

SCAFFOLDING MULTIVOICED DELIBERATIVE DISCUSSION: | 冯 豫 著
An Exploratory Study of Experienced American Social Studies Teachers' Classroom Discourse | YU FENG

主引多元意见的协商讨论

——美国“社会研究”课程教师的课堂话语分析

SCAFFOLDING MULTIVOICED DELIBERATIVE DISCUSSION: | 冯 豫 著
An Exploratory Study of Experienced American Social Studies Teachers' Classroom Discourse | YU FENG

主引多元意见的协商讨论

——美国“社会研究”课程教师的课堂话语分析

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

主引多元意见的协商讨论——美国“社会研究”课程教师的课堂话语分析/冯豫著.

—上海:复旦大学出版社,2012.4

ISBN 978-7-309-08720-8

I. 主… II. 冯… III. 高等学校-教学研究-美国 IV. G649.712

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2012)第 019511 号

主引多元意见的协商讨论——美国“社会研究”课程教师的课堂话语分析

冯 豫 著

责任编辑/唐 敏

复旦大学出版社有限公司出版发行

上海市国权路 579 号 邮编:200433

网址:fupnet@fudanpress.com <http://www.fudanpress.com>

门市零售:86-21-65642857 团体订购:86-21-65118853

外埠邮购:86-21-65109143

上海华教印务有限公司

开本 890 × 1240 1/32 印张 5.875 字数 155 千

2012 年 4 月第 1 版第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-309-08720-8/G · 1054

定价:20.00 元

如有印装质量问题,请向复旦大学出版社有限公司发行部调换。

版权所有 侵权必究

中文概要

本专著以独特的跨学科的视角,基于教育心理学的学习理论和西方教育界“社会研究”课程的认识论,以五位美国优秀的中小学“社会研究”教师的录像资料为研究对象,并以兼有定量和定性的课堂话语微分析为研究方法,揭示了这些教师在对学生的文献分析进行指导以后如何进一步引导学生参与多元意见的协商讨论并形成“历史移情”(empathy)的学科思维方式。本专著的录像资料取自于由美国国家人文基金会(The National Endowment for Humanities)和高等教育革新基金会(The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education)共同资助的科研项目“纵贯历史的永恒主题”(Persistent Issues in History)的资料库,其中包括课堂教学以及对每位教师课前课后所进行的三次访谈。本书第一章描述了探究性“社会研究”课程的教学模式、协商讨论在整体教学模式中的位置及其在教学中遇到的众多挑战,同时交代了本书四个具体的研究问题及其生成的依据。第二章的文献综述就课堂讨论式的“社会研究”教学所引用的理论指导框架以及支持此类教学所涉及的各种因素进行了详尽的阐述。第三章具体地解释了用于回答四个研究问题选择不同话语分析方法的理由,介绍了作者为确保研究结果的效度所采取的一些措施。第四章对研究问题一一作了回答,定量分析指出了教师们鼓励学生参与多元意见协商讨论的共同策略和各自面临的挑战,定性分析展示了教师们定义教学角色的话语策略及其过程、提问策略的几大类别和具体言语行为、促使学生思考不同意见的策略及其具体的交互过程,以及培养学生移情关注(caring as empathy)的话语策略及其过程。最后一章在回顾研究结果后对传统的苏格拉底式问答教学和本书探

讨的主引协商讨论式教学进行比较,接着进一步讨论本研究对于有关理论的构建和研究方法作出的贡献,和对于反思型教师的成长具有的实际意义,最后还指出了本研究的一些局限性和未来的研究方向。

* 注:APA Style(美国心理学协会体例)是英语学术期刊或论文出版所采用的主要体例之一。本专著写作时主要采用了 *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.) (2010) 所规定的体例。

