Expanding the research on interacting and power in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}: contributions of CDA

Expandindo a pesquisa sobre interação e poder no {co-ensino|diálogo cogerativo}: contribuições da ACD

Michele Salles El Kadri[1]
Universidade Estadual de Londrina
mielkadri@hotmail.com

Abstract: This paper aims at discussing the need to formulate a bridge between a theory of language (Critical Discourse Analysis, for example) and research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a means to not only understand participants identity transformation but also the power relations fostered in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} contexts. It is grounded in a socio-historical-cultural perspective of learning and critical discourse analysis. The results of such alignment, in this paper, are presented as a proposal for investigating the ways of exercising control in the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues} or other collaborative and democratic environments.

Key-Words: critical discourse analysis, interaction, power, socio-historical-cultural perspective.

Resumo: O objetivo deste artigo é discutir a necessidade de se formular uma ponte entre uma teoria de língua (análise crítica do discurso, por exemplo) e a pesquisa sobre co-teaching e diálogo cogerativo como uma forma não somente de compreender a transformação identitária dos envolvidos neste contexto, mas também as relações de poder que se forjam. Tem como referencial teórico a perspectiva sócio-historico-cultural de aprendizado e a análise crítica do discurso. Os resultados dessa intersecção, neste artigo, são apresentados em forma de uma proposta para se investigar as maneiras de se exercitar o poder e as maneiras de agir e interagir em contextos colaborativos e democráticos.

Palavras-chave: análise crítica do discurso, interação, perspectiva sócio-histórico-cultural, poder.

Introduction

Coteaching occurs when two or more teachers instruct alongside one another in order to facilitate student learning (Roth, 1998) and 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, 2006a, p. 12). Cogenerative dialogue is characterized by encounters in which students 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, 2002a). 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.*, 2004), which, in my view, cannot be misunderstood 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). Furthermore, the meetings conjure an emancipatory feature that works against the control of interests and ruling relations that characterize most current educational systems (Roth, 2002a).

Both practices has been associated and understood as a dialectical unit called {Coteaching|Cogenerative Dialogue}[2]. Roth *et al*. (2000b) explain that coteaching and the associated cogenerative dialogue evolved because they found that such processes led to understandings that allowed them to generate new possibilities for action and thereby engage in expansive learning and in the transformation of praxis. They argue that they have realized that conceiving {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a dialectical unit offers far more benefits than conceiving them separately. The quotation below sums up fairly well the dialectical unit of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} proposed by these authors:

> […] Cogenerative dialogue is intended to improve teaching and learning and therefore provide participants with opportunities to talk about specific lessons, teaching strategies, and subject matter pedagogy as well as about teaching and learning in general. Having experienced a particular class from a similar point of view (as teacher), and having had to make decisions in the same mode of temporality, participants now have opportunities to develop explanatory accounts of these shared events. That is, their shared lived experiences provide them with a common resource for constructing shared formal explanations (re-presentations) of their praxis. Every attempt is made to allow all participants to contribute to the conversation in equitable ways. […] Our cogenerative dialogue sessions provide a forum in which successes, failures, and (failed) opportunities are raised and analyzed. […]. (Roth *et al*., 2000b, p. 10)

---

[2] 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 article, it means the concepts are understood in dialectical ways. For a more comprehensive view on this form of writing, see Roth *et al*. (2005).

The central motto of the perspective is '*coteaching is colearning in praxis*' (Roth and Tobin, 2006). According to the authors, by co-participating in teaching, particularly with an experienced teacher, novice teachers come to enact appropriate teaching, i.e., teaching *habitus*, as a way of being in the world (Roth and Tobin, 2001a; 2001b). 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, 2001a) since the essence of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is to maximize teaching and learning in the here and now of actual (revolutionary) praxis[3].

Regarding the always problematic relation between everyday teaching and academic research, Roth, Tobin and their followers have argued that in this model, the existing boundaries between academic research and everyday teaching were leveled for the purpose of enhancing learning and placing the student as its primary subject (Roth and Tobin, 2002). In other words, the student's changing relation to the world (learning) was identified as the primary and constitutive motive of the {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. According to the researchers, prioritizing students' learning is possible because as teachers take collective responsibility by teaching together at the same time (rather than dividing up tasks to be carried out independently as this frequently occurs in certain organizations such as team teaching, for example), and as the events of the classroom unfold there are more teachers to deal with them in ways that ultimately benefit the learning of the students (Roth and Tobin, 2001b). By teaching together, novice teachers appear to feel more comfortable in the classroom and are thus able to focus more on students' learning rather than on their own performance. At the same time, because the school teacher and the teacher educator are also present, both have the opportunity to learn since it is based on the premise that by working with one or more colleagues in all phases of teaching (planning, conducting lessons, debriefing, grading), teachers learn from one another without having to stop and reflect on what they are doing at the moment and why they are it (Roth and Tobin, 2006).

As Roth *et al*. (2000a) explain, such practices are underpinned by a (neo-) Marxist psychology. This implies that the purpose of theory is not simply to understand but to change the world (Marx and Engels, 1970) and provide ample space to maneuver by making new forms of action available (Holzkamp, 1985). They also highlight the concept of praxis as grounded in the work of Bourdieu (1980) and Mao Ze (1983). For them, praxis is not necessarily absent from any theory of practice: "the temporality of a practice-cannot be experienced from the outside (e.g., by a theoretician) and to understand a practice one has to participate in praxis (Mao Ze, 1967) and to share being-with (Mitsein)" (Roth *et al*., 2000a, p. 9).

However, the fact that most studies on {cotaching|cogenerative dialogue} do not focus on the language used neither in cogenerative dialogues nor in the representation of the participants of this practice, is problematic for two main reasons. First, because being apart of critical language analysis, they fail to address the power relations inherent to social meetings, even though the perspective aims at creating more equitable discussion and the very fact of recognizing it demonstrates the existing power

---

[3] According to Newman and Holzman (2002), the revolutionary critic activity may be understood as what people do that transforms the totality of what exists.

relation: if they are unequal, it is because there is power control. Second, because a deep investigation on the ways participants represent themselves and the other participants might be informative not only as to how teachers are representing themselves and others as agential or passive participants at school, but also whether teachers maintain/transform their representation of social actor participants in the context of teaching practicum adopting coteaching|cogenerative dialogue.

