

A Pluripedagogical and Dual Language Approach to Teacher Education

Holli Schaubert

holli.schauber@unige.ch
Université de Genève

Synergies Europe n° 7 - 2012 pp. 151-172

Dates de soumission/acceptation: 29 mars 2012 - 20 septembre 2012

Résumé: Partant du principe que les participants ne possèdent probablement pas la compétence linguistique nécessaire à la transition entre des langues différentes pour des événements discursifs oraux et écrits, les modèles de formation initiale des enseignants recourent communément à une seule langue pour l'instruction, l'apprentissage et la proposition de ressources issues de la littérature informant le processus de formation initiale des enseignants. Lorsque cette compétence est présente parmi les participants, les enseignants en formation peuvent profiter d'un contexte d'instruction où la proximité entre des pratiques de langue double et d'entrée pluripedagogiques convergent pour conférer une plus-value au processus de préparation professionnelle. Le concept de pluripedagogie est présenté ici comme une simultanéité d'utilisation de langue double qui baigne l'enseignant en formation dans des perspectives pédagogiques amplifiées grâce aux ressources offertes par deux langues, le français et l'anglais. Cet article traite de la façon dont l'accès à des perspectives pluripedagogiques peut prendre forme et être exprimé au sein d'un encadrement institutionnel unique combinant deux langues.

Mot-clés: formation des enseignants; pluripedagogie, formation bilingue

Abstract: Models of teacher preparation typically rely on a single language for instruction, learning, and the literature that informs the teacher training process, because participants are unlikely to possess the linguistic competence to transition between languages for oral and written discourse events. When the competence exists, trainee teachers can benefit from an instructional context where dual language practices give rise to pluripedagogical access. The concept of pluripedagogy is introduced here as a concomitant of dual language use to convey a set of pedagogical perspectives that expose the pre- and in-service practitioner to an expanded range of instructional contexts culled from resources in two languages - French and English. This article considers how access to pluripedagogical views takes shape and how this gets expressed within a unique dual language instructional setting.

Key words: Teacher education, pluripedagogy, bilingual education

1.0 Introduction

This paper makes an instructional proposal for a *pluripedagogical* and *dual language* approach to teacher preparation as one way to offer internationally comparative and hence expanded theoretical and practical views of the field to pre- and in-service practitioners.

It describes the bilingual practices developed in a year-long teacher education course, *Profession Profession Enseignante - Option Bilingue (the teaching profession - bilingual option, henceforth PEOB)*, which subscribes to and further develops the idea that teacher preparation should expose students to (pluri) pedagogical viewpoints that are not solely bound by the demands and practices of local educational contexts. This is predicated on the idea that dual language use can confer access to an enlarged field of theoretical and practical notions in teacher education in ways that monolingual settings may not.

This experiential argument emerges from an ongoing four year exploratory and ethnographic study conducted by this teacher-investigator. A qualitative approach is used because of its sensitivity to the nuances of the concomitant nature of dual language use and pluripedagogical exposure (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1998). A major goal of the study is the identification of course components that can inform instruction in other teacher education contexts where a bilingual option is possible.

The article first situates the study, then briefly describes the research methodology, followed by a description and discussion of the course and its signature features. PEOB provides an ideal setting for the ongoing exploratory study and discussion of the relationship between pluripedagogy and dual language use as instructional practices. The context also prompts a discussion of code switching and translation as interactional strategies leading to community of practice issues. The course description and discussion are rounded off by a set of concluding remarks with an eye toward further research.

1.1 Origins and definition of pluripedagogy

The notion of pluripedagogy emerged organically from the PEOB course concept presented here, and it was first used by this teacher-investigator in 2010 to describe the course to others who were unfamiliar with it. The underlying notion draws on the growing investment in plurilingual/pluralistic educational policies and practices across the EU that are incrementally nudging programs away from their status-quo monolingual positions.

Operationally and contextually defined, *pluripedagogy* can be understood as the natural concomitant of dual language use that rests on the following features: 1) pedagogical abundance culled from exposure to the range of diverse educational views that two or more languages, in this case, international varieties of French and English and their communities of practice (re)present; and 2) pedagogical adjacency of multiple knowledge sources inter- and comingling in the construction of the knowledge base and identity of pre- and in-service teachers; 3) pedagogical importing and exporting across linguistic and community of practice boundaries; and 4) multiple pedagogical competences as instructional resources where a plurality of views are mobilized to mediate, declare, and evaluate pedagogical stances.

1.2 Dual language programs in French Switzerland

Pluripedagogy meshes with the growing shift in the language policies at universities in French Switzerland that facilitate and encourage dual language

use as a resource for teaching and learning. French-German options already exist at the University of Fribourg in undergraduate and graduate classes, and English has been added to the mix as a French-English dyad at the University of Geneva in specific graduate level programs. Prior to university, some private and public colleges in the Swiss French cantons grant bilingual diplomas for programs followed in French-German, or French-English. Those programs differ from PEOB in that the two languages are never used simultaneously in the same instructional setting. Part of the plurilinguistic shift may involve appealing to plurilinguistic resources. Recognition of that need appears to be unfolding. Promoting a dual language course may not only support bilingual development but it appears to be good politics (B. Schneuwly, personal communication 2008).

2.0 Perspectives framing the study

Several integrated and parallel perspectives have been identified that bear upon this study. They are set against the backdrop of the instructional framework described herein. This variety presents some problems for a research review.

2.1 Teacher knowledge sources

This study is nurtured by the idea that teacher knowledge is a centerpiece of teacher identity (Clandinin, 2010) and that varying and expanding the ways to get, know, have, and experience the ‘big ideas’ in the teaching profession ultimately favours a more informed and versatile practitioner. What may potentially resonate with teachers pedagogically in one particular context draws upon an expanded pool of educational narratives conveyed through the voices of educators and researchers working in different communities of practice and languages. These differences should not, however, be viewed as competing claims but as complementary tangible viewpoints. It speaks as well to the deeply held assumptions about what should and does get valued in 21st century teacher preparation programs (Hammond, 2006). This may well involve developing a globally conscious conception of the profession and the teacher education programs that feed it. In Europe, this is being politically driven by the evolving plurilingual imperatives that naturally facilitate a pluripedagogical dimension within the framework of teacher education.

