

The Social Educator

Volume 32 Number 3 December 2014

Journal of the
Social and Citizenship Education
Association of Australia



SCEAA

ISSN 1328-3480

ARTICLE

An engaging pedagogy for Social Education: Co-teaching in a teacher education program

Dr Linda-Dianne Willis, Gregory Kretschmann, Katrina Lewis, Cate Montes

Abstract

This article examines ongoing research into the utility of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as an approach for teaching and learning Social Education. The context is the introduction of a new Australian postgraduate teacher education program in which three participants – two university educators and a practising primary school teacher – co-taught a Social Education course. This article focuses on how the approach enabled these participants to develop and teach the course to prepare the pre-service teachers to successfully understand and implement aspects of the Australian Curriculum in their future classrooms. The article explores the mutually-beneficial as well as challenging aspects of co-teaching. Conclusions and recommendations about the approach as an engaging pedagogical approach for teaching Social Education are offered.

Introduction and background

This article draws on research, in which the authors participated, that investigated the 2014 implementation of a Master of Teaching (Primary) (MTeach) program that is the first post-graduate offering of its kind in Queensland, Australia. The two-year program, taught over 18 months with the benefit of a summer semester, responds to multiple systemic imperatives. One of these is the development of a new Australian Curriculum (Australian Curriculum, Assessment, & Reporting Authority, 2013) based on the *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* (MCEETYA, 2008) which articulates the goal for all students to become “successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens” (p. 7). A second imperative is the introduction of Australian Professional Standards for Teaching (Australian Institute for Teaching & School Leadership, 2012). Hence, Australian higher education providers (HEPs) are now required to provide enhanced quality assurance to education authorities and prospective employers that graduate teachers will be able to meet the challenges and demands of the new curriculum as well as apply these professional standards in practice.

To oversee the process, each Australian state or territory has a statutory authority. In Queensland, for example, it is the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT). The QCT has indicated support for Caldwell and Sutton’s (2010) *Queensland Review of Teacher Education and School Induction Recommendations*. According to Caldwell and Sutton, the quest to produce top-quality teachers with more than just knowledge and understanding of what needs to be done now challenges HEPs “to work in new and different ways” to ensure pre-service teachers graduate with the requisite knowledge, pedagogical practices, and values to undertake the actual work of teachers (p. 44). Among their recommendations are calls for partnerships between universities and schools to be strengthened, echoing similar calls from national (e.g., Ure, Gough, & Newton, 2009) and international research (e.g., Anderson & Stillman, 2013). The findings of these studies indicate that collaboration and communication between partner schools and universities and greater material and professional support for supervising teachers constitute avenues for achieving more consistent alignment between the experiences of pre-service teachers in university and school classrooms. Thus, significant changes in Australia’s current teacher education landscape have signalled to HEPs the need

to adopt more integrated approaches that enhance pre-service teachers' teaching competency by better bridging the traditional theory-practice gap.

A further challenge to HEPs seeking to improve university-school connections has been continual shifts in the Australian Curriculum which have impacted the development and implementation of programs and courses. Previously, Social Education, for example, was mostly taught to Queensland primary and middle-year students (aged up to 13 years) through an integrated Key Learning Area called Study of Society and the Environment (SoSE) (Willis & Menzie, 2012). Under the Australian Curriculum, SoSE has been replaced by new separate Humanities and Social Sciences curricula in Learning Areas (LAs) such as History, Geography, and Civics and Citizenship (awaiting endorsement), three Cross-Curricular Priorities (CCPs) (e.g., Sustainability), and seven General Capabilities (GCs) (e.g., Intercultural Understanding). Subsequent iterations of the curriculum documents for the different LAs have produced inconsistencies between versions. As well, delayed expected releases of various curriculum documents; a recent curriculum review (Donnelly & Wiltshire, 2014) which recommends major changes to LAs such as Geography and threatens incorporation of the CCPs (Brett & Colliver, 2014); misunderstandings about the nature of the GCs (Adoniou, 2014); and calls to halt further curriculum implementation (e.g., Queensland Teachers' Union, 2014) have cast a shadow of uncertainty for educators over the Social Education curriculum landscape.

It is against this backdrop that the MTeach program and the Social Education course, on which this article focuses, have been re-envisioned and redesigned. For example, in-built to the program's structure, which includes on-campus lectures, workshops, and tutorials, are two practicum placements in a designated partner school in the first year. In addition, MTeach graduates are expected to possess self-management and teamwork knowledge, skills, and abilities to enable them to work effectively with other colleagues and professionals from various different disciplines and backgrounds. They are also required to develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to assist their future students to become active and informed citizens who can responsibly and sensitively negotiate complex, interrelated worlds. These abilities and attributes not only align with the goals of the Melbourne Declaration (MCEETYA, 2008) but also reflect the position of Social Education organisations at State (e.g., Social Educators' Association of Queensland), national (e.g., Social and Citizenship Education Association of Australia), and international (e.g., The National Council for the Social Studies/College and University Faculty Assembly) levels. As well, similar Social Education courses at the university have had a history of being co-taught.

