Translingual context zones: Critical reconceptualizing of teachers' work within the context of globalism

Meg Gebhard [*], Jerri Willett [1]

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, School of Education, Furcolo Hall, Amherst, MA 01003, United States

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The authors draw on Blommaert's (2010) concept of mobile semiotic resources and Canagarajah's concept of translingual contact zones (2013) to argue that the articles in this special edition of *Linguistics and Education* push forward the boundaries of the interdisciplinary fields of critical applied linguistics and research in teacher education by placing the work of teachers, teacher educators, and literacy researchers in the center of semiotic analyses of language education in the context of globalism. Based on this discussion, the authors call for a reconceptualization of teachers' work from a critical language awareness perspective.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction

The articles in this special edition of *Linguistic and Education* center on the uses of critical language awareness (CLA) perspectives as enacted in pedagogical practices situated geographically in the Americas involving global participants. Collectively, these articles explore a broad range of important and intractable conceptual, pedagogical, and ethical problems related to language, race, class, gender, and national identity in the interdisciplinary fields of sociolinguistics, critical applied linguistics, multicultural education, literacy development, and teachers' professional development. Taken collectively, these articles push forward the boundaries of these interdisciplinary fields in a number of crucial ways that have the potential to inform a more robust agenda regarding transforming power dynamics in institutional contexts so these power dynamics might better serve a social justice agenda. One of the distinguishing features of this special edition is how the authors' conceptions of CLA place the work of teachers and teacher educators in the center of semiotic analyses of language education in the context of globalism. The articles taken as a whole, therefore, call for a reconceptualization of teachers' work. Specifically, the authors draw on a critical perspective of language, learning, and social change at all levels of education through research projects conducted in collaboration with pre-and in-service teachers in multilingual contexts using the tools of CLA. In doing so, the authors shunt back and forth in their roles as critical linguists, educational researchers, and teacher educators. Applied to theorizing teachers' work in the context of global semiotic flows, this perspective warrants a commitment to analyzing how semiotic movements play a role in the construction of self-other dynamics through pedagogic interactions in classrooms and in on-line educational contexts. It also requires attention to the production and reproduction of the knowledge base of teaching and learning in rapidly changing, multilingual, and institutionally complex schools. And

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 413 577 0863.
    E-mail addresses: gebhard@educ.umass.edu (M. Gebhard), willett@educ.umass.edu (J. Willett).
[1] Tel.: +1 413 210 4191.

last, this perspective demands an analysis of the production and reproduction of ideologies related to politics of difference in teachers' day-to-day work and in research practices related to teacher education. Clearly, no one article is capable delivering on all of these commitments. However, by individually exploring important research questions using varied conceptions of critical language awareness and research methods, these studies complement one another and, collectively, provide insights that support the development of a research agenda aligned with these ambitious commitments (e.g., Alim, 2005; Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Clark, Fairclough, Ivanic, & Martin-Jones, 1990; Clark, Fairclough, Ivanic, & Martin-Jones, 1991; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; Martin, 2009; Pennycook, 2006).

In an attempt to respond critically to these very diverse projects, we find Blommaert's (2010) concept of *mobile semiotic resources* useful. Specifically, the contexts in which these studies were carried out can be characterized as discursive spaces where linguistically diverse students', teachers', teacher educators', and researchers' historically constructed and physically embodied "mobile resources" meet, collide, and/or fail to be recognized and therefore become "immobile resources" as participants (including the researchers) moved across complex social, institutional, economic, and political boundaries (p. 1). Blommaert writes that individuals, in this case elementary and secondary students, pre- and in-service teachers, teacher educators, and the researchers,

> . . .manage or fail to make sense across contexts; their linguistic and communicative resources are mobile or lack such *semiotic mobility* [emphasis added], and this is a problem not just of difference, but of inequality. It is a problem exacerbated by the intensified processes of globalization. (p. 3)

In further explaining this understanding of "mobile semiotic resources" in ways that provide a useful frame for reflecting on the contributions of each article, Blommaert (2010) argues that globalization entails the movement of people across spaces that have always been someone else's space (p. 6). They are therefore "filled with norms, expectations, and conceptions regarding what counts as proper and normal (indexical) language and what does not count as such" (p. 6). Semiotic mobility in this sense is "a trajectory through different stratified, controlled, and monitored spaces in which language always 'gives you away'" and locates you in a particular subjectivity, role or identity in sometimes insignificant and sometimes highly consequential ways (p. 6).