Teacher trainees would benefit from learning opportunities and knowledge sources that are not unilaterally pegged to locally-informed, monolingual pedagogical perspectives and practices that, for example, rely exclusively on French European and/or French Canadian sources (see Appendix A). Guskey (2003) emphasizes the crucial need for professional development to include multiple data sources that are themselves varied in kind. Change in engagement with the available body of knowledge may yield change in action and hence its interpretation (Clarke and Hollingsworth, 2002: 956). This change emerges through contact with previously unencountered knowledge sources, educational practices, and notions residing in ‘other’ communities of practitioners (Clandinin, 2010). Introducing an additional language signals a capacity to handle and grapple with differences that are both content and language specific.

2.2 Globalization's Contributions

Exposure to 'otherness' draws fuel from a globalization process that is causing pedagogies to be exported from and imported into communities of practice that are both receptive and resistant. Making the pedagogical process a heterogeneous one may require introducing additional languages as resources for teaching and learning. Pluripedagogy therefore lies along a language and teacher education continuum. This can be located within the emerging plurilingual frameworks, increasingly favoured by European researchers in their promotion of the plurality of socioeducational and methodological stances (Gajo *et al.*, 2008; Candelier, 2008). Regardless of the distribution ratio, Gajo (2009) suggests that the languages used be viewed as resources for teaching and learning. Furthermore within Europe, the *Cadre de reference pour les approches pluriel* (CARAP), the framework of reference for the plurality of approaches, is joined by a growing number of policy guides and studies focusing on the language of education (Candelier, 2011; Beacco and Byram, 2007). These types of reference documents are on target for assuming benchmark status in the policy decisions governing language and curricula across Europe. They highlight a set of burgeoning assumptions, practices and principles that favour the co- and inter-mingling of a plurality of languages, cultures, and canons of knowledge to develop a plurilingual and pluricultural set of competences (Darling-Hammond and Lieberman, 2012).

Globalization has drawn educators closer together by integrating and expanding the kinds of collective thinking practitioners, teacher educators and researchers can do. This implicates the kinds of knowledge and experiences they can access, exchange, and construct. While globalization has reduced the distances between practitioners across the world, it has increased what can be deemed pedagogically relevant. The research initiatives, instructional experiences, and insights of educators whose practices occur in school contexts oceans apart has shifted from being merely locally appreciated to being more globally salient. Holden and Hicks' (2007) examination of what 21st century teachers need to know suggests that pre-service teacher preparation programs should be globally sensitive and teach teachers how to "critically evaluate sources of information" (pp. 22-23). In her review of the literature on teacher knowledge, Ben-Peretz (2011) acknowledges the call for teacher education programs to expand the knowledge base to which teachers are exposed (p. 8). Can this be accomplished without access to sources of knowledge in other languages? Our communities of practice are increasingly interconnected and interdependent and it behooves us to exploit these rich and varied sources at our disposal. Doing so may ultimately mean invoking more than one language. While we have the tools to exploit the contributions of educators and researchers across the globe, we may not always have the linguistic resources to do so. When we do, however, the access to other pedagogical experiences, narratives, assumptions and understandings can bolster teacher induction opportunities. Globalization in the teacher education sense means multiple interactions or pluripedagogical exposures as contributors and learners. This in turn means knowing how to navigate the pedagogical terrain in more than one language. Friedman (2005: 8) claims in his often-cited book, *The World is Flat* that globalization 3.0 means that

“individuals’ intellectual work could be delivered and accessed from anywhere. Work can now be disaggregated, delivered, distributed, produced, and put back together again. It is now possible for more people than ever to collaborate and compete in real time with other people on more different kinds of work from more different corners of the planet on more equal footing than at any previous time in the history of the world”.

2.3 Local versus global

At the local level, educational notions often get transmitted inter-generationally and intra-contextually, and are often digested and applied uncritically by beginning practitioners because tradition and initial ways of navigating the pedagogical terrain may override it. This does not diminish the value of what locally experienced practitioners can contribute. However, the exposure to seasoned knowledge should not be restricted solely to local insights. It should rest on opportunities that induct student teachers into the field in ways that allow them to filter and integrate valuable local knowledge and practices through a more global pedagogical sieve. Hiebert et al. argue that “teachers rarely draw from a shared knowledge base to improve their practice” and are not likely to peruse the vast body of global educational research whether conducted by classroom practitioners or university researchers for answers to current and impending instructional challenges” (2002: 3). Expanding the pedagogical pool allows teacher trainees to mesh disparate ideas and practices to address local challenges. Differences emerging from other contexts may positively disturb the status quo, dislodge teachers from positions of comfort and permit comparison between claims that can shape and reinforce teacher knowledge and identity. Expanding the pedagogical toolbox beyond a monolingual induction naturally arms the pre-service teacher with a broader reserve of fundamental knowledge. Meijer (2010: 643) acknowledges that the challenges of teaching necessitate an approach that integrates and draws on a plurality of knowledge sources. For beginning practitioners, this view does not only concern itself with the categories and types of teacher knowledge (craft, content, subject matter, general pedagogical, student etc...) but also with the ways in which different communities of practice shape and express them. Although not deliberate, teacher education programs may unintentionally impoverish student teacher opportunities for expanded knowledge and identity construction by favouring locally-sourced practices over more globally-informed ones.

2.4 Pluripedagogy

Pluripedagogy rests on several existing assumptions about what makes teacher preparation and teaching effective and successful. In most cases, there is a tendency to consider that success in terms of complex, integrated, and innovative adaptation to local instructional contexts. Gatlin (2009) contends that effective teacher preparation must respond in complex, evolved, and responsive ways to newly emerging priorities and demands of schools and the teaching workforce. Exposing pre- and in-service teachers to what might appear to be incongruous or disparate pedagogical claims regardless of the language in which the ideas are expressed, may well qualify as complex and evolved. Fairbanks (2010) posits that negotiating varied instructional contexts positively

leads to the development of responsive and informed practice. Further claims suggest that successful teachers recognize context specific differences and are adept at applying a [pluripedagogical] set of perspectives to the myriad of possibilities, particularities, and peculiarities that Kumaravadivelu (2006) highlights as the challenges they face in the classroom. Such teachers (cited in Fairbanks, 2009) have been described variously as “thoughtfully adaptive” (Duffy, 2002), as having “adaptive expertise” (Bransford *et al.*, 2005), as displaying “disciplined improvisation” (Sawyer, 2004), as possessing “adaptive metacognition” (Lin, Schwartz et Hatano, 2005), or as demonstrating “wise improvisation” (Little *et al.*, 2007). Duffy (1997: 363) called such teachers “entrepreneurial” because they see knowledge “as tools to be adapted, not as panaceas to be adopted”, whereas Sawyer (2004: 13) described them as applying knowledge in “a creative, improvisational fashion”.