Hence, this article explores two questions. First, how did co-teaching enable the participants – two university educators and a practising primary school teacher – to develop and deliver the Social Education course to prepare the MTeach students to successfully understand and implement the Australian Curriculum? Second, what were the benefits and challenges of co-teaching Social Education, particularly as these related to the integration and transfer of theory and practice in the MTeach program between university-based courses and school and classroom contexts?

Literature review

One of the authors of this article (Linda) has previously written about the potential of co-teaching as an engaging pedagogical approach for teaching and learning Social Education in tertiary contexts (Willis & Menzie, 2012). As noted in Willis and Menzie (pp. 2-3), teaching Social Education calls on critical curriculum approaches (Kemmis, Cole, & Suggett, 1983) characterised by: inquiry styles that investigate issues, information, and events in ways that encourage multiple perspectives and a variety of alternative solutions; an acceptance that citizenship, locally, nationally, and globally, is accompanied by rights and responsibilities; ethical approaches inscribed by principles such as respect, responsibility, inclusion, and social justice; and instilling motivation and commitment in students to take action for a better future (Menzie, Tudball, Collins, & Ditchburn, 2011). Given the alignment of these characteristics with the philosophy, theory, and purpose of co-teaching (outlined below), co-teaching was considered highly appropriate for teaching the Social Education course.

In this research, co-teaching was deployed according to Murphy and Scantlebury's (2010) definition as two or more teachers sharing responsibility for meeting student learning needs. Ideally, "co-teachers plan, teach, and evaluate lessons together working as collaborators on every aspect of instruction" (Murphy & Scantlebury, 2010, p. 1). Distinct from other joint teaching practices such as team teaching, co-operative teaching, collaborative teaming, and reflective practice, co-teachers expressly come together to simultaneously experience the classroom at the elbows of one another and to develop a sense of practice through each other's eyes (Roth & Tobin, 2002). Hence, in the co-taught classroom, co-teaching is co-learning (Willis, 2013). Each co-teacher actively seeks to foster collective expertise among the co-teaching group with individual teachers purposefully working together to continually expand and deepen teaching and learning opportunities for not only their students but also themselves.

Co-teaching goes hand-in-hand with co-generative dialoguing. In co-teaching the Social Education course, co-generative dialogues were instituted along comparable lines to LaVan (2004) as interactive social spaces for participants to talk, listen, and learn from one another across boundaries such as age, gender, and educational background. In addition, the principles and processes that underpin the approach particularly the theoretical and philosophical notion of the *ethics of responsibility* (Lévinas (1978 [1998]) were encouraged. Ethics of responsibility refers to the inherent responsibility individuals have *to*, *for*, and *with* one another in the world – a responsibility emphasising everyone's interconnectedness (Stith & Roth, 2008). The notion of ethics of responsibility is interwoven throughout social networks like those associated with education and manifests in proactive behaviours that promote inclusivity regardless of each individual's institutional position (Roth, 2007). Principles framing co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing such as mutual respect for each individual's contributions may be seen in how each one's views are invited, accommodated, accepted, and enacted throughout the process (Roth & Tobin, 2002). During co-generative dialoguing, for example, each participant is encouraged to enter into dialogic exchange through substantive conversations which assume embracing an open disposition to the possibilities of learning from others. Inclusive and respectful practices including: attentive listening, suspending judgement, inviting one another to participate, allowing each other equal talk time, fully discussing one issue before moving on to subsequent ones, and debate without necessarily reaching consensus are therefore encouraged. The term, *generative*, describes the nature of the unfolding processes among participants in developing shared understandings and reaching mutual decisions about ways to precipitate beneficial changes in their particular teaching and learning context (Tobin, 2006).

According to Stetsenko (2008), such changes evidence *collaboration* since participants enter into relationship not only with one another but also the specific task/s at hand and, more generally, the world, to overcome challenges and effect mutually-beneficial outcomes. Such changes have also been shown to signal participants' growth in individual and collective *agency*, that is, their capacity or power to make things happen (Sewell, 1992). The continuation and expansion of participants' individual and collective knowledge and practices may be attributed to the work of *co-generativity*, a potentially transformative process made possible through ongoing dialogic exchange that encourages collaboration and engagement among participants (Stetsenko, 2008).

Hence, the critically-framed, participatory, inquiry-style, ethically-inscribed, action-oriented character of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing enhanced the approach's attraction as an engaging pedagogy for teaching and learning Social Education in the MTeach program. Possible increased opportunities, because of the co-taught classroom, to explicitly model and discuss these aspects and their relationship to Social Education, constituted a further important dimension in deciding to adopt co-teaching in the Social Education course.

