



**University of
Sunderland**

Hepworth, Michael (2019) Argumentation, Citizenship and the Adult ESOL classroom. In: Brokering Britain, Educating Citizens. Multilingual Matters, Bristol, UK, pp. 103-119. ISBN 978-1-78892-461-0

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/14755/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

Chapter 5

Argumentation, citizenship and the Adult ESOL classroom

Michael Hepworth

Introduction

Argumentation and citizenship are tightly interconnected and, in the West, have their roots in Greek democracy. In *The Politics*, Aristotle emphasizes the importance of speech, the political nature of human beings, and the centrality of justice for citizenship:

The power of speech is intended to set forth the expedient and the inexpedient, and therefore likewise the just and the unjust. It is a characteristic of man that he alone has any sense of good and evil, of just and unjust, and the like, and the association of living beings who have this sense makes a family and a state (Aristotle, 4BCE], Book 1: 2, 2000).

Others have followed suit and identified the human ‘capacity for speech’ as foundational for citizenship rights. In Athens, the agora, or public square, was not only a marketplace where everyday life was conducted, but also the place where citizens debated issues of importance to the polity. Similarly, the classroom can be understood as an agora, a place where ESOL students develop their English but also where they can engage in debate.

In this chapter, then, I explore citizenship through its relationship with spoken argumentation. I proceed as follows: first, I establish the theoretical framework for my discussion of argumentation and democratic citizenship. Then I discuss the role and importance of controversial classroom content in the enactment and modelling of citizenship before focussing in more detail upon specific teacher practices in relation to this. I conclude by summarising and drawing out the pedagogical implications of my analysis.

I make a number of claims in the chapter, which I illustrate and support with data from adult ESOL classrooms. The first claim is that classroom argumentation can promote powerful participation. The second is that it can promote social cohesion. I also suggest that classroom argumentation can develop both language learning and argumentation skills.

Argumentation and citizenship

Argumentation can be conceptualised as dialogue, or the interaction of different voices.

These voices are both ‘competing and consensual’ (Costello and Mitchell, 1995) but are always dialogic in that meaning emerges out of their interaction (Bakhtin, 1981). In Socratic dialogue, for example, an issue is explored in order to reach a greater understanding of it or, perhaps more problematically, some kind of ‘truth’ about it. This is often achieved through questioning which helps to build both knowledge and argumentation skills. Indeed, the clarification and exploration achieved through argumentation connect it to critical thinking skills (Andrews, 1995; Vygotsky, 1991). According to Aristotle ([4BCE] 1926), the principal means of authorising argumentation are pathos, logos and ethos. Pathos involves an appeal to emotion; logos, an appeal to reason; and ethos, an appeal to the character and credibility of the speaker.

In more recent times, argumentation has often been seen as central to the functioning of liberal democracy (Andrews, 2001; Habermas, 1984), its value resting on the idea that ‘for a healthy democracy to exist, political discussion among citizens is public, robust and ongoing’ (Hess and Avery, 2008: 507). To be inclusive, this should involve the ‘free and equal right to speak’ (Young, 2000: 23). In education, the development of argumentation skills, particularly the ability to think critically and engage in reasoned debate, is highly valued as a preparation for participation in liberal democracies (Coffin and O’Halloran, 2008).

Argumentation, citizenship and the Adult ESOL classroom

It is a truism that learning English is seen as an essential dimension of citizenship; migrants need English to participate in the workplace and in wider political life and, according to government agendas, to integrate into wider UK communities and contribute to their cohesion.

However, the view I take in this chapter is that citizenship is a communicative achievement (Bora and Hausendorf, 2006) which can be enacted in the dynamics of social positioning.

From this perspective, what matters is how citizenship is lived rather than how it is abstractly defined (Isin, 2008). Thus, the focus is on ‘the range of ways in which people position themselves and each other as citizens in participatory events’ (Fairclough *et al.*, 2006: 99). These are events with an element of public deliberation and participation, such as a public meeting or, indeed, a classroom debate.

Sociocultural theories of language learning emphasise the importance of collaborative dialogue which engages participants in ‘problem-solving and knowledge building’ (Swain, 2000: 102; see also Lantolf *et al.* 2000). Here, the language classroom is a community of practice, whose members share goals and practices and seek legitimate participation (Lave and Wenger, 1991). From this perspective, ESOL teachers have arguably always taught citizenship because language classes involve engaging with sociocultural, as well as linguistic, content (Sutter, 2009). This participation, however, often involves struggle (Pavlenko and Lantolf, 2000) because teachers and students speak from different positions of power. Teachers have authority over students but are themselves subject to the authority of managers and government policies. This unequal positioning means that voices are differently audible. Audibility can be defined as a ‘combination of the right accent as well as the right social and cultural capital to be an accepted member of a community of practice’

(Block, 2007:41). Migrants to the UK often lack audibility because they do not have sufficient linguistic or language capital, or social and cultural capital in the form of education and employment (Bourdieu, 1991). This struggle to participate leads to tension and conflict as well as tolerance and understanding, and my data, as we shall see, provides examples of students contesting authority and developing both their language and argumentation skills in the process.