2.5 (Pluri)pedagogical memes

Adaptation is a cornerstone of operating pluripedagogically. While it may be difficult to express instructional notions and practices as discrete units or memes, the concept is salient to this article’s argument that the evolutionary nature of the teaching profession necessitates access to varied sources of seasoned and theory-driven knowledge for adaptive effectiveness. Stemming from Dawkins meme theory, the idea of a pedagogical meme builds on the concept of cultural memes as ‘the cultural analogues to genes, in that they self-replicate and respond to selective pressures’ (Dawkins, 1989). Extrapolating from that would mean that educators transmit units of pedagogical information as ideas or practices intergenerationally, in this case, between practitioners in educational institutions through oral and written discourse, professional gestures, rituals or through other ‘*imitable*’ practices or artefacts. These pedagogical memes are often accepted and applied uncritically. Local pedagogical memes may rely on too narrow a pedagogical foundation which seems counterintuitive to progress. Examples of memes in the students’ lived professional narratives include how to handle unruly or disgruntled students; how to write and correct tests; how to deal with the administration; how to use and exploit technology; how to collaborate; and how to present a lesson plan to university field supervisors. Above all, a pluripedagogical approach shows teachers that there is always more than one way of doing and understanding things to reach a solution. Monopedagogy conversely, as reflected in a single pedagogical currency, may limit the choices and resources of practitioners whose memetic stance is less pluripedagogical. This paper does not explore whether repositioning oneself pluripedagogically increases instructional efficacy.

3.0 Brief overview of the Study

3.1 Method

The current study has evolved over several years and the instructional options it proposes fall along pedagogical and linguistic lines. No one has studied the relationship between dual language use and teacher preparation as a way to expose beginning practitioners to a broader view of the field. Other issues not

yet considered are the identification of course components that can express that alliance practically beyond status quo monolingual course instruction. Building on that premise, the purpose of this study was to explore the nature of that combination and extract those program elements that can inform instruction and program level decisions. The following questions guided the study:

- 1) What practicalities, particularities and possibilities of teaching and learning emerge at the junction of pluripedagogical exposure and dual language use?
- 2) Is dual language use necessary for pluripedagogical access?

3.2 Data collection and analysis

The research was conducted as a four-year exploratory ethnographic study (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) of a dual language first year teacher education course taught by this teacher-investigator. The study was a classroom-based initiative that examined the ways in which French and English were used in PEOB both for written and spoken discourse as the foundation for their exposure to different ways of encountering the teaching profession. Since this study has a practical orientation, the themes and data sources for analysis include dual language instruction and pluripedagogical practices; translation and code switching as interaction strategies and community of practice issues taken from notes on classroom interaction, bilingual course materials, read and react assignments, and student comments on course evaluations.

3.3 Participants

Since 2009 more than 120 trainee teachers have opted for PEOB and all are considered participants in this study. There are equal numbers of pre- and in-service students with varying experience as substitute teachers. All are speakers of French and English although not all are native speakers of either language. Some are native speakers of German, Italian, Spanish, and Arabic having moved to Switzerland permanently from other countries. All were considered as developing bilinguals. Those native languages were not used in PEOB, although sometimes students referred to their linguistic heritage to frame narratives about their experiences as students in their countries of origin. The trainee teachers come from across the disciplinary spectrum and represent in no hierarchical order: Math, History, English as a foreign language, French, German as a foreign language, Computer Science, Music, Visual Arts, Economics, Philosophy, Chemistry, Biology, and Physics. Students are invited to join the course if they feel comfortable with the idea of participating in both French and English as speakers, readers, writers and contributors. To date, nobody has dropped the course because the linguistic load was too high. Students choose PEOB for one or more of the following reasons: improve their English, reconnect with English, have a different experience, or the course has been recommended by other students. PEOB students fall into a range of proficiencies (B2 to C2) represented below in the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) (North *et al.*, 2005).

Table 1: CEFR

Proficient User	C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.
	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.
Independent User	B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
	B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.

3.4 Teacher investigator role and background

The two sections of PEOB are taught solely by this teacher-investigator whose simple lack of proficiency in French, commensurate with this graduate level course, necessitated the bilingual option. As teacher-investigator my role in PEOB involved facilitating and maintaining the bilingual nature of the course and ensuring participation and access to dual language sources and class proceedings. All seven colleagues in teacher education (profession enseignante) teach their sections as monolingual courses. The pluripedagogical and dual language nature of PEOB draws on several personal sources: 1) this teacher-investigator's professional identity and pedagogical orientation nurtured in Canada, the United States, and England; 2) the selection and introduction of English language articles and materials for the course that reach beyond the course-required European French and French Canadian boundary articles used in the other monolingual sections; and 3) this teacher-educator's English-French-Hebrew multilingual upbringing in Quebec, Canada.

4.0 Description of PEOB

This particular pre- and in-service initial teacher preparation course is a compulsory first year course for all newly entering students seeking certification for the secondary public schools in Geneva. PEOB represents two sections taught by this teacher-investigator in a program with a total of nine other monolingual sections of the course taught by seven other faculty members. All eleven sections of the course are grounded in types of teacher knowledge related to who is to be taught (learners), what is to be taught (subject matter and curriculum), and how and why subject matter should be taught (principles

and practices of teaching). These are set against the contextual influences on practice. All eleven sections of the course are structured into three domains that examine foundational themes related to teacher identity and professionalism, curriculum and instructional design, teaching styles and strategies, ethics, school regulations, classroom management, educational psychology, and the sociocultural and sociopolitical dimensions of schooling. These are organized around required readings in French (see Appendix A). PEOB adds additional readings in English, which gives it part of its bilingual and pluripedagogical slant (see Appendix B). The other parts come from English language teaching videos and classroom tasks that were developed by this teacher-investigator in monolingual English language teacher education contexts abroad. Some of these include read and react assignments (Appendix C), speed debating, literature circles, jigsaw reading, tiered and bias tasks, rubric building, cookie assessment, and wall work.

