

Co-teaching/co-generative dialogues in a teaching education program as room for agency and new forms of participation: 'I found Jesus in [writing] the paper'

Author

Salles El Kadri, Michelle, Roth, Michael

Published

2015

Journal Title

Teacher Development

Version

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

DOI

[10.1080/13664530.2014.976715](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2014.976715)

Rights statement

© 2015 Taylor & Francis (Routledge). This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Teacher Development on 26 Nov 2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13664530.2014.976715>.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/141145>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

The final version of this paper was published as: El Kadri, M. S., & Roth, W.-M. (2015). Co-teaching/co-generative dialogues in a teaching education program as room for agency and new forms of participation: "I found Jesus in [writing] the paper." *Teacher Development*, 19, 40–58.

Co-teaching/co-generative dialogues in a teaching education program as room for agency and new forms of participation: ‘I found Jesus in [writing] the paper’

Abstract: Although the importance of understanding the social and cultural processes mediating pre-service teachers’ expansion of the power to act has been increasingly recognized lately, the way the concept of ‘agency’ is portrayed in most of the studies focuses almost exclusively on the subject of activity and therefore, there is insufficient theoretical attention to the reverse side of agency, the experience of being subject to and subjected to conditions. In this paper, we exemplify the process of *conscientização* and agential development in the case study of Jefferson, a new teacher engaged in a school-teaching education program. The purpose of this paper is to show how new forms of consciousness, expansion of the power to act, and increasing control over conditions simultaneously emerge for teachers in training during praxis and how agency is played out by the relations between being subject to and subjected to conditions. Implications for teaching education programs are discussed.

Key-words: agency; consciousness; co-generative dialogues; teacher education.

Introduction

The coincidence of the change of conditions and human activity can only be grasped and rationally understood as *revolutionary praxis*. (Marx/Engels 1958, 534)

Consciousness [*Bewußtsein*] never can be anything but conscious Being [*bewußte Sein*], and the Being of man is his real life process. (26)

It is not consciousness that determines life, but life determines consciousness. (27)

In the opening quotations, K. Marx relates consciousness (*Bewußtsein*) and conscious Being (*bewußte Sein*), on the one hand, and revolutionary praxis and change of conditions, on the other hand. The process of becoming consciously aware or developing conscious awareness, denoted by Paulo Freire’s concept of *conscientização*, enables transformation, that is, arises from revolutionary praxis. For teachers working in difficult situations, characterized, for example, by absenteeism and lack of discipline, critical consciousness and transformational praxis are therefore crucial ingredients for doing more than just maintaining the status quo. This relation between consciousness and praxis is apparent in the following exchange involving Jefferson, a beginning teacher during his internship, and his co-teachers Tati and Aline (interns) and Author1 (supervisor). The exchange emerged after Jefferson had articulated a new perspective on the lack of discipline in the classes of the public school where he was teaching the subject English together with Author1.

Jeff: After I started studying for the paper that I began to have this view, like that

Mi: Wow, Jefferson, I think the paper was *empowering* for you.

Aline: They once said to me, “teach history for us too, teacher.”

Tati: Look at this Jefferson! ((*Everybody talks at the same time, complimenting Jefferson.*))

Jeff: I found Jesus in [writing] the paper. ((*Laughs.*))

Mi: Found Jesus?

Tati: Found Jesus in [writing] the paper. ((*Everybody laughs.*))

Within the current educational systems, new teachers, when they first come to the school, often find themselves in difficult situations, including how to deal with classroom management (e.g., Balli 2009; Martin 2004; Stoughton 2007). This is especially the case when the new teachers (between 19 and 21 years of age) are not much older than their high school students (16 or 17 years); a sense of solidarity may want them to have good relationships with their near peers. However, the contradiction appears when they need to balance equitable age-based relations and enforcing classroom management based on institutional differences between teachers and students. This was the situation in Jefferson's case. He struggled to find a balance between wanting to be friendly with his students while being responsible for classroom discipline. However, by the time of the conversation, he had found this balance. Using the expression 'to find Jesus', which is often used in Brazil to express the feeling of finding one's way after having been lost, Jefferson articulates awareness of his own development and the new forms of participation in school life. The expression fits the transformation Jefferson experienced in the course of a process from an absence of a calling to teaching – meaning of life of teaching – to the discovery of the light and finding the purpose of life as a teacher. Jefferson attributes the development he experienced to 'the paper', that is, the investigation he completed as part of his teacher education program. In the process, he not only developed a new form of conscious awareness which, according to Marx, expresses a new form of conscious being, but he also experienced an expansion of his power to act (agency). This expansion, which arose in the praxis of teaching, came with and gave him new means to take control over the classroom conditions all the while being subject to these conditions, which he now is enabled to transform through further praxis.

In the research literature, there is a growing awareness of the need for teacher educators to understand more deeply the developmental processes teachers in training undergo when becoming agential teachers, and the ways to support this development (e.g., Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011; Matusov 2001). In the literature, developing 'agency' tends to be theorized as the *prerequisite* for changing conditions. However, the concept of agency overemphasizes human beings as subjects of activity and underestimates that they are simultaneously subject to and subjected to the activity (Author 2011). From a Marxist position, which recognizes the role of conditions as determinants of human actions, praxis itself, though it may be constrained, gives rise to new forms of consciousness. We do not first need to develop consciousness and agency to change praxis – this is the metaphysical position that Marx critiques in the third introductory quotation. Rather, praxis itself changes consciousness as described by Marx/Engels in the third introductory quotation and as exemplified in studies where negative affect is overturned into positive affect – for both students and teachers – precisely because of praxis rather than as its precondition (Author and Radford 2011). As the excerpt from our database shows, Jefferson simultaneously develops a new form of consciousness in the course of teaching and researching the lack of discipline in schools; and this new form of consciousness, therefore, is co-extensive with an expansion of his power to act. Jefferson's actions, as Author1 recognizes in the conversation, have been empowering (rather than following empowerment).

The purpose of this study is to show how new consciousness and expansion of the power to act simultaneously emerge for teachers in training during praxis, a process exemplified here in the transformation of Jefferson. This, therefore, is a case study of a new teacher's development and

transformation from a sense of being powerless to experiencing an expansion of the power to act and increasing control over the (working) conditions in the classroom.