Abstract

Using discourse analysis, this study examines the ways in which five experienced American secondary teachers of Social Studies scaffolded historical empathy during deliberative discussion. This study gives special attention to two major areas. The classroom discourse for coordinating participation in shared inquiry is first examined from the perspective of learning relationships. It features (a) the structural dimensions of classroom discourse where participation was coordinated for meaning coconstruction around the historical issue under discussion; interactional patterns, contributions to theme development, the teacher's mode of topic contribution, and sequence unfolding, and (b) the ways the teachers defined authority in their discourse for orchestrating discussion. The second area of investigation revolves around the ways the teachers fostered persuasive and dialectical reasoning as well as caring as historical empathy. To this end, this study examines the discourse strategies the teachers used to encourage the quality of discussion so that students would develop reasoning skills and demonstrate affective engagement in deliberative discussion. Here the focus is first narrowed down to teacher questioning strategies. In a further move, this study also takes a close look at the teachers' discourse strategies entailed for encouraging students to address different perspectives. Finally, caring as empathy is studied through the analysis

of excerpts where the teachers interacted with students so that they engaged in feeling for other and for self. By making explicit and naming scaffolding strategies, this study provides these resources to help classroom teachers plan, use, and reflect on them consciously.

Table of Contents

中文概要	i
Abstract	iii
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vii
Chapter One: Background	1
Background of the Problem	3
Statement of the Purpose	6
Research Questions	7
Key Terms	14
Summary and Overview	20
Chapter Two: Review of Literature	21
Social Constructivist Perspectives on Teaching and Learning	21
Scaffolding	25
Engagement in Historical Empathy	28
Discussion in Social Studies Classrooms	32
Teacher Questioning	35
Classroom Discourse, Learning Relationships, and Student Agency	37
Summary	42
Chapter Three: Method	44
Participants and Settings	49
Research Design	53

Research Rigor	70
Summary	72
Chapter Four: Results & Findings	73
Research Question 1: What learning relationships were created by the teachers across the group to coordinate student participation?	73
Research Question 2: What questioning strategies did the teachers use to help their students with their argumentation?	95
Research Question 3: How did the teachers attempt to encourage students to address different perspectives?	101
Research Question 4: Given the data, what discourse strategies can be characterized as the teachers' attempts to cultivate caring in their students?	111
Summary	120
Chapter Five: Discussion & Conclusion	121
A Review of Findings	124
A Discussion of Scaffolding Caring as Empathy in Deliberation	125
Comparison and Contrast between Deliberative Discussion and Socratic Discussion	128
Implications of the Study	130
Limitations of the Study	136
Future Directions for Research	138
Conclusion	142
References	143
Footnotes	166
Appendix A: PIH Project prelesson interview questions	169
Appendix B: PIH Project postlesson interview questions	170
Appendix C: Transcription conventions	171

List of Figures

Figure 1: Research Questions and Objects of Teachers’
Scaffolding During Deliberative Discussion 10

Figure 2: A Hierarchy of Discourse System 60

Figure 3: Numbers and Relative Percentages of Substantive
Topics Contributed by Teachers and Students 77

List of Tables

Table 1: A Typology of Discussion in Social Studies Classrooms	33
Table 2: An Overview of Research Questions and Research Methods	46
Table 3: A Description of Five Participating Teachers and the Discussions They Scaffolded	50
Table 4: A Quick Overview of the Research Phases	55
Table 5: The Structural Dimensions of Participation-Coordinating Discourse for Quantitative Analysis	61
Table 6: Frequency Counts of Interactional Patterns for the Five Teachers During Different Discussion Phases	74
Table 7: Frequency Counts of Teachers' Modes of Topic Contributions During Different Discussion Phases	79
Table 8: Purposes and Speech Acts of Teacher Questioning for Encouraging the Quality of Argumentation	97
Table 9: Differences Between Deliberative Discussion and Socratic Discussion	129

Chapter One : Background

In a multicultural and democratic society, where different viewpoints and values are the norm, educators face the challenge of how to prepare young generations for understanding and coping with diversity while engaging in civic participation in social life. As Levstik and Barton (2001) noted, American students “better understand the place of consensus than of conflict in our political system, are unsure of how conflict might be managed or resolved, or what happens when conflicts remain” (p. 124).

Against this sociopolitical background, American social studies educators are envisioning and designing new learning experiences for students through structuring resources, projects, and class discussions to make a disciplinary impact on citizenship education. Diversities and controversies inherent in historical accounts are being put to educational use for fostering reasoned judgment and an expanded worldview (Barton & Levstik, 2004; National Council for the Social Studies, 1994). In the terms of the National Council for the Social Studies (1994), students are expected to “construct a blend of personal, academic, pluralist, and global views of the human condition” (p. 6).