4.1 Instructions on dual language use

Each year, students are told that they have the right to *regulate the dialogical process in either French or English* in response to and as initiators of the content and professional narratives they were constructing throughout the course. The following refrain is offered, “Vous avez le droit d’utiliser votre propre langue dans cette classe pour tous vos travaux, pendant toutes les discussions et les taches que vous menerez en classe”(you have the right to use your own language in this class for all of your work, during all of the discussions and for all of the tasks). This guideline assumed French to be the students’ primary academic language and was extended to writing, group work, and all assignments. No other language was used unless the students were speaking to a classmate of the same first language, or they chose to read an article in their first language for the reading assignment. In the latter case, they reacted to the reading in either French or English. No language related evaluation was ever conducted and issues of accuracy, errors, etc. never entered the teaching/learning/assessment triad. Any requests for language related corrective feedback were outside the purview of the course and were offered only as a courtesy. End of course exams and assignments could be written in French or English with feedback possible in either language.

4.2 Pluripedagogical materials

The additional English language articles used in PEOB explore instructional contexts in Australia, Canada, the U.K., the U.S., Israel, Norway, Finland, South Korea, The Netherlands, Singapore, and Russia and reflect practices and research about experienced and beginning teachers on a range of PEOB-related themes (see Appendix B). Videos of secondary math and English classes originating from the UK and the U.S. are also introduced. These are set against the backdrop of the required readings for the course (see Appendix A for representative bibliographic sample of required texts for the 2011-2012 instantiation of the course). PEOB students read approximately 5-6 more articles than their counterparts in the monolingual sections of the course because in addition to the required texts, they also choose or are presented with these English texts

to read. They are aware of this difference from the first class.

4.2 Tasks and classroom materials

Students in PEOB are not only exposed to bilingual materials but also to dual language tasks. This means that instructions, administrative issues and classroom management language alternate between French and English. Both languages can be used as a function of the language of the readings, the instructions, the task, the task prompt, and the lead off language. The handouts in class are always bilingual, meaning that a single page might contain both French and English content which can include: quotes from an article; theoretical principles; an article summary; instructions for a task; the task prompt itself; questions for reflection; recommended readings; course requirements; and the class agenda. PEOB students may read an article in French or English and submit their 'read and react assignments' in either language (see Appendix C). Read and react assignments ask students to produce a one page personal response to any of the readings using any language combination. They may also conduct their group work in class in either language regardless of the language of the prompt. These particularities are features of the practicalities of the course.

5.0 Making sense of the course

5.1 Introduction

The practicalities and particularities of teaching and learning that emerge at the junction of pluripedagogical exposure and dual language use are discussed below. This is followed by concluding remarks about the advantages, drawbacks and future research possibilities of PEOB for teacher trainers and beginning practitioners.

5.2 Dual language and Pluripedagogy

Dual language education programs (Gomez, Freeman and Freeman, 2005) at the elementary and secondary levels vary widely in terms of how the languages are distributed for students with varying proficiencies and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This flexibility serves to promote inclusiveness and plurality of views and rests on notions of culturally and pedagogically responsive teaching (Gay, 2002; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). This can be understood as a pedagogy that values different cultural references in the same way that PEOB recognizes this importance.

Programs can divide the languages along content instruction and time allocation lines. PEOB did not require an even number of balanced bilinguals and was not faithful to a single type of dual language program model where a given distribution of language is strictly followed. Dual language use varied from class to class to maximize the learning opportunities and as a naturally occurring choice. The instructional environment was responsive to the language and content demands of the learners and the proficiency of the teacher-investigator. Forel (2009: 63-4) for example discusses the different representations of geographic information

in terms of German orientations being more pragmatic and detailed, and French orientations being more abstract and focused on problem solving, as a case in which each language conveys distinct concerns and preoccupations with the subject area. This is understood as a direct reflection of the language. Two languages may treat similar issues differently and hence present students with varied thematic foci, vantage points, and messages. Student teachers in PEOB may associate certain types of teacher knowledge and practices with the first or second language. Furthermore, they may also assign certain instructional stances to a particular linguistic heritage.

For example, two separate treatments of classroom management and discipline are presented to PEOB students (Walker 2009; Payne, 2010) that espouse person-centered and negotiated social-interaction approaches. These readings are assigned in addition to the required ones by Meirieu (2008) and Rey (1999) on classroom discipline. Of these readings, the former locates the issue of discipline and the teacher's authority in the larger societal context and the second focuses on the teacher's position and use of authority in the class. Together these readings provide the enlarged terrain for inductee teachers to grapple with. The core notions within each are culled and analyzed through comparative means. All are viewed as independently valuable sources of knowledge that revolve around nuanced metaphors derived from different language communities of practice. Recognizing the instructional value in each perspective sits at the heart of PEOB.

5.3 Classroom interaction strategies

Translation and code switching were spontaneous but deliberate strategic tools used by the students and the teacher-investigator. This occurred most often in a bidirectional manner between languages and between all course participants. Students could explore the course's themes through discussions in English and/or French. This positioned the linguistic forms and meanings of the content as a key subtext and by-product of the course. Only a handful of English vocabulary definitions were ever presented in a formal and direct way. Students relied on one another for language level "quick translations" or "speed translations". Translating and interpreting content from one language to the other involved co-constructing key concepts to the point that satisfied everyone's understanding. This involved careful attention to the nuances and core referents that the translations produced. Overt efforts were made to maintain the integrity of the original concepts across language boundaries. Certain concepts in French for example have no viable or acceptable equivalents in English and so the original term was retained. For example, 'Gestes Professionnels' (physical, attitudinal, and tactical teaching gestures) one of the major themes of the course and 'dispositifs' (teaching schemes, programs, plans) were left in their original French because of the increased or preferred resonance they had with everyone. In English for example, a distinction is made between evaluation and assessment whereas in French only the word evaluation exists. In this case, the co-constructed translation from English into French introduced the concepts of formative and summative systems and qualitative and quantitative elements.