Background

Agency in teacher education

The English concept of agency denotes the fact that human beings are inherently imbued with the *power to act*, which allows them, in contrast to other animals, to transform the conditions in and under which they live (Holzkamp 1983b). It includes the capacity of human beings to participate in creating their lived-in worlds rather than merely being determined by them. The power to act is simultaneously enabled and constrained by the structures of social/material fields of human action and by the capacity to appropriate both human and material resources available in the fields (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox and Wassell 2008). Agency can also be understood as a breaking away from a given frame of action and as taking initiatives to transform it (Engeström 2005). Teachers cannot therefore just ‘give’ agency to students; students will often achieve authority through a more extended process when they participate in gradually transforming old norms into new ones (Engle and Faux 2006; Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011). One can understand agency and everything that springs forth from it only by acknowledging both the enabling and constraining aspects of the social/material fields of the lived-in world.

The power to act is of particular interest for teacher education programs for numerous reasons. One of the main difficulties for teacher education is how to afford the expansion of new teachers’ power to act rather than merely accept (often-oppressive) conditions as they are, that is, how to engage the person in agency processes (Matusov 2001; Author, Masciotra and Boyd 1999). As the case of Jefferson shows, new teachers often do not recognize themselves as agents of change who are able to create and transform classroom conditions. In the process of becoming teachers, new teachers often are seen and see themselves as passive recipients of bodies of knowledge. This is a contradiction that has to be overcome in the face of the experience of a limitation of agency and passivity towards transgressing limitations and fears and improving the quality of life (Holzkamp 1985). Given that new teachers are expected to work in productive ways for the development of the students and the school itself, the power to act (agency) becomes an important dimension for dealing with the complexities of our educational system. To acquire a sense of one’s agentic self and to develop positive forms of identity, new teachers need to have experiences of exercising agency (e.g., Beijaard, Meijer and Verloop 2004). In our own Brazilian experience, actively working towards changing difficult working conditions in schools does not tend to be considered to be an option in most teacher education programs. Conformity, negative thoughts, and negative attitudes towards public schools have become so habitual that it is so much an accepted discourse in Brazilian society that its effect has become invisible, especially to those who engage in teacher education programs.

Teacher education programs frequently fail to develop agency because they lack the context in which the appropriate resources are available. Thus, there has been a growing body of literature in teacher education concerned with the development of agency in this context (Ketelaar et al. 2012; Lasky 2005; Morgan 2010; Noyes 2008; Roberts and Graham 2008; Sannino 2010). During their practicum experiences, new teachers tend to have few opportunities to design their own educational environment with the students or to contribute significantly to the design (Matusov 2001), to be involved in working with students under guided supervision or to develop social capital within the field (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox and Wassell 2008). New teachers are

reported to learn how to plan lessons and deliver curriculum, but they are not learning how to respond to increasingly complex classroom situations (e.g., Edwards and d'Arcy 2004). They also lack time and context for the development of social relations and few feel like they can make a difference in the educational context and therefore, their sense of agency is constrained. Since agency develops in practice (Lave and Wenger 1991), the implication of the lack of contexts to provide it results in a sense of passivity. New teachers who had not experienced a sense of agency are unlikely to promote their students' agency in the classroom (Edwards 2007; Edwards and Protheroe 2003). This is problematic from a cultural historical perspective on human development, which is based on Marx's insight that human beings have the capacity to change the conditions to which they are subject and subjected to.

Although the importance of understanding the social and cultural processes mediating pre-service teachers' expansion of the power to act has been increasingly recognized lately, the way the concept of 'agency' is portrayed in most of the studies is also problematic from a cultural-historical activity theoretical and critical psychological perspective since it focuses almost exclusively on the subject of activity. There is insufficient theoretical attention to the reverse side of agency, the experience of being subject to and subjected to conditions. Such a failure leads to problems in theorizing how apparent apathy, as Jefferson in our study exhibited early on, is transformed in praxis even though it is initially characterized by apathy. Very few studies have tried to understand how agency could develop in adverse conditions and in the social fields in which new teachers are embedded. Those studies which do pursue such understandings tend to be associated with (a) co-teaching/co-generative dialogues (e.g., Author et al. 2002) as contexts for teacher education implemented in urban schools characterized by rampant poverty (90% of the student body) and inequity (98% African American), or (b) the building of communities of learners (e.g., Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011; Matusov 2001). Besides, we still know relatively little on how new teachers expand and experience expansion of their power to act and move from marginal to more central forms of legitimate peripheral participation.

Research methods

Setting

The present study was conducted within a school-based teacher education program in Brazil. The nationally funded program was designed to improve teacher education and the teaching in public schools by offering scholarships to individuals who are enrolled in teacher education programs. In our implementation of the program, the new teachers learn to teach by teaching in public schools together with regular schoolteachers and their teacher educators (e.g., Tobin and Author 2006). Each co-teaching group also meets for *co-generative dialoguing* sessions to debrief lessons and for planning new lessons that explicitly address the problems that arose from previous lessons. Coteaching works particularly well when paired with cogenerative dialoguing (e.g., Roth et al. 2004). Cogenerative dialoguing are encounters in which multiple stakeholders – any suitable configuration including students, supervising teachers, teachers in training, supervising teacher trainers, department heads, or principals – equitably participate in conversations about curriculum praxis that they have enacted together. New understandings of praxis arise precisely because each participant brings unique understanding and experiences to the meeting (Wassell and Lavan, 2009), where all participants are provided equitable access to the conversation and to the understandings that are *collectively* generated (Roth et al. 2002). Their point, however, is to transform rather than merely understand praxis. A review of the

literature highlights the highly positive impact they have on school culture and, from the perspective of the school, their use as a tool to facilitate the transition of new teachers into the community (Carambo and Stickney 2009). Cogenerative dialoguing has been shown to influence the teaching and learning experiences of all participants (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox and Wassell 2008), to locally relevant theory (Roth, Lawless and Tobin 2000), and to constitute a viable solution to the ethical dimensions tensions – e.g., power over – that arise from the different institutional positions of the participating stakeholders (Stith and Author, 2010). In the teacher education program investigated in this article, cogenerative dialogues were enacted based on the understanding that is an ideal context for research that actually makes a difference in the school and for all stakeholders involved (Tobin and Roth 2006). Both forms of engagement – *co-teaching* and *co-generative dialoguing* – have been reported to create, when paired, many resources for expanding regular and new teachers' power to act (Author et al., 2000; Stith and Author 2010) and have shown to be excellent contexts for building locally relevant theory for the transformation of schooling in the most difficult, inner-city neighborhood settings of the US.

