

Negotiating the Rough Ground between ESL and Mainstream Teachers

Sophie Arkoudis

*Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne,
Melbourne*

English as a Second Language (ESL) and mainstream teachers' collaboration has largely been presented in policy as the unproblematic sharing of ideas. However, in the 20 years since this policy has been in place within Victoria, Australia, teachers are still struggling to find ways of effectively working together. This paper presents a theoretical framework that can be used to explore the dynamics of collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers. It will be argued that developing collaborative practices between teachers who belong to different subject disciplines and often have different views of teaching is a complex process. Collaboration requires specialised skills on the part of the ESL teacher to gain some epistemological authority within the mainstream curriculum and cross the rough ground that can divide ESL and mainstream teachers within the secondary school context.

doi: 10.2167/beb337.0

Keywords: English as Second Language, mainstreaming, team teaching, collaboration, discourse

Introduction

Over the last 20 years ESL teachers have been working in collaboration with mainstream teachers, also referred to as content or subject specialists teachers, in secondary school contexts. Due to 'different histories and different perceptions of issues' (Mohan *et al.*, 2001) the role of the ESL teacher within mainstream curriculum has been represented differently among the various English-speaking countries. In Canada and the USA there are sheltered or content-area curricula for ESL classes (Crandall, 1993; Harklau, 1994; Mohan, 1986), in England there is partnership teaching where the ESL teacher (known as the language support teacher) and the mainstream class teacher work together on planning, teaching and assessment (Leung, 2001) and in Australia there are separate ESL classes as well as ESL teachers working with mainstream teachers (Davison, 2001; Department of Education, 2003; Department of Education and Training, 2004; Herrimen, 1991). What ESL teachers in different English-speaking countries share is the quest to cross the rough ground that at times can separate ESL and mainstream teachers as they attempt to plan curriculum together to enhance the educational opportunities of ESL learners.

Until very recently, there has been very little research into ESL and mainstream teachers' collaboration, especially in understanding the nature of the collaboration and exploring ways that teachers can sustain the

professional relationship and develop better understandings of how to cater for the language and learning needs of ESL students in mainstream classes. Recent studies have focused on the complex and long-term process involved in developing collaborative practices within an international school in Bangkok (Davison, 2002; Hurst & Davison, 2005). Creese (2002) has explored teacher talk between English as an Additional Language (EAL) and mainstream teachers and has found that while subject teachers owned their own subject area, ESL teachers did not discursively project a similar level of ownership within the classroom. She has further argued that ESL teachers are firmly positioned in the role of facilitating learning rather than as having their own language content to teach in the classroom. Gardner (this volume) has shown similar patterns in teacher talk within primary settings in the UK. What these studies have highlighted is that collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers is a complex and complicated process, where the two teachers try to negotiate the mainstream curriculum through their epistemological understandings and through the power relationships that exist within the microsocal world of their school context. Yet educational policy on collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers has assumed that the professional relationship is unproblematic and uncomplicated (Arkoudis, 2003).

In research exploring language policy, what has been largely overlooked is the focus on the school as a basic site where language planning is actualised (Corson, 1999). A policy such as mainstreaming ESL provision has implied that ESL teachers can influence mainstream teachers' pedagogical practices. In reality, how do teachers develop collaborative practices? This paper will explore the purposeful action of an ESL and a science teacher as they plan curriculum for a Year 10 Science class in Victoria, Australia. Issues of how they negotiate their pedagogy and reach shared understandings will be explored through an interpretive framework incorporating Harré's positioning theory (1999) and appraisal analysis (Martin, 2000). As such, this paper is more theoretically oriented, with a small example of teacher interaction offered to illustrate how the framework can illuminate the dynamics at play within the professional relationship. From the outset I want to emphasise that I am not claiming validity for the framework, but simply offering it as a heuristic framework that I have used in the study of ESL and mainstream teachers to interpret the actions of the teachers in their planning conversations.

ESL and Mainstream School Context

Since the late 1980s, ESL teachers in Victoria, Australia, have been working with mainstream teachers to plan curriculum for the mainstream classroom. Implicit within the mainstreaming of ESL was the elevation of the ESL teacher as guiding the professional development of the mainstream teacher and in actually having the epistemological authority to influence mainstream curriculum. Although this may have appeared to be a relatively simple reframing of ESL teachers' work of sharing their pedagogical content knowledge, in practical terms it has proved to be very difficult in secondary schools (Arkoudis, 1994). In negotiating the curriculum with the mainstream teacher the ESL teacher has to have a firm understanding of her own subject

discipline, as well as being aware of the pedagogic needs of the mainstream teacher. As such, the professional relationship is an important one because ideas about teaching the language curriculum within content areas need to be negotiated between the two teachers, if ESL students are to be catered for within the mainstream curriculum. However, while the policy directive from the Victorian Department of Education has been that teachers should work collaboratively in planning curriculum, what is the implication of this for ESL teachers? What does this mean in terms of the ESL curriculum? How can ESL teachers take on this role when they are often isolated in a low status position within the school and are not trained in presenting their subject knowledge to other teachers? The policy directive has offered very little conceptualisation of how this could be done effectively. What has been lacking in the field is some way of theorising and conceptualising ESL and mainstream teacher collaboration.