Describing the research

This research took the form of an interpretive ethnographic case study. In examining the utility of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as a contemporary pedagogical approach for teaching and learning Social Education, the project focused on three co-teacher participants'

experiences: Gary, course coordinator, Estelle, practising primary school teacher and head of curriculum (HoC), and Linda, program coordinator and tutor of the MTeach students. Gary and Linda had previously co-taught Social Education for two years however, 2014 was the first year these three participants worked together. The MTeach course was taught concurrently with the equivalent Bachelor of Education (Primary) (BEd) course. There were nine weeks in total with a four-week block practicum between weeks four and five. The structure of each week comprised one two-hour co-taught workshop followed by one-hour tutorials with individual tutors. In all, there were 102 students: seven MTeach and 95 BEd. Although the MTeach cohort was small, the significance of them being in the course was the opportunity this created to invite Estelle, a teacher and HoC from the partner school, to join the co-teaching team. The workshop and tutorials occurred on one day of the week. This allowed the participants to meet to talk, review, and reflect co-generatively at the end of the day as they discussed what happened during co-teaching, exchanged assessment notes about students, and began planning for upcoming weeks.

Given their university roles and experiences of teaching the course, Gary or Linda would compile the group's ideas that flowed from each week's post-workshop co-generative dialogue. These were emailed in subsequent days for all participants to add further ideas, suggest resources, and/or make adjustments.

The participants used the structure of gateway, cornerstone, and capstone knowledge to organise future co-teaching. Gateway knowledge comprised pre-workshop activities for students which the co-teachers set. This included weekly readings as well as viewing and listening to short online mini-lectures prepared by Linda that introduced the Social Education content and concepts for each week's topic. Reflecting a flipped-classroom approach (Bergmann & Sams, 2012), the co-teachers set students small tasks to accompany these activities (e.g., answering questions that required them to navigate the curriculum documents; devising a concept map to make visible personal and/or professional experience connections with the topic). Activities were planned in each workshop where this information could be shared, reviewed, and discussed (e.g., panels of student experts organised to discuss the readings and share their concepts maps with one another while a larger group of students watched and listened), reinforcing all students' developing Social Education knowledge and laying the foundation for their later learning.

Cornerstone knowledge comprised the information and activities covered in the workshops. The emphasis was on teaching the three dimensions of the Australian Curriculum pertaining to the Humanities and Social Sciences curricula namely: the LAs of History, Geography, and Civics and Citizenship; the CCPs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures, Asia and Australia's Engagement with Asia, and Sustainability; and the GCs of Critical and Creative Thinking, Ethical Understanding, Intercultural Understanding, and Personal and Social Capability. During workshops, hands-on, small-group activities to build the students' knowledge and understanding of the content and concepts for each week were central. These activities emphasised the use of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs). As well, the use of primary sources such as the *Larrakia Petition to the Queen* (National Archives of Australia, 2010) featured highly. Students used ICTs and primary sources to explore connections with content across the LAs in the Humanities and Social Sciences, considering how this might vary with each of the three CCP contexts. They were then asked to use the GCs as lenses – separate and interconnected – for contemplating possibilities around teaching and planning. The intention of the co-teachers was for students to routinely ask questions using the framework of content/concepts, contexts, and lenses to interrogate their planning in light of the three curriculum dimensions. Throughout, the participants took opportunities to metaphorically step forward and share their knowledge and experiences of teaching the different topics, indicating to one another using hand signals or eye contact to ensure smooth exchanges in lead co-teaching roles. At other times, the participants used zoning, dividing the group of students into three to conduct the same learning activity (e.g., to discuss ideas developed in small groups about the use of a primary source), before re-convening as a whole class to share and exchange learnings and insights. During activities, the participants moved freely throughout the workshop

space, interacting with students and, when necessary, convening with one another for mini-gens (short, on-the-spot co-generative dialogues). These opportunities enabled information about teaching and practice to be continually shared as well as cogenerated plans to be immediately updated given emerging needs of teachers or students in-situ. When changes occurred, information about what was happening and why, and, importantly, the thinking and pedagogy that informed decision-making as this related to Social Education, was explicitly shared with students.

Capstone knowledge was covered in tutorials where co-generated activities designed to deepen student knowledge and experiences on Social Education topics and processes were explained and mediated by individual tutors (e.g., planning inquiry lessons or units of work based on workshop activities). Whenever possible, the participants took advantage of visiting one another's tutorials to co-teach these sessions. The MTeach tutorials, for example, were co-taught by Linda and Gary.

Data from the study comprised observations of the planning and delivery of co-taught workshops and tutorials, interviews of the participants, students, and teachers at the MTeach partner school, email communication, and co-generative dialogues. Data were analysed using discourse and conversation analysis to identify patterns or themes as well as inconsistencies (Silverman, 2006). This provided a picture of how co-teaching enabled the participants to develop and deliver the Social Education course as well as revealing benefits and challenges of co-teaching as an engaging Social Education pedagogy.