Participants

As part of their practicum, 12 new teachers were assigned to the supervision by the first author to learn to teach by teaching in a public school in Londrina, Brazil. In this article, we exemplify our findings by drawing on the data involving one new teacher in particular. Jefferson, in contrast to some other members of the group, was a participant who had not had previous teaching experience; he was not even sure whether he wanted to be a teacher at all. He had enrolled in the teacher education program mainly for improving his English language skills.

Data sources and analysis

All forms of engagement in teaching and learning on the part of the entire group were video-recorded and fully transcribed. The new teachers' written assignments were assembled into portfolios that entered the database. The data sources also include talks in seminars, reports, transcribed co-generative dialoguing session, and recordings of individual supervision sessions. The entire database now consists of more than 8,000 pages of transcripts produced over a two-year period. For the purposes of this paper, we extracted from the database all those data in which Jefferson took part. We chose Jefferson's case for several reasons. First, in our survey of the entire database, Jefferson had come to stand out not only because he was one of those participations who had no prior experience in teaching and was not even sure that he actually wanted to be one, but mainly because of the tremendous transformation that he articulated to have undergone during his participation in teacher education. Moreover, Jefferson's case was interesting because he participated during the two years of the enactment of the specially designed teacher education program, he co-taught classes, and was not sure he wanted to be a teacher. In this broad research, other case –studies are presented (see, for example, Author 1 and Author 2 2013; author 1, forthcoming). Episodes of all the activities and tasks carried out during his two-year experience in the teacher education program were selected. The evidence on which our claims are based represents patterns of interaction apparent in the entirety of the dataset.

The analysis of the study is based on interaction analysis, a method specifically designed to investigate the interactions of interest – here, those that Jefferson was involved in – by research teams that interact (Jordan and Henderson 1995). In interaction analysis, samples from the database were analyzed in joint sessions by both authors. We began our analysis by reading

through the transcriptions to identify important themes in the data sources. Our primary focus was to find evidence for the nature and kind of interactions in which Jefferson was involved. We understood interaction in terms of *participation* (Lave and Wenger 1991), especially in the margin | center dialectic for conceiving the term (e.g., Roth and Goulart, 2006). We discussed our emerging sense of what is going on and formulated tentative hypotheses. As required by the method, we then went through the entire database to find evidence that disconfirmed or was consistent with the tentative hypotheses (Roth 2005). The underlying idea of this part of the method is to identify everything that could be used to describe Jefferson's professional growth. Episodes of all the activities and tasks carried out during her two-year of experience in the project were selected. We then described these episodes to deepen our sense of what was happening in each situation. We repeatedly met to discuss our emergent understandings generally and any different understandings specifically. The present report is the result of this iterative process of analysis, writing, and discussing emergent understandings.

We came to this study with different perspectives in at least two respects. Author 1 was the participant teacher-researcher who also had the role of Jefferson's supervisor. Hers is an emic perspective. The second author, who was not directly involved in the data collection, brought an outside, or etic perspective to the data. However, he had done extensive theoretical and empirical groundwork in teacher education using *co-teaching* and *cogenerative dialoguing*. The different perspectives allowed us to deal with the blind spots that frequently comes with the emic perspective, because what goes without saying tends to be a hidden part of work practice (e.g., Heidegger 1977; Suchman 1995).

Conscientização and expansion of power to act

This study was designed to investigate the transformation in the power to act and consciousness of individuals in the course of learning to teach by teaching together with regular teachers and their university supervisor. By analyzing all relations involving Jefferson – including co-teaching, lesson planning sessions, co-generative dialoguing, and supervisory meetings – we noticed three patterns of participation that led to the transformation into new forms. We begin this section with Jefferson's own description of the transformation he experienced, and then describe the trajectory of his development that emerged as the product of his participation in praxis. Initially, passivity and apathy characterized Jefferson's participation in the teacher education program. We then show how one issue identified during the co-teaching experience and discussed in the co-generative dialoguing sessions – classroom management – became transformative when researching the issue changed Jefferson's consciousness and expanded his power to act. Finally, we show some changes in the interactional patterns and how he starts to exercise agency in co-planning meetings and takes a central role in the participative relations of the group.

Having 'found Jesus'

Summarizing what turned out to be a journey of change, Jefferson articulated his experience of learning to teach through teaching in this way:

As an active teacher in the *Programa de Iniciação com Bolsa a Docência* (PIBID) program, at the high school, one of the first problems I identified in the classroom was the lack of discipline. Being a novice teacher, I did not feel that I had enough authority to impose rules on the students, especially when there was a good relationship between us.

To find the balance between being a teacher, which requires some authority, and being an authoritarian, while attempting to keep friendly relations with the students, was what led me to choose this theme [classroom management]. . . . For my personal experience as a teacher, this study showed me how a teacher has power inside the class, a teacher is the one that can produce changes. Although there are many reasons and explanation for lack of discipline, it is worth to reflect on how our teaching methods and *even our posture and attitude in class are creating such behavior.* (Jefferson)

In this account, Jefferson identifies the lack of discipline as the most important issue that he came to face early on in his program. He points out the contradiction he experienced between being recognized as authority and wanting to have good relations. In the course of doing research on classroom management, including the use of questionnaires that his students filled out, Jefferson became consciously aware that the teachers themselves, their methods and postures, contribute to the disciplinary problems. Doing the research was accompanied by an expansion of his power to act and his expanding forms of participation in all aspects of his school-based work (co-teaching, co-planning, co-generative dialoguing). The praxis itself brought about the processes of becoming conscious, conscientização, and expansion of power to act – in distinction of the latter as necessary precursors of changing praxis. Our study shows how, over time, he moved along a trajectory from more marginal to more central forms of legitimate peripheral participation. That is, praxis itself was agency work, which we understand as a dynamic process that emerges relationally in interaction within the cultural field. Instead of expecting Author1 to address him individually for drawing him into greater participation, Jefferson learns how to participate in co-generative dialogues in more productive ways. Thus, although his participation in the praxis of teacher education was marked by passivity and even apathy, we observed a (dialectical) overturn in the praxis toward greater conscious awareness and empowerment. We articulate the transformational process by providing descriptions of forms of participation in interactions with other members of the group.