In further developing the concept of mobile and immobile semiotic resources for language educators, Canagarajah (2013, pp. 6–7) contributes the term *translingualism.* This concept amalgamates the critical sociolinguistics of Blommaert's (2010) with Pratt's (1991, p. 31) concept of "contact zones" to analyze social spaces where "cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (cited in Canagarajah, 2013, p. 30). The contact zones explored in this volume are exactly these kinds of post-colonial, post-slavery, and, we would add, post-industrial contexts. They are historically translingual spaces occupied by Latino heritage speakers of Spanish in California; pre-service teachers exploring conceptions of whiteness and blackness in their teacher education programs in North America; a history teacher and his high school students analyzing primary source texts related to war in Texas; speakers of varieties of Arabic analyzing science texts in an economically struggling former industrial city in Michigan; teachers of Quechua to Spanish speaking students in urban schools in Peru; and international teaching assistants in a graduate program in North America. In using Blommaert's formulation of embodied mobile semiotic resources and Canagarajah's concept of translingual practices, we discuss each study briefly by characterizing the nature of the semiotic movements and contact zones each created and what each offers to the advancement of a critical language awareness perspective for teaching and learning in the context of globalization and for reconceptualizing the knowledge base of teaching. In making these comments, we draw on our own semiotic resources as white, middle class, U.S. born, former public school teachers, teacher educators, and literacy researchers. Meg Gebhard, the first author, comes from a small, once thriving factory town in rural upstate New York, a town that in the 1900s was shaped by a growing Italian immigrant population that moved into a manufacturing and farming economy run primarily by people of Northern European decent. The high school in this town now only has a 66% graduation rate and the vital main street that once existed is now mostly boarded up except for the army recruiting office. Jerri Willett, the second author, grew up in the segregated South where she attended eight different elementary schools. Her family of nine finally landed in a rapidly-growing, linguistically-diverse neighborhood in Miami, Florida. As an adult, she has crossed numerous translingual contact zones, including teaching in polyglot schools in Northern California, France, Northern England, Hong Kong, Mexico, and Massachusetts while exploring the cultures, languages, and literacies of French, Cantonese, Spanish, early Medieval English, African American Vernacular English, and various Southern American and British Englishes. Drawing on our collective mobile semiotic resources and the literature in CLA, we conclude our review of these studies with some comments regarding using CLA to reconceptualize the knowledge base of teaching in globalized translingual context zones.

CLA in translingual contact zones

An example of Blommaert's conception of embodied semiotic mobility is found in Colombi's description of the carefully designed contact zones she created for heritage language learners of Spanish at the college level in California. The theoretical rationale for this course rests on an explicitly critical instantiation of Halliday's theory of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) as both a social theory and as a framework for teaching languages and about language variation in the context of globalism. The translingual context of California, as Colombi makes clear, has historically been a contact zone between Spanish speaking missionaries and indigenous people in the mid-1500s and has steadily become a battle ground for attacks on bilingualism

and bilingual education through the passage of English-only mandates at the end of the 1900s despite demographic data that shows Latinos now form the majority of the state's population. Using Canagarajah's language, these translingual residents of California speak a wide variety of Spanishes and Englishes—varieties that are typically not recognized as legitimate by college language departments that tend to valorize imagined standardized national languages and cultures (Anderson, 2006). Nor are these varieties typically valued by the speakers themselves who tend to describe their dialects in derogatory terms.

To address these issues Colombi draws on Halliday's SFL and argues for a reconceptualization of grammar and of the curriculum in college level language departments. This functional perspective views grammar as a flexible, context sensitive, and expanding meaning making system rather than a finite set of decontextualized formal rules (see also Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010). Therefore, meaning and form are not separate, but stand in a dialectic relation to each other and the context in which they are immersed. Using this perspective of CLA, Colombi describes how she apprentices college students to a critical awareness of language by having them explore their language biographies to "compare the characteristics of the different varieties of Spanish represented in the classroom and describe them from the perspective of the geographical and social variables" (p. X). Students also record, transcribe, and analyze conversations with friends and family using SFL's function metalanguage (e.g., field, tenor, mode) as a way of both learning about language and developing a critical awareness of language politics, and then using this knowledge to facilitate the learning varieties of Spanish used in school and business contexts. Colombi concludes that these pedagogical practices facilitate not only the development of biliteracy, but also the acceptance of cultural diversity in the Spanish-speaking world and of Latinos in contact zones in the United States.

The contribution of the Zavala's article, similar to Colombi, is found in the historicized conceptual framework and methods that demonstrated how teachers mediate policies in post-colonial discursive spaces. Informed by a translanguaging perspective of dynamic bilingualism and pluriliteracies (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009), Zavala analyzes how teachers and students mediate macro ideologies regarding language policies through micro classroom interactions. In this respect, Zavala's research simultaneously takes the widest and most historical lens regarding the development of national language policies and the tightest and most focused on how a teacher and her students used both the colonial language of Spanish and the indigenous language of Quechua fluidly in an urban school in the Southern Peruvian Andes. The contact zone created in this study, therefore, is the nexus of conflicting national and regional language policies and competing languages, marginalities, and pedagogies in the local context of the classroom. At the center of the nexus is a case study teacher named "Silvia." Zavala describes Silvia as having parents "who never spoke to her in Quechua," but as having contact with her parents' primary language through interactions with her grandmother as a child (p. X). Hence, Silvia's investments in teaching Quechua in this urban school were more motivated by personal reasons rather than academic ones because Silvia identified with her students' marginalizing experiences of being socialized in Spanish despite having Quechua-speaking parents. Out of her marginalized position, however, Zavala reports that Silvia was able to create a community of legitimate Quechua speakers in her classroom, using a pedagogical strategy in which she moved fluidly from Spanish to Quechua as needed to position students differently than they typically were in society and in other Quechua classrooms. For example, Silvia positioned the students who were more fluent in Quechua as teachers and those with less fluency as emergent bilinguals as they read about the Quechua culture, history, and language. Her critical pedagogy, like her Quechua, emerged from the semiotic mobility inherent in the contact zone she created rather than an authorized pedagogy (neither critical pedagogy nor second language pedagogy).