Moreover, in order keep up with “the complex communicative demands”, both the teacher-investigator and her students frequently switched from one language to another, either between or within utterances. This phenomenon known as code switching occurred when the students or the teacher-investigator struggled to express themselves or understand in one of the two languages. Myers-Scotton (1995) describes code switching as a type of ‘skilled performance’ within a specific bicultural context. Dual-language courses such as PEOB challenge the prevailing paradigm of “language-as-problem” (Ruiz, 1984: 15) by viewing languages as resources and keys to navigating diverse practices and ideas.

5.4 Code Switching and Roles

Code switching often implies a conscious language choice based on the perceived proficiency of the speaker and the listener and based on whether the interlocutors share both languages in common. Switching to the other language to satisfy classroom communicative needs influenced teacher and student roles and the need to co-construct information. The teacher-investigator’s role shifted to a language learner role when a French term or phrase was unavailable and the students had to fill the gap in the teacher’s linguistic knowledge. Doing so changed the habitual way that information gets exchanged in a class between teacher and student. This further influences how that information is processed, digested, and considered. Students scaffolded the teacher-investigator and vice-versa by manipulating and grappling with the content and the conceptual nature of the issues to find and apply the appropriate terminology. My own bias, as a teacher, tended toward French for receptive language use and English for productive language use purely on proficiency grounds. This meant that the teacher-investigator had to trust the students’ linguistic judgement and their conceptual understanding of the issues. As such my role involved facilitating the discourse process to promote maximum participation and comprehension. However, it is impossible to determine whether all participants understood everything all of the time.

What became interesting was how the two languages were cross-accessed for interaction. Students representing a range of proficiencies greeted each other’s language use with a wide tolerance for ambiguity. Code switching became a commonly accepted way of communicating in the class. Participants were often rescued with specific words and phrases but rarely without a request for it. Each language fulfilled a purpose much like “the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society” (Sridhar, 1996: 53). French was primarily chosen to reinforce and register concepts encountered in English, although certain students preferred not to translate ideas and instead chose to grapple with the concepts and paradigms in their original clothing. In most cases, students chose to interact with the teacher -investigator in English and with one another in French. However there were consistent uses of English among the students in small group interaction. Despite the frequent code switching, many viewed this class as a language learning opportunity.

5.5. Incidental Language Learning

Students participating in the class had the added bonus of learning English as the target foreign language in an incidental and content driven manner. This means that there was no formal or deliberate focus on linguistic forms, rules, or language acquisition strategies. Any language learning that occurred did so organically out of the interactions and exposure during activities through the overall classroom context. It must be acknowledged, however, that content driven language learning is a well-known approach to foreign and second language teaching and learning. Known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), it rests on the idea that language is learned through exposure to content in a target language. Fitts (2006) examined how dual language use in the classroom was conceptualized and implemented and how it contributed to language separation and ‘parallel monolingualism’. She found that it provided students with incidental language learning opportunities linked to their contextualized educational meanings much like this experience did for the pre-service teachers in PEOB. The CLIL nature of PEOB resides in the use of the languages as carriers of the content.

5.6 Pluripedagogy and Dual Language

One persistent question concerns whether a pluripedagogical framework can be achieved without the introduction of a second language. The initial answer is partially yes if we view and value international varieties of French and English, for example, on their own, as representative samples of different communities of practice. However, the weight that more than one language bears upon creating pluripedagogical exposure cannot be denied. The two may be inextricably linked if one considers that conduct, thinking, written and oral discourse, processes and practices take shape through given languages and the cultures they signal. The conceptual link between pluripedagogy, which in essence is a pluricultural view of educational thinking and practices, and a dual language element, seems sustainable. They are counterparts that operate in tandem bidirectionally and with mutual influence. Reading pedagogical ideas in more than one language nurtures the practitioner’s ability to make comparative claims in the face of contextual challenges and practicalities that may otherwise only be met with a more limited set of solutions and possibilities. Thus locally constructed teacher knowledge and identity can benefit from the enlarged exposure created through the access to sources, materials, and activities in more than one language (Clarke and Hollingsworth, 2002: 956).

5.7 Community of Practice

Of particular interest to this author is the fact that the nature of the course shaped and embodied the classroom identity. It produced a dual language and pluripedagogical preservice community of pre- and in-service practitioners anchored to a larger teacher preparation program (Darling-Hammond, 2005). The PEOB community developed particular rituals, attitudes, beliefs, and practices regarding language use and the acquisition of professional knowledge. Within this particular teacher preparation context, using English and French

for class proceedings, handouts, readings, discussions, assignments, and deliberations created a bilingual community operating in part as a distinct student subculture. This student community enjoyed access to source materials and tasks that differed from their counterparts in the monolingual French sections of the course. The concept of community of practice with its emphasis on practice (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 1999: 174) acknowledges the common pursuits of its members and their ritualized, routinized, or novel forms of interaction. In this framework, they develop a common linguistic currency organized around bilingual events and practices. Members depend on one another to share their dual language resources and their linguistic capital flows bi-directionally in response to the task demands and their own communicative and language choices. The bilingual nature of the course also contributed to the understanding and recognition of the epistemological extension it afforded.

6.0 Discussion and Conclusion

The study draws conclusions on the basis of exploratory and descriptive evidence as a means of promoting best practices in contemporary teacher preparation programs where bilingual practices partner with pluripedagogy to inform pre- and in-service teachers in meaningful ways. The purpose of this study was to provide other teacher -educators positioned to engage in bilingual instruction with options that may resonate with their practical initiatives and particular curricular goals. Now in its fourth year, PEOB has permanent status in the teacher education program and, as of the writing of this article, there is a waiting list for the 2012-2013 course. Some immediate conclusions, however, appear relevant.

6.1 Particularities of PEOB

Together, the six particularities listed below give PEOB its signature dual language and pluripedagogical characteristics. While this is one permutation of PEOB, its particularities operate on a flexible basis in terms of the bilingual reading materials and tasks selected, interaction strategies, and languages used. This study however, does not provide specific information about the appropriate ratio of each of these particularities in the overall implementation of the approach.

