

Fostering more symmetrical discursive practices in teacher education programs: The {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues} case¹

Criando práticas discursivas mais simétricas em cursos de formação de professores: o caso do {coensino|diálogo cogerativo}

Michele Salles El Kadri²

mielkadri@hotmail.com

Universidade Estadual de Londrina

ABSTRACT - Educational settings are generally known for using the IRE interaction. This paper aims at discussing an alternative way to transform the discursive practices in teacher education programs by using a theoretical methodology framework known as {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. It draws up on the socio-historical-cultural perspective for learning and teacher education as well as the studies on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a theoretical methodological framework for teacher education. Data sources include a transcription of an audio-record of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings. The data is analyzed by with categories extracted from the Critical Discourse Analysis, interaction conversational studies and characteristics of dialogical practices. Results show that in such encounters new teachers' ways of interacting shifted from being generally characterized by the I.R.E. patterns, to ways of interacting featured by more symmetry, with the participants contributing to the topic of the discussion, having the power to evaluate, interrupting, engaging in the topics initiated by others, showing willingness to participate, coordinating discussions, alternating leadership and alternating the position of the competent peer.

Keywords: interaction patterns, teacher education, {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}.

RESUMO - Contextos educacionais são geralmente conhecidos por utilizarem o padrão de Iniciação-Resposta-Avaliação. Este artigo objetiva discutir uma alternativa para a transformação das práticas discursivas nos programas de formação de professores ao se utilizar um referencial teórico-metodológico conhecido como {coensino|diálogo cogerativo}. Está embasado na perspectiva sócio-histórico-cultural para a aprendizagem e formação de professores, assim como nos estudos de {coensino|diálogo cogerativo} como um referencial teórico-metodológico para a formação de professores. Os dados são transcrições de áudio dos encontros de {coensino|diálogo cogerativo} e são analisados pela análise crítica do discurso, estudos da conversação interacional e características de práticas dialógicas. Os resultados demonstram que, nesses encontros, os modos de interagir dos professores novatos mudam do padrão I.R.A. para maneiras de interagir caracterizadas por uma maior simetria e com os participantes contribuindo com os tópicos de discussão, tendo poder para avaliar, interromper, se engajar em tópicos iniciados pelos outros, demonstrando interesse para participar, coordenando discussões, alternando as posições de liderança e de par mais competentes.

Palavras-chave: padrões interacionais, formação de professores, {coensino|diálogo cogerativo}.

Introduction

The ruling relations which characterize most current educational systems – such as the IRE pattern³, for example, is still a concern for those involved in the task of educating teachers which share the belief that the more dialogic a discourse appears, the more it acts against rules

and controls characteristics of the educational system. As Foucault (1979) highlights, power is played out through institutionalized discursive practices. This is significant in Brazilian context, in which educational settings are generally known for using the IRE interaction. On top of this, socio-historical-cultural approaches to learning have often failed to recognize questions of inequity and authority in

¹ This paper is part of my Doctoral dissertation (El Kadri, 2014) and it is linked to the project “Language, participation, representation and power: investigating identities and agency forged in teaching-learning practices during teaching practicum and ongoing teacher education programs”, under my supervision at Universidade Estadual de Londrina.

² Professor at Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Departamento de Letras Estrangeiras Modernas. Rodovia Celso Garcia Cid, PR 445 Km 380, s/n, Campus Universitário, 86057-970, Londrina, PR, Brasil.

³ IRE consists of an *initiation*, followed by a *reply*, and ends with an *evaluation* (Lemke, 1990). The author, though, consider it only a negative way of participating and learning. See Sinclair and Coulthard (1974), Mehan (1979) and Wells (1993).

the distribution of mediatory means (Rowe, 2011). Bearing it in mind, this paper aims at discussing an alternative way to transform the discursive practices in teacher education program. Thus, I exemplify how new ways of acting foster new ways of interacting in Teacher Education programs and thus, provide more symmetrical space.

Analyzing teachers' ways of acting in teacher education programs has been understood as paramount due to its relation with novice teacher agency. Greeno (2006) and Engle and Faux, (2006) and Nietzsche (2010), for example, argue that one important aspect of developing agency is having the opportunity to participate and contribute in interactions where one is framed and positioned as an accountable author who is in charge of one's actions. In order to do so, appropriate interactional spaces must be created (Nietzsche, 2010).

By using a theoretical methodology framework known as {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}⁴, I present an experience in which new patterns of interaction are fostered among the participants and how such new ways of interacting have the potential to foster new identities. Focusing on language use during {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} interactions could provide us not only with a better understanding of the possibilities for participation and learning for all the participants, but also with contributions towards our understanding of how to foster novice teachers and schoolteachers with more dialogical contexts. In addition, more studies focusing on language might help us understand not only the nature of such interactions but also issues of power.

If changes in discursive practices are indicative of social change (Foucault, 1979), it becomes relevant to investigate whether {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings, are, in fact, providing contexts for alternative discursive practices and providing the possibility to subvert, through discourse, asymmetrical power relations. This becomes possible by investigating the language practices that occur in these contexts.

This paper draws up on the socio-historical-cultural perspective for learning and teacher education (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Leont'ev, 1978; Johnson, 2009; Le Cornu and Edwin, 2008; Lewis and Ketter, 2011) as well as the studies on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a theoretical methodological framework for teacher education (Roth and Tobin, 2002a, 2002b; Wassel and Lavan, 2009a; Scatlebury *et al.*, 2008). Data sources include a transcription of an audio-record of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings. The data is analyzed by with categories extracted from the Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 2003; Van Leu-

ween, 2008), the heuristic of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, interaction conversational studies (Daniel *et al.*, 2003; Cheyne and Tarulli, 1999) and characteristics of dialogical practices (Mateus, 2005).