Although extensive research has been carried out on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, no single study exists which addresses the power relations present in those meetings. In this article, therefore, I argue for the need to formulate a bridge between the theory of language (CDA[4], for example) and research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a means to not only understand participants identity transformation but also the power relations fostered in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}.

Several authors have highlighted the need for combining theories of mind and theories of language in order to fill this gap (Boag-Munroe, 2004; Calvo, 2013; Ortenzi, 2007; Passoni, 2010; Rogers, 2011; Rowe, 2011; William *et al*., 2007). This claim draws from the acknowledgement that "socio-historical-cultural theory provides an incomplete set of conceptual tools and guidelines for the educational researcher presented with problems that are ultimately complex and indeterminate" (William *et al*., 2007, p. 105). Drawing on similar notions, Rogers (2011, p. 12) notes that "social cultural learning theorists have not attended to matters of inequity and privilege nor have critical discourses theorists attended to matters of learning", which require researchers to find particular methodological solutions or develop new combinations of theoretical resources. The author argues that analyzing discourse from a critical perspective contributes not only allows one to understand the process of learning in more complex ways but also affords the analyst insight into aspects of learning that other theories and methods have perhaps overlooked.

Most of the research on the subject has attempted to align studies grounded in social cultural theory with a language framework based on the premise that socio-cultural theory does not provide a precise way to analyze language, which constructs and mediates the activity of classroom teaching. Boag-Munroe (2004), for example, endeavored to demonstrate how critical discourse analysis can be used within the broader theoretical frame of activity theory in order to explore how far teachers follow governmental scripts while Calvo (2013) attempted to bridge CDA with the community of practice framework. It seems to me there has been a move towards the recognition of discourse (e.g., Boag-Munroe, 2004; Calvo, 2013; Ortenzi, 2007; Passoni, 2010). However, none have tried to do so within studies on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}.

From my viewpoint, for a theory concerned mainly with the trajectories of learners and which conceives learning as identity transformation, avoiding how discourses craft identities and are therefore transformed by them, seems to me a huge gap. It is here that an alignment with critical discourse

---

[4] Resende (2008) exemplifies studies aimed at contributing to the development of CDA in Latin America by highlighting the proposals of Magalhães (2009) between CDA and new literacy studies, Pardo-Abril (2007) between CDA and cognitive psychology and (Resende, 2008) between CDA and Ethnography. However, in this study, I do not seek to contribute to CDA; rather I intend to contribute to the studies on teacher education focused on teacher transformation, mainly in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} studies. I assume an opposite position: how the studies on CDA might contribute to our understanding of teacher learning through a socio-culture scope.

analysis might provide us with fruitful insights. I believe that in order to understand what occurs in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, the kinds of language features one encounters and what identities are crafted in this context, it is paramount for those working with {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} to align such studies with theories of discourse analysis[5]. It is not only because such theories for analyzing language provide us with analytical categories that are potentially fertile to the understanding and investigation of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, but also because language is seen as "ubiquitous to human activity" (Rowe, 2011, p. 228) for both discourse analysts and socio-historical-cultural theorists in the kinds of collaborative activities in which they focus.

Moreover, 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 school teachers 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. 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, and the power relations present in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} settings.

Therefore, I argue that the investigation of language use in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} aids us in the understanding of whether or not it provides dialogical practices[6]. If this implies that organizing {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings includes the constant search for allowing and providing the other with better opportunities for learning, in this sense, a social and linguistic oriented-approach such as CDA may provide us with tools to understand and become aware of the ways discourse and power are being enacted. This can then result in the ability to orient our future actions in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings.

Aligning {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} and CDA

Critical discourse analysis aims at establishing an analytical approach able to map the connections between power relations and linguistic resources selected by people or social groups recognizing that "inquiry into meaning-making is always also an exploration into power" (Rogers, 2011). Therefore, its main focus are in the relations between language and power and the way how the structure of the discourse confirms, legitimizes, reproduces or challenge the power relations and society domains (Van Dijk, 1998) and at investigating critically how social inequality is constituted and legitimized through the use of language in the discourse (Wodak, 2004). It is "a broad framework that brings critical social theories into dialogue with theories of language to answer particular research questions. As such, critical discourse analysts are generally concerned with a critical theory of the social word, and

---

[5] I believe any of the several perspectives of critical discourse analysis would add to the {coteaching |cogenerative dialogue perspective}. However, in this investigation, I focus on CDA grounded in Fairclough (2003) and Van Leeuwen (2008).
[6] Roth highlights that {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} sessions are like democracy: it is something always forthcoming; it is something we always want to improve (personal communication).

a methodology that allows them to describe, interpret and explain such relationships (Rogers, 2011, p. 3). Therefore, ADC studies are focused mostly on three central and constitutive concepts: power, ideology and critique (Wodak and Meyer, 2009).

A major common feature of both perspectives—that is, {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} and CDA—which justifies the need for their alignment, is the central role given to *dialogue*. As I have stated in the beginning of this article, the main theoretical underpinning of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} lies in the recognition that learning occurs through *shared contribution* between coteachers and students towards mutual learning in the dialectics of the individual and the collective in the context of the societal relations in which individuals *collaboratively* transform the nature of learning and teaching which aims to provide one another with agency and *more democratic classrooms* (Murphy *et al*., 2009, my emphasis). This conception of learning and development, grounded in the socio-historical-cultural process of learning to teach, supports its premises in the *dialogue*, as we can notice in the very definition of the approach, that it cannot be dissociated from the role language plays in such contexts.

As previously mentioned in the beginning of this article, the 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 (Roth, 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).

The central role given to the social practices in CDA signifies that the use of language is conceived as a social practice. Understanding discourse as a social practice implies understanding it as a situated, historical way of action, which is "not only constituted socially but also constitutive of social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief" (Resende and Ramalho, 2006, p. 26). If one considers learning as the perspective[7] outlined in this investigation, it is significant to investigate how the discourse produced in such organization constrains or allows human agency or provides proper organization for ZPD[8]. Such a social and linguistically oriented approach (Fairclough, 2001) may allow for studies on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} to trace and better understand teacher identity transformation in this context.