Researchers who have investigated collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers know that the professional relationship can be a difficult one (Arkoudis, 2003; Davison, 2001). Reasons for this may be due to the marginalisation of ESL teachers by colleagues (Creese, 2002), the difficulty in developing collaboration (see Gardner, this volume) and the differing views and expectations of developing collaborative practices between mainstream and ESL teachers (see Davison, this volume). It is interesting to note that in research conducted in the UK (Creese, 2002; Gardner, this volume), Bangkok (Hurst & Davison, 2004) and Melbourne (Arkoudis, 2000), similar issues have emerged about the nature of the professional relationship between ESL and mainstream teachers, indicating perhaps the institutionalised epistemological nature of the positioning of ESL teachers within mainstream curriculum.

Both curriculum as institution and curriculum as practice need to be taken into account in any discussion about subject disciplines in secondary schools (Reid, 1992). Curriculum as institution refers to the traditions and claims of content, and curriculum as practice focuses on the teaching and learning processes. ESL is viewed within the Victorian context as curriculum as practice. It has been positioned as an adjunct to the mainstream curriculum (Davison, 2001), and perceived by the policy makers as a strategy-driven curriculum. However, this view of ESL undermines the specialised knowledge of ESL teachers. ESL as pedagogy has claims to content such as knowledge about the English language, knowledge about first- and second-language development, and knowledge of relevant language-teaching methodologies (Hammond, 1999: 33). These are substantial areas of expertise, yet within the institutional context of secondary school education, ESL is positioned as a strategy-driven and does not have the same authority as subjects such as mathematics and science within the secondary school curriculum. Therefore ESL is perceived as being lower in the subject hierarchy of the school. This institutionalised positioning of the subject has an impact on developing collaborative practices between ESL and mainstream teachers.

In order to better understand how an ESL teacher can gain some epistemological authority in working with a mainstream teacher, we need to

enter the 'professional knowledge landscape' (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) of ESL and science within the secondary school context in Victoria. Clandinin and Connolly (2000: 9) see the landscape 'as having a history with moral, emotional, and aesthetic dimensions... To enter a professional knowledge landscape is to enter a place of story'. Before introducing the theoretical framework for analysing collaboration, I would like to briefly discuss the teaching world of Alex and Victoria. It will be their planning conversation that I will draw on to illustrate the dynamics of the professional collaborative relationship.

Victoria, the ESL teacher and Alex, the science teacher, have been working together at their secondary school for many years. They are highly experienced teachers and construct their realities through their experiences of teaching over many years. Siskin (1995) has argued that within a secondary school, teachers identify with the subject areas that they teach. Subject departments play a critical role in shaping and supporting teachers' identities and teachers' working lives in secondary schools (Goodson, 1995; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995; Gutiérrez, 1998). It would appear that secondary school teachers tend to debate and justify their views of teaching through the authority of their positions as mainstream teachers and that subject disciplines can be seen as distinct discourse communities within the secondary school context (Arkoudis, 2003). Victoria is an ESL and English teacher at the school. She is also the Professional Development Coordinator and part of the leadership team at the school. In her interview before the planning conversation, Victoria had positioned herself as being very interested in working across subject disciplines. She viewed support teaching as opportunities for long-term professional development. She wanted to offer Alex insights into language teaching that he could use to help his ESL learners now and in the future. Alex is a science and information technology teacher. He does not hold any positions of responsibility at the school. In the interview before the planning conversation, Alex had positioned himself as a science teacher who was eager for any support that would help with his communication in the classroom. For him, language assisted in the communication of the science content. He has also positioned himself as being aware of the importance of language and the desire to help the ESL students in his classroom.

Both Victoria and Alex teach at Jelford Secondary College. It is a large metropolitan coeducational secondary college with an established ESL programme. The school has students from a predominantly working-class background with a large population of Language Other Than English (LOTE) background residents, as well as a large number of more recently arrived students. Ninety-five percent of the students come from families in which one or more parents speak a language other than English at home. While the school has a large ESL programme, the reality for the mainstream teachers is that each class has a substantial number of newly arrived ESL students, long-term ESL students and some native speakers of English. In effect, all teachers teach ESL learners in their mainstream classes. The discussion below will focus on a small section of the planning conversation between Alex and Victoria, as they prepare a unit of work for Alex's Year 10 class on the topic of genetics.

Planning Conversation

The extract below is from a larger study (Arkoudis, 2000) which had focused on investigating Alex and Victoria's planning conversations over one year and included interviews with the teachers before and after their planning meetings and detailed classroom observation of Alex's science class. In the planning meetings the teachers planned the curriculum for Alex's science class, and discussed different strategies and ideas in an attempt to balance the science and ESL curriculum. The majority of students in Alex's Year 10 class are ESL students who have been in Australia less than seven years. The extract has been selected for discussion because it is representative of the pedagogic tensions that emerged in the teachers' conversations. It highlights the different views and perspectives that the teachers bring to the conversation, which are linked to their views of teaching within their subject disciplines. The planning conversation had lasted for one hour and this particular section occurred 45 minutes into the conversation.

Coding

Overlap between speakers is indicated with == .

Capital letters are used to show emphatic stress and/or increased volume.

Short hesitation within a turn (less than three seconds) are marked by ...

- 162 V: Yes... I... when Sophie told me that you were going to do a concept map, I thought that what you were going to do actually was to... um to do one of, not of the unit, not of the content but of how you would approach it... of your methodology of your strategy and the STAGING that you would have in teaching but umm... not that it matters but that was just my understanding.
- 163 A: Yes... well... what I think I probably misinterpreted because... you know the word concept matter comes into the vocabulary just meaning terms associated == with links and connectors.
- 164 V: == Oh yeah I...
- 165 A: I think I probably misinterpreted that. But I think MAYBE also that I hoped for was that if these were the concepts that we would be able to TOGETHER write in what the staging should be and what activities around... like rather than putting links of just simple verbs on our rows we could put activities in the classroom on our rows and we'd see how we'd go. NOW we probably don't have a lot of time to do that right now but THAT'S the sort of thing that maybe we should try to do. You know... what... what sorts of activities? Unless... you know... in the confines of this discussion, language activities.