In the margins: ‘At some point, somebody was going to talk about it anyway’

Participation in practices often is understood in terms of the opposition of margin and center (e.g., Lave and Wenger 1991). But such an approach tends to be too determinative, because it locks people into their social positions. Thus, a more productive way of understanding participation praxis is in terms of a margin | center dialectic, because participation itself can dialectically invert some apparent position in the margins to the central, praxis-defining position (Goulart and Author 2006). Because of the transformation we observed in Jefferson’s developmental trajectory, the latter approach to the data analysis turned out to be more suited for theorizing what happened. In Jefferson’s case, his initial participation in the program for the entire first year is best described by the adjective ‘marginal’ – though in dialectics, this is only a manifestation of the whole unit analyzed, which always is margin | center. He did not engage in discussions during the co-generative sessions and often played a role of ‘assistant’ in co-teaching. He tended to say that if something was going all right in the classroom, he would not interfere and that is why, most of the time, he allowed Juliana – his co-teacher who had five years of experience in private schools – to take the more central position of lead teacher. The most common pattern of communication during this shows the mentor trying to provide space for his participation. Only in these situations did Jefferson contribute in the cogenerative dialoguing sessions. The excerpt below – in which

the cohort discusses what the evaluative parameters for teaching should be – is an example of such pattern:

- 01 Mi: ... Jefferson is so quiet today... aren't you going to give your opinion on how you want to be evaluated?
- 02 Jef: ah, evaluate the resourcefulness
- 03 Mi: great.. how do we write that? Performance, maybe? Let's put it and then we decide for a better term... You mean everything... like voice..?
- 04 Jef: yeah...
- (Everybody talks at the same time)
- 05 Mi: pedagogy itself?
- 06 Jef: maybe it is more important...
- 07 Mi: maybe...
- 08 Jef: because they have the material and everything, but if they do not have compassion, I think it does not work, right?
- 09 Alice: it is true.
- 10 Mi: cool, Jefferson, very good.... Come on, talk to us... it is great this issue too, I think what you are talking about is didactic transposition, right... for example, you know the content, but what do you do in order to explain it, to delivery it for the students, one thing is to know the content, the other is how to explain it...
- 11 Jef; for me, I think it is difficult to express myself, you get it, with all that...
- 12 Mi: cool, you are saying something that is difficult for you
- 13 Alice: yeah
- 14 Mi: I believe this is the point...
- 15 Jef: by some point, somebody was going to talk about it anyway... (laughs)

When asked, he would frequently say that he did not contribute unless 'he had something important to say'. The most common relational pattern in co-generative dialogues during that period saw the mentor teacher trying to provide space for his participation by inviting him to talk and saw him contribute by providing only brief responses. He never initiated talk about some topic on his own. When asked about his contributions to the collective effort, Jefferson explained: 'At some point, somebody was going to talk about it anyway'. He felt that there was no need for him to initiate talk about any such issue that he might have thought about in private. This pattern of interaction – where Jefferson did not contribute to the co-generative dialogue sessions unless specifically invited by the supervisor Author1 – was predominant for a long period. However, it was in the praxis of teaching, especially when contradictions emerged, that a change became noticeable, as described in the following sections. We understand the change in terms of the margin | center dialectic, where participation itself changes participation to the point of allowing a marginal legitimate peripheral participation to overturn into a central peripheral participation.

Coteaching as context for growth point: providing new tools for agency

An issue identified in the context of co-teaching and discussed in co-generative dialogues was an important step and a resource in the development of new forms of participation. Early in the second year of the program, Author1, after co-teaching a lesson with Jefferson and Vinicius, points out during the co-generative dialoguing session a problem that she had been noticing:

- 01 Mi: Jefferson and Vinicius are embarrassed to call student's attentions.. I have noticed it... haven't you?

- 02 Vi: I am not embarrassed...
- 03 Jef: In fact, I get stuck.
- 04 Mi: You let them go... is it Alice? Have you noticed? How do we deal with it?
- 05 Vi: I try to scream, because when I started with the *bullying* plan...
- 06 Mi: You say 'oh, guys'..
- 07 Jef: 'Ô, ô, ô'
- 08 Mi: ô, guys....
- 09 Pa: XXX
- 10 Mi: Yeah. What we are trying to do here, is to understand how we deal with indiscipline... Jefferson let them talk, so... This was the reason Jefferson started to talk about indiscipline, right, Jefferson?
- 11 Jef: Yeah, I talk to them about other things...but..I don't know
- 12 Mi: Jefferson has a good relationship with the students, but then, he can not call student's attention because he does not want to lose it... this was your issue in the paper, right, Jefferson? Because he has a good relationship, he does not want to lose it and therefore he does not call student's attention. But to what extent the teacher's role.... Because he lets them... I don't know you noticed today.. Jefferson was explaining, explaining and they were talking... then I interrupted and said: Guys, Jefferson is talking by himself and then they stopped!

In this exchange, Jefferson and Vinicius were attempting to 'have good relationships with students', but they did not appear comfortable with the need to manage disciplinary issues to enhance learning. They did not appear to find a balance between good teacher-student relations and assuring optimal learning conditions. Author1 explicated that any disciplinary issues always had to be addressed by the regular schoolteacher, Alice, or herself. Author1 asks whether they felt ashamed of calling students' attention when these were sleeping or talking. Vinicius rejects the charge, and Jefferson acknowledges that he does not know how to deal with these disciplinary issues. It is out of this situation that a new form of consciousness germinates and comes to blossom. Jefferson starts to realize that he is contributing little to management issues, leaving these to the co-teachers Author1 and Alice. He is not holding his end in the co-teaching relationship. The idea for writing his term research paper on this issue thereby both acknowledges and addresses the contradiction. His term paper became an important resource for the collective learning within the group, because it became the starting point for a process of conscientização on the part of all members of the co-teaching group. In and through the writing, Jefferson came to understand an aspect of his world in a way that gave him the opportunity to say something of importance to the cogenerative dialogue sessions. His initial contribution changed the nature of the session in that his contribution fostered actions on the part of others, which also fostered additional actions on the part of Jefferson. Once he had something to say, which had come from his writing, there was more to be said not only on his part but also on the part of others.