Also representative of Blommaert's conception of semiotic mobility in contact zones involving translingual teachers, teacher educators, and researchers is Harman and Zhang's analysis of the use of performativity (Butler, 2002) and SFL (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) in a graduate seminar attended by international teaching assistants from Asia and K-12 teachers working in U.S. schools. Using a post-structural conceptual framework and commensurate research design that relied on multiple data sources and the researchers' multiple embodied subjectivities, Harman and Zhang illustrate how "non-native English speaking teachers" in higher education in the United States experience forms of discrimination and marginalization stemming from the privileging of Western ways of speaking and knowing (p. X). Their study creatively and skillfully illustrates the potential of the performance process to generate texts that teachers can learn to analyze through play using CDA tool in ways that share commonalities with Colombi's description of CLA activities in teaching Spanish and about Spanishes at the college level.

Harman and Zhang's more empirical study, however provides data that illustrates participants' remarkable insights into how semiotic systems construct ways of knowing and subjectivities. For example, the authors provide evidence that participants were able to "jump out" of cultural frames and "step back from the laughter and marginalization" they embodied in their performances to analyze the misunderstanding and contradictions that arose from competing cultural norms using resources from their emerging understanding of SFL (p. X). For example, one participant reflected:

> I found the series of theatrical work (including the theater project and in-class mini performances) most useful for me to get into deep thinking. For example, the way I acted is not a purely Asian-oriented picture of a teacher, but a hybrid of my image of an American teacher and my Asian-like behaviors I unconsciously brought in to the situation. (Harman & Zhang, 2015, p. X)

This comment highlights the potential of using what could be characterized as post-structural teaching/research methods to explore the problems of teaching/learning in formal settings in the context of globalism.

Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers' study, like Harman and Zhang's, involves an analysis of complex contact zones constructed in classrooms, but it crosses more institutional boundaries across a longer time frame. Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers' yearlong ethnographic case study is an attempt to follow the trajectory of a young white women they call "Lisa" as she tries to make sense of "whiteness" and "blackness" in an African American community not far from the now infamous city of Ferguson, Missouri. Their methods of data collection and analysis follow Lisa as she traverses the formidable discursive boundaries between her teacher education program at the university and her work with an African American six year old named "Helen" in a public school facing the threat of a state takeover. In making this "crossing" (Rampton, 2014, p. 291), Lisa enthusiastically takes up key components of her teacher education program's focus on developing a critical awareness of how racism and white privilege are constructed through classroom literacy practices. Nevertheless, Lisa had considerable difficulty in moving from awareness to action in her practicum given the complexity of shifting from knowing to doing in learning to teach in general, and in learning to teach about race in particular (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2010; Picower, 2009). Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers take a developmental perspective in their analysis of Lisa's attempts to talk about race. They argue that Lisa was still early in her understanding of "racial literacy," but nonetheless was able to take the bold steps to disrupt "white talk," which silences discourses that construct racism while simultaneously maintaining white privilege (p. X). In taking this stance, the authors aptly move their critical gaze from Lisa to themselves as teacher educators, noting where they could have provided her with better support. In sum, this study's contribution to this volume is found in how it highlights the complex nexus of discursive spaces created when the scholarly literature regarding race, racism, and white privilege advances into the teacher education courses and when inexperienced and therefore inexpert teachers take up these texts and attempt to turn them into classroom activities that displace canonical and restrictive kinds of literacy practices in schools, but do so in ways that re-inscribe rather than transform racialized power dynamics.