- 166 V: Mmm... just before we do that can I just that... ahh... that's interesting in itself because you're concept mapping the content whereas I'm... whereas I would concept map the staging and that's a reflection on, I guess, of the fact that [pause-3 secs] being your subject the content is apparent whereas in mine... umm... ESL isn't a content in the same sort of sense and so it's more of the staging and the teaching and the learning process things that I would probably... in MY planning go about umm... and I think that's a problem sometimes with ESL teachers talking to subject teachers because we don't have umm... a sense of content in quite the same way like we're a bit indiscriminate in a way, like to me almost it doesn't matter what the content, I mean it does matter. I don't mean that but I mean the...the content is a vehicle whereas for you the content is obviously more primary. Is that right?
- 167 A: Well [pause-3 secs] I find that a little bit difficult to accept in that... you know... I have a difficulty with the word CONTENT in what you're saying because REALLY content is something you must have an idea about otherwise you wouldn't really be able to structure anything... I don't think. Now you have to sort of ask yourself what you're trying to teach.
- 168 V: Yes... I have linguistic aims and linguistic content you know == but
- 169 A: = They sound really vapid but I know they're not.
- 170 V: (laughs) It doesn't matter whether... you know... that the... that the content that I'm dealing with is, you know, what ever topic in Science or is in Science or is in History or is in whatever... umm... I'm still enabled to teach the same linguistic structures and features and FUNCTIONS and umm you know... it's very easy to adapt == to different...
- 171 A ==But don't you start out if you do a lesson, don't you start out by saying OKAY today is, you don't say it's adverbs, you don't say today it's conjunctions. = It's quite random which is covered?
- 172 V: No no no. It's not random at all umm... but... probably [pause 3 secs] you know... I'd think... you know... of what are the particular language functions so not... so not the structure so it's not adverbs and stuff like that. You wouldn't do that, BUT that you want students to be able to describe or to explain or to umm... justify or to you know THAT would be... that would probably be... you know probably come from more a functional we'd call it, in our terms we call it... in ESL terms we'd call it a more functional sort of approach and that we would be looking at different umm text types that they would need to use, to understand... to both understand and to produce, to be able to do that umm...

While the extract above may resonate with the experiences of many ESL teachers, my aim in this paper is to explore not only what is happening in the planning conversation but also why this is occurring. I am interested not so much in descriptive research that focuses on how it is that teachers come to believe things, such as Alex's view of ESL teaching, but rather more normative

studies that focus on how teachers justify and support these positions (Orton, 1996; Roberts, 1996) in order to explore the epistemological authority that an ESL teacher can have in the mainstream curriculum. The rest of this paper will discuss the theoretical framework used to illuminate teacher–teacher interaction and offer insights into how the professional relationship can be maintained and sustained.

Framework of Analysis

Two analytical tools are used for the analysis of the teachers' planning conversations. These are appraisal theory (Martin, 2000; White, 2003) and discursive positioning theory (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). The use of the two analytical tools allows for an analysis of the discourse the teachers use to negotiate their pedagogic perspectives in the conversations and to explore how the professionals position themselves in the conversation.

Positioning theory

Positioning theory is a theory of social behaviour that highlights the 'fluid patterns' of 'dynamic and ever-changing assignments of rights and duties among a group of social actors' (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). They view conversations in terms of mutually contested rights and obligations of speaking and acting. As such, positioning theory seeks to describe how people position themselves and others in conversations as they construct their view of reality. Conversations are viewed as complex interactions between people with differing power relations. Within positioning theory, a framework is provided that focuses on the capacity of the individuals to position themselves and each other in the conversation (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). The commitment in learning then lies in the attempts the individuals make to understand each other and redefine their position as a result of the conversation. Harré and van Langenhove refer to this as repositioning. Within the teachers' conversation the notion of repositioning is important as it can indicate the development of new understanding between the teachers that leads to new teaching practices.

Implicit in Harré's realist position are the three social ontological levels of conversation, agency and structure. Van Langenhove and Harré (1999) and Bhaskar (1989) propose that cultural and structural transformation require human agency. Individuals do not merely reproduce societal structures, they have a choice, through their actions, to transform structures by developing new practices. The policy of mainstreaming ESL can be seen as one where new models of practice are developed that are inclusive of both ESL and mainstream curriculum. Teachers from different curriculum subcultures can develop an understanding of the other's subject discipline culture, not by absolving their own but by becoming involved in dialogue that assists in understanding each other's culture. Gadamer (1975) describes this as a 'fusion of horizons'.

Appraisal theory

Appraisal theory (Martin, 2000; White, 2003), based on the Systemic Functional model of language, offers a linguistic analysis that explores the interpersonal relationship between the teachers by understanding the linguistic resources they use for adopting and managing evaluative positions. Appraisal theory divides evaluative linguistic resources into three broad categories: attitude, engagement and graduation, and involvement.

Attitude refers to the values by which the teachers pass judgements, make assessments and associate emotional responses. It is graded in terms of positive and negative evaluations and it reveals the positions the speakers are explicitly adopting. These are outlined below with some examples.