Students and teachers also speak from different identity positions. How speakers position and reposition themselves and each other moment by moment – what Goffman (1981) terms ‘footing’ – is a central process in identity work, and has been seen as ‘the clearest empirical clue for identity’ (Blommaert, 2005: 209). Goffman (1981) also observes that speakers can participate in talk in complex ways. He demarcated speaker roles into three: the author, or originator, of an utterance; the animator, who gives voice to the utterance; and the principal, the person who is committed to the sentiments expressed by the utterance. Most crucially for this chapter, a teacher can speak as a teacher but also, as we shall see, as a citizen or, indeed, a migrant.

Participation in dialogue is also central to language teaching in participatory pedagogy (Freire, 1970). Here, teaching is seen as transformative in that through dialogue teachers and students address political inequalities and take action to change the world for the better. This is achieved through bringing the world into the classroom and taking it back out again in the form of new understandings and political action. In this way, language teaching connects to argumentation in the form of critical thinking; the research in this field (Bryers et al. 2014a, 2014b; Winstanley and Cooke 2016) is discussed more fully elsewhere in this volume (see Chapter 7).

Having elaborated the theoretical frameworks that underpin my analysis, I now apply them to the theme of controversial issues in the classroom. The rationale for this is that, despite the democratic and pedagogic value of debating controversial issues (Avery 2002; Andolina et al., 2003), they are often avoided by both materials writers and teachers.

Argumentation, citizenship and controversial issues

In this section, I suggest that debating controversial issues is fundamental to the enactment and modelling of citizenship. The diversity of ESOL classrooms makes them powerful places in which to conduct ‘rational deliberations of competing conceptions of the good life and the good society’ (Gutman, 1999:44). Research evidence suggests that engagement with controversial issues leads both to greater tolerance and a greater awareness of the need for tolerance (Avery, 2002) as well as to increased political participation outside the classroom (Andolina et al., 2003).

However, despite these strong claims for the importance of debating controversial issues in relation to citizenship, language learning materials generally avoid them. The writers of ELT course books – often used in ESOL – avoid controversial topics partly because their publishers wish to reach the largest possible global market (Gray, 2002). The *Adult ESOL Skills for Life Learning Materials* (DfES 2003), do include certain political topics such as genetically-modified food but more often than not the content is limited to ‘safer’ topics such as weddings or festivals. Even when materials explicitly address political topics, e.g. the *Adult ESOL Citizenship Materials* (DfES 2005), pedagogic approaches adopted by teachers often appear to favour what Freire (1970) termed the ‘banking model’ of instruction in which students are positioned as the passive recipients of knowledge deposited by the teacher. Furthermore, evidence suggests that many teachers, especially the less experienced, avoid controversial issues in the classroom; in schools, for example, it has been found that teachers

in more ethnically diverse classrooms are less likely to engage with controversial issues (Campbell, 2007). This reluctance is often explained in terms of the fear of offending communities (Phillips, 1997) or the individuals within them (Hess, 2002, see also Gray and Cooke, this volume). In my doctoral pilot study, I also found some ESOL teachers reluctant to engage with controversial issues because of a desire to build safe, harmonious classrooms (Hepworth, 2015). This may reflect a pressure to be inclusive and to build social cohesion both in and out of the classroom. Additionally, it may be viewed as necessary for students who have experienced trauma in their personal lives; Hodge and Pitt (2004: 34), for example, found that for some asylum seekers the classroom was ‘a refuge from some of the realities of their lives outside.’ However, I would argue that deliberately avoiding controversial topics is counter-productive, however well-intentioned; indeed, as I show below, controversy will emerge, even if teachers do not want it to.

