Text 1 - Abstract

Within the Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE) at Charles Sturt University, teacher education researchers have been quick to respond to the opportunities created by what is known as 'the practice turn' that characterises contemporary theory around the globe and across disciplines. We are working, together and in parallel, to explore ways in which we can take up the affordances of renewed attention to theories of practice in professional (teacher) education. Our aim is to build new theories of teacher education practice that can sustain us as we interact within and around contemporary higher education and school education policy and regulatory frameworks. While these may work to constrain and delineate teacher education curriculum decisions, they also delineate the social and interpersonal parameters of the field on which we practise as teacher educators in universities today. In this paper I explore and examine the idea of practice in pre-service teacher education to ask if there are ways to reconceptualise professional practice and professional experience outside of the now dominant 'days in schools' model that has become the major way in which we provide pre-service (student) teachers with the opportunity to actually study the act of teaching and the actions that are involved in the practice of their profession. Drawing on the work of Grossman, teaching is an idea that has devolved over time. What was once a core teacher education practice of the 'demonstration lesson' followed by student practice of key skills has disappeared from initial teacher education curricula. Similarly, other forms of studying teaching such as the 'micro-teaching' approach of the 1970s and 80s have also diminished over time. With new developments in practice theory and attention to professional practice as a research area within Charles Sturt University and elsewhere, a focus on the study of teaching as a practice is timely.

> Reid, J. (2011). A practice turn for teacher education? Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 39, No. 4, 293-310.

Text 2 - Introduction

My son Jon was a skateboarder, one of those annoying kids on boards who skated and jumped off driveways and slid along cement edges in public car parks. We lived in Armidale at that time, a small regional city in northern New South Wales. We'd told the children when moving that Armidale was 'half way between Brisbane and Sydney', but it looked small and pretty isolated on the map. Less than a month after our arrival, the youngest, Andrew, claimed we'd misled them, pointing out: 'Mum, it's actually halfway between *Guyra* and *Uralla*!'– two even smaller rural highway towns, for which Armidale served as a larger 'sponge city' (Argent et al. 2008).

We had moved when the children were 11, 13 and 15, and the kids that Jon, the eldest began to hang out with were nice kids he'd met at school whose out-of-school activities were focused on skating, heavy metal rock music and deep hanging out. In the schoolyard, he and his group were seen as cool enough to keep out of trouble, with their black trench coats, dreadlocks and good grades. As the 'black coats', they sat with older boys on the 'Year 11 lawn' at lunch time, separated from other groups of adolescent 'petrol heads', 'footy boys', 'rodeo riders', and the racially marked 'Koori kids'. Girls divided their attention among these groups, or sat in their own segregated girl groups that the boys did not differentiate by name.

After being pulled over by police for skateboarding on a main road, Jon decided to join with a group of other kids to lobby the local Council to build a skate park down in the creeklands, where skaters, boarders and bikers could legally meet and practice. The kids wrote letters, attended Council meetings, worked with the local youth officer, spoke on local radio, held a skate competition to raise

money, and were ultimately successful in achieving their aim. As a parent *and* teacher educator, I was impressed at the range of 'authentic literacy experiences' that were being taken up by these young people as they shared skill sets and energy in achieving what was, for them, an engaging, purposeful social activity. For me, it looked just like what I was describing to my pre-service teacher education students at that time as a 'Rich Task'. This concept, introduced along with the idea of 'productive pedagogies' (Hayes et al. 2006) as part of the Queensland New Basics curriculum, is described by the Department of Education and Training, Queensland (2001) as 'transdisciplinary activities that have an obvious connection to the wide world'.

As a view of curriculum, this story offers substantial challenge to views of literacy then (and still) on offer in NSW schools – where literacy is seen as a set of functional skills and tools for reading, writing, talking, listening and viewing – hierarchised into a syllabus whose outcomes can be regularly tested, so that, as Green notes in Chapter One, '[L]iteracy is what gets assessed.'

> Reid, J. (2013) Rural boys, literacy practice and possibilities of difference: Tales out of school. In Green, B. & Corbett, M. (eds) Rethinking Rural Literacies: Transnational perspectives. Palgrave Macmillan

Text 3 – Abstract

This paper explores the language used by Australian Football League (AFL) footballers and Australian Broadcast Corporation (ABC) journalists in their post-match interviews broadcast on ABC (774 Melbourne) radio. From Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Appraisal is used to investigate the evaluative language expressed by the AFL footballers in their exchanges with ABC journalists. Despite the many applications of linguistics to media discourse, especially within SFL, this research is the first to analyse the language of Australian athletes in their post-match interviews. It is found that irrespective of the result of the game, ABC journalists and AFL footballers maintain a neutral stance by countering expressions of positive Attitude with negative Attitude, as well as employing Graduation and Engagement resources that reduce authorial endorsement. These findings are summarized and discussed, including reference to neutralism from Conversation Analysis. The paper goes on to claim that the tenor between AFL footballers, ABC journalists and the broadcast audience makes it difficult for AFL footballers to express authoritative evaluations. The ultimate aim is to show that AFL footballers do well to negotiate a particularly challenging register. (Contains 4 tables and 1 figure.)

> Caldwell, D. (2009) "Working your words": Appraisla in the AFL post-match interview. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol.32, No.2, 13.1-13.7.

Text 4 – Abstract

Following the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), which mandates standards-based accountability for the academic progress of all students, much attention has been given to integrating language and content instruction for English learners (ELs) in K-12 classrooms in the US. Although TESOL and other state-approved language proficiency standards acknowledge that academic English requires progressive linguistic complexity to tackle progressively complex content, they give no indicators for this progression beyond some generalizations about increased sentential variety. An enlightening characterization of linguistic complexity comes from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), specifying how grammatical choices actually construct meaning, making a strong case for explicit, proactive instruction, and calling for a systematic analysis of the language our English learners need to master.