- Affect: values of emotional response.
- Judgement: values by which human behaviour is socially assessed.
- Appreciation: values that address the aesthetic qualities of objects and entities.

The second category is concerned with managing and negotiating positions through engagement and graduation. Engagement outlines the degree to which the teachers are open or closed to negotiating their view. Graduation refers to values by which the teachers either raise or lower the interpersonal impact of their utterances.

Appraisal theory offers a linguistic analysis of how the teachers negotiate their stance by:

- their utterances and illocutionary force,
- the way their linguistic choices reveal the power relations between the teachers, and
- the way the teachers negotiate their positions within the heteroglossic diversity of cross-disciplinary conversations.

Appraisal, with its focus on the linguistic resources used by the teachers to negotiate meaning, allows for a detailed linguistic analysis that assists the positioning analysis. Appraisal and positioning cannot be collapsed into each other because they exist as separate forms of analysis. While the two analytical tools retain their own frameworks within the analysis, together they can form an integrated framework for examining the teachers' transformational social action (Bhaskar, 1989) within a critical realist paradigm.

A Framework for Interpreting Teachers' Transformative Social Action

The critical realist perspective (Corson, 1995: 8) is concerned with identifying agency within social structures through discursive practice. It takes into account the wider contexts of human interaction and the power relations that both constrain and liberate that interaction. As discussed earlier, ESL is positioned as an adjunct to the mainstream curriculum. Therefore how can we analyse the agentic power of an ESL teacher within the mainstream curriculum and how is this linguistically realised within the planning

conversation? The model presented in this section brings together appraisal analysis and positioning theory within a framework, which aims to explore the purposeful action of the teachers in the planning conversation. Positioning theory offers an ontological frame on the teachers' conversations, and appraisal an interpretive linguistic frame.

In Table 1, both the analytical tools of positioning and appraisal exist independently of each other and cannot be merged as one. The interpretive frame represents a transdisciplinary dialogue (Martin, 1993) between appraisal and positioning theories, which allows for interpretations of the causal powers of the teachers within the causal field of ESL and science education. While it is possible to debate the placement of certain aspects of the framework, it allows the reader to view the landscape from which I analyse and interpret the teachers' conversations.

The social ontological categories within critical realism of discourse, agency and structure are placed along the vertical axis of the framework (Archer, 1995). These categories are inherent within Harré's positioning theory. It is through the discourse, in this case the teachers' planning conversations, that agency and structures emerge. Agency refers to the teachers as agents with reasons for acting in a certain way. Their actions can be interpreted in relation to their subject disciplines, their intentions in the conversations and in their positioning. The school provides the conditions for acting, and the possibilities for transforming those structures. The structures of the school are the bureaucracy of the Victorian education system, the subject hierarchy within the school and the canons of pedagogic knowledge about science and ESL teaching.

On the top of the framework are the three key categories of appraisal that inform the positioning analysis. The three categories represent the teachers' negotiation of their stance within the heteroglossic diversity in their conversations. Discourse cannot occur without the use of physical materials that are found in given structural conditions. The effectiveness of the teachers' discourse is conditioned by social position (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999), which depends on underlying social structures. For these reasons, Bhaktin (1973) describes discourse as simultaneously material, sociological and meaningful. The first category in the vertical axis of Table 1 deals with the material in the planning conversations, such as the utterances and illocutionary acts – the actual words spoken by the teachers. The second category refers to the way their linguistic choices reveal the power relations between the teachers. The third category refers to the teachers' negotiation of their positions within the heteroglossic diversity of cross-disciplinary conversations. It is through the analysis of the discourse that teacher agency within the institutional context in which they work is revealed.

I have attempted to indicate what sorts of social elements occupy each section of the framework, drawing on the discussion so far. Beginning with the conversation category, from the material processes of the conversation (the utterances) emerge social relations about the linguistic choices the teachers make, which leads to understanding the way they negotiate their stance within the conversation. From the conversations emerge the agency of the teachers and the structures that they reproduce or transform. The teachers, as agents,

Table 1 A framework for interpreting social action within ESL and mainstream collaboration

<i>Social ontological levels within acritical realist perspective</i>	<i>Categories of interpretation Appraisal theory</i>		
<i>Discourse</i>	<i>Material utterances</i>	<i>Social relations illocutionary force</i>	<i>Hermeneutic negotiating heteroglossic diversity</i>
	Texts, utterances, illocutionary acts	Power as choice to make linguistic expressions and interpretations	Enacted representations
	The words the teachers use in their conversations	Expressed meanings functionality of language when taking a stance when accounting for their pedagogic understandings	Meanings attributed to negotiating intersubjective positioning
<i>Agency</i>	Subject disciplines	Power as ability to act	Articulation and/or reasoning of educational theories, interests, curricula, and other cultural products
	Teachers within their subject departments	Teachers' intentions in relation to taking action	Symbolic representations
	Professional associations	Curriculum as practice	Discursive positioning
<i>Structures</i>	Forces of production	Power as domination	Identities as self-images, other images and identification
	Gender	Subject hierarchy within school	Iconic representation of science and ESL
	Bureaucracy of Victorian Education System	Curriculum as institution	Canons of pedagogic content knowledge about science teaching and ESL teaching
	School	Relations between ESL and science as subject disciplines within school	
	Department of Education		
	Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority		
	Professional subject organisations		

belong to different discourse communities. They have different motivations for engaging in the conversations and what they hope to gain from them differs also. For example, the science teacher wants to develop better ways of communicating the scientific concepts to his students and the ESL teacher is interested in assisting with the science teacher's professional development in teaching ESL students. The teachers also experience differing capacities to realise their motivational interests and intentions to act due to their differing positions, resources, and rights and obligations within the local order of the school (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999), and this results in the positioning of the teachers in the conversation.