Six elements have been found to be particular to PEOB:

1. The introduction of second language (English) materials representing other communities of practice,
2. Dual language use by all participants to navigate and interpret those varied communities,
3. An unequal and flexible distribution of English and French in oral and written discourse events,
4. The use of code-switching and translation as communication and comprehension strategies by all participants,
5. Student exposure to a foreign-trained teacher-investigator whose classroom tasks, experiences, and assignments emanate from abroad, and whose language of instruction differs from their monolingual PE (profession enseignante) counterparts,
6. The creation of a dual language community of practice with identifiable rituals, routines, and practices linked to dual language use and pluripedagogical exposure.

The above may therefore serve as foundational elements that others adapt to the practical contextual variables of their own particular teacher preparation programs.

6.2 Practicalities of PEOB

From a practical perspective PEOB recognizes the advantages and drawbacks that the above particularities present for both teacher educators and students. This approach naturally involves an increased time commitment on the part of the student teachers because of the additional readings and assignments. It also may present problems for all participants from a language comprehension perspective. There are particular moments when not everyone understands the discussion or the documents because either or both the language and the topic are unfamiliar. This difficulty was expressed and resolved in PEOB through interactional strategies of code switching and translation.

By the same token, working out the problem through the dual language process served to reinforce and recycle concepts that might not otherwise have received a second glance. This may in fact have led to a deeper understanding of certain concepts because of the increased time devoted to struggling with them. Language can therefore be considered a mediating tool in the acquisition of pluripedagogical knowledge. Language choices may be a feature of discourse events, interactional strategies, or the desire for conceptual saliency. The decision to retain the phrase or word in its original language is based on whether the speaker/hearer perceives it to be a more efficient use of the language to maintain conceptual integrity. In this regard, PEOB students and this teacher-investigator interact with one another in a flexible way relying on a dual language use that best achieves their communicative intent. Interactional strategies and their relationship to maintaining conceptual integrity do not pose the same kinds of language related challenges in monolingual contexts.

6.2 The necessity of dual language use for Pluripedagogy

A persistent issue is whether dual language use is a necessary concomitant for pluripedagogy as an instructional practice in, specifically, a teacher education program. A monolingual view of the field, which can likewise present varied communities of practice, may confer different teacher preparation opportunities and experiences than PEOB does. Monolingual opportunities may involve naturally imposed limits that PEOB does not in terms of different language-sourced literature and hence the knowledge culled and valued. This may further influence the comparative and linguistic frames applied for interpretation. Thus, the possibility for a pluripedagogical view does not necessarily hinge on bilingual circumstances but it may be enhanced by it. For example, international varieties of French representing European and Quebec communities of practice offer a certain transnational view of the field. By the same token, so do international varieties of English albeit the number of communities they represent cover more communities of practice. Together however, as Guskey (2003) points out, there is a need for professional development to sample multiple and varied data sources. Engaging these

multiple sources to facilitate pluripedagogy does not only mean reading articles in a second language, it involves as well interacting with and around the concepts they express. Doing so bilingually may well promote pluripedagogy in ways that monolingual options cannot.

Monolingual-only advocates tend to operate in contexts where the use of a second language is either limited or even frowned upon. Therefore a PEOB initiative has little possibility of being implemented. This approach may only be viable in contexts where students and teachers share linguistic competence in more than one language and where program level support exists.

6.3 Possibilities for further research

The possibilities that PEOB presents give rise to recommendations for further research. In fashioning a pluripedagogical and dual language framework for teacher education, this paper has presented the seedlings for the development and refinement of a potential framework for a teacher education approach. In so doing, it has raised questions and opened a discussion about its potential impact on teacher preparation and practice. While a shift toward pluripedagogical perspectives in teacher preparation may not only depend on dual language capacities and competencies for the teacher or students, few studies have examined the combined influence of either on teacher knowledge, teacher identity, or furthermore on prospective practice.

Several areas therefore merit further empirical investigation. Further study of what gets valued and what resonates across different communities of practice may well be worthwhile investigating as our local reference points become more globalized (Darling-Hammond and Lieberman, 2012). Guskey (2003) has emphasized the crucial need for professional development to include multiple data sources that are themselves varied in kind. That variation may well involve different language-sourced materials. Since this approach can be implemented with languages other than French and English, it would be worthwhile to investigate a different dual language dyad.

A more widespread and longitudinal study is needed to observe how pre- and in-service practitioner knowledge and practice develops over the year long course and how it gets expressed pedagogically in the classroom later on. This resonates with the idea that changing the way we ask students to interact with and view the available body of knowledge may influence interpretation, understanding and application. Thus, a logical follow up to this study would determine how this approach to teacher education impacts on beliefs and practices (Clarke, Hollingsworth, 2002: 956). It would also be worthwhile to compare PE in its monolingual version with PEOB to determine the kind of change that emerges through contact with previously unencountered knowledge sources, educational practices, and notions residing in 'other' communities of practitioners that are accessed through the second language (Clandinin, 2011).

Finally, this study stands as part of an interest in understanding ways to promote more comprehensive pre- and in-service training options, and applying what

makes good pedagogical sense, whereby teachers through their own capacity sift through and take from the enormous range of available resources. Building a teacher training course around the particularities and practicalities addressed herein, PEOB-like approaches have the potential to make practices within other instructional communities relevant and timely. First, we may need to push the boundaries of what has been considered adequate in terms of epistemological exposure and extent in teacher preparation programs. Second, we may need to persuade inductees to traverse and peruse a broader set of educational traditions as part of their training. This may well involve the use of more than one language. Third, we may want to promote the appreciation of experiential and theoretical co-existence with different-minded educators who are grappling with similar instructional issues in diverse ways in the face of disparate contextual challenges. Teacher preparation programs in the 21st century and beyond may well become grounds for globalized knowledge and practice.

Appendix A

Required Readings for Profession Enseignante 2011-12

Domaine 1

Cattonar, B. (2006). Convergence et diversité professionnelle des enseignantes et des enseignants du secondaire en Communauté française de Belgique : tensions entre le vrai travail et le sale boulot. *Education et francophonie*, 34(1), 193-212.

Prairat, E. (2009). Les métiers de l'enseignement à l'heure de la déontologie, *Education et sociétés*, 23, 41-57.

Tardif, M. et Lessard, C. (1999). *Le travail enseignant au quotidien*. Bruxelles: de Boeck. (pages retenues : 159 à 175).