This paper describes an ongoing project to answer this call by charting a developmental continuum of complexity for school-age English learners. Its preliminary analysis is based on some 90 compositions, collected over the course of a year from more than 30 students in a New England middle school classroom.

O'Dowd, E. (2012). The Development of linguistic complexity: A Functional continuum. Language Teaching, Vol.45, No.3, 329-346.

Text 5 – Abstract

Reflective skills are widely regarded as a means of improving students' lifelong learning and professional practice in higher education (Rogers 2001). While the value of reflective practice is widely accepted in educational circles, a critical issue is that reflective writing is complex, and has high rhetorical demands, making it difficult to master unless it is taught in an explicit and systematic way. This paper argues that a functional semantic approach to language (Eggins 2004), based on Halliday's (1978) systemic functional linguistics (SFL) can be used to develop a shared language to explicitly teach and assess reflective writing in higher education courses. The paper outlines key theories and scales of reflection, and then uses SFL to develop a social semiotic model for reflective writing. Examples of reflective writing are analysed to show how such a model can be used explicitly to improve the reflective writing skills of higher-education students.

Ryan, M. (2011) Improving reflective writing in higher education: A Social semiotic perspective. Teaching in Higher Education, Vol.16, No.1, 99-111.

Interview questions and answers
(Questions from Cassily, answers from Jo-Anne Reid, Professor of Education)

1. **You refer to yourself** as a writer and researcher in the first person (e.g. "in this chapter, I rehearse..."). You also refer explicitly to multiple identities that you have – researcher, writer, parent, educator (e.g. " As a parent *and* teacher educator, I was impressed..."). Many research writers avoid referring to themselves – and of course this varies a lot between disciplines.

   Have you reflected on the norms for researchers to refer to themselves in Education?
   It's the norm in certain epistemological and methodological frameworks... i.e. positivist research, which is reporting facts and figures, hardly ever uses the first person, while interpretivist and post-positivist research almost requires it, as an indicator of the recognition that knowledge is provisional and temporary, not universal truth.

   What are the other reasons for which you bring your identities explicitly to the surface in your research writing?
   Mainly in terms of creating a relationship with the reader – the interpersonal moves in the text produce a less formal tenor, attempting to encourage the reader to relate to what is being talked about as 'in the world', rather than 'from an ivory tower'.

2. **You use concrete and emotional language** when you talk about the people whose experiences you are researching, including your own (e.g. "angry with self-satisfied bigotry", "dreams for the man he would like to become", "his longed-for baby sister as 'probably, good at school'"). At other times, you refer to these phenomena in more abstract and impersonal language (e.g. "The strong binary association of school success and femininity in this boy's story")

   Do you feel that the way you describe emotional and moral aspects of people is simply a direct consequence of the kinds of phenomena which you are researching in your discipline? Or are there

> other reasons that you write about people's experiences in a concrete, personal and emotionally rich ways?

Yes – this data was chosen because it provided researchers access to the feelings and emotions of the boy, who while just one rural boy, is still perceived in policy, schooling and social terms as 'a rural adolescent'. This data demonstrates that this stereotype is not a universal truth, so that teachers can think in more complex ways about how they approach all 'rural adolescent boys'. Chris Lilley does the same thing in Angry Boys! Other data would not allow this sort of discourse analytic interpretation – because people often try to leave emotions out of interview data , for example.

> Why does your stance on these experiences change in different parts of the text – so that at some points you are writing in ways which bring the experiences emotionally closer to yourself and the reader, and in other places you are writing in ways which move the individual experiences further away, and are instead more objective and abstract?

This is a rhetorical move to mirror the job of the professional practitioner.. who needs information about their 'client' but needs to respond in ways that conform with policy, and current practice norms. What we do with knowledge as a professional, is not always what we might want to do with it, as a human being. This is not necessarily a conscious move, so the move between more conventional academic-speak and personal response, is a response to my sense of the assumed audience of the piece (here, academics and teachers).

3. **Risks associated with claims and identities in research writing**

> Do you ever reflect on the risk associated with the interpretations and recommendations you make? For example, the risks to you of making strong claims which may be contentious – or, conversely the benefits of taking risks which may provoke responses or actions on the part of your readers?

As a writer I always want a response from a reader. If a text is so humdrum they read and underline a key point and then forget it, then the communication of knowledge is not achieved... if knowledge is something we feel and hold with us, it is narrative that gets remembered. This gets to the question of research impact- something contentious may well be great for getting cited by others, so that they can disagree with you! I've had an experience of this in the last 6 months which has actually taught me a lot.

> Are there risks which you are prepared to take, or able to take, now as an experienced research writer, which you would not have taken when you began writing about research?

Interesting question – and the answer is yes. There is a point where people know what you stand for, and so you become less worried about offending anyone because you already have.   But it means I now try to be really clear about what I mean so that complex issues are not presented as simpler than they are.

4. **Writing with others**

> When you co-write with other researchers, what kinds of negotiations and decisions take place, about the 'voice' which comes through in the article?

Usually one person takes the lead, and others come in as they can. I can talk about strategising this within the TERRAnova research project.

5. **Your understanding of your readers/audience**

> Looking back at the times when you were beginning and developing as a researcher and research writer, can you see any ways in which your knowledge of your readers and audience has changed?

I became a researcher after being an English teacher, so the idea of purpose, audience and form was something I drew on in my beginning writing... a paper is not a story, a thesis is not a report, etc

> Has any change or development in your understanding of your readers influenced the way you write about your research now?

This has come from assessing theses and supervising doctoral students... I keep learning how important it is for language to be clear – there is so much room for misinterpretation due to assumptions on the writer's part about reader knowledge.