To illustrate the value of controversy in the classroom, as well as some of the challenges it presents, I focus on a debate I observed whilst conducting my doctoral research (Hepworth, 2015). The class is working at Level 1 and 2 of *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (DfES 2001), so the students are intermediate and advanced level speakers of English. The teacher has brought her own topic and materials into the classroom, ironically - in the light of what ensues – based around the speech act of ‘complaining’. When the students arrive, however, they bring their own, more pressing, topic. One of them sits down angrily and the following exchange emerges:

S1: I have to pay FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS

S2: HOW much (shocked)

S1: I have to pay full (.) always was half (.) now I have to pay full

S3: WHY (rising intonation)

The first point to make is that the students bring the topic into the classroom and so begin to generate their own curriculum. S1 is angry that, under the new 2010-2011 college fee regime, students will have to pay the full fee of £500 for their ESOL classes. The other students participate in the discussion immediately, asking questions. S2's question seeks clarification and S3's question 'Why?' opens the way for the students to explore the issue. In this way, they take control of the discourse. Their heightened emotional investment in the topic is revealed prosodically by the rising volume and pitch. This forces the teacher to address the topic:

T: I know it's going to be a problem next year (.) we're going to talk about it (.) (uncomfortably).

S1: NOBODY talk about it.

The teacher concedes that the policy will be problematic and that they will discuss it. However, S1 replies there has been no dialogue or debate about this topic in the college. Until now the students' voices have not been audible (Block, 2007). The silencing effect of powerful discourses - what Bourdieu terms 'doxa' - signifies a state of affairs where the 'political order' is seen as 'self-evident and natural', not as one arbitrary possibility among many (Bourdieu, 1977: 166). The students challenge this doxa by putting the topic, clearly a matter of social justice for them, on the agenda.

The students then participate powerfully in the debate, exploring the new fee policy and exposing its injustices:

S1: I don't want pay full price because for me it's not fair if someone have for free and I pay

T: well you only get it if you're on job seeker's allowance or housing benefit]

S1: yes] I know but look how many people they not coming they have for free (.) if they pay they come (.) it's true (.) why they don't come and because they don't pay for this class (.) I pay and I come

T: I'm not sure because I don't even know who pays and who doesn't so I can't make this judgement

S1: it's my opinions

T: but you

S3: because it's the different situations (.) depend where you're coming from

S1: If I'm working I have to pay

S3: yeah

S4: but we are on the lowest wage

Thus, S1 leads off by observing that 'it's not fair' that she now has to pay the full fee. The students then co-construct a reason-based critique of the policy. S1 authorizes her claim by observing that those who are on welfare payments (Job Seeker's Allowance or Housing Benefit) get classes for free but are not attending while those who pay do. S4's contribution – prefaced by the adversative conjunction 'but' – develops the critique of the new policy on the grounds that, although they are working, they are 'on the lowest wage' and so will struggle to pay the increased fees. Later, in the same vein, S1 builds upon this by observing that it is difficult for them to access fixed-timetable ESOL classes when they do shift work. This is a *reductio-ad-absurdum approach*, where arguments are probed and logical inconsistencies exposed (Aristotle, [4BCE] 1926).

The argumentation is also authorized by ethos (Aristotle [4BCE] 1926), its credibility drawing upon the character of the speaker; here the students appeal to their own experience and an understanding of their position as low-waged, part-time migrant workers who need affordable language provision. Again, they are aware of their lack of audibility (Block, 2007)

and the need for them to accrue greater linguistic capital in order to participate more fully and equally in the job market.

The students, and indeed the teacher, begin to uncover the power networks behind the new policy:

T: if you are on a low income you pay half price (.) but from next year it's not going to be available]

S2: (laughs) good news (ironic)]

T: good news yeah (hesitant) (2) park town college (.) so if you come next year]

S2: from the government]

The student attributes responsibility for the fee increase to government policy, displaying what Freire (1970) termed *conscientizacao* i.e. a critical awareness of his positioning within wider power networks.

In contrast, the teacher simply states that the policy is changing and does not attribute responsibility. She is positioned awkwardly and there are tensions between the different aspects of her identity. Professionally, she plays the role of mediator or broker (see Cooke, this volume) and ventriloquizes (Bakhtin, 1986) the policy. However, her voice is hesitant, reflecting her lack of commitment to the content, or, in Goffman's (1981) terms, the principal, of the utterance. She is not the author but merely the animator of the policy. This is not necessarily her view as a citizen; indeed, she herself is a migrant to the UK, another identity position, and so possibly more empathetic to the plight of her students.

This exchange demonstrates how there can be a 'struggle for participation' (Lantolf and Pavlenko, 2000) or audibility (Block, 2007) in the language classroom. Using the authority invested in her role, the teacher closes down the debate and refers the students to the college manager. In this, she is acting within the institutional constraints as she perceives them. Her

intervention denies the students the opportunity to participate in a proper classroom debate on the issue. This includes foreclosing the opportunity to make the teaching transformative by taking the debate outside the classroom in the form of lobbying or writing letters to the college authorities or local MPs.

