaching methods, and taking up a sociocultural perspective has allowed me to step around long-playing arguments about appropriate methods of second language teaching and therefore also avoided discursive constructs of the Chinese learner/teacher who supposedly adopt rote learning as the pedagogic default model. Instead, I have argued that a crucial issue in effective second language teaching pedagogy is the privileging of voice in classroom discourse.

9.3 Voice and Discourse Formats: Monologic or Dialogic Pedagogy?

In this study I have taken up the concept of the privileging of voice to explore different power relations evident in the relative positioning of the teacher and students within their classroom discourses. Using the analytic tool of Discourse formats, I identified four distinct formats namely: invitational, switching, scaffolding and collaborative. The invitational format was noted as privileging the teacher’s voice whilst the student voices were only heard in particular spaces allocated by the teacher following a typical Initiate-Respond-Evaluate (IRE) discourse pattern. The switching format likewise was monologic in that it privileged the teacher’s voice. However, to maintain students’ interest and add variety to the activity, nominated students were allowed to temporarily ventriloquate the teacher’s voice by leading the practice activity and so directing the language learning responses of their peers. By contrast, the scaffolding format and the collaborative format privilege both the teacher’s and students’ voices in classroom discourse patterns that demonstrate a more dialogic nature. In the scaffolding format, the teacher’s voice encourages and takes up student voices
weaving them into the unfolding classroom discourse. Once students are confident enough, the teacher steps back and gives the student the necessary space to lead the discourse. The collaborative format is characterised by the interplay of the teacher's and students' voices which permeate both the regulative and instructional elements of the classroom discourse.

Interestingly, an expected format, the authoritative, was not in evidence. The features of an authoritative format were anticipated as similar to the standard discursive construct of the teacher as traditional formal authority figure, who adopts a transmissive approach based on inflexible initiate-respond-evaluate (IRE) discourse patterns. The failure to negotiate an authoritative format was initially a stated source of frustration for one of the preservice teachers, Wei-Li, suggesting that such a format may exist but was not found in this data. To locate and analyse the constituents of such an authoritative format in second language pedagogy, if one exists, could be a productive avenue for future research.

Having noted these four formats, it would be possible to step back and maintain a neutral position about whether each of these formats is of equal standing in the second language classroom. However, I have argued earlier in this study in favour of a reciprocal approach to learning rather than a predominantly transmissive one. A reciprocal approach to classroom discourse is based on dialogue and patterns of voicing within the classroom that privilege both the teacher's and students' voices.

We need to reflect on whether our pedagogic practices encourage students' voices to engage with learning and to be able to do this we need to make our practices more transparent to enquiry and reflection. Deploying the analytic tool of Discourse formats, offers a means of doing this.

9.4 Discourse Formats: Analytical Tools for Making Sense of Practice

At this stage in their professional career, the beginner teachers who are the focus of this study are mainly concerned about maintaining students' attention and avoiding
student behaviour problems. The mechanics of classroom management are their focus at the moment, rather than how to scaffold students' thought processes other than through imitation and translation. Whilst they show awareness of genres of second language pedagogy, such as elicitation, repetition and matching, there is a need to focus on the principles underlying these familiar genres of classroom discourse to ensure that there is actual language learning and understanding taking place. For example, in transcript 6.1, Lai-Tai’s efforts to introduce the topic of Chinese New Year by showing the children a Fai Chun, a wall-hanging containing a New Year blessing, concludes without the students having any idea about the identity or purpose of the Fai Chun. Why was there a breakdown in communication here? Why did the classroom talk in this episode have the appearance of a formal dance, where teacher and students know the moves and yet the expected knowledge formation fails to materialise?

From a sociocultural approach, learning is understood as a shared process of joint knowledge construction which is carried out through language. In the school classroom it is usually the teacher who provides the cognitive support through the classroom talk to guide the students from their current knowledge to new understandings. Lai-Tai as a beginner teacher appears to lack the knowledge of how to provide this linguistic scaffolding for the students. Rather than exploring the students’ suggestions of the object being a Chinese calendar or a dreamcatcher and linking these perceptions to an explanation of the Fai Chun, she tries to draw on non-existent cultural knowledge hoping the students will simply recognise the object (Transcript 6.1, Lai-Tai introducing Chinese New Year). Lai-Tai’s inability to progress the classroom talk and turn it into a learning event points to the importance of focusing attention on classroom discourse as guided participation within initial teacher education.

Just as Lai-Tai’s students need guiding to notice salient features of the Fai Chun, so Lai-Tai as a preservice teacher needs guidance in how to use classroom talk as the framework for recontextualising students’ experiences. In addition to existing
research into classroom discourse and learning opportunities, the four discourse formats that I have introduced in this study offer analytic tools to preservice teachers to reflect on their classroom discourse, consider which format(s) they are taking up and how this empowers or constrains the voices of their students.