In cultural-historical activity theory, the notion of *growth point* is used to denote the emergence of a new idea that consolidates itself in subsequent activity and talk (McNeill 2002). Because new forms of thought concretize themselves in communicative expressions (Vygotskij 2005), the actual growth point of an idea can be identified only after the fact when an apparent idea is tracked backwards to its first appearance in germinal form. Although being in the margins may be considered a hindrance for the expansion of agency, praxis itself may overturn the position into the central activity (Goulart and Author 2006). It is precisely the inner contradiction in the margin | center dialectic that constitutes a growth point. In the present instance, our analysis of all the data pertaining to Jefferson allowed us to backtrack the new form of

consciousness to this co-generative dialoguing session. It is subsequent to this point that Jefferson expresses conscious awareness of his role in co-teaching; it is the point of emergence of *conscientização*. He is becoming increasingly more comfortable to contribute actively to managing disciplinary issues during co-teaching and to the co-generative dialogues.

Some scholars might say that Jefferson started to exert his *relational agency* (Edward 2007; Edwards and D'Arcy 2004), but this concept may actually overemphasize individual agency at the expense of *relation*. However, we did notice an expansion in the capacity of utilizing the support given by others as well as being a resource for others that one could attribute to Jefferson (in a reduction of a relational quality to an individual participant). Jefferson exhibits a new form of consciousness when he acknowledges the contradiction and starts to research the topic of classroom discipline and management. For us, this episode clearly shows that the growth point did not just occur because of Jefferson's agency. Rather, it is out of the dialectic of an invitation (on the part of Author1) and its acceptance (on the part of Jefferson) that a new form of participation emerges. Our data show that it is subsequent to this episode that Jefferson opens up (to) opportunities to learn from and with others.

From marginal to central forms of legitimate peripheral participation

It is apparent in our database that with the co-taught lesson and the associated co-generative dialoguing session where the issue of classroom management was discussed, there are changes: Jefferson's legitimate peripheral participation (understood dialectically as a margin | center unit) manifests itself in more central ways, contrasting the marginal role he initially has played.

Co-planning sessions as safe space for power to act

Co-planning sessions – understood as ‘meetings in which co-teachers plan the classes to be enacted through co-teaching and it is seen as a safe space to collectively generate visions of co-teaching and become sites where interns gain or lose social capital’ (Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox and Wassell 2008, 973) – were part of those spaces in which Jefferson demonstrates new, qualitatively different forms of participation and starts to exhibit increasingly central ways of participation. As he contributes to these meetings generally and to the design of the curriculum specifically, Jefferson acquires confidence and experiences himself as an accountable actor. The transformation here is the developing of conscious awareness that arises from transformational (‘revolutionary’) praxis: our data show that new teachers experience these sessions as important sites of learning where they ‘feel secure’ to reflect upon how a future lesson might unfold. The videotapes show that Jefferson is more engaged in the dialogues that cogenerate the lesson plans. He is more active and he appears to be comfortable to contribute to the lesson design. Since human consciousness develops depending on the specific social activities in which people engage (Johnson 2006) – being subject to and subjected to conditions in the field – that is, by participating in the praxis itself (the dynamic process that emerges relationally in interaction within the cultural field), we understand the empowerment Jefferson experiences to be the result of praxis. It is in the dialectical *relation* with others and the resources that become available that Jefferson's power to act expands. Direct evidence of such an expansion includes: Jefferson's active role in the generating ideas for topics and texts to be used in lessons and for guiding the anticipated whole-class discussions. There is no longer a need for Author1 to solicit his participation. Contributions, previously being the result of the relations, now are unsolicited. This points us to a development typically resulting from and understood in terms of the zone of

proximal development (Vygotskij 2005): performances initially only observable in (societal) relations come to be solo performances. Being actively involved in the curriculum production, Jefferson experiences autonomy and further expands his power to act and gain control over this lived in world rather than merely being determined by it. A beginning of the expansion of agency also is observable in the lessons, although his participation in the co-teaching lagged behind his more active contributions to the planning sessions.

- 01 E: then, in the next we was going to introduce the slowfood that is the controversial
 02 J: a movement that originated in Italy, which is for, so they can get the opposite of fastfood. Meals usually last from 4 to 5 hours. They eat a little and talk.
 03 E: there is even a snail picture, right?
 04 J: yeah, it is a snail, they eat very slow, they talk, it is not just about the meal itself, they eat natural food
 05 M: nice text, explaining it all. And how do you think of doing this one, are you going to bring them here?
 06 J: there is one at Wikipedia that is even better... at Wikipedia it is explained how it has arisen and there are the objectives
 07 M: very nice this text
 08 J: We thought of doing a similar one, in this style, the same activity but with the slow food, given that it is recent and I also think that since we had one about fastfood before, it gets clearer talking about slowfood, right?!
 09 M: yeah, and we could work a lot with critical literacy, right, with these two texts, right? Because, for example, with the Mc Donald is doing that and suddenly slowfood is doing this, right, what does it mean?
 10 E: it has arisen against that, right. If there was not this one, maybe the other one would not make sense, right
 11 J: the history is (???). It has originated in 96 to resist the opening of McDonalds.
 12 M: maybe we could think of how we, Brazilians, are facing it, right? How do we see this...
 13 E: I think here not so much, right? I have never heard about it, Jeff told me about this thing with the slowfood
 14 M: very interesting, Jefferson... I haven't heard about it either

Cogenerative dialogues as praxis

The pattern of interaction between Jefferson and Michele that we articulated in the first section was predominant for a long period (within several meetings Jefferson did not engaged in the discussion; the one he did engaged himself followed this pattern in which Michele addresses him individually.) However, the excerpt below exemplifies the new interactional pattern that has emerged from the continuous participation of both in cogenerative dialoguing.

- 01 Mi: and what was your first impression, what did you think of it? Why are we reading it?
 02 Jef: to understand, eh, how do we say...
 03 Mi: What? I did not get it Jefferson
 04 Jef: to know if we are applying, we are working with reading, to see if there is something else we could do..
 05 Mi: (signaling yes) who else? Who are going to complement what Jefferson just said? Is this why we are reading it?