Reflecting on and analysing the process of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing

What follows is a written conversation or metalogue (Roth & Tobin, 2002) comprising data from one co-generative dialogue convened at the MTeach partner school. Linda met with Gary and Estelle to reflect on the course. The discussion provides a reference point for analysing the utility of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing pedagogy in Social Education.

Estelle: I was thinking about when Linda first approached me to co-teach. I thought, 'Gosh, I'm not good enough to be doing anything like this', and it was a bit scary but professionally, personally, what I've gained from co-teaching Social Education is enormous. My depth of understanding of these new curriculum areas is better because of what I've done and it's changing my practice here at school. For example, I'm a connector, so when I was at the HoC conference, I couldn't wait to tell you what I'd done and then the professional development that the MTeach students did with me on Civics and Citizenship was all connected to what I know we were doing back at uni.

Linda: So, it was completing that circle?

Estelle: Yes! and that was so exciting to me, I mean I'm a HoC, and I love all subjects, but I think my depth of knowledge of the Humanities and Social Sciences subjects wouldn't have been this deep without co-teaching. Working with you, for example, has brought to light the General Capabilities again and the Cross-Curricular Priorities which, I have to admit in most schools, and I've talked to HoCs about this, are not a priority in our curriculum because we're so rushed: here's a new subject, teach it. We've not gone into the depth that we should be going into on those two important curriculum dimensions. I would like that knowledge to be imparted onto our staff here because the Australian Curriculum, the way it's been rolled out, it's been very quick and not very deep. And I've talked to Linda about ways we might work together to make that happen in the future.

Gary: What I'm hearing Estelle say is that the co-teaching relationship with the university has actually helped her own professional development; it's another source of getting information that she can then return to her school and say, 'Right, this is what's happening and this is something that we need to do'. It also possibly shows, if I just think about the

Social Education course that what we're doing at the moment in embedding those things that Estelle is talking about, like the General Capabilities and the Cross-Curricular Priorities, and the way we unpack the curriculum, is getting the students to have a deeper knowledge of it now, so that it becomes more second nature to them when they're teachers in school. They fully understand the breadth of History or Geography or Civics and Citizenship and how the General Capabilities and the Cross-Curricular Priorities fit into it. So they have that framework in their head when they come into a school.

Estelle: And I think I said to the students in one of our workshops, 'You guys are going to walk into schools with a much deeper knowledge of these subjects than what teachers currently have in schools'.

Linda: Given you're an expert in the students' eyes, it helps to reinforce that what we're saying in the course is authentic.

Gary: That's always an issue, the authenticity of the experience; that the academics at university can be seen to be removed whereas in our co-teaching arrangement, we have somebody who has recent and practical school experience who's right in-the-moment, confirming what's going on and contributing to the development of the course.

Estelle: And because both of you also helped me make connections; the course is written so well, it's very clear what you're doing, and so I'm thinking, 'Okay, well what does that mean in the real world?'

Linda: That critical lens.

Gary: You mention the critical lens. That's important as there's so much information out there, so much of everything. What's relevant? What can you take on board and where can you locate it? Back here at school or at the university? Rather than hitting everybody with every piece of information, it has to be critically-framed.

Estelle: And I keep saying to the MTeach students how lucky they are to be able to develop relationships, not only with their prac teachers here but also with the specialist teachers and me, because we're all teachers. And I think working with the MTeach students has given me scope, permission.

Linda: I call it agency.

Estelle: Yeah, you feel a responsibility in everything. It's like I approach them and say, 'Look, I'm having this staff meeting'. I never say that to a pre-service teacher! And what I've found is that I'm doing things differently with these students. For example, I sat down with one of them to talk about a lesson, I modelled it, and then we co-taught a small group together. I gave him the theory behind what I was doing. See that's just great experience.

Linda: And that's not happened before?

Estelle: It's very rare unless you've got a really proactive pre-service teacher. But I think it's the closeness. And I've noticed this in my conversations with them in the workshops. They have become very professional so when they ask me questions, it's not, 'I'm not really a teacher but I'm going to ask you this'. It's more, 'I'm a teacher. I need to speak to a colleague'.

Linda: From the start in our course, we set up a social contract with the students, asking them what is reasonable of them to expect of us and then having them tell us what we

could reasonably expect from them. We've also articulated the principles around co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing like the ethics of responsibility and the processes of collaboration like active listening. When I interviewed one of their prac teachers yesterday, she said that, 'Normally I would let a pre-service teacher observe my teaching and then maybe they would take over'. This time with my MTeach student, she said immediately it was like, 'Let's do it together'. The teacher told me, 'I'd never done that before'.

Estelle: But you've been very explicit in saying to the students about collaboration and cooperation. That was the one thing that struck me about the course: straight away I could see that you were telling the students that, 'We're practising this for you to use in teaching Social Education in schools'.