This paper is organized as follows: first, I present the tenets of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a theoretical methodological approach for Teacher Education; then, the context and analytical methods are described and finally, I exemplify the patterns of interaction that emerge in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}.

{Coteaching|Cogenerative dialogues} as a theoretical-methodological approach for Teacher Education

Coteaching occurs when two or more teachers instruct alongside one another in order to facilitate student learning (Roth, 1998) and that they “*may* be novice teachers – i.e., those in training – beginning certified teachers, seasoned supervising teachers (mentors), school supervisors, department heads, university supervisors of novice teachers, or researchers” (Roth, 2006, p. 12). This approach to teaching began in the late 1990s when Tobin and Roth first implemented coteaching models as means for supporting teacher learning (Roth, 1998; Roth *et al.*, 1999; Tobin, 2006; Tobin *et al.*, 2001; Roth and Tobin, 2002a, 2002b). Based on their own experience in practicing coteaching, Roth and Tobin provided the rationale and the first experience of this implementation in a teaching education program (Roth and Tobin, 2002a, 2005; Roth *et al.*, 2004; Tobin and Roth, 2006; Tobin *et al.*, 2003). The authors report that initially the focus was placed on coteaching as an instructional experience, but they soon figured out that it was necessary to incorporate conversations about coteaching that occurred outside of instructional time. Roth and Tobin realized that coteaching was insufficient if it was not articulated with conversation about praxis (with cogenerative dialogues)⁵.

Cogenerative dialogue is characterized by encounters in which students-teachers and teachers participate in conversations regarding praxis that focuses on teaching and learning with the purpose to further develop existing understandings of the learning/teaching situation in order to build local theory and thereby increase the action potential of all participants (Roth, 2002). One of the most significant features of cogenerative dialogue meetings is the ability for such meetings to provide space for all participants to utilize a more equitable approach towards making sense of and generating an understanding of praxis (Roth *et al.*, 2002), which, in my view, cannot be misun-

⁴ Here, {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is written between brackets and the Sheffer stroke in order to “allows us to keep dialectical tensions alive and to eschew the use of independent polar opposites” (Roth *et al.*, 2005, p. 7). Thus, every time the Sheffer stroke “|” appears between words in this dissertation, it means the concepts are understood in dialectical ways. For a more comprehensive view on this form of writing, see Roth *et al.* (2005).

⁵ Verbal Information. Lecture presented at Griffith University, in August 2012 by Professor Wolff-Michael Roth.

derstood power-relations-free. Thus, the main theoretical underpinnings of such encounters is the belief that each participant brings unique understanding and experiences to the field of activity while experiencing and interacting with the field in different ways (Wassell and Lavan, 2009a, 2009b).

Taking this into account, Roth and Tobin (2005) suggested the articulation of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. {Coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is grounded in socio-cultural theories of learning⁶, which underpin how coteaching is enacted in the classroom, how practices might be altered as a result of coteaching and how learning might come about through coteaching (Murphy *et al.*, 2009). Tobin *et al.* (2001), for example, defines it in terms of a collective practice, in which learning arises from the experience of being-together-with where new teachers learn and develop their practices with more experienced practitioners. Lehner (2006) affirms that the researchers acknowledge the significance of Lave and Wenger's (1991) theory for the development of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a model for teacher learning, which means that, from this perspective, new teachers begin their learning trajectory as legitimate peripheral participants in a community of teaching practitioners and move closer to the center of this community as they progressively demonstrate effective implementation of those practices considered by its members as markers of membership (Lehner, 2006).

The very definition of cogenerative dialogues stresses the role of dialogue: it is defined as (a) the “*effective negotiation* of the systems they navigate each day” (Stith and Roth, 2010); (b) “*open discussions* in which *all participants' opinions and voices* have equal value, and the participants *co-generate* a product” (Martin, 2006; Scantlebury *et al.*, 2008); (c) a “*radically democratic' discussion* among collaborator with varying experience and expertise (Tobin *et al.*, 2001) in the “democratic construction of (open) theory” (Roth *et al.*, 2004) for a “*collectively engagement* in building theory” (Roth *et al.*, 2004) in “a form of *structured discourse*” (Martin, 2006), which thus results in the “*co-generation of solutions*” and local theory (Martin and Scantlebury, 2009). Therefore, from my standpoint, an epistemological theory based on dialogue and the social relations individuals share could not avoid a critical look into the language used in this context because linguistic structures are used as ways of

acting, interacting, representing and being in the world and with people (Resende and Ramalho, 2006).

Because the very definition of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} stresses the centrality of the use of language in both social practices, I believe understanding how linguistic structures are used as ways of action in the world and between people is of great value for those involved in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. The possibility of subverting, through discourse, asymmetrical power relations may become a characteristic aspect of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings in creating a more democratic environment for education.

The aim of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is to provide spaces in which the distribution of power is shared. Therefore (a) “everybody needs to be active, contributing to the dialogue; all participants are equal at the outset and participants' experience must be treated as legitimate, even if it might not be shared” (Roth *et al.*, 2004, p. 21) and (b) the exchange of ideas between participants who hold radically different philosophical positions are allowed and facilitate the creation of a “third-space”⁷ (Lehner, 2006). This framework is, in essence, concerned with social changes that might overcome asymmetrical relations of power and are, in part, supported by discourse. In this sense, the aim at intervening socially to produce change that favors those in a disadvantage in a specific social practice, that is, to contribute to combating relations of domination (Resende and Ramalho, 2006), is at the core of such perspectives.