Structures include social organisations, institutions and cultural products (school organisation, subject discipline hierarchy, image of the subject discipline). These refer to the features, which are a part of the pre-existing set of social arrangements that teachers enter into within the school context. From the material and social interaction categories emerge meanings in the form of concepts and images of the subject disciplines that can be seen as iconic. The subject disciplines, the teacher and the learner are icons of intellectual and social exchange within the school. Teachers attain certain beliefs and have canons of knowledge that they see as important in defining their subject discipline. Structures are not fixed but can be transformed insofar as the teachers enact the social routines or choose to interact in different ways, thereby redefining them. For example, as the teachers engage in conversations their self-image or perceptions of the other teacher might change, and this offers insights for understanding these shifts and how they might inform future work in this area.

The framework offers a critical realist perspective that views the professional relationship as jointly constructed towards a fusion of purpose. Implicit within the mainstreaming of ESL policy (Board of Studies, 2000) is a model of transformational social action. The ESL teacher is represented as an agent of change, who engages in planning conversations with the science teacher with an aim of improving language development in and through science learning. The goal of cross-disciplinary planning conversations is to reposition the subject specialist with regards to language and science teaching, and, through the actions of both teachers, transform practices.

The interpretive framework assumes:

- cross-disciplinary conversation is a product of joint action,
- conversation is the central data used for cross-disciplinary research in schools,
- positions are created within conversations,
- agency and institutions inter-relate in the discourse to offer a picture of how institutions impact on teachers and how teachers' actions can transform institutional practices.

Research into teachers' knowledge has not captured a picture of the teacher as an agentive self within the school context. It has tended to rely on descriptions of teachers' practices, which are deconstructed but do not offer any directions for future practice. The framework is developed as a research approach that

moves beyond the notion of unintended outcomes and interprets the determinate actions of teachers in the process of practice. In crossing the rough ground of interpreting their epistemological assumptions to each other, the operating curriculum within the teachers' planning conversations is the lived curriculum of the teacher. Conversations, as research data, are valuable for informing cross-disciplinary discussion, as they can capture the shared construction of the causal field and the causal powers of the teachers involved. The teachers' interactions are taken to be purposeful as they account for their epistemological beliefs. They position themselves as they respond to what the other teacher says about them. The collaboration of the two teachers is interpreted within a framework that explores agency among the teachers involved in professional discourse and offers insights on how their social action can transform institutional practices. Integral to the framework is the use of positioning and appraisal as analytical tools. The interpretive framework presented in Table 1 moves beyond Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) research into private practical teachers' knowledge, and explores how teachers' knowledge is brought to bear within conversations.

Interpreting the Conversation

In the extract presented above, the general linguistic features (see the Appendix) are similar to other parts of the conversation. Alex's appraisal choices of closed engagement, such as 'I don't think' and 'I find' indicate that he is not willing to negotiate his stance with Victoria. He also uses high graduation to stress his views in the conversation. The effect of this is that Alex asserts his views quite clearly in the course of the planning meeting. An example of this is evident in the following extract:

I find (*engagement: close proclaim*) that a little bit (*graduation: low grade*) difficult (*appreciation: valuation-*) to accept in that... you know... I have a difficulty (*engagement: close proclaim*) with the word CONTENT (*graduation: high grade*) in what you're saying because REALLY (*graduation: high grade infused with graduation: high grade*) content is something you must (*graduation: focus sharpen*) have an idea about (*engagement: close proclaim*)

With Alex clearly asserting his views, Victoria seeks to sustain the conversation and not put at risk the professional relationship. To achieve this she uses low graduation through words such as 'sort of' and 'a bit', which indicate that she is lowering the interpersonal impact of her utterances. Her high use of open engagement (for example, 'probably', 'I guess', 'I thought') reflect her managing of the conversation by opening up the possibility of negotiating her positioning with Alex. These linguistic features signal that she is deferring to Alex as the more assertive in this relationship and also the one who has the authority over the science curriculum in the school. This is demonstrated in turn 166 when she contradicts herself and then defers to Alex's opinion:

... like to me almost it doesn't matter (*engagement: close deny with graduation: low grade*) what the content, (mm)(*engagement: open*)

minimal response) I mean it does matter (engagement: close proclaim). I don't mean that (engagement: close deny) but I mean (graduation: repeat) the... the content is a vehicle whereas for you the content is obviously more primary. Is that right (engagement: closed question)?

It is only after Alex uses humour, 'That sounds really vapid' to make a negative evaluation of what Victoria has said that she is forceful in voicing her opinions. This leads Alex to inquire more about her subject positioning. In this extract Alex demonstrates a willingness to understand Victoria's views on teaching ESL. Where the tension lies is in Victoria's ability to explain what she means by 'linguistic aims and linguistic objectives'. This statement is easily understood in the ESL field. However, for Alex this comment is confusing. He is having some difficulty conceptualising a lesson without any content, especially considering that content is pivotal to his teaching. Victoria situates her justification for how she plans lessons in concepts and language that are not shared by Alex, and therefore he finds it hard to understand her perspective. Victoria's explanation of her pedagogy is conceptually dependent and not necessarily accessible to Alex, reflecting that subject disciplines function as social worlds with distinct and shared ways of talking about their subject knowledge (Siskin, 1995).