Gary: Could I possibly then raise another point for us to think about? In terms of our co-teaching, last year and this, we decided that we would continue doing a workshop format. So there isn't a formal lecture; the workshop has some information-giving and then there are hands-on activities where the students jump online. We wanted to use the ICTs available in the teaching space so that's another thing built into co-teaching where the students have to unpack the curriculum. We've used various strategies for them to share information and plan investigations using primary sources.

Linda: And we've used one another, for example, to do role plays like, 'What happened at the coffee shop?' to highlight important ideas such as the historical concepts and how these can be used to build knowledge and understanding.

Estelle: I think that's the strength of the course. If I were a student, Social Education would be the workshop I'd want to be at because it's real-life and it's hands-on.

Gary: And see, for instance, when we send the students off to do activities, we don't stand back and have a chat. We're all observing and consulting with them. That's part of our assessment.

Estelle: Everything we're doing, we're turning this into real-life practice.

Gary: Yes, what we've done is to say, 'We're going to model practice in schools'. That's why we have a framework which is, 'What's the Social Education curriculum we're going to teach? What's the pedagogy we're going to use to teach it? What's the assessment that we're going to use?' So students know the curriculum that teachers use in schools. We're going to model the pedagogies that teachers use, and we're going to model the assessment that you have to use in schools. And they're seeing this modelling in the school situation as well as in the university situation.

Linda: At the same time, we've modelled co-teaching to the students by telling them what's happening in bringing Estelle in to co-teach and by describing how that's different from what we've done previously.

Gary: And the next thing is the dialogue that develops in the co-teaching arrangement. Linda, you introduced me to co-generative dialogue but it's no longer just modelling: 'Watch what I do'. It's the debriefing, it's the dialogue, it's the discussion, the professional discussion that occurs to help that person understand what that practice is about and why you do that. And that comes back to Estelle's point about professional development. It is so professionally developing, not only for the pre-service teachers but it's also professionally developing for the co-teachers.

Linda: It means we've travelled a lot further in a shorter time than we might otherwise have done. Co-teaching seems to speed up the process. One person can produce a good course but with co-teaching you've got more resources.

Estelle: It's also more dynamic. But just thinking about how we could improve. The busyness of school is something to consider. If I'd known earlier about the co-teaching opportunity and structured it into our big-picture program here, I think things would've run even better than they have in partnering with the university.

Gary: As a past principal, Estelle's comment about the busyness of schools, that's really the crux of the matter. Schools are so involved in their own operations, co-teaching the course may not have given her enough time to get her head around things initially, since while she's co-teaching, her work at school doesn't get put on hold. But developing the partnership through co-teaching is an educative process and it's probably something that will develop over time.

Estelle: I think the most powerful thing in co-teaching Social Education is that these students have not only heard it, they've seen the connection between the university and real-school practice and they're living and breathing it. They're hearing it and I just think that's phenomenal. I'm jealous that I never got it when I went through university because it's just so good. It makes it more real for them there and when they're here at the school.

(Co-generative dialogue, 18 September 2014)

Findings and discussion

The data presented in this metalogue pertaining to the question of the utility of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as an engaging pedagogy for teaching and learning Social Education shine light on two broad themes. The first concerns the different ways co-teaching enhanced the three participants' and students' individual and collective agency and the second concerns the ways in which co-teaching facilitated collaboration and engagement among the participants and students. These themes are explored below, illuminating answers to the further question concerning the mutually-beneficial as well as challenging aspects of the approach in the context of Social Education.

Evidence of the first theme emerges in the metalogue where the participants describe and explain how co-teaching pedagogy has improved their knowledge and understanding of the Australian Curriculum documents for teaching and learning Social Education. Estelle commented, for example, about how co-teaching had improved her "depth of understanding" of the different Humanities and Social Sciences LAs while Linda added that co-teaching seemed to "speed up the process" of knowledge development for participants. The participants attributed their enhanced learning and development to the ways co-teaching had strengthened their knowledge of the links among the different curriculum dimensions. At the same time, knowledge gaps, notably around the GCs and CCPs, had been exposed, which, for Estelle, had enhanced her agency as head of curriculum (HoC) for teaching Social Education. Her words, "and it's changing my practice here at school" are telling. Estelle further indicated that these gaps signalled potential future opportunities for reciprocity between the university and school (e.g., "I would like that knowledge to be imparted onto our staff here because the Australian Curriculum, the way it's been rolled out, it's been very quick and not very deep").

Co-teaching also increased the participants' agency by enlarging their access to resources. This included not only material resources such as teaching units and lesson plans but also each participant's knowledge, skills, experience, and expertise for teaching and learning Social Education. A distinguishing characteristic of these resources was their currency. Gary and Linda, for example, were able to access Estelle's resources from having recently attended a HoC conference where she gained new information and insights about teaching the Humanities and Social Sciences in Queensland schools. Co-teaching therefore enabled the participants to provide one another with ongoing professional development and support. This point is particularly important given the state of flux surrounding the ongoing development and implementation of the Australian Curriculum detailed earlier in this article.