9.5 Questioning Pedagogy: Engaging with Difference

As we tend to be socialised into assuming that the particular sociocultural contexts we have grown up in are appropriate and just a fact of the way the world is, it can sometimes be difficult to maintain a critical distance from which to question our pedagogy. One way of making these practices visible again is to engage in communities of practice outside our usual local boundaries, where different Discourses are in play. Encountering these different Discourses as a participant allows us to engage with difference, producing dilemmas and novel experiences which foreground our taken-for-granted assumptions. The transnational context which is the focus of the current study offers this opportunity to the Hong Kong preservice teachers as they introduce cultural and second language items to their groups of Australian students. Wan-Yee explained that preparing for an intercultural teaching activity was “quite challenging” as “we haven’t got any experience on teaching on this topic” so she and her partner Oi-Yan had to carefully prepare their materials and techniques beforehand (transcript 8.1, lines 4-5).

That the participants perceived their transnational classroom experience as different is evident in their reflective comments, particularly noting how the students are more interactive in Australian classrooms. For example, Tak-Wah stated: “in Hong Kong it’s quite different because students tend not to start new things” (Transcript 8.8 line 3). Pik-Wah and her partner Lai-Shan commented on the higher level of interaction in the Australian classroom: “Here obviously we have more interaction with kids than in Hong Kong” (Transcript 8.5 line 3). Interestingly, both teaching pairs (Tak-Wah and Mei-Kei; Lai-Shan and Pik-Wah) draw the same conclusion from their transnational classroom experience that the students “can actually learn from their own … We are more like a facilitator” (Lai-Shan, Transcript 8.5, lines 15-16) and “the students themselves have
initiated a way to learn” (Tak-Wah, Transcript 8.8, line 1d) from which Mei-Kei observes that the teacher “acts as a facilitator here” whereas “in Hong Kong the teacher takes the main role of speaking in the classroom like teacher-centred classroom” (Mei-Kei, Transcript 8.8, lines 4a – 4c).

To appreciate the depth of the impression made by this transnational classroom experience, I refer to Oi-Yan’s reflection where she explains her “surprise” to see that after the conclusion of her teaching activity the students “were sharing the knowledge they got was correct and they shared it and this is what a teacher really hopes to get and we actually experienced it because I really never came across students like this” (Oi-Yan, Transcript 8.4, lines 7 – 11, my emphasis).

9.6 Responding to Conflicting Discourses through Dialogic Reflection

Moments such as the one recounted by Oi-Yan where expectations are suddenly unsettled can be interpreted either positively or negatively. For example, where Discourses are in conflict and disrupted expectations about student/teacher roles are viewed negatively is evident in the speech of Wei-Li when she describes her students’ initiation of questions as a threat to her authority: “they take my role!” (transcript 7.7, line 14). However such unexpected moments are not always understood negatively, but as opportunities to experiment with different approaches. For example, when Tak-Wah’s students initiated the interaction by choosing the words for pronunciation, Tak-Wah happily changed his plans and followed the students’ interests, commenting afterwards “here we can see that if students are more active actually we can cooperate to work out our lesson” (Transcript 8.8, lines 3a-3b). It all depends on how the individual participant chooses to perceive the experience. I argue in this study that a process of dialogic reflection has the potential to facilitate identity development in these preservice teachers as it affords them the opportunity of recontextualising their experience through engaging with other voices and other viewpoints. In voicing their particular viewpoints they are also drawing on the words of others directly or indirectly as they weave their utterances into the unfolding sociocultural dialogues
about the role of the teacher and “what we’re supposed to do” (Wei-Li, Transcript 7.7, line 11).

The process of dialogic reflection taken up in this study has encouraged examination and articulation of professional identity in regard to perspectives on the roles of both the teacher and the students. The participants demonstrate different viewpoints on this which is not remarkable. However, what is of interest is to track how these viewpoints themselves are being constructed and reconstructed through the discussions with their peers and the researcher.