---

[7] Learning is seen here as "becoming kinds of persons" (Lave, 1996), "changing participation in social practice" (Lave, 1993) or "a progressive movement from external, socially mediated activity to internal mediation control by individual learners, which results in the transformation of both the self and the activity" (Johnson, 2006, p. 238).
[8] 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)

Another issue key to this discussion is the possibility that CDA analysis will potentialize research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. Because {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} also aims at positioning 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), it might be seen as a form of critical educational research[9] which seeks to create more open and equal relations between academic research and classroom teaching (assuming that is also a goal for CDA studies).

First, the views and the agenda portrayed by Fairclough (2011) related to critical research, led me to the belief that learning and social transformation are at the core of both CDA and {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} in the researching educational practices. For instance, it might be a way to deal with some of the criticisms of the {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} framework (see article 1), such as, "the danger of the research seeing things rosier than they are" (Roth and Tobin, 2002). What I wish to convey here is that critical discourse analysis may aid us in dealing with preconceptions, not only those of the participants but also the researcher's own. This is important because in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}, "no 'fly-on-the-wall' observers were allowed to participate" (Roth *et al*., 2002, p. 9) and therefore, the researcher is also an active participant of the context, being part of the teaching and learning experience.

Although Michael Roth in his studies with his collaborators did not use CDA as a tool to analyze their experience, they did anticipate the need for critically analyzing {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} experiences due to the fact researchers on this context use immediate descriptions of the context which are likely to remain stuck and reproduce ways of perceiving and acting in a particular context (Roth *et al*., 2002). In their studies, they displayed a concern for the necessity to engage in a critique of the researcher's own ideology in order to avoid being trapped in immediate understanding (Roth *et al*., 2002; Roth and Tobin, 2002a; 2002b; 2006). Their argument is grounded in the need for researchers to exercise a 'radical doubt' (Bourdieu, 1992 *in* Roth and Tobin, 2006) in order to deal with the dangers that existing understandings could be reified. While this view aligns with the concerns of CDA, this particular analytical approach may contribute to a move towards exercising 'radical doubt'. For Bordieu (1992 *in* Roth and Tobin, 2006, p. 202), "we can understand ideology, a condition for subsequently changing in a conscious manner by exercising radical doubt and deconstructing our constructive process".

Another reason I would like to highlight, is the linkage between {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} theory and the CDA perspective on the role of the analyst's position when carrying out a research. Both theories argue in favor of a positioned view, admitting the ideological stance of their work rather than emphasizing a neutral view. Chouliaraki and Fairlclough (1999), for example, posit that the personal engagement of the research does not imply a negative partiality as long as he/she specifies his/her perspective of analysis and does not simulate a scientific impartiality. From the same perspective, Wodak and Meyer (2009, p. 7) add: "CDA researchers have to be aware that their own work is driven by social, economic and political motives like any other academic work and they are not in any priv-

---

[9] I use the term 'critical educational research' as described by Fairclough (2011).

ileged position". Such acknowledgement raised awareness of the ideology in my own discourse. The incorporation of the CDA perspective in the discussion of the topic of this study is in fact, my exercise to critically examine our own discourses. Along the same lines, Resende and Ramalho (2006, p. 140) also argue that, "we acknowledge the supposition of neutrality in science is an ideological position, and we do not intend to be neutral—we know we cannot be and, more than that, we do not want to be". Van Leeuwen (2008) reminds us, "the critical term only implies specific ethical standards: an intention to make their position, research interests and values explicit and their criteria as transparent as possible, without feeling the need to apologize for the critical stance of their work" (Van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 293 *in* Wodak and Meyer, 2009). Both theories attempt to deal with the danger of being 'corrupted by the system' and end up being reified by acknowledging a variety of theoretical background oriented to different data and methodologies.

Thus, critically examine our own discourses may contribute to the establishment of research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} favoring and acknowledging the researchers' positioned view but also demonstrating how language used allowed the perspective taken.

Another reason for which I argue for critical studies in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} draws on the definition of social practice supported by Fairclough (2003). For Fairclough, "social practices can be thought of as ways to control the selection of certain structural possibilities and the exclusion of others, and the retention of those selections over time in particular areas of social life" (Fairclough, 2011, p. 120). Moreover, Fairclough (2011) believes "social practices such as teaching and learning are mediated by structures and events and are networked in particular ways through orders of discourse" (Fairclough, 2011, p. 119). In my view, based on Fairclough (2003), one is unable to understand the ways of representing (that is, the discourses) and the ways of being (the identities) without understanding and taking into account the ways of acting and interacting (the genre).

Furthermore, the orientation for emancipatory agendas for learning and social transformation of both CDA and {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} are key issues which encourage my claim towards critical studies in teacher education in the context of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}. {Coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is grounded in the transformative potential of the social practice, that is, the outcomes intended are not only the transformation of teaching and learning but also the transformation (and improvement) of the collective condition for people who work together at schools (Roth, 2006b). This view aligns with CDA regarding to the fact that the focus is not only grounded in the mechanisms of reproduction, but also in its transformative stance. In this sense, looking at the linguistics resources used in a situated social practice such as {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} may afford researchers with the tools to point out whether there is transformation or reproduction of the social practices. Such movement might even corroborate not only with the establishment of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a research field (which is based on the language used and therefore, not "romanticized" as Roth (2002a; 2002b) has pointed out being one of the criticisms of the perspective) but also with the development of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a methodological framework for educating teachers (even if this analysis demonstrates the reproduction of social practices and little transformation; recognizing it might be the first step to re(orient) our practices in the methodological approach).

Such concern with regard to the transformation of the collective condition for people who work together at schools (Roth, 2002a)—typical of studies on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}—also underlies Fairclough's proposal in his attempt to explain the "critique" in CDA. The author reports, on one hand, that:

> […] critique is oriented to analyzing and explaining, with a focus on theses dialectical relations, the many ways in which the dominant logic and dynamic are tested, challenged and disrupted by people, and to identify possibilities which these suggest for overcoming obstacles to addressing 'wrongs' and improve well-being (Fairclough, 2012, p. 164).