Godley, Reaser, and Moore (2015) also take on the issue of whiteness, white talk, and white privilege in pre-service teacher education, but their focus is more on exploring the knowledge base of teaching English language arts at the secondary level in ways that include attention to dialects and dialect variation in the United States, specifically African American English. In articulating the rationale for this insightful mix-methods analysis of the experiences of 24 white, pre-service teachers enrolled in a four-week on-line sociolinguistics course, the authors argue that it is not enough for high school English teachers to have strong "content knowledge" (e.g., knowledge of English literature, see Shulman, 1987, p. 5). Rather, English teachers must also have an ability to translate content knowledge into effective pedagogy by developing an ability to teach in classrooms where linguistic prejudices regarding dialects are constructed and reinforced. The semiotic contact zones their study forged were multimodal texts in the field of sociolinguistics including scholarly articles written by the study's authors; YouTube videos; vernacular texts produced by dialect speakers; and on-line posts produced by the pre-service teachers themselves. Similar to Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers' study, Godley et al. found that pre-service teachers "seemed to accept without resistance that language ideologies and linguistic prejudices existed and upheld social inequalities, particularly those based in racism" (p. X). These finding are encouraging in that they run counter to research that suggest white teachers (and perhaps teacher educators and literacy researchers) are often resistant to acknowledging racism. The authors add that participants in their study were invested in advocating for the value of all dialects and literacy instruction that recognized the vernacular dialects used by students and found in canonical English literature (e.g., *To Kill a Mockingbird*). However, they also found that these pre-service teachers tended to overgeneralize commonalities, making statements such as "everyone code-switches" and "we've all been judged on our language" without "acknowledging their own privilege as white standardized English speakers or the more serious discrimination faced by speakers of vernacular dialects, particularly racial minorities" (p. X). These findings make a valuable contribution to the fields of critical applied linguistics and teacher education by highlighting the power of well designed and implemented teacher education opportunities, even very short ones implemented in on-line environments. However, what we do not find in this study, which was discussed in detail in Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers' study, is an analysis of how these teachers used a critical language awareness of language variation in designing and implementing curriculum with students who speak African American English. This broader issue was clearly not the focus of this investigation of a four-week course. However, as scholars in the field of language teacher education have remarked, there is a strong need for longitudinal studies of how teachers make sense of and enact theories of language and learning through coursework, pre-practicum and practicum experiences, and then as employees in specific institutional contexts that marginalize non-dominant students, given the degree to which context matters in theorizing teacher professional development and critically analyzing the trajectory of teachers' practices as they enroll in teacher education programs and transition into enacting classroom practices that shape student experiences in consequential ways (e.g., Andrews, 2003; Borg, 2003; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Gebhard, Chen, Graham, & Gunawan, 2013; Gebhard, Chen, & Britton, 2014; Johnson, 2009).

Carpenter, Achugar, Walter, and Earhart's (2015) article complements Godley et al.'s study as well as Mosley-Wetzel and Rogers' in regard to its methodology and findings. Methodologically, Carpenter et al. shift the focus away from the work of pre-service teachers to analyzing how an experienced teacher used SFL's metalanguage to design, enact, analyze, and improve his ability to teach his students how to make sense of primary source historical documents in the context of a high performing high school in Texas. This ability was made possible through this teacher's participation in a research-by-design experiment with the authors (Brown, 1992). This methodology illustrates the potential of researchers/teacher educators and classroom teachers collaborating in designing, implementing, and analyzing the complex nature of teaching and learning in situ. This methodology, from a critical language awareness perspective, offers the possibility for researchers to use their institutional positions to co-construct a discursive space for reciprocal learning, more fluid identities and roles

for participants (including themselves), and the transformation of power dynamics that typically exist between critical scholars, teacher educators, and classroom practitioners. Moreover, it engages scholars more intimately in understanding and participating in the stratified, controlled, and monitored spaces of schools where their embodied semiotic resources are often rejected and become immobile in ways that parallel the immobility of teachers' semiotic resources when they enter a university setting. In other words, the research design, which included an analysis of curricular materials, transcripts of teacher/researcher interactions, and transcripts of teacher/student interactions created a discursive space through which semiotic practices could be critically analyzed over time in a contact zone where each participant's resources had traction and provided reciprocal opportunities for building theory and informing practice.

In addition, Carpenter et al., like Godley et al., make a case for a reconceptualization of the knowledge base of secondary teaching to include much greater attention to language. In the discipline of English language arts, Godley et al. push for greater attention to dialects and dialect variation in teacher education courses so that English teachers, who are predominately white and speakers of standardized English, can work more productively with African American speakers of non-dominant varieties of English and use this knowledge to analyze vernacular dialects found in literature. Similarly, Carpenter et al. argue that history teachers benefit from developing a functional metalanguage for critically deconstructing the meaning of primary source documents with students to develop both teachers' and students' disciplinary ways of knowing, being, and doing. For example, their data illustrate that a history teacher and his students were able to use SFL's metalanguage to make sense of transitivity and authorial stance patterns found in primary source documents in ways that facilitated students' engagement with these texts. In sum, both Godley et al. and Carpenter et al. contribute to a growing body of literature in teacher education that argues *all* teachers, not just ESL and bilingual specialists, need to understand and be able to explicitly teach the differences between "everyday," "academic," and "discipline" specific varieties of language to support their work with *all* students, including the growing number of ESL students and speakers of non-dominant varieties of language attending U.S. schools in the context of high stakes school reforms and globalism (e.g., Bunch, 2013; Fillmore, 2014; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Turkan, de Oliveira, Lee, & Phelps, 2014; Valdés, Bunch, Snow, & Lee, 2005; Valdés, Menken, & Castro, 2015; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Godley et al. work is particularly relevant because most of the scholarship aimed at reconceptualizing the knowledge base of teaching has attended to the needs of students institutionally designated as "English language learners" (ELLs) but has not included the same attention to speakers of African American English or other non-dominate varieties of English in the U.S. who also are dropping out, or more accurately, being pushed out of schools in record numbers in the wake of No Child Left Behind legislation (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Moreover, the finding that teachers and students benefit from learning to use a functional metalanguage is supported by the extensive research conducted by Schleppegrell et al. who developed the California History Project (e.g., Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteíza, 2007) and the Language and Meaning Project in Michigan (Moore & Schleppegrell, 2014; Palincsar & Schleppegrell, 2014; Schleppegrell, 2013). This body of work draws on Halliday's theories of language, learning, and social change and the scholarship of educational linguists who have developed commensurate pedagogical approaches to assist teachers in designing, implementing, and reflecting on discipline-specific literacy practice in translingual contexts around the globe (e.g., Achugar & Pessoa, 2009; Brisk, 2014; Celani & Collins, 2005; Christie, 2012; Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Gibbons, 2002, 2006; Hammond, 2006; Iwasaki & Kumagai, 2015; Janks, 2009; Llinares, Morton, & Whittaker, 2012; Lorenzo, Casal, & Moore, 2010; Macken-Horarik, 2009; Macken-Horarik, Love, & Unsworth, 2011; Martin & Rose, 2008; Oteíza & Pinuer, 2013; Rose & Martin, 2012; Unsworth, 2000; Williams, 2005). As part of contributing to this volume, O'Hallaron et al., like Carpenter and his, use an iterative research by design methodology that involves creating, piloting, refining, and then implementing and analyzing how elementary teachers and their students make sense of SFL-based literacy instruction. The globalized contact zones created by this research team brought together well established university literacy scholars and 23 elementary teachers working in a post-industrial city in Michigan where Arabic, English, and varieties of both were widely used. The authors describe this community as one in which students spoke Arabic as a first language and more than 90% were classified as ELLs. Other students were U.S.-born to parents who had grown up in the community, while others were first- or second-generation immigrants. In addition, most of the teachers were users of Arabic as a first or second language.