This extract highlights the dual ontologies that are present in this conversation and embedded in different discourses (Harré, 1997). The word 'content' has a different meaning for both teachers. The signs, and the meanings of the signs, that the teachers have for describing their subject disciplines are different. This extract demonstrates that it is difficult for the teachers to communicate when they do not have a shared meaning, when different epistemological assumptions are buried in similar words.

The appraisal analysis reveals that Alex asserts his opinion, using resources of high graduation and closed engagement. Victoria tends to defer to Alex's opinion, revealing that the power relations are not equal in their relationship. However, this study seeks to explore the dynamic nature of the teachers' professional relationship by moving beyond generalisable comments of power relations. Research (Cahill, 1996; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Corrie, 1995) into joint planning has indicated that the power relations between the teachers involved are unequal. Victoria has a higher status position in the school than Alex, and I have observed her being very assertive in her role as Professional Development Coordinator. The analysis has revealed that when she plans with Alex she positions herself, and is positioned by Alex, as supportive to the conversation. This is reflected in their appraisal choices and in part mirrors the status of the subject disciplines within the Victorian Department of Education, the school and the teachers' own experiences of working together. While Alex has the moral authority, in terms of his rights and responsibilities as the science teacher, Victoria is unable to assert her opinions about his science teaching. Therefore, by using open engagement and low graduation, she acknowledges Alex's different views and engages with him in conversation, which results in positive positioning (Howie, 1999). By doing this she maintains the conversation; also by choosing linguistic resources that do not put at risk their professional relationship. In this way, Victoria can gain some

epistemological authority within the conversation that is not afforded to her within the institutional practices of the hierarchy of the education system. In order to place the ESL curriculum within the science curriculum and to give the ESL students the opportunity to access the language of science, Victoria needs to be much more skilful than Alex in maintaining the conversation. Even though Victoria is in a leadership role in the school, within the planning conversation she is positioned as the ESL teacher within Alex's domain of science. Therefore she needs to make language teaching meaningful within the science curriculum, to assert her position and negotiate the curriculum with Alex, and this is mainly done through sharing their beliefs and assumptions about teaching.

Conclusion

Policy about mainstreaming of ESL in secondary schools has assumed that the ESL teacher has the authority to influence the mainstream teacher in curriculum planning. Very little has been offered to ESL teachers about what this means in terms of the ESL curriculum as practice within the mainstream context. ESL teachers have felt uneasy about working with mainstream teachers as the professional relationship is fraught with misunderstandings and misconceptions, where the subject specialist has the power to accept or reject suggestions and where ESL teachers feel increasingly frustrated in their work. Judging by Alex and Victoria's interaction, negotiating pedagogic understandings is a profound journey of epistemological reconstruction, the nature of which has not been theorised by the policy makers. This is because the two teachers' views of language and teaching are embedded within their subject disciplinary prejudices and biases.

The rules and structures of the school, of which the mainstreaming of ESL can be viewed as a micro-world, dominate the planning conversation and the teachers are socially constructed within it. Victoria gains a footing in the conversational life-world of Alex. She does this by positioning herself as a mainstream teacher, like Alex, and by demonstrating an interest in science and science teaching. Alex also claims his footing in the conversation by voicing his interest in language, even though he reveals a disciplinary prejudice by referring to language as a conduit. They speak through their histories, their prejudices and their biases about what teaching means to them. Their conversations are not about language learning in science, but about teaching. This is a pedagogic relation that they share. The epistemology of mainstreaming ESL within their conversations is about their teaching and allows new understandings to emerge through their disciplinary biases and prejudices. Disciplinary prejudices are not, as Victoria and Alex illustrate, obstacles to knowledge so much as a condition of knowledge, as they make up the fundamental structure of their relationship with their historical traditions.

Even though the social context dominates the conversation, the teachers display their power to act and make choices within their discussions. They demonstrate their powers by the way they position each other and through their linguistic choices. Victoria is more skilful in positioning than Alex. Alex has the authority within the local school context to dominate the conversation.

Science is his area and he is responsible for teaching the high status content. Yet, he listens to her ideas and attempts to appropriate some of her views about teaching into his own teaching world. Victoria does not have the epistemological authority in the school to force Alex to reposition the science curriculum, but she is able to reposition Alex by asking him questions to guide his re-evaluation of comments that he makes. In this regard, Victoria is more skilful than Alex in positioning. Van Langenhove and Harré (1999: 30) point out that people will differ in their capacity to position themselves and others.

The conversations demonstrate the skill and perseverance necessary for the ESL teacher to establish some epistemological authority within science education. Yet the policy directions on mainstreaming ESL have assumed that any ESL and mainstream teacher can engage in cross-disciplinary planning. This assumption is problematic. It can be argued that cross-disciplinary conversations are a specialised skill and one that may not be suited to every ESL teacher, or every mainstream teacher. Implicit within this is the training of ESL teachers to be more aware of how to develop collaborative practices and strategic ways of gaining epistemological authority within the mainstream curriculum, and smoothing the rough ground that currently exists between ESL and mainstream collaboration.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Dr Sophie Arkoudis, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia (s.arkoudis@unimelb.edu.au).