The central motto of the perspective is ‘*coteaching is colearning in praxis*’ (Roth and Tobin, 2005). According to the authors, by co-participating in teaching, particularly with an experienced teacher, novice teachers come to enact appropriate teaching, as a way of being in the world (Roth and Tobin, 2002a, 2002b). These authors support that this is mainly concerned with student learning followed by addressing impediments within schooling which would then result in the improvement of the conditions of learning (Roth and Tobin, 2002a) since the essence of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is to maximize teaching and learning in the here and now of actual (revolutionary) praxis.

A considerable amount of literature has been published on the results and benefits of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. These studies are not solely interpreted as a methodology for the improvement of teacher education

⁶ Although there are many approaches to learning that fall under the heading of socio-cultural theories (socio-cultural, cultural-historical and CHAT, for example), they all share their roots in the work of Vygotsky (1978), and therefore, are grounded in the notion that “human development relies on the appropriation of pre-existing cultural tools, that this appropriation occurs through social interchange, and that as a consequence of these dynamics, people grow into the frameworks for thinking afforded by the cultural practices and tools made available to them in the social setting of their development” (Ellis *et al.*, 2010, p. 4).

⁷ Third space is understood here as the space in which alternative and conflictive discourses and positionings transform the contradictions and the difference in collaborative environments of learning created by the overlap of two different spaces and the reciprocity between participants. It means new social practices – different from the ones existing – are created through the collaboration of the participants (Gutiérrez *et al.*, 1999; Norton-Meier and Drake, 2010; Max, 2010).

by providing new opportunities for learning to teach and for the enhancement of student learning, but also as means to overcome the theory/practice gap. The main benefits of implementing {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, according to the studies, are its impacts on the teaching and learning experiences of all participants (Roth *et al.*, 2004; Roth *et al.*, 1999; Roth and Tobin, 2002a; Scantlebury *et al.*, 2008), as it increases opportunities for actions that would otherwise not occur (Roth *et al.*, 2004). For instance, several researchers have noted that a very important type of learning occurs from pairing up both activities (coteaching and cogenerative dialogue): the creation of resources that provide teachers (not only novice teachers but all the participants involved) with opportunities for the development of agency (Elden and Levin, 1991; Roth *et al.*, 2000; Stith and Roth, 2006, 2010). Eick *et al.* (2003) also argue that coteaching provides shared experiences for student teaching supervisors, methods instructors, schoolteachers and novice teachers in order to engage in theoretical discussions and improve their practice in the classroom. Others have highlighted that the process makes merging the usually separate activities of professional development, supervision, evaluation and research viable (Roth and Tobin, 2002a). In doing so, the process sets a pretense for ongoing evaluation in which the focus is placed on teaching with the intent of enhancing the learning of the students (Roth and Tobin, 2002a).

Regarding the use of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} in teacher education, research has shown that its implementation within professional education programs offers various possibilities for the evocation of positive change not only in teacher education programs, but also in the classrooms of the participants at schools (Milne *et al.*, 2011). It has been argued that the process exhibits the potential to (a) expand evaluation methodologies that will position participants more centrally not only in the collection of data, but also in the analysis of this data in order to catalyze transformative practices in education programs (Martin and Scantlebury, 2009), (b) reduce the number of hindrances associated with assessment, (c) provide contexts for generative learning, and (d) contribute to a more sophisticated activity system associated with preparing teachers (Milne *et al.*, 2011). This is possible according to the researchers, because, in cogenerative dialogue (meetings that follow cotaught lessons), all teachers discuss and theorize their experiences in the foregoing lesson with the intent to designate changes in the learning environment. These changes are subsequently implemented to thus improve teaching and learning (Wassel and Lavan, 2009b).

However, little has been researched about the ways people interact in such encounters. Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 109) posit that participation in a community

of practice entails ‘learning to talk’ within a practice. Based on this perspective, we still need to understand how one “learns to talk”, how the language used affords or constrains participation and shared contribution in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} settings (El Kadri, 2014). This paper aims at addressing such gap.

The context

This study is part of a two-year investigation of teacher induction through {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} organized within the Brazilian Institutional Bursary Program for the Initiation to Teaching⁸ (henceforth PIBID). PIBID is a program designed by CAPES⁹ to enhance teacher education and teaching in public schools. The program aims at promoting innovative teaching practices in public schools and the integration of theory and practice by inserting novice teachers in public schools, positioning the schoolteachers as co-supervisors. This study focuses on a teacher education program involving a public university in Paraná, Brazil and PIBID. Within this context, I chose to implement {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} as context for the teaching practicum, which occurs during the third and fourth term of the teacher education program.

This article is part of a doctoral dissertation which aimed at understanding the transformation of teacher identities during their teaching practicum organized within PIBID through {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a methodological approach. Teacher identities were investigated through new teachers’ ways of acting, interacting, representing and being and data sources include audio-records of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings, lectures by novice teachers given in academic seminars, papers, journals and reports. The analysis carried out was a longitudinal one focusing on two particular new teachers during two years. For the purpose of this paper, however, I focus only on the ways of interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} and data source include one transcription of a cogenerative dialogue.

In the present study, participants had chosen to implement {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} based on an initial outline of what the model implies. Inherently, because none of the participants had prior experience, they had to grow into their new roles in and through implementing the model. Realizing cogenerative dialoguing as described in the research literature was also made difficult when a new teacher exhibited resistance (El Kadri and Roth, 2013). Similarly, participants had to grow into their roles of teaching alongside someone else and to take full responsibility for student learning even though someone else was taking currently the lead.