Domaine 2

Altet, M. (1993/2009). Styles d'enseignement, styles pédagogiques. In J. Houssaye (Ed.), *La pédagogie : une encyclopédie pour aujourd'hui* (2e éd.) (pp. 89-102). Paris : ESF.

Huart, T. (2001). Un éclairage théorique sur la motivation scolaire: un concept éclaté en multiples facettes. *Cahiers du Service de Pédagogie expérimentale - Université de Liège*, 7-8, 221-240.

Rey, B. (1999). *Les relations dans la classe au collège et au lycée*. Paris : ESF. (Chapitre 4 sur la conduite de la classe)

Domaine 3

Dubet, F. (2005). Les épreuves et les enjeux de la culture scolaire. In F. Jacquet-Francillon et D. Kambouchner (Ed.), *La crise de la culture scolaire* (pp. 319-330). Paris : PUF.

Astolfi, J.P. (2008). *La saveur des savoirs*. Paris : ESF.

Houssaye, J. (2000). *Le triangle pédagogique ou comment comprendre la situation pédagogique*. Bruxelles : Peter Lang.

Please note:

Three (3) readings in English to be assigned. The readings are applicable to the final exam.

Two (2) of the readings will involve a read and react assignment (to be written in French or English).

Appendix B

Additional readings for PEOB 2011-2012

Ben-Peretz, M. (2011) Teacher knowledge: What is it? How do we uncover it? What are its implications for schooling? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 3-9.

Meijer, P.C., (2010) Teacher Education - Preservice: The knowledge base. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition), Pp. 642-649.

Capel, S., Leask, M., et Turner, T. (eds.) (2009) Learning to Teach in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience (Learning to Teach in the Secondary School Series. New York: Routledge.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Rosemary E. Sutton, Renée Mudrey-Camino et Catharine C. Knight (2009): Teachers' Emotion Regulation and Classroom Management, *Theory Into Practice*, 48(2), 130-137.

Ulvik, M., Smith, K., et Helleve, I., (2009) Novice in secondary school-the coin has two sides. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 25(6), 1-8. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-5/fry.pdf>

Sara Winstead Fry, S.W. (2010) The Analysis of an Unsuccessful Novice Teacher's Induction Experiences: A Case Study Presented Through Layered Account *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5) September, 1164-1190

Korthagen, F A J., (2010), The Relationship Between Theory and Practice in Teacher Education, *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition) Pp. 669-676.

Frances V., et Bartlett, L., (2006) Comparatively Knowing: Making a Case for the Vertical Case Study, *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 8(2).

Feyfant, A. (2007) Transformations du travail enseignant : finalités, compétences et identités professionnelles/How teachers' work is changing: aims, competences and professional identity. Dossier d'actualité Veille et Analyses : La lettre d'information INRP, 26, avril 2007. <http://ife.ens-lyon.fr/vst/DA/detailsDossier.php?parent=accueil&dossier=26&lang=fr>.

Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., et Stigler, J.W., (2002) A Knowledge Base for the Teaching Profession: What Would It Look Like and How Can We Get One? *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), pp. 3-15. June/July.

Hammond (2006) Constructing 21st-Century Teacher Education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, May/June 2006 57(3).

Entire Vol. 48, Issue 2, Spring 2009, of *Theory Into Practice*, explores person-centered classroom management and teachers emotion regulation.

Epstein J.L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Rodriguez Jansorn, N. et Van Vooris, F.L., (2002). *School family and community partnerships* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corvin Press.

Epstein, J. L., (2001). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Carmit T. Tadmor, Philip E. Tetlock and Kaiping Peng. Acculturation Strategies and Integrative Complexity: The Cognitive Implications of Pluriculturalism *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 2009; 40; 105.
- Hong, Y., Benet-Martínez, V., Chiu, C., et Morris, M. (2003). Boundaries of cultural influence: Construct activation as a mechanism for cultural differences in social perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 453-464.
- Hong, Y., Morris, M., Chiu, C., et Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55, 709-720.
- Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W.D., Irvine, J.J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J.W. et Stephan, W.G. (2001). *Diversity Within Unity: Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society*. Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle.
- David, H.L. et Capraro, R.M. (2001) Strategies for Teaching in Heterogeneous Environments While Building a Classroom Community. *Education*, 122 (1), 80-87.
- Gay, G., (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory and Practice*. Teachers College Press.
- King, D. (2000). Experience in the Multicultural Classroom. *Community College Week*, 13 (4), 4-6.
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., et Duffy, H. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In J. Bransford, L. Darling-Hammond, et P. LePage (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stiggins, R. et Chappuis, J. (2006). What a difference a word makes: Assessment FOR learning rather than assessment OF learning helps students succeed. *Journal of Staff Development*, 27(1), 10-14.

Appendix C

Read and React - I - 21.10.2010

Transformation du travail enseignant: finalités, compétences et identités professionnelles.

Selon plusieurs études menées dans divers états. Démocratiques, autoritaires ou communistes, le métier d'enseignant est en pleine mutation¹. En plus de transmettre le savoir en utilisant des méthodes adaptées², il doit endosser des rôles de médiateur, animateur culturel, psychologue et éducateur spécialisé ; la société attend de lui qu'il prépare les élèves issus de toute classe sociale à devenir eux-mêmes des représentants de cette société³.

Qu'est donc un bon prof ? Il semble très difficile de répondre à cette question malgré toutes les études menées à ce sujet. Une chose est cependant certaine : le métier d'enseignant est fait de changements, d'adaptation à ces changements et de réactions rapides et constructives face aux diverses attentes de l'Etat, des parents, du système éducatif et des élèves eux-mêmes⁴. Pas étonnant alors de voir que même un « bon prof » soit déstabilisé à cause de la tension existant entre ce qu'il a appris, ses connaissances académiques et expérimentales, et ce qu'il doit mettre en pratique tous les jours⁵. Si les recherches ont pointé du doigt les problèmes de gestion de l'hétérogénéité et d'apprentissage dans plusieurs pays, ces mêmes difficultés peuvent être rencontrées à Genève⁶. Les mêmes réflexions sont donc à faire partout où la culture de l'éducation est primordiale, en tenant compte des diversités préexistantes dans ces sociétés⁷.