However, the students resist this attempt to stifle debate and, shortly afterwards, S1 tries to wrest back topic control, when the teacher, having returned to her planned lesson content, shows the class a picture of an unhappy person and elicits possible reasons for this unhappiness. The student says ‘maybe someone asked them to pay £500.’

In sum, this exchange reveals that students can participate actively and powerfully in classroom debate, bringing topics from their own lives into the classroom, achieving a degree of audibility (Block, 2007) and developing their language and argumentation skills in the process. But it also illustrates the potential threat posed by controversial issues to classroom harmony and cohesion and it is to this that we now turn.

Argumentation, citizenship and classroom cohesion

The focus of the analysis thus far has been participation. What, then, of social cohesion, the other dimension of citizenship identified earlier? Social cohesion is an ill-defined term (Cooke and Simpson, 2009). In much government discourse, the promotion of ‘cohesion’ is based on the concern that some migrant communities are living ‘parallel lives’ and are poorly integrated with the wider community (see Home Office, 2001; Home Office, 2016). Cohesion is often used as ‘a byword for good behaviour’ with the emphasis placed upon migrants to cohere – although with what is not always made clear (Cooke and Simpson 2009: 26).

Moreover, in wider media and political discourse, there is often an implication that multilingualism is in and of itself responsible for the social fragmentation of communities (see Simpson, this volume). Official reports into the riots in Northern cities in 2001 (e.g. Home Office, 2001) attributed some blame for the breakdown of social cohesion to a lack of language competence amongst migrant communities. Whilst this problematic inference has been contested by sociolinguists (Blackledge, 2006) it helped to pave the way for the inclusion of citizenship in ESOL teaching (see Simpson, this volume; Peutrell, this volume). However, if, following Wetherell et al., (2007: 3) we characterise a cohesive community in broad terms as one in which diversity is valued, those from different backgrounds have both equal opportunities and a sense of belonging and there is a good degree of integration between migrant and host communities, we can argue that the value for citizenship of debating controversial subjects in the ESOL classroom lies in the fact that they provide teachers and students with an opportunity to learn how to manage fundamental differences when they emerge and in so doing foster tolerance and understanding between those who hold radically different viewpoints, particularly over topics such as religion. These topics do not always lend themselves readily to a stance of respect for different opinions, perhaps because issues of identity, i.e. political or religious belief, are at stake.

I will now illustrate and support my argument about the value of debating controversial topics for social cohesion by referring to a debate on capital punishment. My data here suggest that adult migrants to the UK are capable of handling the differences that open up when debating controversial issues. Indeed, they can even do so by explicitly invoking citizenship. So it was that, towards the end of a debate on capital punishment, one student acknowledged the viewpoint of their antagonist by saying: 'this is my opinion I respect yours and I realize that we pay taxes we don't agree.' In making this move, she is modelling citizenship in the form of tolerance, establishing the parameters within which debate can take place, agreeing to

disagree, and explicitly acknowledging their rights as equal tax-paying citizens not just to express different opinions but to have those opinions respected. In doing this, she is speaking from an identity position as a citizen.

Moving beyond explicit invocations of citizenship, avoiding controversial issues also deprives students of the opportunities to develop ways of dealing with controversy in their day-to-day lives. My data suggests that they can learn to deal with controversy diplomatically and to diffuse classroom tension, often by using humour. For example, in the same capital punishment debate, a student said that ‘only god has the right to judge’ in order to authorize her claim that capital punishment should not be legalized. Another student, arguing for legalization, responds to this, saying: ‘but I am the tool in god’s hands.’ This humour in the form of parody is an example of what Bakhtin calls a double-voiced utterance, one ‘directed toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward another’s discourse, toward someone else’s speech’ (Bakhtin, 1994: 105). By playfully appropriating and subverting the voice, identity and argument claim of a religious fundamentalist, the student helps to manage the risk of offence to the other student. Here, in effect, is a dialogue within a single utterance and a sophisticated and playful strategy in which the student is parodying those who would use religion to authorize their claims.

Moreover, this example provides evidence for Cook’s (2000) claim that debating controversial issues provides students with the opportunity to engage in language play and, most importantly, play-related language development, which he identifies as an important dimension of language learning; avoiding these topics in the classroom can deprive students of these opportunities (Cooke and Simpson, 2008). Debating controversial issues in the Adult ESOL classroom thus raises interesting issues for teacher roles and practices in debate and it is to these that I now turn.