⁸ In Brazil, it is called ‘Programa Interinstitucional de Iniciação à Docência’. It offers bursary to teachers who are involved in it.

⁹ CAPES is an agency under the Ministry of Education in Brazil which is responsible for several teacher education programs.

Cogenerative dialogues occurred weekly at the school involving with all participants including all new teachers in the cohort, the cooperating teacher¹⁰, and the teacher educator; on occasion, a member of the school administrative staff also participated. Most of the cogenerative dialogue meetings focused on issues related to (a) the enactment of coteaching and coplanning; (b) strategies for dealing with classroom management; (c) skills to be focused in the English teaching curriculum; (d) resources to be used; (e) approaches to teach English; (f) student motivation and attitudes; (g) debriefing preceding lessons; (h) participating in teaching social practices (e.g. seminar and school evaluation board); and the (h) relationship with the school. The particular transcription represented in this paper focus on pedagogic strategies that would improve the learning conditions of LGBT students in the classroom.

As part of their practicum in a program to be certified as English teachers, 12 new teachers were assigned to a cohort led by the author of this paper. In this article, I exemplify the findings about ways of interacting by focusing on an interaction between two new teachers – Aline and Estéfani¹¹ – a cooperating teacher – Alice – and myself.

After the transcription, the analysis were carried out with categories extracted from the Critical Discourse

Analysis (Fairclough, 2003; Van Leeuwen, 2008), the heuristic of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, interaction conversational studies (Daniel *et al.*, 2003; Cheyne and Tarulli, 1999) and characteristics of dialogical practices (Mateus, 2005).

Patterns of interaction in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}: A case-study

This section exemplifies the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}. In the episode below, teachers begin to debate pedagogic strategies that would improve the learning conditions of LGBT students in the classroom. Dealing with the prejudice against LGBT students in English classes turned out to be a topic of the coteachers' concern when contemplating further transformation and the implementation of such topics into the curriculum. This theme then became the topic of several {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings and, as a result, began to appear in the curriculum in non-explicit forms due to a lack of confidence among the teachers in dealing with this topic. However, the way teachers clearly *speak freely* about it is significant for the trust relations between teachers.

Excerpt 1

Co-planning meetings, May 3rd, 2011

Fragment 6

- 01 Ste: About the activities you sent us by e-mail, I thought *they were very cool... but you have to know how to work* with that, right?
- 02 Mi: yeah... I was thinking about it... guys, there is one unit there called 'gay families'...a unit... maybe it is...
- 03 A: there are some...
- 04 Ste: yeah, I saw it... [...] so, *but you have to know how to do* with that, Michele, because at the time I saw it I said: My God! How do we...
- 05 A: yeah, there are some units... *they are easy* to work with, *but there are some I said*, Oh!
- 06 Mi: but have you seen the title? Taboos and Issues... so, all the units are about taboos issues...they talk about euthanasia, a girl who dates an older guy... everything is a taboo, things that people do not talk about it.
- 07 Ste: but *it is interesting* for them!
- 08 A: guys, *I do not know how to work with that...* I am very prejudiced [...] Sometimes we think we are not, but then comes the time... and no... I think I am already... I have prejudice.
- 09 Mi: *ok, what about we start to think about... let me see... with diversity?* With stereotypes, for example.... Do you know this other material? The Intercultural Resource Pack? *I think maybe we could start working* with it, and not be specific about it, you know, do not touch the issue.... Let's work with diversity in general.
- 10 Ac: yeah, in general, in general...

¹⁰ The cooperating teacher is the schoolteacher.

¹¹ All the participants authorized the use of their real name.

Excerpt 1. Continuation.

- 11 A: *I think it is complicated...like that... for example, in the day we were talking about it in the meeting, Duda said, for example: “No, I do not agree... I think we shouldn’t work with it” ... And then, I was watching Grey’s Anatomy and they were discussing it, so.... [...] I thought, why not?*
- 12 Ac: look, but if in the class I am going to say something about it, *I am afraid, I do not know how to....* I have to pay a lot of attention so I do not say something.... I don’t know...
- 13 A: No, *but I think...you know what happens, Alice?* Depends on where you are.... The context you are working with, for example.... Here, I believe it is fundamental. Students are feeling really bad about it.
- 14 Ste: Can we think about it a little bit more?
- 15 A: It is better.
- 16 Mi: Ok. We discuss it next meeting then...
- 17 A: But we have to do so!¹²

In Excerpt 1, Stefani is the one *initiating dialogue/ideas*, calling attention to the topic by (turn 01) referring to a virtual post I sent to them (a link to the book, *Taboos and Issues*). It is possible to note that this may have been a topic that worried Stefani. She initiated the topic evaluating the material as “cool” and, at the same time, proposes an adversative sentence introduced by the contrastive marker “but” (“*but you have to know how to work with it*”), followed by a request for confirmation “right?”. Stefani requires a direct answer from me, and I begin to explain my intention for sending the material by suggesting that it was a unit to be used for future lesson plans. As I try to express this by using a deontic modality (*maybe it is...*), I am interrupted by Aline, who also evaluates the material (“they are easy to work with but there some... I said Oh! – turn 05). I then agree with Aline, justifying the topics in the material by its title “*but have you seen the title?*” and highlighting that this was the main point (turn 06). Stefani interrupts me, introducing her evaluative utterance using the adversative, “*but it is interesting for them*” (turn 06). At this point, for Stefani, although the activities are interesting, she does not know how to work with them. Aline interrupts again stating that she also is not knowledgeable on the subject of approaching this topic in the classroom, labeling herself as a prejudiced person (turn 08). My next utterance is then a “step back” from my first proposal. By using the expressions, “*what about*” and “*let me see*”, I re-think my first suggestion and decide to propose using the unit on “diversity” as a means of not addressing the issue directly, since novice teachers were feeling uncomfortable with this. My suggestion continued with the subjectively marked modalities, “*I think maybe we could start*”, indicating the *subjective*