On the other hand,

> […] it analyses and seeks to explain dialectical relations between semiosis and other elements to classify how semiosis figures in the establishment, reproduction and change of unequal power relations (domination, marginalization, exclusion of some people by others) and ideological processes, and how in more general terms it bears upon human 'well-beings' (Fairclough, 2012, p. 163).

These quotations ultimately address the issue of unequal power relations and the transformative stance of overcoming obstacles in order to improve "well-being" and the "quality of life". These ideas render the epistemological closeness of both theories possible. Regarding this concern with transformation, Rowe (2011) agrees, in the following quotation, with the need to make some connections between CDA and socio-historical-cultural approaches to learning because:

> […] a socio-cultural approach to learning and language in use thus addresses CDA's concern with transformation by focusing on the way in which member's resources are privileged, appropriated, rejected, and deployed as part of participation in activity (Rowe, 2011, p. 228).

As I have stated, the key transformative stance is central to both perspectives and is related to the concept of subject: they both understand individuals as social agents. They are not considered 'free agents', rather they are seen as socially constrained, but nor are their actions completely socially determined. For Fairclough (2011), subjects can re-structure the domination and discursive formation, that is, they are shaped by the practice but also shape these practices. More precisely, "agents have their own 'causal power' which is not reducible to the causal powers of social structures and practices[10] […] Social agents texture text, they set up relations between elements of texts" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 22). The CDA perspective, in this sense, rejects the non-agential concept of the subject in discourse

---

[10] "Structure denotes 'resources' that human beings can draw upon in their actions and in the 'schema' that come to fruition in their perceptions of and actions toward the material and social resources in their current situation (Swidler, 1986). Structure is therefore a dialectical concept, for without the schema, human beings would not perceive the social and material world in patterned ways; but without patterned resources in the social and material world, no schema could form. In fact, existing schema is the result of the engagement of human agency with structures. […] Structure requires agency to become salient and operative, but agency requires structure to accomplish anything. This double dialectic comes with several interesting consequences" (Roth *et al.*, 2004, p. 883).

analysis, and positions itself with the view of structure|agency in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} (Roth *et al*., 2004; Scantlebuty *et al*., 2008). According to Roth *et al*. (2004) for example, this view of structure|agency is seen as a powerful theoretical tool for explaining individual growth, institutional (historical) development in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} and is fundamental to the sociological theorizing of this approach. For them,

> Agency denotes the fact that human beings are inherently imbued with the power to act. Power to act means that all human beings can appropriate available resources and, in so doing, change rather than merely react to the currently existing social and material conditions" and "Structure requires agency to become salient and operative, but agency requires structure to accomplish anything" (Roth *et al*., 2004, p. 882).

Owing to the fact that the concern of the {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} approach rests with which participant is supposed to take part in the collective responsibility for maximizing the learning, the concept of agency|structure becomes essential in this regard. Likewise, the relation between structure|agency is a significant concept for CDA, which conceives discourse as a historically situated way of acting. This signifies that it is not only *structures* organizing the discursive production in society but also that each utterance is a new individual *action* over such structure which can contribute to the continuity or transformation of current ways of action. CDA oscillates "between a focus on *structures* and a focus on the *strategies* of social agents, i.e., the ways in which they try to achieve outcomes or objectives within existing structures and practices, or to change them in particular ways" (Fairclough, 2011, p. 165).

This relation of structure|agency proposed by CDA also coincides with the tenets of cogenerative dialogue meetings: "human beings live in (and under) certain conditions that determine their actions but they also have the power-to-act ('Handlungsfähigkeit') to change these conditions" (Roth *et al*., 2000b, p. 5). More specifically, "agency and structure also leads to a change of existing material and social resources" and "actions provide resources for future actions in an indeterminate way" (Roth *et al*., 2004, p. 882). Therefore, the freedom of the subject, although it cannot be erased, is relative (Resende and Ramalho, 2006), which implies the recognition of the individuals, participating in social and discursive practices who corroborate with the maintenance or transformation of the social structures. Roth *et al*. (2004) articulates one example of the transformation provided by this concept of agency| structure in the following excerpt:

> […] agency and structure leads to learning and development, and therefore to the possibility for any existing schema to change. Thus, a new teacher who works at the elbow of another teacher changes his or her ways of looking at classroom events and at him or herself, and thereby not only becomes a good teacher, but also may develop confidence. The dialectic of agency and structure also leads to a change of existing material and social resources, such as when a teacher uses chalk and chalkboard to produce a diagram (a social and material resource), which others in the classroom can subsequently use in making some argument. That is, this way of viewing praxis leads to an emergent view of lived curriculum, where actions provide resources for future actions in an indeterminate way. Lessons become dynamic because each teacher and student action creates social and material resources, for better or

worse, that others subsequently use in their actions, based on their priorities at the moment of action (Roth *et al.*, 2004, p. 883).

In this sense, issues of structural characters and factors linked to agency are also at the core of both theories. Both seek to create more open and equitable relations not only between academic research and classroom teaching but between all participants in order to transform social conditions and render possibilities for social transformation and learning through new forms of agency in the recontextualization of contexts. Thus, CDA may help understand how the analysis of the histories, aspects socially permitted and constraints of the particular Discourses people appropriate and reject as part of learning (Rowe, 2011) as well as the agential identity one assumes in a particular discourse (Fairclough, 2003; Van Leuwen, 1996). Two relevant categories for those who wish to understand how the question of agency in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} might be seen in texts are that of *transitivity* and the *representation of social actors.* Proposed by Fairclough (2003), such categories may aid us in the understanding of the representations of teacher participants in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} and its relation with agency. What motivates this argument is the fact that analyzing whether actions or actors are represented in ways which specify or conversely elide the agency of actors and what kind of process subjects use to represent themselves and others may be telling, not only with regard to how texts represent agency but also to the significance of this textual 'choice' (Fairclough, 2003).

One can thus notice that the concept of the power to act (or agency, that is, the capacity of individuals to participate in creating their lives in the world rather than merely being determined by it (Roth *et al.*, 2002) plays a crucial role in both theories. These theories are grounded in the same ontological view of human being (as described below) and the same epistemological stance that we can only study the "real" world through the mediation of our experiences, beliefs and attitudes: we conceive the world as constituted of what we have experienced[11].

