



Barnard, Roger & and Torres-Guzmán, Maria E. (Eds.).
(2008). *Creating Classroom Communities of Learning: International Case Studies and Perspectives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pp. xiv + 201

ISBN 978-1847691125

Reviewed by Ruth Rees
Queen's University, Canada

November 23, 2009

The purpose of this edited volume is to show how teachers in specific but culturally and nationally different learning communities (i.e., classrooms) induct or socialize their students into appropriate attitudes and behaviours while learning English. The editors attempt to accomplish this goal by having: a) a variety of international academics present and analyze their findings; b) then someone else interpret these transcripts of teaching and learning; and c) author one presents another set of transcripts and leaves the reader (an educator) with some questions to reflect upon and/or discuss. These different “takes” or perspectives of what went on are intended to help the reader understand more fully and broadly how teaching and learning are co-constructed in specific (ethnic and cultural) contexts; and also understand that there is not *one* objective view or interpretation of transcript data, but that patterns are different within the different contexts. I review takes one and two in each chapter of the book. Take 3 in all chapters presents

About the Editors

Roger Barnard is Senior Lecturer in Applied Linguistics at the University of Waikato in New Zealand since 1995. His PhD is from the University of Southampton, UK.

Maria E. Torres-Guzmán is Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her PhD is from Stanford University in Bilingual/Bicultural Education.

Citation: Rees, Ruth. (2009 November 23). Review of *Creating Classroom Communities of Learning* by Roger Barnard & Maria E. Torres-Guzmán. *Education Review*, 12. Retrieved [Date] from <http://edrev.asu.edu/reviews/rev865.pdf>

more transcripts followed by questions from author one for the reader, presumably teachers and/or teacher educators to follow up in group discussions.

Chapter 1 presents data by Fred E. Anderson from a teacher and students in a Japanese lower elementary classroom (take 1). The focus is on three important classroom routines that Anderson says are representative of Japanese society more generally. This is carried out by analyzing what Anderson has coined as ‘interactional routines’ which Peters and Boggs (1986, p. 81) define as “a sequence of exchanges in which one speaker’s utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants.” Anderson says that the routines together form an instructional sequence consisting of four steps: Initiation, Presentation, Reaction, and Evaluation. He has called this an ‘interactional umbrella,’ suggesting that “the role of the Japanese teacher is primarily to *structure interactions among students*, rather than to engage in dyadic interaction with students individually...” (p. 29, italics in original). Sylvia Wolfe presents her perspective (take 2) -- that the data “reveal a preoccupation with ritual and authority in some Japanese educational practices” (p. 30); and “there is an expectation that the students will think for themselves and respect each other’s points of view’ (p. 31). She believes these “genres of communication” (p. 32) prepare students for life in the hierarchical Japanese society.

Chapter 2 describes how middle primary students who are linguistically and culturally diverse learn the English language and are socialized in an Australian ESL class. Rhonda Oliver presents the data and first explanation in Take 1. Her analysis of the data indicated that there are various ways that the teacher interacted with the students. When the focus was communicative, interactions were less formal, shared between teacher and student. When the purpose of the interaction was for: a) managing student behaviour (i.e., socializing the students to act appropriately in the class) and b) curriculum or content, then didactic one-way interactions occurred, from teacher to students. When the interaction was for content, feedback was often provided. James McLellan re-analyzed the same data (take 2) described seven different types of interactions, comprised of pedagogical and socializing focuses, into a chart to demonstrate the variety of interactions. He observed that students may get confused with they receive different kinds of



Roger Bernard

responses/reactions from the teacher, despite the teacher's attempts to make her expectations explicit.

James McLellan and Pearl Chua-Wong Swee Hui provide take 1 in chapter 3, presenting and then analyzing interactions between a teacher and students in her upper primary English language classroom in Brunei Darussalam. They say that data illustrate 'safetalk,' with students' chorused repetition, a lack of open questions, and limited content. They comment that "the classroom is a place of ritual, formulaic public performance, which satisfies local socio-cultural normal and elite-group expectations concerning how language lessons should be conducted" (p. 61). María E. Torres-Guzmán, one of the co-editors, provides take 2, commenting that the pattern of relationship between the teacher and students in this classroom is either reflective of the society and its expectations, or it is evidence of a well-established relationship between the players. She provides reasons for both these reflections.