Anchored in this translingual contact zone, the purpose of O'Hallaron, Palincsar and Schleppegrell's study is to report on activities that helped teachers and students recognize that science texts, like all texts, present author's attitudes and perspectives through the author's conscious and unconscious linguistic choices from a system of choices that can be identified and discussed during literacy instruction (e.g., use of interpersonal adjuncts; interrogatives and imperatives; the modality of likelihood or obligation). To support teachers and children in identifying and discussing the meaning of these features in challenging science texts, the authors developed lessons that included guides for highly interactive readings and discussions in which functional metalanguage enabled interpretations of information and discussions of what the research team termed "author attitude." Based on a set of professional development activities and associated data collection activities that included transcripts of teachers' interactions in professional development workshops and with students in their classrooms, O'Hallaron et al. illustrate how teachers and students developed the beginnings of a critical orientation to reading informational texts in science. They describe this process as a multi-staged one in which teachers first had to recognize, contrary to what is commonly assumed, that authors of informational texts present factual information in ways that are infused with their own perspectives. The teachers and students then began to identify the language resources that construct author attitudes and recognize how language functions to shape perceptions of information using methods demonstrated in the professional development workshops. The authors found that an important initial step in transforming understandings of SFL metalanguage into critical awareness was developing the concept of readers as always being in dialog with authors

rather than being passive recipients of uncontested knowledge. While they are cautious not to make strong claims regarding the consequences of their collaboration in light of the ambitious goals of a critical language awareness research agenda, they do conclude that their study demonstrates that even very young children are capable of beginning to engage in critical reflection and inquiry using SFL-informed metalanguage.

Taken collectively, O'Halloran et al., like Carpenter et al., Harman et al., make a strong contribution to the interdisciplinary fields of critical applied linguistics, literacy studies, and teacher education by providing clear descriptions of pedagogical activities and data displays from classroom interactions between teachers and students that collectively demonstrate how SFL-based pedagogy can be enacted in translingual elementary, secondary, and college classrooms shaped by globalism. O'Halloran et al.'s contribution, in particular, demonstrates that students in elementary school are able to take up the role of critical text analyst if their teachers provide them with opportunities, scaffolding, and the tools with which to do so. A key tool, in the Vygotskian sense of the word, is the availability of functional metalanguage that makes visible how language makes meaning in the types of texts students and teachers routinely ask students to read, write, and discuss in schools (e.g., Gánem-Gutiérrez & Roehr, 2011). This metalanguage is explicit knowledge about how school language functions that can be brought to conscious awareness, articulated, and used reflexively as a psychological tool to construct knowledge and critical awareness of school-based literacy practices. Importantly, SFL metalanguage is a specific kind of metalanguage that provides categories that are functional rather than formal or structural. They are functional for analyzing how language constructs ideas or experiences, how it reflects and enacts relationships between speakers and listeners and readers and writers, and how it manages the flow of information within a text and a communicative context. It is distinct from other kinds of metalanguage that focus on classes of words (e.g., nouns, verbs, prepositions, adverbs) in the absence of how these words construct meaning in social, economic, and political contexts (Halliday, 1993; Hasan, 1996; Martin & Rose, 2008).

Interestingly, the question O'Halloran et al. pose in discussing findings from their study centers on how to prevent "reductionist interpretations" of SFL metalanguage in classroom practice. Carpenter et al. take up this same issue in reflecting on their analysis. They state, "The challenge lies in how to make it [SFL metalanguage] accessible and useful while not diluting its power" (p. X). While reductionist interpretations are an ever-present challenge when scaling up innovation, empirical studies have documented that the problem is not necessarily that SFL metalanguage is too technical or too complex to be pedagogically relevant, as is often the claim (e.g., Bourke, 2005).