Another reason for which I argue in favor of merging both theories is because of how the CDA perspective recognizes power relations and language resources. In this sense, a theory which presupposes to work against the control interests and ruling relations that characterize most current educational systems (Roth, 2002) may benefit from being interrelated with analytical frameworks concerned with mapping such connections between power relations and language and endeavor to contribute to the overcoming of relations of domination. As such, "the ruling relations which characterize most current educational systems"—such as the IRE pattern, for example, or ideologies hidden in discourses which do not co-generate ideas and do not allow others to participate in new and different ways—are potentially revealed if the analysis on the social practices within {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} are associated with a linguistic analysis. The more dialogic a discourse appears, the more it acts against rules and controls characteristic of the educational system. I support the view that participants may benefit from the understanding of the role they enact in such situated and historical social practices and the possibilities they offer for one's own learning and the learning of others. An analysis like this may

---

[11] A broader discussion on the conception of the world for CDA is found in Resende (2008) and Ramalho and Resende (2011). Ramalho and Resende (2011), based on Bhaskar (1978), calls "epistemic fallacies" the idea of intending to have access to the "real" world in an objective way.

have much to offer in regards to our understanding in terms of beliefs, practices, ideologies, activities, interpersonal relations and the identities (Resende and Ramalho, 2006) of the participants.

As Foucault (1997) highlights, power is played out through institutionalized discursive practices. This is significant in our context in which educational settings are generally known for using the IRE interaction. If changes in discursive practices are indicative of social change (Foucault, 1997), 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. On top of this, socio-historical-cultural approaches to learning have often failed to recognize questions of inequity and authority in the distribution of mediatory means (Rowe, 2011).

This view concurs with the aims of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} 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 which facilitates the creation of a "third-space"[12] (Lehner, 2006). Both frameworks are, in essence, concerned with social changes which might overcome asymmetrical relations of power and are, in part, supported by discourse. In this sense, the aims 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 both perspectives.

In this sense, CDA might help research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} in making a connection between power relations and linguistic resources used in texts (Resende and Ramalho, 2006) and allow us to "map the relations between the linguistic resources used for social actors and groups of social actors and aspects of the web of practices in which the discourse interaction is within" (Resende and Ramalho, 2006, p. 12). Because the very definition of {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} demonstrates the centrality of the use of language in such 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. Some of the features suggested by the CDA perspective as ways of investigating power control in oral texts may also contribute towards the investigation of power relations in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as presented by Fairclough (1989), Young and Fitzgerald (2006) and Simpson and Mayr (2010).

Analyzing the means of exercising control in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} is important because this enables novice teachers to play a more central role in the transformation of teacher ed-

---

12 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 (Max, 2010).

ucation programs and schools. In order to do so, appropriate interactional spaces must be created (Niesz, 2010). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) explain that *action* represents a potential tool for the overcoming of asymmetrical relations. In a context such as {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} meetings—which is invested in formulating new forms of action (Holzkamp, 1985)—, investigating whether hegemonic discourses and ideologies are present becomes essential in order to avoid the naturalization of such practices, fundamental in the permanence of power structures. This notion is relevant to CDA owing to the fact that the concept of hegemony is intrinsically related to the concept of human agency. Hegemony[13] is seen in terms of relative permanence of in the articulations of social elements and because there is an intrinsic possibility of disarticulation and re-articulation of such elements, the more hegemonic and ideological[14] a discourse is, the more it constrains the potential for expansion with regards to the power to act. If we desire more democratic ways of educating teachers and the improvement of the quality of teaching at schools, an investigation of ideologies in new arrangements such as {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} may foster a more profound understanding of which power relations are at stake.

Fairclough (1989; 2003a) states that power relations are sustained by tacit meanings because the search for hegemony is likewise the search for the universalization of particular perspectives. That is, the more tacit the discourses, the more hegemonic and less dialogical they become. Acknowledging this may contribute to research {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} with regard to investigating the power relations that may be occurring in these contexts and, as a result, diminish the opportunities for the cogeneration of ideas and prohibit the expansion of the power to act among the participants. Resende and Ramalho (2006) clarify that because ideology is, by nature, hegemonic in the sense that it serves to establish and sustain dominating relations, it also serves to reproduce the social order that favors individuals and dominant groups. In the context of teacher education programs and teaching at schools, this becomes essential if one's objective is to enable more democratic and more equitable relations between teachers and students. An alignment of both theories is therefore also justified by the very premise that oppressing situations might be altered (because they are social constructions) and the participants of any social practice might participate actively in this process.

As stated earlier, "representation is clearly a discoursal matter, and we can distinguish different discourses, which may represent the same area of the world from different perspectives or positions" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 26). Based on this idea, it is possible that CDA will contribute to our understanding of the ways teachers, for example, represent themselves when organized through {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} because understanding which options are chosen in which institutional and social context and why these choices have been made, what interests are served by them and what purposes achieved will aid in the understanding teacher representation in the process of becoming a teacher. This

---

[13] Hegemony is "a particular way of conceptualizing power and the struggle for power in capitalist societies, which emphasizes how power depends on consent or acquiescence rather than just force, and the importance of ideology. Discourse, including the dominance and naturalization of particular representation is a significant aspect of hegemony, and struggle over discourse of hegemonic struggle" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 218). It is generally based on the consensus rather than on strength (Fairclough, 2003, p. 43).

[14] Ideology is paramount for the sustaining of power relations because power depends on the consensus.

elucidation may also propel acts towards an informed choice regarding which arrangements to choose when educating teachers.

A focus on the linkage between representations and identities is essential for studies grounded in the premise that it is "from changes in the discursive practices and their role in broad processes such as social and cultural change that historical changes are made possible" (Fairclough, 2001). From my point of view, the incorporation of *the representation of social actors* proposed by Van Leeuwen (2008) will contribute substantially to {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} studies, which share similar views on identity construction: identity can be regarded as one of the outcomes of a person's participation in an ongoing activity (Roth *et al.*, 2004). In other words, our social and personal identities are continuously produced and reproduced in activity and "who we are in relation to others and as we experience ourselves change as part of continued participation within and across activity systems" (Roth *et al.*, 2004, p. 62). The representation of social actors may prove to be a significant framework for critically analyzing modes of representing, using critical, socio-semantic categories related to the specific grammatical and rhetorical realization because of the strict link to ways of being. Analyzing how social actors are represented in the discourse may help determine whether social roles are transformed and asymmetrical relations give rise to more symmetrical ones or just maintain the ones established. Through this, it is possible to analyze the agency of the participants and the identities crafted in this context then revealed in the ways of being[15].