modality. There is explicit subjectivity here in regards to the degree of affinity with the proposition, marking, it is clear that the affinity represented belongs to myself (Fairclough, 2003), therefore demarcating the existence of other possible views. Alice agrees with this (turn 10) and Aline (turn 11) takes the turn, evaluating what we were doing: “it is *complicated*.” By evaluating this as complicated, Aline adopts a position that differs from that taken in the beginning of the conversation, *showing willingness to participate* in different ways. Although labeling herself as a prejudiced person, she contemplates this and reconsiders it when I retract. By offering varied points of view, e.g. by *providing evidence* that another teacher is against it and a counter-argument that the TV show “Grey’s Anatomy” discussed it, she reconsiders: “*I thought, why not?*” (turn 11). Alice disagrees with the idea of addressing the topic in English classes based on her personal feeling: “*I am afraid, I do not now how to*” (turn 12). She appears to feel insecure about it, confirmed by her utterance, “*I don’t know.*” Then, Aline supports a different perspective than the one she adopted in the first year. Even though she stated that she did not know how to do it, she wanted to do so. She disagrees politely with Alice’s perspective through the adversative *but* and the subjectively modality ‘*I think*’ (“*but I think... you know what happens, Alice?*” – turn 13), explaining that it depends on the context and, in ours, and in her perspective, it was *fundamental*, since students were saddened by the occurrences in the classes. Stefani, who first initiated the topic, asks for more time to think about it (turn 14). Alice agrees with this, (turn 15) evaluating it (“it is better”) and I suggest we leave the discussion for the next meeting (turn 16). Aline’s reinforcement demonstrates great levels

¹² Excerpt originally in English.

of commitment to the perspective through the deontic modality *we have to*: “but we have to do so!” (turn 17).

This excerpt is a significant example for attempting to understand the ways of acting in {coteaching|cogenerative} and the relations of power within this context. One of the ways to determine whether the relationship between the participants is equitable and characterized by little social distance is by the fact that their evaluation of the topic is similar (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006). Here, most of the participants explicitly evaluate and represent themselves as without knowledge of how to deal with this issue. Although I do express this explicitly, the fact that I step back from my suggestion is an implicit way to say that I concur. Despite the presence of disposition among the participants towards discussing the topic, all of them appear to evaluate the topic as necessary but also difficult (due the lack of knowing). According to Young and Fitzgerald (2006), the fact that the participants share views and appraise facts similarly is an important feature in more equitable relations.

Indeed, what we can notice here is that power is distributed in more even ways than traditional contexts. Here, all the participants contribute to the topic initiated by Stefani; Stefani and Aline have the power to evaluate (turns 01, 07 and 11) and Aline, Alice and Stefani interrupt (turns 04, 11 and 13). Thus, the fact that people can decide to enter dialogue whenever they wish to do so and can also decide to continue the dialogue on other occasions (Fairclough, 2003), as suggested by Stefani (turns 01 and 14), is a demonstration that power is being equally distributed. Power is also seen as distributed because no one in the interaction is explicitly told when to start talking and acting, rather, everybody engages in the topic instigated by Stefani as they continue the dialogue. When suggestions are made, one no longer tells the other how to do something, but, rather, all are encouraged to speak. For example, in my turns 02 and 09 the language employed is orientated for difference: there is a high level of epistemic modality and there are questions that suggest others should join in the discussion and that the proposition is open to negotiation. These features might be seen as an indication of intention towards developing shared knowledge (Nystrand *et al.*, 1997). Since more powerful institutional participants in each context can indirectly constrain or allow participation of others by selecting the discourse type (Fairclough, 2003, p. 46-47), language choice is made “in regard to the meaningful proposal intended by certain forms of exercising power” (Pardo-Abril, 2007, p. 140). Although social situations define people with more or less power (Fairclough, 2003) with regard to institutional position, many may attempt to subvert such relations through language. It is in this space that lexical choices may reallocate the roles played by the individuals.

Although I seem to still ‘control’ the power, as I am the one that sent the material and suggested the approach,

this power is distributed in more even ways as a result of this specific type of interaction: a mixture of questions and responses shows people are equally engaged in asking and answering questions (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006). There is also a more equitable distribution of turns, a great number of interruptions, and a low number of turns dominated by the teacher educator, such are characteristics of dialogical practice (Mateus, 2005).

All the participants take turns to act in various ways: asking questions, making requests, explaining, etc. (Fairclough, 2003). Stefani selected and changed topics (Fairclough, 2003), Alice and Alice were free to disagree, recognizing the differences between their perspectives (Fairclough, 2003), and Aline offered her interpretation of what has been said (Fairclough, 2003). Aline’s way of acting here is particularly significant. She expresses her opinion by agreeing and disagreeing (Roth, 2002) in a way that contributes to the discussion. She is more opened to the difference (Fairclough, 2003), despite her ways of acting during the first year. A disposition to talk about the issue was noticeable, even without feeling comfortable, which shows she is implicated in the process and consequences of the activity in the teaching/learning.