References

- Archer, M. (1995) *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arkoudis, S. (1994) Changing the role relationship between classroom teacher and ESL teacher. *Prospect* 9 (3), 47–53.
- Arkoudis, S. (2000) The epistemological authority of an ESL teacher in science education. Unpublished PhD, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Arkoudis, S. (2003) Teaching English as a second language in science classes: Incommensurate epistemologies. *Language and Education* 17 (3), 161–173.
- Bakhtin, M. (1973) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bhaskar, R. (1989) *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of Contemporary Human Sciences*. New York: Harvester, Wheatsheaf.
- Board of Studies (2000) *ESL Companion to The English CSF 2*. Melbourne: Board of Studies.
- Cahill, D. (1996) *Immigration and Schooling in the 1990's*. Canberra: Department of Multicultural Affairs.
- Clandinin, D.J. and Connelly, F.M. (2000) *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Corrie, L. (1995) The structure and culture of staff collaboration: Managing meaning and opening doors. *Educational Review* 47 (1), 89–99.
- Crandall, J. (1993) Current directions in curriculum development for culturally and linguistically diverse children. In G.R. Tucker (ed.) *Policy and Practice in the Education of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: View from Language Educators* (pp. 13–25). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Creese, A. (2002) Discursive construction of power in teacher relationships. *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (4), 597–616.

- Davison, C. (2001) Current policies, programs and practices in school ESL. In B. Mohan, C. Leung and C. Davison (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp. 30–50). London: Pearson Education.
- Davison, C. (2002) Collaborative education for ESL and content teachers: A development continuum. Paper presented at TESOL 2002, Utah, USA.
- Department of Education (2003) *The ESL Report 2002*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Training.
- Department of Education and Training (2004) *The ESL Report*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Training.
- Gadamar, H. (1975) *Truth and Method* (G. Barden and J. Cummings, trans.) New York: Seabury Press.
- Goodson, I. (1995) Studying the teacher's life. In J. Smyth (ed.) *Critical Discourses on Teacher Development* (pp. 55–64). London: Cassell.
- Grossman, P.L. and Stodolsky, S.S. (1995) Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. *Educational Researcher* 24 (8), 5–11, 23.
- Gutiérrez, R. (1998) Departments as contexts for understanding and reforming secondary teachers' work: Continuing the dialogue. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 30 (1), 95–103.
- Harklau, L. (1994) ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly* 28 (2), 241–272.
- Harré, R. (1997) Forward to Aristotle: The case for the hybrid ontology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 27 (2/3), 173–191.
- Harré, R. and van Langenhove, L. (1999) *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*. London: Blackwell.
- Herrimen, M. (1991) An evaluative study of the Commonwealth ESL Program. Unpublished report for the Federal Department of Education, Employment and Training, University of Western Australia.
- Howie, D. (1999) Preparing for positive positioning. In R. Harré and L. van Langenhove (eds) *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts for Intentional Action* (pp. 53–59). London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hurst, D. and Davison, C. (2005) Collaboration on the curriculum: Focus on secondary ESL. In J. Crandal and D. Kaufman (eds) *Case Studies in TESOL: Teacher Education for Language and Content Integration*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Leung, C. (2001) Mainstreaming: ESL as a diffused curriculum concern. In B. Mohan, C. Leung and C. Davison (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning, Identity* (pp. 165–176). London: Pearson Education.
- Martin, J.R. (1993) Genre and literacy-modelling context in educational linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, 141–172.
- Martin, J.R. (2000) Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston and S. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text* (pp. 1–42). London: Oxford University Press.
- Mohan, B. (1986) *Language and Content*. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
- Mohan, B., Leung, C. and Davison, C. (2001) Conclusion. In B. Mohan, C. Leung and C. Davison (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning, Identity* (pp. 215–220). London: Pearson Education.
- Orton, R.E. (1996) How can teacher beliefs about student learning be justified? *Curriculum Inquiry* 26 (2), 203–217.
- Reid, W.A. (1992) *The Pursuit of Curriculum: Schooling and the Public Interest*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Roberts, D. (1996) Epistemic authority for teacher knowledge: The potential role of teacher communities – a response to Robert Orton. *Curriculum Inquiry* 26 (4), 417–431.
- Siskin, L.S. (1995) Subject divisions. In L.S. Siskin and J.W. Little (eds) *The Subjects in Question* (pp. 23–47). New York: Teachers College Columbia University.
- White, P.R.R. (2003) Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23 (2), 259–284.