...

- 06 Mi: I think that this is within the concept of critical readers... and what do you understand by citizens? What is citizen? Isn't it what is emphasized by the official documents? Educating critical citizens? What is the relation between reading, citizens.... ok, let's think about it in part... What is to be a citizen?
- 07 A: that one who acts and transforms the world...
- 08 Jef: someone aware of his/her role...
- 09 Mi: aware, ok... what do you mean Jefferson?
- 10 Jef: of his/her role in society...

Here, instead of having to address Jefferson individually for allowing his participation, Jefferson learned how to participate in cogenerative dialoguing in more productive ways (turns 02 and 08). There is a new form of consciousness occurring. Jefferson starts to become aware of his role in the collectively part and starts to participate more comfortably with the whole cohort, not needing the individual addressing anymore. Michele did not address Jefferson individually anymore, but her discourse has become predominantly characterized by a great number of questions directed to the whole cohort. Michele had learned with Jefferson that, after being addressed individually for a long time he did not need it anymore. She learned that she was able to use more questions addressed for the whole cohort she would allow opportunities for increasing not only Jefferson participation but also to the whole group. At the same time, Jefferson learned how to participate actively in cogenerative dialoguing without being addressed individually. Since to steer pre-service teachers towards active agency a new kind of teacher - student relationship is needed (Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011), this is just the beginning of a relationship that will develop in a way that mediate agency and new forms of participation.

Finding Jesus – conscientização

It is apparent from our data that writing the research paper affords Jefferson new forms of participation and awareness. These not only allow him to recognize the constraints provided by the (school) conditions but also set him up for bringing about change. New consciousness and expansion of the power to act simultaneously emerge for Jefferson in the praxis of co-generative dialoguing, where he finds opportunities to further expand his power to act and increase control; a lesser expansion is observable with respect to the classroom conditions, where the process of conscientização is ahead of the evolution of agency. For Jefferson, praxis comes with changes in the way he relates to the teacher education program generally and how the 12-member cohort is perceiving and understanding in the disciplinary problems in the school. The interactional patterns involving him change, attributing to him a more central position in contributing to the collective responsibility for co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing.

Jefferson's active participation and engagement in the teacher education program deepens while working on the research for his final paper. This became particularly apparent in one recorded episode, where he expresses a new conscious awareness of the relationship between teaching and student behavior. The process by means of which this new form of consciousness arises from a previous form is what we understand as and denote by *conscientização*. Jefferson articulates the disciplinary issues founding a new form: although schools aim to develop critical citizens, students are not allowed to criticize the schools. In the episode from the co-generative dialogue session, Jefferson assumes a more central position in the conversation, teaching the others – including the teacher educator – how to understand the lack of discipline. But it is not just because he enacts a form of 'agency' that Jefferson is taking such a central role at that

instant. The group members, including the teacher educator, step back, recognizing that Jefferson has acquired tremendous expertise on understanding disciplinary issues through his investigation. Jefferson is the expert in this situation. Interrupted only by interjections and other encouraging remarks, Jefferson says:

I just wanted to comment on what Aline talked about . . . she said that there was criticism from the teachers there. I saw, in [doing] the paper, that [teachers] want to educate the new critical citizen. When the criticism is on the school, than, it is all wrong, you can do it. The student is to be critical until he criticizes the school. Because it is like that: the teacher is never wrong, right? If the student is not paying attention, it is because he is lazy. If the student does not do anything, it is because he does not want to know. But it is not because the subject is sometimes boring or because the teacher is not approaching it correctly. . . . There are thirty students who do not want to learn? Like, how is that possible, right? There are classrooms where with one teacher, everybody attends; and when another teacher comes, everybody disappears. But the teacher never sees that he is the problem, it is always the class, but he [teacher] is perfect. His teaching is perfect; he gives everything for everybody. But nobody wants to learn. And when [the student] criticizes the schools, he is a rebel, he is in that teenager phase, he just wants to rebel, teenagers do not want anything...

Jefferson argues that teachers should also (and not only) take responsibility for the misbehavior of students. Here, there is the developing of a new form of consciousness in which both teachers and students are responsible for the outcome of the activity (Stith and Author 2008). Jefferson's action of assuming responsibility is twofold: he assumes responsibility for articulating his needs while also assuming his part of responsibility as a teacher for students' learning. As Jefferson mobilizes the attention of others to focus on one's contributions to the collective effort assuming his role in the collectively responsibility, the manifestations of his participation qualitatively change from more marginal to more central forms. We do not understand this change, as is common, in the terms of the cause-effect figure: Jefferson first becomes conscious and then somehow 'constructs' positionality and expands his agency. Rather, it is participation itself – even though and despite being marginal – that brings about the (dialectical) reversal.

We actually see a double transformation in this episode. On the one side, Jefferson becomes aware that the lack of discipline cannot be attributed just to students; teachers are as responsible for it, though they tend to blame students. On the other side, Jefferson is beginning to have – taking and receiving – a greater role in the context where he is the learner, that is, in the practical part of the teacher education program. While assuming new attitudes in co-teaching towards the behavior of the students, he also engages in co-generative dialogues in qualitatively new ways. The new levels of consciousness and agency that emerge for Jefferson exist, therefore, in two contexts: in the class and in the co-generative dialogue sessions. In class, it is visible when he exhibits a new approach (and therefore attitude) in the classroom, where he contributes to addressing disciplinary issues. Pertaining to the lack of discipline, the co-teaching group now is consciously aware of the fact that not only students but also their own approaches and materials contribute to the problem. The process of becoming conscious, denoted by Paulo Freire's concept of *conscientização*, as we outline at the beginning of this paper, enables revolutionary praxis. This relation between consciousness and praxis is apparent in the following exchange involving Jefferson:

Jeff: After I started studying for the paper that I began to have this view, like that

Mi: Wow, Jefferson, I think the paper was *empowering* for you.

Aline: They once said to me, “teach history for us too, teacher.”

Tati: Look at this Jefferson! ((*Everybody talks at the same time, complementing Jefferson.*))

Jeff: I found Jesus in [writing] the paper. ((*Laughs.*))

Mi: Found Jesus?