Van Leeuwen reinforces in his work that "the question of who is represented as reacting how to whom, or what, can be a revealing diagnostic for critical discourse analysis" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 56). In our investigation of the way teachers represent themselves in such contexts, it is also important to note that actions are represented in ways that allow us to specify or suppress the agency of the participants. For instance, teachers who position themselves as "actors" or "recipients/passive" of the actions in a certain context imply different roles and this is significant with regard to the way they first represent themselves and later identify themselves: the use of grammatical realization, such as the transitivity of the verbs, for instance, shows us how agency is played out because "the ability to 'transact' requires a certain power, and the greater that power, the greater range of 'goals' that may be affected by an actor's action" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 61). In this sense, the *representation of social actors* and *transitivity analysis* might also help to identify the self-representation of teachers.

What Van Leeuwen actually proposes is that there are different ways of representing social actors in socio-semantic terms other than the various possibilities of linguistic realization of such representation[16]. According to Van Leeuwen's theory of representation of social actors, representations *include* or *exclude* social actors in order to suit their interests and in relation to the audience to whom they are intended (Van Leeuwen, 2008). The exclusion of social actors has been an important aspect of CDA because of its relation to a strategy of obfuscation of the social actor's responsibility in action or in

---

[15] Such analysis is possible, according to Fairclough (2003, p. 223), because "the full social development of one's identity, one's capacity to truly act as a social agent intervening in and potentially changing social life, depends upon 'social roles' being personally invested and inflected, a fusion between social identity and personality". Thus, according to him, it is possible to contribute to research on identity through textual analysis focused on a textual dialectic between social and personal identity, which interprets styles as 'ways of being' or identities in their language.

[16] In order to do so, the author grounds his work in the Hallyday's work. For a more comprehensive view of Functional Systemic Linguistic see, for example, Ramalho and Resende (2011).

the activity. Stated in other terms, social actors or groups involved in social practices and the relations established can be analyzed in terms of a representational point of view (Resende, 2012, p. 445). Such forms of representation may perhaps be intertwined with the linguistic choices of individuals in representing their world experiences. Resende (2008, p. 45) further explains the relationship between the linguistic choices of social actors and the construction of identities: "it is possible to map connections between linguistic choices of social actors and the broad social context in which analyzed texts are formulated. Knowledge is generated on the internalization of discourses in the identities construction and in the constitution of social relations […]".

According to Fairclough (2003), such emphasis on the discursive construction of identities reveals the importance of looking towards language identity function because the ways the construction and categorization of identities occurs in a specific society reflect its functioning in regards to power relations, reproduction and social change. Therefore, through the lens of this dissertation, the use of CDA categories such as modality, metaphors and evaluation—in the research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} may also be of great contribution to the process of understanding teachers' identification. For example, it may improve {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} research when displaying teacher representation, opinions and views not only in regards to this particular way of organizing the practicum but also with emphasis on a teacher's identification with the profession.

Also, it may prove helpful to understand for whom, when and to what kind of personality this methodological approach suits the need of institutions. More importantly, it may elucidate how different subjects understand the process of becoming teachers, how they are committed to the process and how they position themselves within it. Although research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} aims at addressing these objectives, the fact that language is constantly deemphasized in the research, readers gain the impression of 'not seeing it', which leads to the general feeling that participants portray elements as 'rosier than they are' (Roth *et al.*, 2002).

Based on the perspectives articulated thus far, one particular scope of this article is that research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue}—as a theory and methodological approach embedded in dialogue and societal relations—needs to look critically at language use in order to (a) more profoundly understand the transformation of participants' identities and (b) prove that language features are the basis of their research interpretation.

A Proposal for investigating the ways of exercising control in the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}

Arriving at this particular, I have discussed in this article the articulation of both theories in order to show how the articulation of the analytical categories of CDA could possibly contribute to research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} by offering an analytical approach to makes claims on transformation generally found in the literature evident. I believe the movement of incorporating linguistic realization in the theory may provide a better understanding of the ways of acting, interacting, representing and being in this context.

As I was carrying out an extensive research on teacher's transformation, I came to notice that CDA provided a fertile range of categóries for the analysis of the teachers' ways of representing and being (such as modality, evaluation, transitivity, metaphor and the theory of social actors), which suited my purposes of tracing the novice teachers' trajectory regarding their representations and identities. However, in order to analyze teachers' ways of acting and interacting, as CDA was conceived first to analyze written texts (Wodak and Meyer, 2009) and not oral ones, I needed different categories. Then, I created a criteria list for analyzing ways of exercising control compiled from the works of Fairclough (1989), Simpson and Mayr (2010) and Young and Fitzerald (2006). This criteria list was then complemented by the heuristic ways of participating in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} suggested by Roth and Tobin (2002a; 2002b) along with studies that analyze interactional patterns in classroom discourse (Nystrand *et al.*, 1997; Daniel *et al.*, 2003; Cheyne and Tarulli, 1999; Lewis and Ketter, 2011). The chart that follows is the result of the discussion presented in the section before and it exemplifies the categories of analysis proposed.

Therefore, such chart merges the heuristic for the purpose of creating productive and equitable cogenerative dialogue sessions (adapted from Roth and Tobin, 2002a; 2002b) and the studies from CDA which analyze ways of interacting and exercising control (Fairclough, 1989; Simpson and Mayr, 2010; Young and Fitzerald, 2006) and it has been used in El Kadri (2014). It is ideal for analyzing language and power control in collaborative contexts.

Final remarks

This paper discussed the need to formulate a bridge between a theory of language (Critical Discourse Analysis, for example) and research on {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} as a means to not only understand participants identity transformation but also the power relations fostered in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} contexts. The results of such alignment was presented as a proposal for investigating the ways of exercising control in the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues} or other collaborative and democratic environments.

Focusing on language use during {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} interactions could provide us with a better understanding of the possibilities for participation and learning for all the participants. Understanding how language patterns and use can afford or constrain agency in such contexts seems to me as essential for enacting cogenerative dialogues and providing participants with contexts for the development of agency.