Reconceptualizing the knowledge base of teaching in translingual context zones

Collectively, the papers in this volume analyze how students', teachers', teacher educators', and literacy researchers' embodied mobile semiotic resources moved across modernist binaries constructed by power dynamics related to the formation of class-based, racialized, nationalized, and professionalized identities within post-colonial, post-slavery, and post-industrial translingual contact zones in schools (e.g., "Quechua/Spanish," "Spanish/English," "Arabic/English," "African American Vernacular English/Standardized English," "Black/White," "native/non-native," "urban/rural," "everyday/academic," "bilingual/monolingual," "expert/novice," "student/teacher," "teacher/professor," "subject/researcher"). In producing these papers, the authors push the interdisciplinary fields of critical applied linguistics and teacher education together and forward in interesting ways related to research methodologies, conceptualizing teachers work in the context of globalism, and engaging in teacher education practices in translingual contact zones.

First, the authors actively designed contact zones through the curriculum they developed and implemented with translingual students and teachers and/or the methods of data collection and analysis they employed. In doing so, the authors took up and moved back and forth among their multiple roles as researchers, text analysts, teacher educators, curriculum designers, and critical policy analysts in ways that appeared to be consequential. For example, the authors used their institutional positions to co-construct discursive spaces for reciprocal learning across linguistic, cultural, and institutional fault lines and more fluid identities and agentive roles for participants, including themselves. As a result, the volume as a whole suggests that carefully designed and reflexively researched teacher education experiences can shift assumptions regarding the nature of language, language variation, language teaching, and teacher education in productive ways. The volume as a whole, therefore, re-signifies language teaching and teacher education as intellectually engaging, contextualized, and politically relevant semiotic work as opposed to decontextualized, anti-intellectual, and skills-based training, as is too often the case in the context of current school reforms (e.g., Gebhard, Willett, Jimenez, & Piedra, 2010).

Second, in regard to the authors who introduced students and teachers to a Hallidayan perspective of language as a semiotic social practice, these studies demonstrate the degree to which elementary, secondary, and college students, as well as practicing elementary school teachers, were able to make sense of SFL as a social theory of meaning-making in translingual contact zones. Central to this ability was the use of a functional metalanguage to critically analyze the ideational content of texts and how texts create reader positions, as well as construct power dynamics related to self and other in and outside the classroom. These studies, along with other critical uses of SFL-based pedagogy, should put to rest claims that SFL based pedagogies are somehow inherently uncritical and reproductive approaches to teaching literacies and work to valorizes "academic" varieties of language while devaluing other "everyday" language practices. On the contrary, these papers illustrate that an SFL-based understanding of critical language awareness supports educators in deconstructing such binaries and creates the terrain over which educators can negotiate the paradoxes of giving students access to learning the multiple codes of power that circulate in and outside of school (Janks, 2009).

Third, these studies provide additional support for Macken-Horarik's (2008, p. 46) argument that a functional metalanguage can provide teachers with a "powerful navigational toolkit" for teaching and learning. She maintains that this toolkit enables students—and we would add teachers, teacher educators, literacy researchers—to recognize and name patterns within and across texts, expand their semiotic repertoires, and assist educators in tracking students' literacy development over time as their semiotic resources expand. As Macken-Horarik et al. make clear, a functional metalanguage for teaching and learning or "grammatics" does not need to be exhaustive, nor do teachers and teacher educators need to have an advanced understandings of SFL before they can get started. Rather, they need what Macken-Horarik et al. (2011) term a "good-enough" grammatics that allows them to approach the teaching of literacy practices from a social semiotic perspective that connects language forms to meaning making in contexts of use (p. 9).

Fourth, this volume signals areas for further research to explore more fully the role CLA can play in critically reconceptualizing teaching and teacher education in the context of globalism (see also Andrews, 2003). For example, as these studies suggest, there is a need for CLA-informed longitudinal studies of how teachers traverse institutional boundaries and enter translingual contact zones outside of the university where their professionalized semiotic resources may or may not have purchase and therefore may or may not become mobile in the Blommaert sense when they meet, collide, and/or fail to be recognized by their students, colleagues, and school administrators. Relatedly, there is a need to articulate CLA-informed frameworks for analyzing changes (or the lack of changes) in teachers' professional practices in translingual contact zones. For example, the authors in this volume clearly articulate their projects' theoretical frameworks regarding language and learning, but they are less explicit about how they conceptualize teacher learning, teacher professional development, or teacher knowledge from a CLA perspective. The exceptions are authors who drew on Lave's concept of "communities of practice" to describe teachers' movements from novice to more expert practices (Lave, 1991, p. 63). However, as a number of scholars have remarked, the notion of communities of practice does not always include a consideration of how semiotic practices construct knowledge and whose knowledge counts as "expert" in contexts that can be described as translingual contact zones (Tsui & Law, 2007; see also Hughes, Jewson, & Unwin, 2013, for a critical analysis of the concept of communities of practice).