Another important element of these particular ways of acting is the accentuation of difference and the struggle over meaning, norms and power, which characterizes dialogical meetings. How to deal with the conflicts encountered in the classroom went unresolved in these meetings, as participants agree with the need to discuss it again but not on how or whether we should do so. There is an implicit struggle for power: Alice demonstrates her power by presenting doubts regarding the topic and participants accepting this; Aline also shares power by demanding the conversation should continue and I also exert power by determining that we could bring it up again in the next meeting. There is a certain level of orientation to difference seen here as people understand the differences of perspectives but at the same time feel free to disagree with it through the use of adversative markers (*but*). These ways of acting in a committed way through these ways of interacting between the participants is significant because it is in this discursive production between participants that the relation between being an actor (agency) and what is potentially available in the {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} (structure) that fosters a teacher’s power to act. In other words, the possibilities for agency are intrinsically related to the ways in which social actors are positioned and position themselves in the practices in which they participate.

These ways of acting thus culminated in new representations that contributed to a sense of recognition at the schools. Aline represents this by stating, “*the practices that we have been doing for two years allowed us to have these successful results.*” This way of representing is different because here, Aline, rather than using the pronoun “I” as was typical during the first year representations of

the practice, starts to use the pronoun “we” for most of her representations. Such a change is significant in terms of the meanings of identification with regard not only to how texts represent and construct group communities (Fairclough, 2003) but also with regard to how it demonstrates a form that is substituted for ‘everybody’ (Lewis and Ketter, 2011). In addition, Aline includes herself as the one who ‘performs’ the action. There is a causal and consequence relation in Aline’s representation: they only have successful results because of their practices.

Rather than positioning herself as a passive agent here, Aline represents herself as the active and dynamic forces of the activity. She includes herself as the one responsible for the actions. Not only is she doing this, but she acknowledges that the whole group is doing so as well. Through this *activation*, Aline posits herself as the one who is also “doing things”. This interpretation is also confirmed by the fact she chooses a material process (to do), “*the practices that we have been doing*,” in order to represent herself. This is crucial for the process of becoming agential if we understand identities as a set of cultural representations constructed in specific situations and as a way of meaning-making which influences and organizes not only our actions but the conceptions we have about ourselves (Hall, 2005).

Final consideration

This paper aimed at discussing an alternative way to transform the discursive practices in teacher education program through {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. The ways of interacting in such encounters shows that the new teachers’ ways of interacting in this context is featured by more symmetry, with the participants contributing to the topic of the discussion, having the power to evaluate, interrupting, engaging in the topics initiated by others, showing willingness to participate, coordinating discussions, alternating leadership and alternating the position of the competent peer.

The Table 1 displays the ways of acting and interacting forged in this group while participating in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}.

Finding and analyzing such ways of interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is important in order to present alternative ways or organizing teacher education programs which aim at enabling novice teachers to play a more central role in the transformation of teacher education programs and schools. Such ways of acting and interacting in teacher education programs are crucial for the development of accountable actors’ identities. An accountable actor identity is only fostered by the creation of interactional spaces in which novice teachers (a) are positioned as contributors whose inputs are recognized and credited (Nietz, 2010), (b) have the possibility to problematize and resolve noteworthy issues (Greeno, 2006), (c) are able to propose and evaluate ideas, and (d) are treated as if one can do something of one’s own volition, having experiences that exercise agency (Edwards and D’arcy, 2004).

What this table demonstrates, therefore, is that {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} can provide room for the development of agency and new forms of participation as a teacher becomes respected and positioned as an accountable actor and for learning how to be a practicing participant at schools in and through participation in praxis.

{Coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} appeared to have crucial aspects of a context that allowed for transformation to occur and to be constitutive of the process of becoming a teacher (as teaching with others over an extended period of time fosters changes in the relations with others). In a similar vein, {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} proved to be a useful context for developing agency in teachers’ professional development. It was also useful in the sense that cogenerative dialogue meetings open the floor to the examination of the ideas of (all) teachers and provide context for more symmetrical relations between teacher educators and novice teachers; it also provides a context for the development of the

Table 1. Ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}.

| Ways of acting | Ways of interacting |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • taking turns to act and not to act in various ways – asking questions, making requests, explaining, greater mutuality of participation, more symmetrical ways of interacting • contributing to the topic, having the power to evaluate, interrupting, deciding to enter dialogue whenever they want, deciding to continue the dialogue on other occasions, engaging in topic brought up by others • using a more equitable distribution of turns between the novice teachers, decreasing number of turns taken by the teacher educator • language used opens for difference | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using a mixture of questions and responses, which shows people are equally engaged • presenting features of dialogical practice (Mateus, 2005) • showing a high level of epistemic modality and questions |

Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)¹³ that allows the relationships to be otherwise. {Coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} evidently fosters the transformation of teachers' identity as they fully integrate novice teachers into schools, allowing novice teachers to become respected, practicing participants among others teachers at schools. In becoming so imbued with the practice, they become part of the everyday life of the school for other participants and others, in turn, become part of their practice (Lave, 1996).

There is also evidence that {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues} provide more symmetrical relations and call attention to the need to reconsider the concept of the ZPD in more symmetrical terms (in the line with Roth and Radford, 2011; Zuckerman, 2007; Magalhães, 2009) in order to overcome power relations in teacher education programs.

Summing up, we demonstrated in this paper that such organization has the potential to foster more dialogical practices and thus, provide more symmetrical space in teacher education programs.