The reflections of Wei-Li in her post-teaching focus group discussion with her peers evidenced indignation that the expectations of achieving an authoritative format had been disrupted by the students’ initiations in the classroom discourse (Wei-Li, Transcript 7.7). Wei-Li’s plight is understood and described by Mei-Ki, one of her colleagues, as the problem of “the students take your role” (Transcript 7.7, line 13). This ability to recognise and state the problem suggests that this group of preservice teachers share an understanding of the teacher’s role as being the authority figure in the classroom who has the sole right to ask questions and direct the flow of classroom discourse. Wei-Li’s thwarted expectations of creating an authoritative format are revisited by her during her stimulated recall interview one week later. Her later reflections demonstrate a different interpretation of her teaching situation and an accompanying shift in her teaching identity, suggesting that she has gained new insight from this experience. Hence, we are able to track how Wei-Li’s indignation at the “rowdy and naughty” boys who initiated questions in her first teaching activity (transcript 8.7, line 17) are reframed as “funny” (line 19) and offering “excitement” (line 22) when compared to the much quieter second group of students that they worked with the next day. The recursive nature of the dialogic process in this study is seen as a particular strength which allows participants to revisit their first impressions and recast them in the light of later events and further discussions: “We have this quieter group but then, in the end we talked about it and, we’re like oh we actually prefer the first group more” (Wei-Li, Transcript 8.7, lines 14-15).
The design of this research has sought to promote a range of opportunities for negotiation of diverse viewpoints by offering two peer focus group discussions and then a stimulated recall interview with the researcher. This has maximised opportunities for heteroglossia within the reflective process, despite the time constraints associated with a SLIM program. This research design has not only encouraged a range of different voices, or viewpoints, but has also been mindful of addressivity which acknowledges that we construct our discourses differently when addressing our comments to different people, as we make adjustments in our speech to fit our conversational partner. The current study has been designed to encourage this dialogic negotiation of identity as a jointly constructed undertaking acknowledging the different affordances and constraints of addressing utterances to one’s peers and to the lecturer/researcher. Different addressees will be perceived differently and hence call forth different utterances, different expressions and different viewpoints. Encounters with different addressees allows the speaker the opportunity of taking up different positions from which to view the experiences they are discussing. To summarise, different addressees make it possible for speakers to take up different lenses through which to view events and people.

An example of this can be seen in the case of Wei-Li and her noted difficulties in engaging in intercultural explanations about the purpose of reversing the character for good luck in the Fai Chun. On reviewing the DVD of both of her teaching activities, Wei-Li felt her second attempt at explaining this process to another group the next day was more successful. In the stimulated recall interview with her lecturer/researcher, she chose to stop the DVD at the point where she was trying to give the explanation to the first group, however her comments related to her better performance on the second occasion (Transcript 8.3). In this more professional context of the discussion with her lecturer/researcher, Wei-Li is taking this opportunity to reframe a more positive interpretation of her competence as a teacher and is scaffolded in this by her addressee the lecturer/researcher. Wei-Li begins by noting “I don't know why at that time it seems like no matter how many times I try to say it it didn’t come out right” (Transcript 8.3, lines 19-21). However, she states that
having reviewed the DVD she realizes that her performance was “OK” and the researcher then summarises Wei-Li’s new understanding: “So actually the DVD has confirmed that you did much better than you thought you did” (lines 30 -31) and Wei-Li concurs: “Yeh I was really surprised because I thought I did very bad” (line 32). I would suggest that Wei-Li’s choice of topic to discuss and the framing of her perceptions were influenced on this occasion by the fact that she was in dialogue with her lecturer, rather than in a group conversation with her peers. Hence the importance of having a number of conversational partners with whom to interanimate. This example serves to show how engagement in the dialogic reflective process can help participants reframe their understanding of their competence as second language teachers, in this case the participant has achieved more self-confident and positive self-awareness.

9.7 Developing Teacher Identity through Dialogic Reflection

I have argued that this process of interrogating one’s assumptions about what is involved in being a teacher is a life-long undertaking as part of our ideological becoming. On this basis, dialogic reflections on the classroom experience within the transnational language immersion program afford productive moments for the negotiation of meaning. Through engaging with multiple voices and viewpoints, the participants try to make sense of their encounters with difference, not just their own but those of their peers. We can see this process in action by focusing on Mei-Kei’s contributions to the reflective discussions in which she positions herself in the role of ‘translator’, as noted in Chapter Eight. In her first focus group discussion, Mei-Kei steps in and summarises Wei-Li’s description of the students’ behaviour as “the students take your role” – a reading of the situation which Wei-Li confirms as correct by immediately repeating Mei-Kei’s words (transcript 7.7, line 13). Then, during the stimulated recall interview with her teaching partner Tak-Wah, Mei-Kei again takes up this role of translator by reformulating Tak-Wah’s observation about being able to cooperate with the students: “it means that the teacher acts as a facilitator here” (line 4a, my emphasis). Her role as interpreter is clear in her opening words where she is clarifying the meaning of her colleague’s utterances. Her clarification takes the form
of providing a professional gloss on the more informal expression of her peers. Mei-Kei’s translations serve to place her discussions with her peers within the larger conversations that frame professional debate within the Discourse community of second language teaching.