Last, this volume's use of CLA pushes teaching, teacher education, and research in teacher education into a post-structural frame that we would argue is both highly conceptual and practical. Conceptually, this frame has the potential to inform empirically driven discussion of what the knowledge base for teaching and teacher education ought to be to support teachers and teacher educators in working more productively in schools shaped by the powerful forces of globalism (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2010). For example, recent scholarship produced by applied linguists has made a significant contribution to research in teacher education by calling for clearer articulations of what *all* teachers, not just language specialists, need to know and be able to do in schools that are experiencing rapid demographic changes while simultaneously trying to negotiate the tightening grip of the discourses of positivism, standardization, accountability, and privatization. These contributions have led to important reformulations of Shulman's conceptions of "content knowledge" and "pedagogical content knowledge" (Shulman, 1987, p.5) to include a knowledge of "academic language," "pedagogical language knowledge," "disciplinary linguistic knowledge," and "sociolinguistic knowledge for teaching" (for discussion of the new knowledge base for teaching in U.S schools see Bunch, 2013; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Fang, 2008; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Fillmore, 2014; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Gebhard, 2010; Gebhard & Harman, 2011; Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici, & Carpenter, 2006; Lucas, de Oliveira, & Villegas, 2014; Reeves, 2009; Tellez & Waxman, 2006; Turkan et al., 2014; Valdés et al., 2005; Valdés et al., 2015; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). The authors in this volume contribute to these conversations but do so using a more post-structural conception of language drawing on CLA research.

In regard to this approach being practical, we are aware that readers may react to calls for greater attention to post-structural conceptions of language in teacher education as unrealistic. And they may be right given that investments in teacher education have historically been characterized as weak (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Lortie, 1975). However, as these articles attest, working in and across translingual contact zones is both very challenging and highly rewarding work that is also essentially practical (see also Janks, 2009; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006). For example, the authors of these studies collectively demonstrate the effectiveness of teacher education opportunities that include teachers and literacy scholars working side by side to accomplish highly do-able tasks, such as collecting and analyzing texts from the local community to develop deeper understandings of the diverse semiotic resources of the communities in which they work; co-designing curriculum that meets the often paradoxical needs of the students who live in these communities by valuing diverse forms of literacy while also supporting the development of critical disciplinary ones; systematically collecting multiple kinds of classroom data; analyzing these data from multiple subjectivities; and using the findings from these analyses to improve their practices as researchers, teachers, and change agents in multiple and overlapping spheres of influence. As this volume attests, students, teachers, teacher educators, and researchers are fully capable of engaging in these practices when CLA scholars have the will and semantic resources to traverse translingual contact zones and negotiate the development of new discursive spaces over which more meaningful learning in schools can take place.

References

Achugar, M., & Pessoa, S. (2009). Power and place language attitudes towards Spanish in a bilingual academic community in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context, 6*(2), 199–223.

Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M., & Oteíza, T. (2007). Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistics approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 6*(2), 8–24.

Alim, H. S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher, 34*(7), 24–31.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (new ed.). New York: Verso Books.

Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness, 12*(2), 81–95.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(2), 81–109.

Bourke, J. (2005). The grammar we teach. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 4*, 85–97.

Brisk, M. (2014). *Engaging students in academic literacies: Genre-based pedagogy for K-5 classrooms*. New York: Routledge.

Brown, A. L. (1992). Design experiments: Theoretical and methodological challenges in creating complex interventions in classroom settings. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 2*(2), 141–178.

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, (37)*, 298–341.

Butler, J. (2002). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced L2 writing development in collegiate FL education: Curricular design, pedagogy, and assessment. *Modern Language Journal, 94*(Monograph Issue).

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.

Carpenter, B. D., Achugar, M., Walter, D., & Earhart, M. (2015). Developing teachers' critical language awareness: A case study of guided participation. *Linguistics and Education*.

Celani, M., & Collins, H. (2005). Critical thinking in reflective sessions and in online interactions. *AILA Review, 18*(1), 41–57.

Christie, F. (2012). *Language education throughout the school years: A functional perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum.

Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanic, R., & Martin-Jones, M. (1990). Critical language awareness Part I: A critical review of three current approaches to language awareness. *Language and Education, 4*(4), 249–260.

Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanič, R., & Martin-Jones, M. (1991). Critical language awareness. Part II: Toward critical alternatives. *Language and Education, 5*(1), 41–54.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.

de Jong, E., & Harper, C. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(2), 101–124.

Fang, Z. (2008). Going beyond the Fab Five: Helping students cope with the unique linguistic challenges of expository reading in intermediate grades. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 51*(6), 476–487.

Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2008). *Reading in secondary content areas: A language-based pedagogy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fillmore, J. (2014). English language learners at the crossroads of educational reform. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 624–632.

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–54). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 397–417.

Gánem-Gutiérrez, G., & Roehr, K. (2011). Use of L1, metalanguage, and discourse markers: L2 learners' regulation during individual task performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21*(3), 297–318.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gebhard, M. (2010). Teacher education in changing times: A systemic functional linguistics (SFL) perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*, 797–803.