As an innovative approach, problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI, Saye & Brush, 2003; Saye & Brush, 2006) has been proposed to immerse students in rich experiences of “doing history” (Levstik & Barton, 2001). In PBHI, students reconstruct, interrogate, and reflect on historical narratives, as opposed to merely learning historical facts as

“inert knowledge” (Renkl, Mandl, & Gruber, 1996; Whitehead, 1929). Under this pedagogical model, students draw heavily on primary source documents (e.g., text, media, political cartoons) to study persistent issues in history as instantiated in a particular historical period. The intensive and scaffolded textual analysis prepares students for the next activity, which brings together all the students in a discussion on a central question that juxtaposes various perspectives represented in the documents studied. This particular type of discussion in social studies classrooms is deliberative discussion (Parker & Hess, 2001). A significant learning outcome expected of students is the caring disposition to recognize and weigh differing perspectives through engaging in productive deliberations. This is what is termed in social studies as *historical empathy*. The ability to think and care empathically is, as Barton and Levstik (2004) contended, what democratic deliberation depends on and can contribute to citizenship. In grappling with historical complexities and extending reasoning skills to discussions of issues still persistent in modern society, students learn to experience the intellectual and affective struggles of going beyond oneself and understanding the logic of different conceptions of social reality.

During deliberative discussion, teachers play a critical role in guiding students in developing historical empathy in a tension-filled, multilogic discourse. Such responsibilities placed on teachers' shoulders make prominent the issue of teachers' own epistemology, moral values, subject knowledge, and pedagogical competence. Studies conducted by Saye and Brush (2003, 2004, 2006) identified specific challenges teachers encountered while enacting PBHI for cultivating historical empathy. These challenges included: epistemological assumptions about knowledge, assumptions about students, content familiarity, energy, mental flexibility, as well as spontaneous and interactive support of students' inquiry.

Background of the Problem

Fostering historical empathy is a curricular goal of social studies in North America and Europe. Educators have been advocating it for helping students organize their substantive knowledge about history and develop historical understanding through inquiry (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 2004; Davis, Yeager, & Foster, 2001; Lévesque, 2008; VanSledright & Limón, 2006). Its components are still debatable (see a comprehensive review by Brooks, 2009). Barton and Levstik (2004) proposed “a production tension” (p. 242) between recognizing multiple historical perspectives contextually and feeling for people of the past. They suggested that these two aspects of historical empathy are “indispensable for public deliberation in a pluralist democracy” (p. 224).

As a pedagogical tool, deliberative discussion entailed in historical inquiry provides possibilities for the cultivation of historical empathy. It has its unique characteristics. It, first and foremost, requires students to be familiar with the positions of historical figures after “reading thoughtfully historical narratives created by others” and “reconstructing the narratives and arguments of their own” (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996). When differing viewpoints are presented, then, each side has to argue reasonably and deliberate effectively about their views. Second, deliberative discussion involves collaborative meaning construction, contrary to some inadequate conceptions of discussion in theory and practice in the context of democratic education that promotes civic competence (Hess, 2004a; Hess, 2009; Wilen, 2004; Wilen & White, 1991). As Parker (2003) aptly defined, discussion for such instructional context is “a kind of *shared inquiry* the desired outcomes of which rely on the *consideration of diverse views*” (p. 129, emphases added; see also Parker & Hess, 2001).

During deliberative discussion, therefore, participants present and respond to reasoned arguments with the goal of making justifiable decisions on the matter at hand. In this respect, social studies education moves beyond its disciplinary boundary of history learning to consider its broader implications for student learning (cf. Stevens, Wineburg, Herrenkohl, & Bell, 2005). It is closely tied to what has been expounded as deliberative democracy by scholars such as Dewey (1916), Dryzek (2000), and Gutmann and Thompson (1996, 2004). In an effort to expand a view on citizenry participating in democracy, these scholars proposed that citizens participate in open-minded, well-informed, reasoned, and egalitarian discussion, where they seek mutually justifiable reasons and develop critical self-awareness in light of others' perspectives (cf. Carpini, Cook, & Jacobs, 2004).