References

- CHEYNE, A.; TARULLI, D. 1999. Dialogue, difference, and the "third voice" in the zone of proximal development. *Theory and Psychology*, **9**:5-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354399091001>
- DANIEL, M.F.; LAFORTUNE, L.; PALLASCIO, R. 2003. *The development of dialogical critical thinking*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 35 p.
- EDWARDS, A.; D'ARCY, C. 2004. Relational agency and disposition in socio-cultural accounts of learning to teach. *Educational Review*, **56**(1):147-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0031910410001693236>
- EICK, C.J.; WARE, F.N.; WILLIAMS, P.G. 2003. Coteaching in a science methods course: a situated learning model of becoming a teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, **54**(1):74-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487102238659>
- ELDEN, M.; LEVIN, M. 1991. Cogenerative learning: bringing participation into action research. In: W.F. WHYTE (ed.), *Participative action research*. Newbury Park, Sage, p. 127-142.
- EL KADRI, M.S. 2014. *English language teachers' changing identities in a teaching practicum: PIBID and {Coteaching|Cogenerative Dialogue} as opportunities for professional learning*. Londrina, PR. Doctoral dissertation. State University of Londrina, 348 p.
- EL KADRI, M.S.; ROTH, W.M. 2013. "I am a Pibidiana": societal relations as the locus of sustained development in a teacher education program in Brazil. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, **38**(1):89-114. Available at: <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol38/iss5/7>. Accessed on: Jan. 5, 2014.
- ELLIS, V.; EDWARDS, A.; SMAGORINSKY, P. 2010. *Cultural-historical perspectives on teacher education and development: learning teaching*. New York, Routledge, 258 p.
- ENGLE, R.A.; FAUX, R.B. 2006. Towards productive disciplinary engagement of prospective teachers in educational psychology: comparing two methods of case-based instruction. *Teaching Educational Psychology*, **1**(1):1-22
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2003. *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London, Routledge, 270 p.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1979. *Discipline and punish: birth of the prison*. New York, Vintage Books, 333 p.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K.D.; LÓPEZ, P.B.; TEJEDA, C. 1999. Rethinking diversity: hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, **6**(4):286-303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10749039909524733>
- GREENO, J.G. 2006. Authoritative, accountable positioning and connected, general knowing: progressive themes in understanding transfer. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, **15**(1):537-547. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1504_4
- HALL, S. 2005. *A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade*. 10th ed., Rio de Janeiro, DP&A, 102 p.
- JOHNSON, K. 2009. *Second language teacher education: a socio-cultural perspective*. New York, Routledge/Amazon, 160 p.
- LEHNER, E. 2006. Creating collaborative third-space discourse to address contradictions in coteaching. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, **7**(4). Available at: <http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0604198>. Accessed on: Jan. 5, 2014.
- LEMKE, J. 1990. *Talking science: language, learning and values*. Norwood, Ablex, 261 p.
- LAVE, J. 1996. Teaching as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, **3**(3):149-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca0303_2
- LAVE, J.; WENGER, E. 1991. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, Cambridge University Press, 138 p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- LEWIS, C.; KETTER, J. 2011. Learning as social interaction: interdiscursivity in a teacher and researcher study group. In: R. ROGERS (ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. 2nd ed., New York, Routledge/Amazon, p. 128-153.
- LE CORNU, R.; EWING, R. 2008. Reconceptualising professional experiences in preservice teacher education: reconstructing the past to embrace the future. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **24**(1):1799-1812. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.008>
- LEONT'EV, A.N. 1978. *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Moscow, Progress Publishers. Available at: <http://lhc.ucsd.edu/MCA/Paper/leontev>. Accessed on: Jan, 2014.
- MAGALHAES, M.C.C. 2009. O método para Vygotsky: a zona proximal de desenvolvimento como zona de colaboração e criticidade criativas: the method to Vygotsky: the zone of proximal development as zone of creative collaboration and criticism. In: E.H. SCHETTINI; M.C. DAMIANOVIC; M.M. HAWI; P.T.C. SZUNDY (org.), *Vygotsky: uma revisita no início do século XXI*. São Paulo, Andross, p. 53-78.
- MARTIN, S. 2006. Where practice and theory intersect in the chemistry classroom: using cogenerative dialogue to identify the critical point in science education. *Cultural, Science and Education*, **1**(1):693-720.
- MARTIN, S.; SCANTLEBURY, K. 2009. More than a conversation: using cogenerative dialogues in the professional development of high school chemistry teachers. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, **21**(1):119-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9062-y>
- MATEUS, E. 2005. *Atividade de aprendizagem colaborativa e inovadora de professores: ressignificando as fronteiras dos mundos universidade-escola*. São Paulo, SP. Tese de Doutorado. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, 327 p.
- MAX, C. 2010. Learning-for-teaching across educational boundaries: an activity-theoretical analysis of collaborative internship projects in initial teacher education. In: V. ELLIS; A. EDWARDS; P. SMAGORINSKY (org.), *Cultural-historical perspective on teacher education and development: learning teaching*. New York, Routledge, p. 212-240.