Teacher roles and practices in argumentation

In this section, I claim that teachers can play a major role in the enactment and modelling of citizenship in the classroom. I illustrate and support this claim by focussing on teacher questioning and teacher disclosure.

Teacher questioning

The traditional role for the language teacher in debate is that of chair, or facilitator, who frames debate, manages contributions, and closes debate down. This role has the advantage of allowing the teacher to distance themselves from the debate and ensure everyone has the opportunity to participate. This is what I do in the extract below from the debate on capital punishment discussed in the previous section:

S1: government they so of course they need to check each case (.) if they sure 100%
that person can be]
S2: they will sending an innocent man to prison]
T: go on S2 (.) what were you saying

Teacher questioning here allows S2, who I know to be a quiet student, to participate more actively in the debate, by giving them the conversational floor. This promotes the ‘free and equal right to speak’ (Young, 2000: 23) (see Home Office, 2001; Home Office, 2016).

However, the teacher can also participate more actively in debate by taking up a Socratic role. The dialogue that follows is from the same debate on capital punishment:

S1: some people you know giving prison 20-30 years and they finding that they are
innocent
T: so (rising intonation)
S1: they find out proves that others kill

T: ok (.) so doesn't that mean that capital punishment is a bad idea (.) if we're killing innocent people (.) how would you answer that (.)

S1: yeah yeah (.) but always can be mistake

My questions in this excerpt help to scaffold (Bruner, 1985) both argumentation and language work. In terms of developing argumentation skills, the first question invites the student to elaborate by pushing them to draw inferences from the argument they are making. This, again, is a strategy of *reductio-ad-absurdum*, undermining a case by exposing its contradictions or paradoxes (Aristotle, [4BCE] 1926). The next question ('doesn't that mean..?') is rhetorical in effect and states the inference to be drawn from the line of argument unfolding. The final question ('How would..?') challenges the student to respond to this and they concede that absolute proof of guilt is not possible. In short, this exchange has the hallmarks of a Socratic dialogue; as the teacher, I probe the student's arguments and force them to address other positions. Socratic dialogue here helps to develop argumentation skills and 'challenges students to think, to clarify their own point of view, to become aware of the contradictions and inconsistencies in their own thinking' (Stradling et al., 1984: 9). This means that the teacher should have a good level of knowledge of the issue. In terms of language learning, teacher questioning functions as a form of what Swain (1985) calls 'pushed output', i.e. when, as a result of dialogic interaction and the pressure to produce meaningful language, students engage in deeper language processing at the cognitive level.

However, teacher questioning needs to be located within a network of power relations. The roles and relationships in Socratic dialogue are not equal (Andrews, 1995: 61). As the teacher I am in the more powerful role, interactionally as well as institutionally, despite the fact that the students are adults. As a result, my rhetorical question in the dialogue above ('so doesn't that mean..?') functions more as a statement than a genuine question. Indeed, it shows me

taking up a position in the debate just as surely as if I were explicitly disclosing my opinion in debate. This is because I am questioning a view that I am opposed to. Teacher questioning is one practice through which the teacher can play a more active role in debate. I now move on to discuss another practice which similarly allows a more active role, that of teacher disclosure.

Teacher disclosure

Teacher disclosure can be defined as ‘the level of self-disclosure and personal narrative that [teachers] bring into their teaching’ (Baynham, 2007: 37). Teachers routinely face decisions about whether or not to disclose their views in issue-based discussions with students. However, until relatively recently, there had been little research on this issue (Hess and Avery, 2008). In Adult ESOL, however, there is research suggesting that some teachers disclose because it helps to create a climate of openness and tolerance in the classroom (Baynham et al., 2007). Building on this, I suggest that teacher disclosure in debate can enact and model citizenship and also develop language and argumentation skills.

The teacher can decide not to disclose but to remain neutral in debate. In doing so, the argument goes, they avoid the implication that the issue can be settled simply by an appeal to the authority of the teacher (Stradling et al., 1984). Moreover, they can avoid the charge that they are indoctrinating their students, abusing their position of authority by presenting their view as the only valid one. However, this can be countered in various ways: covert and implicit bias – or indeed the avoidance of certain topics – is arguably more widespread and deleterious to open debate. Furthermore, explicit disclosure: ‘gives students a chance to make allowances for your prejudices and opinions when evaluating what you say and how you tackle an issue’ (Stradling et al., 1984: 9). Moreover, students are perhaps just as likely to be influenced by their own families, communities or the media (Stradling et al., 1984:108). The

right response, in my view, is for the teacher to be honest about disclosure; indeed, as I have argued, this can help to model citizenship in the form of openness.