Tati: Found Jesus in [writing] the paper. ((*Everybody laughs.*))

Power to act: consciousness, collective responsibility, social capital and motivation in relations

The purpose of this paper is to show how new forms of consciousness, empowerment, and increasing control over conditions simultaneously emerge for new teachers in praxis. We exemplify the different forms of Jefferson’s consciousness, the result of conscientização, and agential development. Conscious awareness means recognizing that we are subject and subjected to the conditions as much as being the agential subjects who can change the conditions. To arrive at the new form of consciousness, the immediate conditions of the lifeworld had to be transcended, which only critical analysis can do (Smith 1990). An analysis based on the experience of the situation itself is limited because participants (here students and teachers) only tend to blame each other without realizing that their actions and consciousness are determined by those societal relations that reproduce the conditions (Holzkamp 1983a). We show how participating in co-generative dialogues and co-planning comes with a new level of conscious awareness for Jefferson. Concomitantly, his power to act expands and, thereby, he gains a greater control over the conditions (here, the lack of discipline).

By engaging actively in the co-generative dialogues and therefore becoming conscious, Jefferson simultaneously assumes his role in the *collective responsibility*, which means assuming both responsibility for the Self and responsibility for the Other independent of any particular intention of ‘taking responsibility’ (Author 2006). That is, by more actively participating in praxis, Jefferson opens up (and has opened up for him) opportunities for taking part in the collective responsibility because ‘as part of the condition of and for the being of another, each human being therefore, is responsible not only for the other’s *being*, but, because the other is a condition for the self, each human being is responsible for his or her self’ (Stith and Author 2010, 364). Collective responsibility is essential for the development of power to act as individuals become conscious and provide themselves with new forms of participating. We understand the dialectic of participation in praxis as the locus and context for the processes of conscientização and empowerment (rather than these being the prerequisites of changing participation, as this would have to be the case in constructivist approaches).

We therefore understand participation in praxis to be the pre-requisite for the emergence of new forms of consciousness and expansion of the power to act. Co-planning (as one model of co-generative dialogue sessions) provided Jefferson with human and material resources to participate in different ways in the school environment. Contributing to the design of the English curriculum in co-planning is an important context for the expansion of Jefferson’s power to act as it allows him to act as an accountable actor in the school environment. This is one important aspect of developing agency is having the opportunity to participate and contribute in interaction where one is framed and positioned as an accountable actor (Greeno 2006, Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011).

As Jefferson becomes conscious and experiences an expansion of his power of act (which, to underscore again, is the result of a dialectic of participation rather than of cogitation and personal construction), his affective stance also is transformed. It has been suggested that individuals find it reasonable to engage even in difficult tasks when they can anticipate that learning will lead them to greater control over conditions or quality of life (Author et al. 2005). This anticipation is associated with a positive affect, making unnecessary any additional concept of motivation (Holzkamp-Osterkamp 1975, 1976). That is, when the subject of activity recognizes that by doing something his/her power of act is increased, there is no need for internal or external motivation. That is, ‘the individual who recognizes that the contribution to the collective activity also opens up control over and improvement of individual situation is inherently motivated’ (Author et al. 2005, 19).

Implications for teacher education programs

Agency is the result of relations. In this study, co-teaching and co-generative dialogues are contexts in which human and materials resources ‘conspire’ to give rise to the experience of greater agency on the part of Jefferson; concomitantly, his affective stance toward the teacher education program changes. With the appropriation of the resources, new forms of consciousness, expansion of the power to act, and increasing control over conditions simultaneously emerge for teachers in training during praxis. In this study, co-teaching and co-generative dialogues constitute the necessary conditions for Jefferson’s development. By discussing the discipline-related issue in co-generative dialogues and afterwards researching the topic identified, the new teacher, using the resources available, experiences the emergence of qualitatively new forms of consciousness (the phenomenization is the result of a process of conscientização), participation, and power to act. More specifically, we show how the enactment of co-teaching and co-generative dialogues provide contexts in which power to act and new forms of productive participation emerge from their joint practical (*sympractical*) actions mediated by different tools. It allows us to understand that new teachers come to be empowered (i.e., expand their power to act), which opens up new forms of participation not only for themselves but also to others in co-generative dialogues if this practice is also associated to research.

Between 1998 and 2006, Ken Tobin, in his role as the director of teacher education at the University of Pennsylvania, implemented co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as the institutionalized form of teacher education (Tobin and Author 2006); new teachers attended formal seminar courses following their praxis in the field. Our two-year study of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing in the teacher education program at the Universidade Estadual de Londrina allows us to understand such a move. Our database provides extensive evidence of the growth new teachers experience through tacit and explicit forms of learning in the program designed according to the principles of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing. Teacher education then empowers, leads to deeper understandings, creates empowered identities for dealing with the complexities of our (Brazilian) educational system, and leads to self-enabling professionals. Contexts in which resources that not only support the power to act but enable empowerment are essential for transforming the conditions that otherwise – as it had been for Jefferson and his peers – are perceived as hopeless with the only option to submit to resignation. To overcome such situations, the participants themselves have to understand and overcome immediacy and determination – which had led our great educator Paulo Freire to enable conscientização prior to beginning the lessons that would improve the farmers’ literacy. Our

study here suggests that similar courses of events arise from co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as the pillars of a teacher education program.

Acknowledgment

This study is part of a two-year investigation doctoral research on co-teaching experience through the ‘Programa Interstitucional de Bolsa de Iniciação a docência [Scholarship Interinstitutional Program for Initiation to Teaching]’ (PIBID). The research was supported by a grant from the CAPES Foundation, Ministry of Education of Brazil (5726/11-5). Our thanks go to Jefferson Saraiva, who allowed us to tell his story and learn from it.