¹³ The concept was initially defined as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

- MEHAN, H. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 227 p.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674420106>
- MILNE, C.; SCANTLEBURY, K.; BLONSTEIN, J.; GLEASON, S. 2011. Coteaching and disturbances: building a better system for learning to teach science. *Research in Science Education*, **41**(3):413-440. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11165-010-9172-7>
- MURPHY, C.; BEGGS, J.; CARLISLE, K. 2009. Can they go it alone? Addressing criticisms of coteaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, **4**(1):461-475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11422-008-9150-9>
- NIESTZ, T. 2010. Chasms and bridges: generativity in the space between educators' communities of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **26**:37-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.015>
- NORTON-MEIER, L.A.; DRAKE, C. 2010. When third space is more than the library: the complexities of theorising and learning to use family and community resources to teach elementary literacy and mathematics. In: V. ELLIS; A. EDWARDS; P. SMAGORINSKY, *Cultural-historical perspectives on teacher education and development: learning teaching*. London, Routledge, p. 196-211.
- NYSTRAND, M.; GAMORAN, A.; ROBERT, K.; PRENDERGAST, C. 1997. *Opening dialogue: understanding the dynamics of language learning in the English classroom*. New York, Teachers College Press, 155 p.
- PARDO-ABRIL, N. 2007. *Como hacer analisis critico del discurso: una perspectiva latinoamericana*. Santiago de Chile, Fraix, 259 p.
- RESENDE, V.; RAMALHO, V. 2006. *Análise de discurso critica*. São Paulo, Contexto, 158 p.
- ROTH, W.M. 1998. Science teaching as knowledgeability: a case study of knowing and learning during co teaching. *Science Education*, **82**(1):357-377. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-237X\(199806\)82:3<357::AID-SCE4>3.0.CO;2-B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(199806)82:3<357::AID-SCE4>3.0.CO;2-B)
- ROTH, W.M. 2002. *Being and becoming in the classroom*. Westport, Ablex, 208 p.
- ROTH, W.M. 2006. Collective responsibility and the other. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, **1**(1):607-614.
- ROTH, W.M.; GOULART, L.; LEE, J. 2005. *Participation, learning, and identity: dialectical perspectives*. Berlin, Lehmanns Media, 287 p.
- ROTH, W.M.; LAWLESS, D.; TOBIN, K. 2000. {Coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} as praxis of dialectic method. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, **1**(3). Available at: www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/1054. Accessed on: Jan. 5, 2012.
- ROTH, W.M.; MASCOTRA, D.; BOYD, N. 1999. Becoming-in-the-classroom: a case study of teacher development through coteaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **15**(1):771-784. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(99\)00027-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00027-X)
- ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K. 2002a. *At the elbow of another: learning to teach by co teaching*. New York, Peter Lang, 304 p.
- ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K. 2002b. Redesigning an "urban" teacher education program: an activity theory perspective. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, **9**(1):108-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327884MCA0902_03
- ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K. 2005. *Teaching together, learning together*. New York, Peter Lang, 275 p.
- ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K.; ZIMMERMANN, A. 2002. Coteaching: learning environments research as aspect of classroom praxis. *Learning Environments Research*, **5**(1):1-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015662623784>
- ROTH, W.-M.; TOBIN, K.; CARAMBO, C.; DALLAND, C. 2004. Coteaching: creating resources for learning and learning to teach chemistry in urban high schools. *Journal of Research in Science teaching*, **41**(9):882-904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tea.20030>
- ROTH, W.M.; RADFORD, L. 2011. *A cultural-historical perspective on mathematics teaching and learning*. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 193 p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-564-2>
- ROWE, S. 2011. Discourse in activity and Activity in Discourse. In: R. ROGERS (ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. 2nd ed., London, Routledge, p. 79-96.
- SCANTLEBURY, K.; GALLO-FOX, J.; WASSELL, B. 2008. Coteaching as a model for preservice secondary science teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **24**(4):967-981. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.008>
- SINCLAIR, J.; COULTHARD, M. 1974. *Towards and analysis of discourse*. London, Oxford University Press, 163 p.
- STITH, I.; ROTH, W.-M. 2010. Teaching as mediation: the cogenerative dialogue and ethical understandings. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **26**(1):363-370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.09.008>
- STITH, I.; ROTH, W.-M. 2006. Who gets to ask the questions: the ethics in/of cogenerative dialogue praxis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, **7**(2):art. 38. Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/124/262>. Accessed on: Jan. 15, 2014.
- TOBIN, K. 2006. Learning to teach through coteaching and cogenerative dialogue. *Teaching Education*, **17**(2):133-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10476210600680358>
- TOBIN, K.; ROTH, W.-M. 2006. *Teaching to learn: a view from the field*. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 275 p.
- TOBIN, K.; ROTH, W.-M.; ZIMMERMANN, A. 2001. Learning to teach science in urban schools. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, **38**(8):941-964. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tea.1040>
- TOBIN, K.; ZURBANO, R.; FORD, A.; CARAMBO, C. 2003. Learning to teach through coteaching and cogenerative dialogue. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, **10**(2):51-73.
- VAN LEEUWEN, T. 2008. *Discourse and practice: new tools for critical discourse analysis*. New York, Oxford University Press, 192 p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195323306.001.0001>
- VYGOTSKY, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 176 p.
- WASSELL, B.; LAVAN, S. K. 2009a. Revisiting the dialogue on the transition from coteaching to inservice teaching: new frameworks, additional benefits and emergent issues. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, **4**(1):477-484. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11422-008-9152-7>
- WASSELL, B.; LAVAN, S.K. 2009b. Tough transitions? Mediating beginning urban teachers' practices through coteaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, **4**(1):409-432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11422-008-9151-8>
- WELLS, G. 1993. Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, **5**(1):1-37. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(05\)80001-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(05)80001-4)
- YOUNG, L.; FITZGERALD, B. 2006. *The power of language*. London, Equinox, 325 p.
- ZUCKERMAN, G. 2007. Child-adult interaction that creates a zone of proximal development. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, **45**(3):43-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/RPO1061-0405450302>

Submetido: 30/03/2015

Aceito: 08/09/2015