I investigated teacher positions on disclosure in the pilot study of my doctoral research (Hepworth, 2015) and the following exchange is taken from a teacher focus group where the discussion has turned to teacher disclosure:

T1: I tend not to remain strictly neutral (.) when we've talked about (.) for example (.) Tony Blair's Iraq war I said no (.) I was against it but that's my (.) I always label it that's my point of view this is my point of view (.) you may disagree with it (.) that's fine (.) and that sets to some extent the parameters for the discussion that we might have about it (.) I said I don't think it's right you might think it's right and we go from there rather than pretending I have not got a point of view...which I find difficult to do and we go from there (.) I think it's more honest and more uhm productive to say that's my point of view and you may disagree with it but you've got to add that that I'm perfectly happy for you to disagree

T2: yeah (.) you have to be clear about that

T3: and it's a good class when they actually turn round and say 'what do you think?'

T2: I only ever give my opinion if asked

This reveals that some teachers do disclose their opinions on controversial topics (in this extract, the war in Iraq) as part of parameter setting in classroom debate. So, T1 observes that it is important to label such disclosure as a point of view. He states he finds it 'difficult' to 'pretend' he doesn't have a point of view and that, in this sense, disclosure is more 'honest'. He points to the importance of making it clear that it is perfectly acceptable for students to disagree with him. In this way, he aims to establish a framework of openness and tolerance within which the debate will take place. However, this discussion also reveals that not all

teachers adopt the same position on disclosure. Thus, T2 asserts that she only discloses if students ask her to do so, with T3 saying that this request for disclosure is one of the hallmarks of a successful discussion.

How can teacher disclosure enact and model citizenship? Consider the following exchange, which emerged in my own classroom towards the end of the debate on capital punishment:

S1: what do you think Michael

T: my opinion's not important

S1: why (rising intonation)

T: if you want to know I'm against the death penalty because we make mistakes (.) I don't think it stops people

S2: because human life is priceless

T in the heat of the moment I don't think it's right to kill somebody in cold blood (.) which is what]

S3 yeah] but what if the killer actually killed with cold blood

S4 so I think maybe you change your mind if you go to prison talking with prisoners who (.) like serial killers or something like this (.) you change mind]

T but] to kill somebody (.) for the state to kill somebody in order to stop them killing seems

S3 ok

T a bad example to me]

The first point to make is that my disclosure is prompted by a student request; students often want to know what their teachers think. My initial response is to hide behind the convention of teacher neutrality. However, the student questions this response, implying that my view is important to them. By deciding to disclose, I thus model citizenship in terms of

participation. In an inclusive democratic society, everyone, including the teacher, is a citizen with the right to participate in debate (Young, 2000). Most of the students present in the class are drawn into the debate. Indeed, it is possible that my disclosure here encourages student participation in that S2, hitherto a reluctant participant, enters the debate by building on my contribution. Moreover, in a reversal of conventional roles, it is the students who ask the questions, both to elicit and then to challenge my argument. My disclosure also models citizenship here in terms of openness; if teachers expect their students to be open, then teachers should presumably reciprocate. This is risky for the teacher as disclosure always brings with it the possibility of challenge. However, if the teacher's view is to be regarded as simply one among many, it too should be open to challenge and rational scrutiny. My disclosure here also models argumentation skills in that I authorize my argument rather than simply asserting a point of view. I do so through reason, or *logos* (Aristotle [4BCE] 1926), drawing an analogy between state killing and individual killing: if the state wants to show that it is wrong to kill, it needs to set an example. To say that killing is wrong but to engage in it is a paradox. Teacher disclosure here also scaffolds (Bruner, 1985) the development of argumentation skills. This is visible when S3 asks me a question, taking up my argument through analogy and turning it against me in arguing that one cold-blooded killing deserves another.

Teacher disclosure can also be more productive in terms of language learning. My disclosure here elicits turns of talk from three students. The interruptions following my disclosure suggest a high degree of engagement with the topic, and this has been shown to generate extended turns of talk (Cooke and Roberts, 2007). The language that emerges here has not been introduced by the teacher; rather it emerges spontaneously as students and teacher strive to persuade each other of the merits of their arguments. In more cognitive terms, teacher disclosure also provides opportunities for students to 'notice', or pay

conscious attention to, elements of the teacher's language. In this excerpt, for example, I use the prepositional phrase 'in cold blood' and this is taken up, if inaccurately, by a student.