In addition, pooling their knowledge and ideas for developing the Social Education course enabled the co-teachers to carefully and critically select information for their students. Commenting on this, Gary noted, "Rather than hitting everybody with every piece of information, it has to be critically-framed". A further benefit of co-teaching gained through co-generative dialoguing was articulating and developing overarching philosophical approaches and particular frameworks to guide teaching and learning in the course. Concepts such as the ethics of responsibility and processes of collaboration were part-and-parcel of these discussions. So too, several frameworks including: the interrelated, three-dimensional nature of the Australian Curriculum, the tripartite model of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment, and gateway, cornerstone, and capstone knowledge. These concepts and frameworks, some co-generated in previous years, focused the participants' attention to enable them to interrogate their co-planning and co-teaching, thus facilitating alignment between what was espoused and enacted in the course. Estelle's words to Gary and Linda, "But you've been very explicit in saying to the students about collaboration and cooperation", and Gary's reflection on assessment, "We're all observing and consulting with them. That's part of our assessment", are evidence of how these ideas provided a platform for effective co-teaching.

MTeach student data also highlighted how concepts and frameworks to emerge from co-generative dialogues influenced the co-teachers' practice. Below, one student's comments are representative of the data:

I feel that the classes flow seamlessly from one teacher to another. The knowledge that is evident from having multiple teachers is also stronger and more cohesive than perhaps a single teacher. Co-teachers bring in different viewpoints as well which helps to facilitate all sides of a debate or topic. With this point I think it is very beneficial to us as teachers. I really enjoy how animated and entertaining the workshops can be when there are multiple teachers working together.

(Female student, email correspondence, 19 September 2014)

In noting how the classes flowed seamlessly, this student highlights how co-teaching enhanced the participants' agency for modelling best practice in general, namely effecting smooth transitions to heighten classroom management. The student's words also provide insight into how co-teaching enabled the participants to impart learning about pedagogical content knowledge. For example, by enabling them to express different viewpoints, the co-teachers modelled ways to explore multiple perspectives. At the same time, the co-teachers could explicitly describe and explain what they were doing and why, deepening the students' knowledge not only of Social Education topics and issues but also ways to facilitate constructive discussions through active listening, willingness to engage, looking for alternatives, showing careful negotiation, and using reasoned arguments. The student's comment, "With this point I think it is very beneficial to us as teachers", signals how co-teaching enhanced her agency for teaching Social Education in the future. At the same time, mentioning "how animated and entertaining the workshops can be" reflected the various strategies the co-teachers used (e.g., integration of ICTs, role plays) to build the students' knowledge of concepts and practices and the positive working atmosphere that prevailed in the co-taught classroom.

Evidence of the second theme about ways co-teaching Social Education facilitated collaboration and engagement among the participants and students manifested in the metalogue around ideas of connections as well as relationships. Estelle, for example, highlighted how co-teaching expanded her capacity for purposefully connecting aspects of the course with her work involving the MTeach students, teachers, and HoC community. Significantly, her comments, "Okay, well what does that mean in the real world?" showed how co-teaching challenged her to locate her learning and insights in the context of teachers' actual work. Linda subsequently noted how Estelle's ability to make explicit links between the university and school classrooms positioned her as "an expert in the students' eyes". And Gary emphasised how having someone "who's right in-the-moment, confirming what's going on and contributing to the development of the course" disrupted common student discourses about the authenticity

of their university experience. These aspects signify how co-teaching enhanced the fluency of collaboration among the participants and students.

At the same time, these connections built particular relationships among the participants and with the MTeach students. Speaking generally, the metalogue shows how co-teaching generated considerable enthusiasm and excitement among the participants for their individual and collective work. Specifically, the metalogue highlights how co-teaching saw the participants adopt new practices. Estelle's comments about inviting the students to staff meetings where she noted, "I never say that to a preservice teacher!" and "I'm doing things differently with these students" are revealing. She attributed the difference to having more "scope" or "permission" with the MTeach students compared with past pre-service teachers, explaining that "you feel a responsibility in everything". Co-responsibility for teaching and student learning has been found to develop among co-teachers in previous studies where teachers have worked with outside experts (e.g., Willis, 2013). Co-responsibility manifests in the different ways co-teachers participate in the classroom such as attending to what is being said, scanning students for signs they need assistance, monitoring student participation, and tutoring individual students (Tobin, 2006). According to Roth and Tobin (2002), co-responsibility encourages more substantive instruction and support through the number and quality of teacher-student interactions and learning experiences that are possible compared with solo teaching. However, in the metalogue, Estelle describes how, in this case study, co-responsibility that developed during co-teaching manifested in the school context, transforming her usual interactions and practices with pre-service teachers. Her recount of taking time to talk about a lesson, modelling best practice, co-teaching a small group, and discussing theory-practice links with one student is illustrative. The professional "closeness" developed with the MTeach students through co-teaching Social Education enabled her to inscribe her relationship with them in productive ways outside the co-taught classroom, strengthening engagement between the university and school.