Appendix

Appraisal analysis of excerpt of the planning conversation

- 162 V: Yes... I... when Sophie told me that you were going to do a concept map, I thought (*engagement: open probabalise*) that what you were going to do actually (*graduation: high grade*) was to... um to do one of, not of the unit, not (*engagement: close deny*) of the content (*involvement: technical language +*) but of how you would approach it... of your methodology of your strategy (*graduation: repeat and involvement: technical language +*) and the STAGING (*graduation: high grade*) that you would have in teaching but umm... not that it matters but that was just my understanding (*graduation: low and engagement: open*).
- 163 A: Yes... well... what I think I probably (*engagement: open probabalise with graduation: repeat*) misinterpreted (*judgement: capacity -*) because... you know the word concept matter (*involvement: technical language +*) comes into the vocabulary (*involvement: technical language +*) just (*graduation: low grade*) meaning terms associated == with links and connectors.
- 164 V: ==Oh yeah I
- 165 A: ==I think I probably misinterpreted (*engagement: open probabalise with graduation: repeat*) that. But I think MAYBE (*engagement: open probabalise with graduation: repeat has the effect of low graduation*) also that I hoped (*affect: desire +*) for was that if these were the concepts (*involvement: technical language +*) that we would be able to TOGETHER (*graduation: high grade*) write in what the staging should be (*engagement: open interactional*) (mm hm) (*engagement: open minimal response*) and what activities around... like rather than (*engagement: close deny*) putting links of just (*graduation: low grade*) simple verbs (*appreciation: composition and involvement: technical language +*) on our rows we could (*involvement and engagement: open probabalise*) put activities in the classroom on our rows (*involvement and graduation: repeat*) and we'd (*engagement: open probabalise*) see how we'd go (*graduation: repeat*). NOW (*graduation: high grade*) we (*involvement*) probably don't (*engagement: open probabalise and close proclaim*) have a lot (*graduation: high grade*) of time to do that right now but THAT'S (*graduation: high grade*) the sort of thing (*graduation: focus soften*) that maybe we should try to do (*involvement with engagement: open probabalise*). You know... what... what sorts of activities (*engagement: open question*)? Unless... you... know... in the confines of this discussion, language activities.
- 166 V: Mmm (*engagement: close, redirect*)... just before we do that can I just that (*engagement: close proclaim*)... ahh... that's interesting (*appreciation: reaction +*) in itself because you're concept mapping the content whereas I'm... whereas I would concept map the staging and that's a reflection on, I guess (*engagement: open probabalise*), of the fact that [pause-3 secs] being your subject the content is apparent

whereas in mine... umm... ESL isn't a content (*engagement: close deny*) in the same sort of sense (*graduation: focus soften*) and so it's more of the staging and the teaching and the learning process things that I would probably (*engagement: open probabalise*)... in MY (*graduation: high grade*) planning go about umm... and I think (*engagement: open probabalise*) that's a problem sometimes with ESL teachers talking to subject teachers (mm) (*engagement: open minimal response*) because we don't (*engagement: close extra vocalised and close deny*) have umm... a sense of content in quite the same way (*graduation: focus soften*) like we're a bit indiscriminate (*judgement: tenacity- and graduation: focus soften*) in a way, like to me almost it doesn't matter (*engagement: close deny with graduation: low grade*) what the content, (mm) (*engagement: open minimal response*) I mean it does matter (*engagement: close proclaim*). I don't mean that (*engagement: close deny*) but I mean (*graduation: repeat*) the... the content is a vehicle whereas for you the content is obviously more primary. Is that right (*engagement: close question*)?

- 167 A: Well [pause-3 secs] I find (*engagement: close proclaim*) that a little bit (*graduation: low grade*) difficult (*appreciation: valuation-*) to accept in that... you know... I have a difficulty (*engagement: close proclaim*) with the word CONTENT (*graduation: high grade*) in what you're saying because REALLY (*graduation: high grade infused with graduation: high grade*) content is something you must (*graduation: focus sharpen*) have an idea about (*engagement: close proclaim*) otherwise you wouldn't (*engagement: close proclaim*) really (*graduation: high grade*) be able to structure anything... I don't think (*engagement: close proclaim*). Now you have to (*engagement: close proclaim*) sort of (*graduation: focus soften*) ask yourself what you're trying to teach.
- 168 V: Yes... I have linguistic aims and linguistic content (*involvement: technical language*) you know == but
- 169 A: == They sound really (*graduation: high grade*) vapid (*appreciation: valuation -*) but I know they're not (*engagement: close counter expect*).
- 170 V: (laughs) (*involvement: humour*) It doesn't matter (*engagement: close proclaim*) whether... you know... that the... that the content (*involvement: technical language -*) that I'm dealing with is, you know, whatever topic in Science or is in Science or is in History (*involvement: technical language +*) or is in whatever... umm... I'm still (*graduation: high grade*) enabled to teach (mm) (*engagement: open minimal response*) the same linguistic structures and features and FUNCTIONS (*involvement: technical language-and graduation: high grade*) and umm you know... it's very easy (*graduation: high grade and appreciation: composition +*) to adapt == to different
- 171 A: == But don't you start out if you do a lesson, don't you start out (*graduation: repeat*) by saying OKAY (*graduation: high grade*) today is, you don't say it's adverbs (*involvement: technical language +*), you don't say today it's conjunctions (*involvement: technical language +*).

- == It's quite random (graduation: high, judgement: capacity -) which is covered (engagement: close question)?
- 172 V: ==No no no (graduation: high repeat, engagement: close deny). It's not random (engagement: close deny) at all (graduation: high grade) umm ... but (engagement: open probabalise) ... probably (engagement: open probabalise, graduation: repeat) [pause 3 secs] you know ... I'd think (engagement: close proclaim) ... you know ... of what are the particular language functions (involvement: technical language-) so not ... so not (graduation: repeat) the structure (involvement: technical language-) so it's not adverbs (involvement: technical language +) and stuff like that (graduation: low grade). You wouldn't do that (engagement: close proclaim), BUT (graduation: high grade) that you want (affect: desire +) students to be able to describe or to explain or to umm ... justify (involvement: technical language +) or to you know THAT (graduation: high grade) would be ... that would probably be ... you know probably (engagement: open probabalise, with graduation: repeat) come from more a functional (involvement: technical language +) we'd (engagement: close extra vocalised) call it, in our terms we call it ... in ESL terms we'd call it a more functional sort of approach (judgement: capacity +with high graduation preceding it and low graduation following it) and that we (engagement: close extra vocalised) would be looking at different umm text types (involvement: technical language-) that they would need to use, to understand ... to both understand and to produce, (mm) (engagement: open minimal response) to be able to do that umm ...

Copyright of International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism is the property of Multilingual Matters and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.