This kind of noticing facilitates language learning (Ellis, 2015) and can provide opportunities to support, or scaffold (Bruner, 1985), emerging language. Here, it introduces key vocabulary and also offers the student the opportunity to notice the correct form of the prepositional phrase. In sum, teacher disclosure is a complex issue and teachers clearly need to think carefully about whether or not to disclose. However, I believe there is a strong democratic and pedagogic case for it.

Conclusion and pedagogic implications

In this chapter I have suggested that classroom argumentation can enact and model democratic citizenship in the form of powerful participation and that it can also foster integration and social cohesion as well as language development. Organising and facilitating discussions is one way of modelling the ways in which a citizen can participate democratically in policy making beyond the classroom. The main implications of my argument are therefore for teacher education; teachers should be able to engage in argumentation effectively themselves if they are to model these skills to their students.

However, many teachers report that they have had little or no training in how to facilitate issue-based discussions as part of their initial teacher education or professional development (Oulton et al., 2004) and indeed some research has suggested that many peoples' skills in argumentation are 'only of the most elementary sort' (Kuhn, 1991: 264). Engaging students in meaningful debates in class also necessitates that teachers be informed themselves about current affairs – citizenship is predicated upon the idea of an informed citizenry – and that they know their students well enough to identify which issues are likely to be seen as controversial; after all, issues are not intrinsically controversial but only become so from the perspectives of the participants (Hess and Avery, 2008: 510).

Classroom pedagogy around argumentation should be transformative and allow students and their teachers to promote social justice outside the classroom; one striking example of this in the sector happened in 2010 when the rise in student fees was debated in some ESOL classrooms and teachers and students across England participated in the Action for ESOL campaign (Peutrell 2015). Research suggests that these debates led to high levels of student participation and to productive language work (Winstanley and Cooke, 2016). Similar debates are now being had in connection with the issue of Brexit (see Cooke *et al*, this volume); such debates, even if they do not directly result in political action, might at least enable students to better engage in debates on key issues such as these in their daily lives outside of class. Teaching the kind of citizenship I discuss in this chapter will, in my opinion, empower students to better defend their positions as well as their rights, challenge unhelpful stereotypes, become more audible and in the process transform both themselves and the communities they live in.

Transcription Key

] Overlapping Speech/Interruption

(.) Pause

CAPITAL LETTERS: Volume

References

Andolina, M., Jenkins, K, Keeter, S., and Zukin, C. (2003) Searching for the meaning of Youth Civic Engagement: Notes from the field. *Applied Developmental Science* 6 (4), 184-195.

Andrews, R. (2009). The importance of argument in education. Inaugural lecture. Institute of Education. University of London

- Andrews, R. and Mitchell, S. (eds) (2001). *Essays in Argument*. London: Middlesex University Press.
- Andrews, R. (1995). *Teaching and Learning Argument*. London: Cassell.
- Arendt, H. (2006). *On Revolution*. London: Penguin.
- Aristotle (2000). *The Politics*. New York: Dover.
- Aristotle (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Auerbach, E. (1992). *Making Meaning; Making Change: Participatory Curriculum Development for Adult ESL Literacy*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Avery, P.G. (2002). Political Tolerance, Democracy and Adolescents. In Parker, W. (ed). *Education for Democracy: Contexts, Curricula, Assessments*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bakhtin, M. (1994) Problems in Dostoyevsky's poetics. In Morris, P. (ed.) *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Volosinov* (pp. 110-113). London: Arnold.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, M., Roberts, C., Cooke, M., Simpson, J., Ananiadou, K., Callaghan, J., McGoldrick, J. and Wallace, C. (2007) *Effective teaching and learning: ESOL*. London: NRDC.
- Blackledge, A. (2006). The Racialization of Language in British political discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 3 (1), 61-79.

- Block, D. (2007). *Second Language Identities*. London: Continuum.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bora, A. and Hausendorf, H. (2006) *Analyzing Citizenship Talk: social positioning in political and legal decision-making processes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outlines of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1985) Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 1 (1), 111-114.
- Bryers, D., Winstanley, B., and Cooke, M. (2014a). Whose Integration? In Mallows, D. *Language Issues in migration and integration: Perspectives from teachers and learners*. London: The British Council
- Bryers, D., Winstanley, B., and Cooke, M. (2014b). The power of discussion. In D. Mallows (ed.) *Language Issues in migration and integration: Perspectives from teachers and learners*. London: The British Council.
- Campbell, D.E. (2007). Sticking Together: Classroom Diversity and Civic Education. *American Politics Research* 35 (1), 57-78.