References

- Balli, S. J. 2009. *Making a difference in the classroom*. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Beijaard, D., P.C. Meijer, and N. Verloop. 2004. Reconsidering research on teachers’ professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20: 107–128.
- Edwards, A. 2007. Relational agency in professional practice: A CHAT analysis. *International Journal of Human Activity Theory* 1: 1–17.
- Edwards, A., and C. D’Arcy. 2004. Relational agency and disposition in sociocultural accounts of learning to teach. *Educational Review* 56: 147–155.
- Edwards, A., and L. PAuthoreroe. 2003. Learning to see in classrooms: What are student teachers learning about teaching and learning while learning to teach in schools? *British Educational Research Journal* 29: 227–242.
- Engeström, Y. 2005. Knotworking to create collaborative intentionality capital in fluid organizational fields. In *Collaborative capital: Creating intangible value*, ed. M.M. Beyerlein, S.T. Beyerlein, and F.A. Kennedy, 307–336. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Author & Author 1. 2013. “I am a Pibidiana”: Societal relations as the locus of sustained development in a teacher education program in Brazil. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. 38, 89–114. <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol38/iss5/7>
- Author 1. Understanding teacher’s development in PIBID through {coteaching|cogenerative dialoguing}. Doctoral dissertation. Universidade Estadual de Londrina. Forthcoming.
- Carambo, C., & Stickney, C. T. (2009). Coteaching praxis and professional service: facilitating the transition of beliefs and practices. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4, 433–441.
- Engle, R.A., and R.B. Faux. 2006. Towards productive disciplinary engagement of prospective teachers in educational psychology: Comparing two methods of case-based instruction. *Teaching Educational Psychology* 1: 1–22.
- Goulart, M.I.M., and W.-M. Author. 2006. Margin|center: Toward a dialectic view of participation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 38: 679–700.
- Greeno, J.G. 2006. Authoritative, accountable positioning and connected, general knowing: Progressive themes in understanding transfer. *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 15: 537–547.
- Heidegger, M. 1977. *Sein und Zeit* [Being and time]. Tübingen, Germany: Max Niemeyer.
- Holzkamp, K. 1983a. Der Mensch als Subjekt wissenschaftlicher Methodik [Man as subject of scientific method]. In *Karl Marx und die Wissenschaft vom Individuum*, ed. K.-H. Braun, W. Hollitscher, K. Holzkamp, and K. Wetzel, 120–166. Marburg, Germany: Verlag Arbeiterbewegung und Gesellschaftswissenschaften.
- Holzkamp, K. 1983b. *Grundlegung der Psychologie* [Founding/Foundation of psychology] Frankfurt/M, Germany: Campus.

- Holzkamp, K. 1985. Grundkonzepte der Kritischen Psychologie [Foundational concepts of critical psychology]. In *Wi(e)der die Anpassung. Texte der Kritischen Psychologie zu Schule und Erziehung*, ed. AG Gewerkschaftliche Schulung und Soltau Lehrerfortbildung, 13–19. Germany: Herman Schulze Verlag.
- Holzkamp-Osterkamp, U. 1975. *Grundlagen der psychologischen Motivationsforschung 1* [Foundations of psychological motivation research vol. 1]. Frankfurt/M, Germany: Campus.
- Holzkamp-Osterkamp, U. 1976. *Grundlagen der psychologischen Motivationsforschung 2* [Foundations of psychological motivation research vol. 2]. Frankfurt/M, Germany: Campus.
- Johnson, K.E. 2006. The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly* 40, no. 1: 235–256.
- Ketelaar, E., D. Beijaard, H.P.A. Boshuizen, and P.J. Den Brok. 2012. Teachers' positioning towards an educational innovation in the light of ownership, sense-making and agency. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28: 273–282.
- Lasky, S. 2005. A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 21: 899–916.
- Lave, J., and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Lipponen, L., and K. Kumpulainen. 2011. Acting as accountable authors: Creating interactional spaces for agency work in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27: 812–819.
- Martin, S. 2004. Finding balance: Impact of classroom management conceptions on developing teacher practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20: 405–422.
- Marx, K./Engels, F. 1958. *Werke Band 3* [Works vol. 3]. Berlin, Germany: Dietz.
- Matusov, E. 2001. Intersubjectivity as a way of informing teaching design for a community of learners' classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17: 383–402.
- McNeill, D. 2002. Gesture and language dialectic. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 34: 7–37.
- Morgan, B. 2010. Fostering conceptual roles for change: Identity and agency in ESEA teacher preparation. *Kritika Kultura* 15: 34–55.
- Noyes, A. 2008. Choosing teachers: Exploring agency and structure in the distribution of newly qualified teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24: 674–683.
- Roberts, J., and S. Graham. 2008. Agency and conformity in school-based teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24: 1401–1412.
- Roth, W.-M. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: Praxis of methods*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Author, W.-M. 2006. Collective responsibility and the other. *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 1: 607–614.
- Author, W.-M. 2011. *Passibility: At the limits of the constructivist metaphor*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Author, W.-M., S. Hwang, Y.-J. Lee, and M.I.M. Goulart. 2005. *Participation, learning, and identity: Dialectical perspectives*. Berlin: Lehmanns Media.
- Author, W.-M., D. Lawless, and K. Tobin. 2000. Time to teach: Towards a praxeology of teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education* 25: 1–15.
- Author, W.-M., Masciotra, D., & Boyd, N. (1999). Becoming-in-the-classroom: a case study of teacher development through coteaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17: 771–784.
- Author, W.-M., and L. Radford. 2011. *A cultural-historical perspective on mathematics teaching and learning*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

- Author, W.-M., K. Tobin, A. Zimmerman, N. Bryant, and C. Davis. 2002. Lesson on and from the dihybrid cross: An activity theoretical study of learning in coteaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 39: 253–282 .
- Sannino, A. 2010. Teachers' talk of experiencing: Conflict, resistance and agency. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26: 838–844.
- Scantlebury, K., J. Gallo-Fox, and B. Wassell. 2008. Coteaching as a model for preservice secondary science teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24: 967–981.
- Smith, D.E. 1990. *Conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Stith, I., and W.-M. Author. 2008. *Students in action: Cogenerative dialogues from secondary to elementary schools*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Stith, I., and W.-M. Author. 2010. Teaching as mediation: The cogenerative dialogue and ethical understandings. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26: 363–370.
- Stoughton, E.H. 2007. 'How will I get them to behave?': Pre service teachers reflect on classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23: 1024–1037.
- Suchman, L. 1995. Making work visible. *Communications of the ACM* 38(9): 56–64.
- Tobin, K., and W.-M. Author. 2006. *Teaching to learn: A view from the field*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Vygotskij, L.S. 2005. *Psychologija razvitija čeloveka* [Psychology of human development]. Moscow, Russia: Eksmo.
- Wassell, B. A., & Lavan, S. K. (2009). Tough transitions? Mediating beginning urban teachers' practices through coteaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4, 409–432.