María E. Torres-Guzmán analyzes data in chapter 4 about second language learning within a US elementary classroom where both Spanish and English are used throughout all the school's curriculum (dual language education), in terms of appropriateness: of student interpretations of the text; of the ways of communicating in the classroom; and the types of relationships between teacher and students (p. 70). The basis of the relationships is one of respect, a core Latin value, and was revealed in all the interactions which she observed: between teacher and students in response to her directed open-ended questions and between students in a pair share situation. Vijay Kumar and Wong Bee Eng interpret the same data in take 2 in a comparison to a Malaysian classroom, described in chapter 7, using the perspective of constructivism, where knowing is "constructed through interaction with others" (p. 82, Hendry, Frommer, & Walker, 1999). They determine that meaningful learning is co-constructed in the US classroom through interactions and collaborative exchanges. In this US classroom, students responded individually, and not in a group (common to the Malaysian classroom). Here the researchers perceive that the student-centred classroom allows for the students' contributions to the newly-gained knowledge where the teacher is "*an* authority ...for not *in* authority" (p. 84) (as in a Malaysian classroom).



Ching-Yi Tien and Roger Barnard write chapter 5, analyzing data taken from a Taiwanese grade 6 class learning

English, considered as an important but not yet official language of Taiwan. In this teacher-centred classroom, the data were assessed in terms of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) framework (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1974). Here the teacher elicits information from the students; the teacher is not developing the students' "linguistic performance". Fred Anderson follows up with 'take 2,' observing two points that the two researchers did point out: one, the fact that the teacher used a number rather than a name of each student; and two, the teacher used codeswitching, using Mandarin for classroom management and necessary classification. Anderson views the data from an additional perspective, one as a long-time EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teacher in the East Asian context.

Chapter 6 presents data and an analysis by Sylvia Wolfe of learning through dialogue in a primary school class in England, where students are 9 and 10 years old. This 'dialogue' perspective, Wolfe says, is opposite to the IRF pedagogy; with the view that dialogue improves motivation and hence students' learning. Students are observed as actively participating in their own learning, with guided feedback from the teacher, are presenting opinions, albeit sometimes tentative, ask questions, and pursue aspects of specific interest to them, where they are viewed as "co-constructing" the agenda (p. 118) and thus building new understandings (p 120). The classroom discussion is more free-flowing with more students' voices commenting and adding to the previous ideas, and for the most part, respectful. Ching-Yi Tien and María E. Torres-Guzmán present their perspective of this data, summing up that the "teacher enhances the students' communication skills through guided practice" (p. 120). They acknowledge that both the students and teacher are all active participants in their learning, with the teacher facilitating a safe environment, so that students feel comfortable in expressing their opinions in front of the group.

Wong Bee Eng and Vijay Kumar present and analyze data in chapter 7 from two different subject-specific classes in grade 4 in Malaysia: one, a mathematics class where the Malay instructor often switches into Malay to explain or clarify a point; and two, a sciences class where the Chinese instructor does not switch languages. The researchers analyze the data in terms of constructivism, finding that little co-constructivism is taking place; the classrooms are teacher-centred, offering students a safe place to make limited responses with minimal or no

interferencing. Both teachers have limited English fluency, which is suggested as one reason perhaps as encouraging more interpersonal connection with their students; their cultural/societal norms is another reason. Roger Barnard re-analyzes the data and commented that “neither teacher sought, or perhaps was able, to create ...a community of learning in terms of encouraging their students to think creatively and critically in co-constructed instructional conversations” (p. 143) with unidirectional discourses, and minimal demands made on the students other than to make very limited linguistic responses.