Since discussion-based teaching is more likely to create a sense of agency than didactic-based teaching (Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011), {coteaching|cogenerative dialogue} appears to be appropriate contexts in which the development of agency can take place. However, more studies focusing on language might help us understand not only the nature of such interactions but also issues of power. Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 109) posit that participation in a community of practice entails 'learning to talk' within a practice. We still need to understand how one "learns to talk" and how the language used affords or constrains participation and shared contribution in {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing} settings.

Chart 01 - Categories for analyzing power control when investigating the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}

Categories for analyzing power control in the ways of acting and interacting in {coteaching|cogenerative dialogues}
- interrupting (interrupts in order to control the contribution of the students, to ensure the student gives key information expected) (Fairclough, 1989)
- 'announcing' the nature of what is going on (Fairclough, 1989)
- telling others how to do something (Fairclough, 1989)
- evaluating students' contributions (as encouraging as they are, these are still techniques of control which would be regarded as presumptuous or arrogant if they were addressed to an equal or someone more powerful) (Fairclough, 1989)
- having different levels of formality (the more formal it is, the more restrictive) (Fairclough, 1989) or politeness
- using negative questions (Fairclough, 1989)
- using more declarative sentences than interrogative sentences (Fairclough, 1989)
- controlling (who asks the questions, if they are answered fairly, compliantly indicating a level of adherence (or not) to conventional rights and obligations)
- attempting to exert control (forms of power – resistance (Sympson and Mayr, 2010)
- using reverse discourse (Simpson and Mayr, 2010) – (people engage in the forms of resistance noted above through talk and they do so, for example, by often rejecting derogatory classificatory labels)
- having unequal distribution of questions and answers (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006)
- having symmetrical relationship with others (one of the ways to determine whether the relationship between the participants is one characterized by equality and little social distance between them is whether or not their evaluation of the topics is similar. It shows they share views and appraise them in similarity) (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006)
- using a mixture of questions and responses (it demonstrates that people are equally engaged in asking and answering questions) (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006)
- asking questions (who asks is in a position to expect answers, indicating a powerful position; the purpose that questions serve and what discussion topics they conjure are possible indicators of power) (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006)
- using low level of modalization (Young and Fitzgerald, 2006)
- Controlling time (students are explicitly told when to start talking and when to start completing tasks) (Fairclough, 1989)
- participating in different ways: (a) coordinating discussion; (b) listening attentively; (c) initiating dialogue/ideas; (d) posing critical questions; (e) providing evidence; (f) expressing an opinion (agree/disagree); (g) speaking freely; (h) clarifying and elaborating on ideas; (i) suggesting alternatives for actions; and (j) evaluating ideas and practices (Roth, 2002)
- having opportunities to participate: (a) contributing to an equitable playing field; (b) listening attentively; (c) making space to participate; (d) showing willingness to participate; (e) making invitations to participate; and (f) refusing all forms of oppression (Roth, 2002)

Source: The author (El Kadri, 2014), based on Roth and Tobin (2002), Fairclough (1989), Simpson and Mayr (2010) and Young and Fitzerald (2006).

References

BOUDIEU, P. 1980. *Le sens pratique.* Paris, Les Éditions de Minuit. 480 p.

CALVO, L.C.S. 2013. *Reflexões sobre uma comunidade de prática constituída a partir das interações de formadoras de professores de inglês em um grupo de estudos*. Londrina, PR. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Estadual de Londrina - UEL, 192 p.

CHEYNE, A.; TARULLI, D. 1999. Dialogue, difference, and the "third voice" in the zone of proximal development. Theory and Psychology, **9**:5-28. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354399091001. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

CHOULIARAKI, L.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. 1999. *Discourse in late modernity*: rethinking critical discourse analysis. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 176 p.

DANIEL, M.F. *et al*. 2003. *The development of dialogical critical thinking*. Chicago, Research Report, 32 p.

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 (Doctorate in Language Studies). State University of Londrina, 348 p.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London, Longman, 248 p.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2001. *Discurso e mudança social*. Brasília, UNB, 316 p.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2003. Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research. London, Routledge, 272 p. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203697078.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2011. Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. *In*: R. ROGERS (Ed.). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. 2th ed. New York, Routledge, p. 119-127.

FOUCAULT, M. 1997. *Resumo dos cursos do Collège de France (1970-1982)*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar, 134 p.

HOLZKAMP, K. 1983. Der mensch als subjekt wissenschaftlicher. In: K.H. BRAUN *et al. Karl Marx und die wissenschaft vom individuum*. Marburg, Verlag Arbeiterbewegung, p. 120-166.

JOHNSON, K. 2006. The socio-cultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. Tesol Quarterly, **40**(1):235-257. Avaliable at: : https://doi.org/10.2307/40264518. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

LAVE, J. 1993. The practice of learning. *In*: S. CHAILIN; J. LAVE. Understanding practice: perspectives on activity and context. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 3-32. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511625510.002. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

LAVE, J. 1996. Teaching as learning, in practice. Mind, Culture, and Activity, **3**(3): 149-164. Avaliable

at: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca0303_2. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

LAVE, J.; WENGER, E. 1991. Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation. New York, Cambridge University Press, 140 p. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355.

LEHNER, E. 2006. Creating collaborative third-space discourse to address contradictions in coteaching. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, **7**(4). Avaliable at: http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0604198. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

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*. 2ᵗʰ ed. Routledge, Amazon, p. 128-153.

LIPPONEN, L.; KUMPULAINEN, K. 2011. Acting as accountable authors: creating interactional spaces for agency work in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, **27**:812-819. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.01.001. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

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 criticismo]. *In*: E.H. SCHETTINI *et al*. (Org.). *Vygotsky*: uma revisita no início do século XXI. São Paulo, Andross, p. 53-78.

MAO, Z. 1967. *Selected works*. Peking, Peking Foreign Press. v. 1. 157 p.

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**: 693-720. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-006-9031-z. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

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**:119-136. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9062-y. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. 1970. *The german ideology*. New York, International. 158 p.

MAX, C. 2010. Learning-for-teaching across educational bounderies: 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.