The MTeach students' enhanced agency as evidenced in their dispositions and behaviours with Estelle and teachers at the school is also notable. There is alignment, for example, between Estelle's descriptions of their interactions with her during workshops when asking questions and Linda's interview data from teachers at the school. Estelle indicated that the students were becoming "very professional", interacting with her as if needing to "speak with a colleague". Linda reported about one teacher who, at the instigation of an MTeach student, adopted a collaborative approach, contrasting with her previous experiences of working with pre-service teachers. Gary's words provide insight into the processes at play during co-teaching which may have encouraged the students' dispositions and behaviours. He spoke, for example, about how co-generative dialoguing helped the participants to understand certain practices and their alignment with Social Education. He therefore highlighted the importance and value of creating dialogic spaces to encourage rich conversations among the participants for exchanging ideas, information, and insights about Social Education knowledge and practices. In turn, these co-generated understandings explicitly and implicitly infused the co-taught classroom. Learning gained through experiences in the co-taught Social Education setting thus enabled the MTeach students to view themselves in authentic educational relationships not only in the classroom with the participants but also at the school with Estelle and the teachers. This continuation and expansion of knowledge and practices exemplifies co-generativity at work and signals the considerable benefits for all involved of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as an engaging pedagogy for Social Education.

Nevertheless, co-generativity is threatened by logistical challenges such as finding suitable times to co-teach. In the metalogue, for example, Estelle and Gary spoke about the importance of planning for co-teaching given the difficulties around timetabling in large educational organisations. The need for appropriate lead-up time was identified to facilitate coordination of university and school schedules, especially if participants want to fully exploit cross-fertilisation opportunities. As well, this need underscored the importance of recognising how early planning for co-teaching can ensure appropriate structures are in place to avoid compromising any non-university employee's primary work such as Estelle's school role as HoC. Gary also stressed

the need to recognise that co-teaching is an educative process, taking time to develop. These findings reinforce earlier research by Willis (2013) that highlights how paying attention to the reciprocal relationship between logistics and the notion of the ethics of responsibility can facilitate successful co-teaching.

Conclusions and recommendations

This article presented co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as an engaging pedagogy for teaching and learning Social Education. Co-teaching was shown to be a dynamic approach with transformative potential. The participants noted the breadth, depth, and speed of their personal and professional learning and development, made possible by the different ways co-teaching increased their individual and collective resources. These included: sharing of relevant knowledge and material resources, critical selection of information, adopting appropriate and innovative practices, and articulating and developing overarching concepts and frameworks to guide course design and delivery. Hence, co-teaching increased the participants' knowledge and understanding of Social Education concepts, content, skills, inquiry processes, and dispositions, especially as these related to the three interconnected dimensions of the Australian Curriculum. In turn, this expanded their agency in the co-taught classroom and, for the teacher, as head of curriculum, saw her make conscious, deliberate changes to improve school practices when leading learning about Social Education. Co-teaching was also shown to be an adaptive pedagogy. Dialogic exchange during co-generative dialoguing enhanced the participants' reflexivity about past co-teaching sessions as well as their responsiveness to changing contexts such as the continued unfurling of the Australian Curriculum. During these conversations, participants also explored their strengths and preferences for participation, showing how the approach allowed them to accommodate and capitalise on their different roles in and outside of co-teaching. Hence, co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing built positive participant relationships that encouraged a supportive learning and working environment.

Student data indicated that co-teaching enabled the participants to create an academically and intellectually-stimulating yet challenging course. Students received current, practical information and benefited from authentic, [inter]active learning experiences which encouraged substantive conversations, critical thinking, and a range of perspectives on topics, teaching, and learning. They also benefited from the participants' heightened sense of co-responsibility. This finding highlighted the power of co-teaching to positively impact other settings in which the participants and students participated, signalling its potential for linking theory, research, and practice for students in teaching and learning Social Education. At the same time, the students evidenced enhanced personal, social, and professional capacity, displaying behaviours, dispositions, and capabilities that reflected their learning in Social Education. This included their willingness to create dialogic spaces for collaboration with teachers outside the co-teaching arrangement. Hence, the possible ripple effects of co-teaching may hold more general significance beyond the context of Social Education by shining light on the utility of the approach for building university-school collaboration and engagement.

Co-teaching also facilitated ongoing dialogic exchange that enabled the participants and students to develop beneficial relationships with one another and their mutual and individual work that included the school community. The continuation and expansion of participants' and students' individual and collective knowledge and practices highlights the role of co-generativity. Conceptualising co-teaching through the lens of co-generativity explains how the participants not only did things differently but also did different things than previously in teaching and learning Social Education. As well, this lens revealed challenges to co-teaching such as ways to maximise opportunities for reciprocity and logistical considerations when involving university and school participants.