Notes

¹ Feedback on student's work (Read and react) that would have been given as comments in the page margin [editor's note]. But «en pleine mutation» for a variety of reasons that traverse the sociocultural, political, psychosocial and pedagogical landscape prompted in part by research driven insights from teacher-led research and policy reforms.

² Adaptées selon la recherche ou la discipline de référence ?

³ This is the mandate of the teacher according to recent reforms.

⁴ Est-ce qu'il y a une hiérarchie ?

⁵ Is subject matter expertise sufficient or does one also need the didactic and pedagogical underpinnings to impart the knowledge to students?

⁶ The purpose behind assigning this as a first reading is because it draws attention to universals of the profession from different corners of the world.

⁷ How do we individualize and tailor educational practices so that equity and equality are achieved?

References

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L. et LePage, P., 2005. Introduction. In: L. Darling-Hammond et J. Bransford (eds). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: what teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1-39.

Beacco, J.C., et Byram, M., 2007. *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. Language Policy Division, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Candelier, M., 2008. «Approches plurielles, didactiques du plurilinguisme : le même et l'autre». *Les Cahiers de l'Acedle*, vol. 5, n° 1.

Candelier, M., et al., 2011. *CARAP-FREPA : A Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to languages and cultures*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Clarke, D., et Hollingsworth, 2002. «Elaborating a Model of Teacher Professional Growth». *TATE* Vol. 18, #8, pp.947-967.

Clandinin, J.D., 2010. «Acknowledging the international breadth and depth of research on teaching and teacher education». *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26, pp. 1115-1116.

Clandinin, D. J., et Connelly, F. M., 2000. *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., et Lieberman, 2012. *Teacher Education around the World: Changing policies and practices*. Taylor and Francis: New York.

Darling-Hammond, L. 2006. «Constructing 21st-Century Teacher Education». *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 57, No. 3, May/June, pp. 300-314.

Dawkins, R., 1989. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Duffy, G., 1997. Powerful models or powerful teachers? An argument for teacher-as-entrepreneur. In: S. Stahl et D. Hayes (Eds.), *Instructional models in reading* (pp. 351-367). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duffy, G. G., 2002. The case for direct explanation of strategies. In: C. C. Block et M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 28-41). New York: The Guilford Press.

Fairbanks, C., Duffy, G. G., Faircloth, B., He, Y., Levin, B. B., Rohr, J., et Stein, C., 2010. «Beyond knowledge: Exploring why some teachers are more thoughtfully adaptive than others». *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, Jan., pp.161-171.

- Fitts, S., 2006. «Reconstructing the Status Quo: Linguistic Interaction in a Dual-Language School». *Bilingual Research Journal*, v30 n2 p337-365 Summer .
- Forel, S., 2009. *L'enseignement immersif de la géographie. Enseignement Bilingue: 10 ans de maturité, mention bilingue, contextes, expériences défis*. WBZ forum. Centre Suisse de formation continue des professeurs de l'enseignement secondaire.
- Friedman, T., 2005. *The World is Flat*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Gajo, L. et al., 2008. *Construction intégrée des savoirs linguistiques et disciplinaires dans l'enseignement bilingue au secondaire et au tertiaire*. Rapport final. Fonds national suisse de la recherche scientifique : PNR 56.
- Gajo, L., 2009. «De la DNL à la DdNL: principes de classe et formation des enseignants». *Les Langues Modernes* (4).
- Gatlin, D. A., 2009. «Pluralistic Approach to the Revitalization of Teacher Education». *Journal of Teacher Education*. 60.5 (Nov-Dec): pp 469-477.
- Gay, G., 2002. «Preparing for culturally responsive teaching». *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gómez, L., Freeman, D., et Freeman, Y., 2005. «Dual Language Education: A Promising 50-50 Model». *Research in Practice: Volume 29, Number 1 Spring*.
- Guskey, T., 2003. «What makes professional development effective?». *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(10) 748-750.
- Holden C., et Hicks, D., 2007. «Making Global Connections: The knowledge, understanding and motivation of Trainee Teachers». *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 23, pp. 13-23.
- Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., et Stigler, J.W., 2002. «A Knowledge Base for the Teaching Profession: What Would It Look Like and How Can We Get One? ». *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 3-15
- Holmes, J., et Meyerhoff, M., 1999. «The Community of Practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research». *Language in Society*, 28, pp 173-183.
- Kumaravadivelu, B., 2006. «TESOL Methods: Changing Traces, Challenging Trends», *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), pp. 59-81.
- Lin, X., Schwartz, D. L., et Hatano, G., 2005. «Toward teacher's adaptive metacognition». *Educational Psychologist*, 40, pp. 245-255.
- Little, J. W., Lampert, M., Graziani, F., Borko, H., Clark, K. K., et Wong, N., 2007. *Conceptualizing and investigating the practice of facilitation in content-oriented teacher professional development*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Meijer, P.C., 2010. Teacher Education-Preservice: The Knowledge Base. In: *International Encyclopedia of Education (Third Edition)*, pp.642-649.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1995. What do speakers want? Codeswitching as evidence of intentionality in linguistic choices. In: Pamela Silberman and J. Loftin (eds.), *Salsa 2, Papers from Symposium about Language and Society at Austin*, pp. 1-17. Austin: Univ of Texas Dept of Linguistics.
- North, B., et al., 2005. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Council of Europe.
- Pane, D.M., 2010. «Viewing classroom discipline as negotiable social interaction: A communities of practice perspective». *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (2010) 87-97.

Rey, B., 1999. *Les relations dans la classe au collège et au lycée*. Paris : ESF. (chapitre 4 sur la conduite de la classe).

Ruiz, R., 1984, *Orientations in language planning*, NABE Journal, 8(2), 15-34.

Sawyer, R., 2004. «Creative teaching: Collaborative improvisation». *Educational Leadership*, 33, pp. 12-20.

Schneuwly, B., 2008. personal communication.

Sridhar, K. K., 1996. Societal multilingualism. In: S. L. McKay et N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47-70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. et J. Corbin, 1998. Basics of *Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, Sage.

Villegas, A. M., et Lucas, T., 2002. «Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum». *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(13), pp. 20-32.

Walker, Joan M. T., 2009. «This Issue: A Person-Centered Approach to Classroom Management», *Theory Into Practice*, 48: 2, pp. 95-98.