MURPHY, C.; BEGGS, J.; CARLISLE, K. 2009. Can they go it alone? Addressing criticisms of coteaching. Cultural Studies of Science Education, **4**:461-475. Avaliable at:
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-008-9150-9. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

NEWMAN, F.; HOLZMAN, L. 2002. Lev Vygotsky: cientista revolucionário. São Paulo, Loyola. 248 p.

NIESTZ, T. 2010. Chasms and bridges: generativity in the space between educators' communities of

338

practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (26):37-44.

NYSTRAND, M. *et al*. 1997. *Opening dialogue*: understanding the dynamics of language learning in the English classroom. New York, Teachers College Press, 47 p.

ORTENZI, D.I.B.G. 2007. *A construção de um artefato mediador da prática de ensino de inglês*. Londrina, PR. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Estadual de Londrina, 281 p.

PARDO-ABRIL, N. 2007. *Como hacer analisis critico del discurso*: uma perspectiva latinoamericana. Santiago de Chile, Frais, p. 152.

PASSONI, T.P. 2010. A inter-relação entre práticas discursivas, aprendizagem e organização das regras de participação nas aulas de língua inglesa. *In*: E. MATEUS; G. QUEVEDO-CAMARGO; T. GIMENEZ (Org.). *Ressignificações na formação de professores*: rupturas e continuidades. Londrina, Eduel, p. 167-194.

RAMALHO, V.; RESENDE, V.M. 2011. *Análise do discurso (para a) crítica*: o texto como material de pesquisa. 177 p.

RESENDE, V. 2008. Não é falta de humanidade, é para dificultar a permanência deles perto do nosso prédio. *Discurso & Sociedad*, **2**:422-444.

RESENDE, V.; RAMALHO, V. 2006. *Análise de discurso crítica*. São Paulo, Contexto, 158 p.

ROGERS, R. (Ed.). 2011. *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. 2th ed. London, Routledge, 336 p.

ROTH, W.M. 1998. Science teaching as knowledgeability: a case study of knowing and learning during co teaching. Science Education, **82**:357-377. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(199806)82:3<357::AID-SCE4>3.3.CO;2-U. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

ROTH, W.M. 2001. The implications of co teaching/ co generative dialogue for teacher evaluation: learning from multiple perspectives of everyday practice. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, **15**:7-29.

ROTH, W.M. 2002a. *Being and becoming in the classroom*. Westport, Ablex, 208 p.

ROTH, W.M. 2002b. Redesigning an "urban" teacher education program: an activity theory perspective. Mind, Culture, and Activity, **9**:108-131. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327884MCA0902_03. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

ROTH, W.M. 2006a. Collective responsibility and the other. Cultural Studies of Science Education, **1**:607-614. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-006-9030-0. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

ROTH, W.M. 2006b. *Teaching together, learning together*. New York, Peter Lang, 275 p.

ROTH, W.M. *et al*. 2004. Coteaching: creating resources for learning and learning to teach chemistry

in urban high schools. Journal of Research in Science teaching, **41**:882-904. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20030. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

ROTH, W.M.; GOULART, L.; LEE, J. 2005. *Participation, learning, and identity*: dialectical perspectives. Berlin, Lehmanns Media, 287 p.

ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K. 2002. *At the elbow of another*: learning to teach by co teaching. New York, Peter Lang, 208 p.

ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K. 2006. *Teaching to learn*: a view from the field. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 275 p.

ROTH, W.M.; TOBIN, K.; ZIMMERMANN, A. 2002. Coteaching: learning environments research as aspect of classroom praxis. Learning Environments Research, Netherlands, **5**:1-28. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015662623784. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

ROTH, W.M.; LAWLESS, D.; TOBIN, K. 2000a. {Coteaching | cogenerative dialoguing} as praxis of dialectic method. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, (1):3. Avaliable at: www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/1054. Accessed on: 05/01/2012.

ROTH, W.M.; LAWLESS, D.; TOBIN, K. 2002b. Time to teach: towards a praxeology of teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education*, (25):1-15.

ROTH, M.; TOBIN, K. 2001b. The implications of co teaching / co generative dialogue for teacher evaluation: learning from multiple perspectives of everyday practice. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, (15):7-29.

ROTH, M; TOBIN, K. 2001a. Learning to teach science as praxis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (17):741-762.

ROWE, S. 2011. Discourse in activity and Activity in Discourse. *In*: R. ROGERS (Ed.). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. 2th 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. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.008. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

SIMPSON, P.; MAYR, A. 2010. *Language and power*: a resource book for students. London, Routledge, 272 p.

STITH, I.; ROTH, W-M. 2010. *Students in action*: cogenerative dialogues from secondary to elementary schools. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 183 p.

VAN DIJK, T. A. 1998. *Ideology*: a multidisciplinary approach. London, Sage, 384 p.

VAN LEEUWEN, T. 1996. The representation of social actors. *In*: C.R. CALDAS-COULTHARD; M. COULTHARD (Ed.). *Texts and practices*: readings in critical discourse analysis, London, p. 32-70.

VAN LEEUWEN, T. 2008. *Discourse and practice*: new tools for critical discourse analysis. New York, Oxford University Press, 192 p.

VYGOTSKY, L. 1978. *Mind in society*: the development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, Harvard University Press. 26 p.

WASSELL, B.; LAVAN, S.K. 2009a. Revisiting the dialogue on the transition from coteaching to in-service teaching: new frameworks, additional benefits and emergent issues. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, (4):477-484.

WASSELL, B.; LAVAN, S. K. 2009b. Tough transitions? Mediating beginning urban teachers' practices through coteaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, Heidelberg, (4): 409-432.

WILLIAMS, J.S.; DAVIS, P.S.; BLACK, L. 2007. Subjectivities in school: socio-cultural and activity theory perspectives. International Journal of Educational Research, **46**:1-2. Avaliable at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2007.07.001. Accessed on: 20/04/2019.

WODAK, R. 2004. Do que trata a ACD: um resumo de sua história, conceitos importantes e seus desenvolvimentos. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso - LemD*, **4**: 223-243.

WODAK, R.; MEYER, M. (Ed.). 2009. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London, Sage Publications, 200 p.

YOUNG, L.; FITZGERALD, B. 2006. *The power of language*. London, Equinox, 325 p.