This research contributes to earlier findings about co-teaching as a form of professional development in tertiary settings (e.g., Willis & Menzie, 2012). The study begs more investigation of co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing as a transformational pedagogy for Social

Education, including the notion of co-generativity as a driving force. Nevertheless, the authors see this experience of co-teaching Social Education as invaluable, informing not only subsequent iterations of the Social Education course but also possibly other teacher education programs by offering co-teaching pedagogy as an innovative collaborative approach for enhancing teacher education practice and research. At the same time, the authors consider that co-teaching Social Education has ensured the MTeach students involved are equipped with essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions for their future work in helping students become successful learners and active and informed citizens. Significantly, they sense the MTeach students' demonstrated commitment to collaboration and engagement signals their potential for not only positively changing the nature of teaching and learning in classrooms and schools but also improving the professional stance of teachers.

References

- Adoniou, M. (2014). *What if we had asked teachers to do the curriculum review?* Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/what-if-we-had-asked-teachers-to-do-the-curriculum-review-33027>
- Anderson, L., & Stillman, J. (2013). Student teaching's contribution to preservice teacher development: A review of research focus on the preparation of teachers for urban and high-needs contexts. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 3-69.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment, & Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2013). *Curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum/curriculum>
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2014). *Australian professional standards for teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/australian-professional-standards-for-teachers>
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom*. Washington, DC: International Society for Technology in Education.
- Brett, P., & Colliver, A. (2014). Editorial. *The Social Educator*, 32(2), 2-3.
- Caldwell, B., & Sutton, D. (2010). *Review of teacher education and school induction*. Second report - Full report. Department of Education and Training, Queensland Government.
- Donnelly, K., & Wiltshire, K. (2014). *Review of the Australian curriculum final report*. Retrieved from <http://docs.education.gov.au/node/36269>
- Kemmis, S., Cole, P., & Suggett, D. (1983). *Orientations to curriculum and transitions: Towards the socially-critical school*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Victorian Institute of Secondary Education.
- LaVan, S. K. (2004). *Cogenerating fluency in urban science classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Lévinas, E. (1978[1998]). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence*. (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- MCEETYA. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.au/melbourne-declaration-educational-goals-young-people>
- Menzie, K., Tudball, L., Collins, C., & Ditchburn, G. (2011). *Social Education*, In Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia Conference: Discipline-specific Threshold Concepts (Forum), 4-7 July 2011, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Australia.
- Murphy, C., & Scantlebury, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Coteaching in international contexts: Research and practice*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- National Archives of Australia. (2010). *Larrakia petition to the Queen*. Retrieved from <http://vrrroom.naa.gov.au/records/?ID=19522>
- Queensland Teachers' Union. (2014). *Reclaim the profession: Halt further implementation of new learning areas in the Australian Curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.qtu.asn.au/collections/australian/australian/>
- Roth, W.-M. (2007). Solidarity and the ethics of collaborative research: A grounding in first philosophy. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 27-42). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Roth, W.-M., & Tobin, K. (2002). *At the elbow of another: Learning to teach by coteaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Sewell, W. H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1-29.

- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data* (3rd ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Stetsenko, A. (2008) Collaboration and co-generativity: on bridging the gaps separating theory-practice and cognition-emotion. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3(2), 521-533.
- Stith, I. T., & Roth, W.-M. (2008). *Students in action: Cogenerative dialogues from secondary to elementary schools*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Tobin, K. (2006). *New teachers and resident teachers collaborating in coteaching and research on enacted science curricula*. Conference paper for the international conference on science teachers' professional development: Perspectives of supervision and mentoring. National Taipei University of Education, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Ure, C., Gough, A., & Newton, R. (2009). *Practicum partnerships: Exploring models of practicum organisation in teacher education for a standards-based profession final report*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Willis, L.-D. (2013). *Parent-teacher engagement: A co-teaching and co-generative dialoguing approach*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Willis, L.-D., & Menzie, K. (2012). Co-teaching social education: An oasis in changing times. *The Social Educator*, 30(1), 15-22.

Dr Linda Willis coordinates the Master of Teaching program at the University of Queensland where she teaches Social Education courses. She researches collaborative approaches to curriculum and pedagogy involving different educational stakeholders including parents, teacher educators, and schools. Linda is a committee member of the Social Educators' Association of Queensland.

Greg Kretschmann teaches curriculum and pedagogy courses including Social Education at the University of Queensland. Previously, he taught for 37 years in primary, secondary, and special education contexts in numerous locations across Queensland.

Katrina Lewis works at Ironside State School as Head of Curriculum, leading the direction and implementation of the whole school teaching and learning program. In 2014, she supported the teaching of Social Education at the University of Queensland.

Catherine Montes has her PhD in Education from the University of Queensland. Her research interests centre on issues associated with the teaching of English as an additional language in internationalising educational contexts.