Chapter 8 reviews data described and analyzed by Roger Barnard on students in New Zealand intermediate school, grades 7 and 8. They analyzed the data in terms of three dimensions of classroom learning: interactional, instructional task performance, and cognitive/academic (p. 147), taken from Richards and Hurley (1999). They point out examples of how students are socialized through the language of the teacher, indicating not only where the teacher helped to co-construct understanding with the students but also where the students influenced the direction of learning. The teacher demonstrated using the students’ current knowledge to move to a greater understanding of a topic. James McLellan re-analyzes the data for take two. His comments are not as complementary as Barnard’s, identifying inconsistent amounts of positive feedback proffered by the teacher which may hold back more students volunteering their responses.

Patricia Duff presents and the analyzes data from a Canadian secondary school grade 10 class in chapter 9 where students are giving oral presentations on a current events item. Duff refers to socialization through language, observing that the students who were newcomers were not as competent in making such presentations and were much less reluctant to participate in the ensuing discussions. Rhonda Oliver re-analyzes the data from her perspective (see Chapter 2) that “particular patterns of interactions occur in classrooms and that these are context dependent” (pp. 178-9). She points out different kinds/purposes of interactions of the teacher: management, content, communicative, and language-focused exchanges, concluding with an observation how the teacher easily moves from one kind of exchange to another.

This was a different kind of book to review, and one not without challenges. First, the format for each chapter—take one, two, and three—was unusual but was certainly broadening

and informative. First, the researchers described and then analyzed data from her/his perspective/framework. Second, another researcher analyzed the same data from her/his perspective which was sometimes similar and other times different. Third, the original researcher presented some more data and then left the reader with questions to consider. Each chapter contained its own references. The research discussed the socialization of newcomers into the England language who were students in many countries—Japan, Australia, Brunei, United States, Taiwan, England, Malaysia, and Canada. Through the chapter introductions, the reader was exposed to some aspects of the different cultures and ethnocentricisms and how those impacted on these students' education. Not only was the reader privy to different theoretical frameworks for analyzing the data, but through the extracts and the discussions, the reader as a teacher was given a variety of teaching techniques to use with EFL students. I found this book quite interesting, giving me much to reflect upon. I believe this book can be used by both future and practising teachers, and for any educator who has EFL students. The 'take 3' sections in the book provide much fodder for future discussions.

I wrote the above paragraph before I read the Afterword chapter by John Fanselow. Interestingly, he wrote that he “developed two key reasons for analyzing transcripts: see something we had not noticed before—move beyond our initial interpretation and judgment – and expand the range of our teaching practices’ (p. 189), two points that, in the paragraph above, I complimented the contributors. Observing teachers and/or preservice teachers is indeed a challenge; the co-editors provide the reader with a method to do so -- using three different ‘takes’ on an issue. In essence, as assessment is made after three different eyes weigh the evidence, as they each perceive it. Fanselow leaves the reader with some points for consideration when analyzing data: one vs. multi-dimensional perspectives; conventional vs. unconventional interpretations; claims supported vs. not supported by data. He ends with a question common to those of us in teacher education: “How can you hope to understand classroom interactions when you deal with such short exchanges?” (p. 198). I recommend that one reads and reflects on this book to provide some sorely needed direction.

References

- Hendry, G.D. Frommer, M., & Walker, R.A. (1999).
Constructivism and problem-based learning. *Journal of
Further and Higher Education*, 23, 359-371.
- Peters, A.M. & Boggs, S.T. (1986). Interactional routines as
cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B.
Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across
cultures* (pp. 80-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.
- Richards, J.C., & Hurley, D. (1999). Language and content:
Approaches to curriculum alignment. In J.C. Richards
(Ed.), *The language teaching matrix* (pp. 144-162). Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J.M. & Coulthard, R.M. (1974). *Towards an analysis of
discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

About the Reviewer

Ruth Rees is a professor in the Faculty of Education at
Queen's University in Kingston. Ruth has been involved in
teaching visiting teachers and principals from countries such
as China and Bangladesh, as well as working extensively
with graduate students in issues of Educational Equity and
Leadership.



Copyright is retained by the first or sole author,
who grants right of first publication to the Education Review.
<http://edrev.asu.edu>

Editors

Gene V Glass
Gustavo Fischman
Melissa Cast-Brede