Coffin, C. and O'Halloran, K. (eds.) (2008). Argumentation in educational contexts: new methods, new directions. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education* 31 (3), 219-227.

Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooke, M. and Roberts, C. (2007) *Developing adult teaching and learning: practitioner guides. ESOL*. Leicester/London: NIACE/NRDC.

Cooke, M., and Simpson, J. (2008). *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooke, M., and Simpson, J. (2009). Challenging Agendas in ESOL: Skills, employability and social cohesion. *Language Issues* 20 (1), 19-30.

Costello, P., and Mitchell, S. (eds.) (1995). *Competing and Consensual Voices: The Theory and Practice of Argument*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Department for Education and Skills (2005). *Citizenship materials for ESOL learners*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. [Online]. [Accessed 12 December 2017]. Available from: <http://esolcitizenship.org.uk>

Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *Learning Materials ESOL*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. [Online]. [Accessed 23 January 2017]. Available from: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/readwriteplus/LearningMaterialsESOL>.

Department for Education and Skills. (2001). *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. [Online]. [Accessed 14 February 2017]. Available from: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/curriculum_esol

Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N., Pardoe, S., and Szerszynski, B. (2006). Critical Discourse Analysis and citizenship. In H. Hausendorf and A. Bora (eds.) *Analysing citizenship talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Pennsylvania; University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in ELT. In Block, D and Cameron, D. (eds.) *Globalisation and Language Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Gutman, A. (1999). *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hepworth, M. (2015). *Spoken Argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Leeds.

Hess, D. (2002). Teaching Controversial Public Issue Discussions: Learning from Skilled Teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 3 (1), 10-41.

- Hess, D. and Avery, P.G. (2008) Discussion of Controversial Issues as a Form and Goal of Democratic Education. In Arthur, J., Davis, I. and Hahn, C. (eds.) *Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: SAGE.
- Hodge, R. and Pitt, K. (2004). *This is not enough for one's life": Perceptions of living and learning English in Blackburn by students seeking asylum and refugee status*. Working Paper. Lancaster University, Lancaster.
- Home Office (2001). *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team (Cantle Report)*. London: Home Office.
- Home Office (2016). *The Casey Review: A Review into opportunity and integration (Casey Report)*. London: Home Office.
- Isin, E.F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In: Isin, E.F. and Nielsen, M. (eds.) *Acts of Citizenship*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuhn, D. (1991). *The Skills of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lantolf, J. (ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lave J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Oulton, C., Day, V., Dillon, J., and Grace, M. (2004). Controversial Issues: Teachers attitudes and practices in the context of Citizenship Education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 30 (4), 489-507.

Pavlenko, A. and Lantolf, J.P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re) construction of selves. In Lantolf, J.P. (ed). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable Discourses. *Applied Linguistics*. 15 (2) 115-138.

Peutrell, R. (2015). Action for ESOL: Pedagogy, Politics and Professionalism in Dailey, M.; Orr, K. and Petrie, J. (Editors) *Further Education and the Twelve Dancing Princesses* London IOE

Philips, J. (1997). *Florida Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Study of Controversial Issues in Public High School Social Studies Classrooms*. PhD Dissertation. Florida State University.

Reflect ESOL Resource Pack. Action Aid. Available at: <http://www.reflect-action.org/~reflecta/sites/default/files>

Stradling, R., Noctor, M., and Baines, B. (1984). *Teaching Controversial Issues*. London: Edward Arnold.

Sutter, J. (2009). A Review of *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. *Language Issues* 20 (1), 75-77.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In Lantolf, J.P. (ed.) *Socio-cultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). 'Three functions of output in second language learning.' In Cook, G. and Seidlhofer, B. (eds.) *Principles and practices in Applied Linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative Competence: some roles of comprehensible input and output in its development. In Gass, S.M. and Madden, C.G. (eds.) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA. Newbury House.

Vertovec, S. (2006). *The Emergence of Superdiversity in Britain*. Oxford: University of Oxford Centre on Migration, Policy and Society. Paper No. 25.

Vygotsky, L. (1991) Genesis of the higher mental functions. In Light, P., Sheldon, S. and Woodhead, M. (eds.) *Learning to Think*. London: Routledge.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wetherell, M., Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds). (2007). *Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion*. London: SAGE.

Wilkins, M (2009). Language and Context in ESOL Teaching. In Paton, A. and Wilkins, M. (eds.) *Teaching Adult ESOL: Principles and Practice*.

Winstanley, B. and Cooke, M. (2016) *Emerging Worlds: The Participatory ESOL Planning Project, Paper 4: Literacy*. Available at www.efalondon.org

Young, I.M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.