However, Mei-Kei’s speech is noteworthy for going beyond the professional revoicing of her colleague’s comment about the teacher being a facilitator in Australia, because she also adds her own reflection to Tak-Wah’s words concluding that “as a teacher I need to spread this idea back to Hong Kong” (Transcript 8.8, line 4d). Why does Mei-Kei make this link back to Hong Kong? It could be for the benefit of myself as lecturer/researcher and her assumption that I would expect this endorsement of Australian practice as a desirable model. It might be because she does indeed intend to try this out in her subsequent teaching in Hong Kong. Whilst it is interesting to conjecture on this issue, it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate this further. However, in mentioning Hong Kong, Mei-Kei is not introducing a new dimension to the discussion but rather taking up and extending the comparative viewpoint mentioned already by Tak-Wah who noted “in Hong Kong it’s quite different” (lines 2a-2b).

Engagement in this transnational classroom experience has allowed these participants to take up a position of outsideness where they can discuss the nature of classroom interaction in two different educational contexts that they have experienced. It was suggested that this ability to consider alternative viewpoints is one of the features of a cosmopolitan identity and indicative of intercultural and creative understanding. The imperative for such intercultural professional engagement has been pointed out by Nozaki, Openshaw and Luke (2005) in terms of “the ethics of globalisation”:

> If education is to be, or can be, about learning to live together across borders and within them, and in and through differences instead of against or in spite of them, then educators and educational systems must tackle matters of diversity and difference directly and explicitly. (p. 3)

I have argued in this study that through reflecting dialogically on encounters with difference in the transnational classroom, these preservice teachers can develop more
flexible and empathetic understandings of diversity and difference. Such understandings are reciprocal – these preservice teachers as cultural emissaries from Hong Kong offer their Australian students “a cultural experience or an eye-opener that after today they will see to know that in this world there are other kinds of language that work very differently from English” (Hong-Ming, Transcript 8.2, lines 1d – 1f). In turn, these preservice teachers have gained different understandings from their interaction with their Australian students, as noted by Oi-Yan when reflecting on her transnational classroom experience (Transcript 8.4, lines 1 – 5):

I think the participation really helped us in our teaching. Cos back in Hong Kong you know students are really passive, because it’s always the teacher talking talking, but here it’s both sides. And I think that really helps us in our future teaching, remembering back what we did with these kids. All these experiences combine together and I think the happiest part was seeing the participation.

As a participant-observer in the school-based experience of these young ESL teachers, I agree with Oi-Yan’s sentiments. For me also participation in this research has been a positive and productive experience. As part of asking these preservice teachers to question their pedagogy, I have necessarily engaged in questioning my own. Engaging in dialogic interanimation with the voices of educational theorists and researchers, as well as the voices of these preservice teachers has helped clarify for me the importance of fostering dialogue within learning processes, whether within the school context or within teacher education in the on-going process of developing our professional identities. On the conclusion of this SLIM program, as the preservice teachers stepped onto their bus to the airport to fly back to Hong Kong, I was surprised and touched by Hong-Ming’s parting words: “Thank you for all your questions”. I in turn deeply thank my students and look to them to generate more questions as we all look for potential answers.
Appendix I: Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Overlapping utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gh</em></td>
<td>Glottal Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>word</em></td>
<td>Stressed word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(( action))</em></td>
<td>Explanation of significant contextual features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>?</em></td>
<td>Unclear utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>.</em></td>
<td>Pause in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>↑</em></td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>↓</em></td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>/ pronunciation/</em></td>
<td>Phonetic pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlining</td>
<td>Signals voice emphasis; the extent of underlining within individual words locates emphasis, but also indicates how heavy it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>Mark speech that is louder than surrounding speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcription of Cantonese Tones (Lau System)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cantonese</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
<th>Tones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foo¹</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>High Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foo²</td>
<td>bitter</td>
<td>Middle Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foo³</td>
<td>trouser</td>
<td>Middle Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foo⁴</td>
<td>charm</td>
<td>Low Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foo⁵</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>Low Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foo⁶</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transcription symbols used in this study take up the Jefferson Transcription System (Jefferson, 2004).

Table 9-1 Explanation of Transcription Symbols (Transcription symbols adapted from Jefferson, (2004, p.25-32), Cantonese tone system adapted from Brown (1994, p.9))

*Six tone markers are used for the Cantonese transcriptions in this study, following the convention outlined in Brown (1994, p.9), who notes that whilst Cantonese has seven tones: “most speakers do not distinguish between the high level and high falling tones, we commonly consider only 6 basic Cantones.” (Brown, 1994, p.9)
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