However, research indicates that discussion has rarely occurred in social studies classrooms, much less discussion involving controversial issues (Hess, 2004a, 2008, 2009). Teachers have personal, sociopolitical, instructional, and organizational challenges as well as misconceptions with respect to the use of discussion. Various patterns of teacher engagement and disengagement have emerged, ranging from denial, to privilege, to avoidance, and to balance (Hess, 2004b). Teachers who do not use or who believe they are using discussion have misconceptions (Rossi, 2006). Even some strong believers in discussion revert to brief fact-based teacher-student exchanges in classroom teaching, perhaps for their lack of facilitation skills and preoccupation with tests (Roberts, 2009).

With regard to deliberative discussion, teachers face an intellectually challenging task and need to address two purposes of "teaching with and for discussion" (Parker & Hess, 2001, p. 273). That is, they have to help students develop disciplinary learning (subject matter) and democratic competence (curriculum objective) at the same time. To scaffold such discussion for teaching social studies,

a teacher needs thorough preparation and facilitation skills (Hess, 2002; Hess, 2004a; Rossi, 2006). Those skills include nurturing the disposition of trusting “reason, dialogue, and experience” (Parker & Hess, 2001, p. 275). They also involve encouraging “participation,” “serious thinking together on powerful questions,” “genuine exchange and perspective taking,” and “close reading and close listening” (Parker, 2003, p. 129).

In contrast, students generally like and benefit from classroom discussion, particularly when they see the connection between classroom discussion and what is valuable beyond school, and their participation skills improve over time (Hess, 2008; Hess & Posselt, 2002). If teachers can channel students’ interest by creating an open multivoiced classroom climate for discussing controversial issues, discussions can support democratic values and affect students’ political efficacy and engagement (Hahn, 1996, as cited in Rossi, 2006; Hess, 2008; cf. Brookfield & Preskill, 2005). Such civic engagement through participation in deliberating questions of what constitute common, public good can plausibly enhance adolescents’ health, psychological well-being, and educational success, as reported in national longitudinal studies (Levine, 2007). In addition, authentic, open-ended and in-depth discussions have also been empirically investigated with a large data set or in experimental design studies. The findings have supported the value of discussion for students’ academic gains of content knowledge and thinking skills in language arts and social studies as measured in the form of essays (e.g., Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, & Camoran, 2003; Nystrand, 1997; Nystrand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, & Long, 2003; Reznitskaya, Anderson, & Kuo, 2007).

As well-conducted discussion holds out promise for facilitating student learning, it warrants researchers’ efforts to document and explicate, for knowledge sharing and building, the strategies of those

teachers who have tried out this teaching approach.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to examine the discourse strategies used by five experienced American secondary teachers of social studies for scaffolding disciplinary habits of mind during deliberative discussion. While acknowledging the diversity of practices, the teachers are studied *as a group* for identifiable discourse heuristics across five of them. The reason for studying them as a group lies in the consideration of the collective strengths of these classroom practitioners' scaffolding strategies and underlying principles to which they attended.

The teachers selected for this study had previously developed and implemented problem-based history learning activities in their classes. They were recommended by social studies teacher educators in the U. S. to be videotaped for a demonstration unit on a grant project PIHNet (Persistent Issues in History Network).¹ In their enactment of the units designed by themselves or in collaboration with teacher educators, they demonstrated their scaffolding of deliberative discussion during the phase of historical inquiry after in-depth document analysis.

Given the dearth of foundational knowledge in using deliberative discussion to encourage disciplinary habits of mind, it is hoped that this study will provide some pedagogical insights, but not necessarily prescriptions, for wise classroom practice under the overarching PBHI (problem-based historical inquiry) pedagogical model. Teaching through deliberative discussion for historical inquiry requires one to teach differently from the ways he or she may have been used to as a student or a practicing teacher. As Morine-Dersheimer (2006) posited, classroom discourse studies “provide possible models of classroom interaction processes that other teachers might choose to try out, whether they teach in similar types of classroom settings or in quite