Gebhard, M., Chen, I., & Britton, B. (2014). "Miss, nominalization is a nominalization": English language learners' use of SFL metalanguage and their literacy practices. *Linguistics and Education, 26*, 106–125.

Gebhard, M., Chen, I., Graham, H., & Gunawan, W. (2013). Teaching to mean, writing to mean: SFL, L2 literacy, and teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(2), 107–124.

Gebhard, M., & Harman, R. (2011). Reconsidering genre theory in K-12 schools: A response to school reforms in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*, 45–55.

Gebhard, M., Willett, J., Jimenez, J., & Piedra, A. (2010). Systemic functional linguistics, teachers' professional development, and ELLs' academic literacy practices. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners* (pp. 91–110). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.

Godley, A. J., Reaser, J., & Moore, K. G. (2015). Pre-service English language arts teachers' development of critical language awareness for teaching. *Linguistics and Education*.

Godley, A. J., Sweetland, J., Wheeler, R. S., Minnici, A., & Carpenter, B. D. (2006). Preparing teachers for dialectically diverse classrooms. *Educational Researcher, 35*(30), 29–37.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom: Students, teachers and researchers*. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education, 5*(2), 93–116.

Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Hammond, J. (2006). High challenge, high support: Integrating language and content instruction for diverse learners in an English literature classroom. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(4), 269–283.

Harman, R. M., & Zhang, X. (2015). Performance, performativity and second language identities: How can we know the actor from the act? *Linguistics and Education*.

Hasan, R. (1996). Literacy, everyday talk and society. In R. Hasan, & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 377–424). Harlow, Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

Hughes, J., Jewson, N., & Unwin, L. (Eds.). (2013). *Communities of practice: Critical perspectives.*. New York: Routledge.

Iwasaki, N., & Kumagai, Y. (2015). *The Routledge intermediate to advanced Japanese reader: A genre-based approach to reading as a social practice*. London: Routledge.

Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy and power*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, K. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lave, J. (1991). Situating learning in communities of practice. *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition, 2*, 63–82.

Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(3), 418–442.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological inquiry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, T., de Oliveira, L. C., & Villegas, A. M. (2014). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers in multilingual contexts. In A. Mahboob, & L. Barratt (Eds.), *Englishes in multilingual contexts: Language variation and education* (pp. 219–230). New York: Springer.

Macken-Horarik, M. (2008). A "good enough" grammatics: Developing an effective metalanguage for school English in an era of multiliteracies. In C. Wu, C. Matthiessen, & M. Herke (Eds.), *Proceedings of the ISFC 35: Voices around the world*. Sydney: 35th ISFC Organizing Committee.
Macken-Horarik, M. (2009). Navigational metalanguages for new territory in English: The potential of grammatics. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *8*(3), 55–69.
Macken-Horarik, M., Love, K., & Unsworth, L. (2011). A grammatics "good enough" for school English in the 21st century: Four challenges in realizing the potential. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *34*(1), 9–23.
Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, *20*(1), 10–21.
Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. London: Equinox.
Moore, J. P., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2014). Using a functional linguistics metalanguage to support academic language development in the English Language Arts. *Linguistics and Education*, *26*, 92–105.
Oteíza, T., & Pinuer, C. (2013). Valorative prosody and the symbolic construction of time in historical recent national discourses. *Discourse Studies*, *15*(1), 43–64.
Palincsar, A. S., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2014). Focusing on language and meaning while learning with text. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(3), 616–623.
Pennycook, A. (2006). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.
Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *12*(2), 197–215.
Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33–40.
Rampton, B. (2014). *Crossings: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Routledge.
Reeves, J. R. (2009). A sociocultural perspective on ESOL teachers' linguistic knowledge for teaching. *Linguistics and Education*, *20*, 109–125.
Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*. London: Equinox.
Schleppegrell, M. (2013). The role of metalanguage in supporting academic language development. *Language Learning*, *63*(1), 153–170.
Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(1), 1–23.
Turkan, S., de Oliveira, L., Lee, O., & Phelps, G. (2014). Proposing a knowledge base for teaching academic content to English language learners: Disciplinary linguistic knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(4).
Tellez, K., & Waxman, H. C. (Eds.). (2006). *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies and practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Tsui, A., & Law, D. (2007). Learning as boundary-crossing in school-university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*, 1289–1301.
Valdés, G., Bunch, G. C., Snow, C. E., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the development of students' language (s). In L. Darling-Hammond, J. Bransford, P. LePage, K. Hammerness, & H. Duffy (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 126–168). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Valdés, S., Menken, K., & Castro, M. (2015). *Common core, bilingual and English language learners: A reference for educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon, Inc.
Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
Williams, G. (2005). Grammatics in schools. In R. Hasan, C. M. I. M. Matthiessen, & J. Webster (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language: A functional perspective* (pp. 281–310). London: Equinox.
Young, L., & Fitzgerald, B. (2006). *The power of language: How discourse influences society*. London: Equinox.
Unsworth, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Researching language in schools and communities*. London, England: Cassell.