Editors' Note

In describing the current and future trajectory of Educational Linguistics, King (2016) writes that scholars in our field "increasingly are in positions where they can work against … implicit biases" (p. 15). This call resonates with a long-standing tradition in Educational Linguistics of analyzing the role of language and discourse "in reproducing or creating alternatives to dominant social structures and ideologies" (Hornberger, 1995, p. 235), founded in the field's focal concerns with language in context, problems, and social justice (King, 2016). In this way, Educational Linguistics has always been at the forefront of examining interactional processes, pedagogical practices, and institutional ideologies that have generally been taken for granted in classrooms and other educational contexts (Hornberger, 2001, 2013).

Across the articles of this issue, we see the authors taking up this call in novel and diverse ways, as they draw on various methodological traditions and make new interdisciplinary connections. The authors call attention to things that have been taken for granted by (a) exploring how language learning in both formal and informal contexts is shaped by emergent, local meaning-making and values rather than a narrow focus on English as a target language system (Jo, Miele, Schwab); (b) highlighting the complex interactional norms of second language teacher education contexts that may often be simplified and overlooked by teacher educators and novice teachers themselves (Wagner & Lewis, Wang); and (c) challenging the field itself to examine how our own theoretical terms and conceptual tools relate to problematic framings of language, race, and disability (Phuong, Schmeltz). This issue of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* includes a special section focused on Classroom Discourse Analysis (beginning on p. 69; Miele, Schmeltz, Wang). In addition, this issue introduces our first *Note From the Field*, a new format that is intended to raise questions and spark discussions pertinent to the field by inviting doctoral researchers to reflect on key moments in fieldwork or teaching (Phuong).

Opening this issue, Wagner and Lewis explore how a novice teacher's complaints function within post-observation meetings with her Teaching English for Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) mentor. Drawing on conversation analysis and narrative analysis, they closely examine how three complaints emerge in the interaction, what relevance these might have for the teacher's developing reflective practice, and the various ways in which the mentor responds. Wagner and Lewis propose that complaints, though not immediately hearable as relevant to the work of the post-observation meeting, are a complicated undertaking and may be an important (and undervalued) component of novice teacher reflection. Offering implications for second language teacher educators, they call on us to "[learn] to hear complaints *as relevant to novice teacher learning*" (p. 23).

Schwab's article demonstrates the inspiring possibilities inherent in an approach to adult English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction that draws on practitioner inquiry as both research and pedagogical methodology. She narrates an approach to identifying immigrant adult student goals—and building curriculum around these—grounded in learner *dreams*, including those deferred and interrupted by experiences of immigration and national borders. By centering the experiences of learners who have often been relegated to the periphery of our field (King, 2016; Ortega, 2018), Schwab pushes against the neoliberal tendencies

of both adult education and TESOL to call for an approach to adult ESOL that more fully recognizes students' humanity and desires.

Jo takes us to South Korea, where he explores the complex pragmatic norms involved in Korean address terms, as well as how these cross linguistic boundaries when Korean young adults meet to practice English under the auspices of self-development. Synthesizing studies of Korean honorific styles and complementing these with analysis of a broadcast comedy show, he traces the evolution and complexity of Korean address terms, making the case that "how, when, where, and with whom to apply" these (p. 55) relates to both denotational facts and shifting social-indexical expectations. In addition, Jo draws on ethnographic and discourse analytic data to propose that young adults' use of specific Korean address terms (and their English equivalents) during informal English study sessions functions as a form of translanguaging (Li & García, 2017). Ultimately, Jo's analysis illustrates how even such seemingly simple discursive practices (that the participants themselves were unaware of) cultivate the social relations and local–global identities of these multilingual language learners.

In the first article of our *Classroom Discourse Analysis Special Section*, Miele uses various discourse analytic lenses to examine the shifting participation dynamics and student relationships within her adult English as a Second Language (ESL) class. In particular, Miele describes how one student's invocation of a Chinese innuendo (without naming it as such) allows her to build connections with her Saudi male classmates. Miele's analysis thus exemplifies the potential of a communicative repertoire approach (Rymes, 2010, 2014) for both researchers and teachers interested in exploring—and perhaps transforming—multilingual classroom dynamics. She leaves us with the powerful reminder that language instruction is not about "the capital L, that is, L1 or L2" or "notions of normalcy or even correctness," but rather about "creat[ing] an environment conducive to communication, one in which everyone's voice matters" (p. 80).

Wang, in the second article of our *Classroom Discourse Analysis Special Section*, examines co-teacher discursive moves as part of her TESOL practicum teaching. Her novel analysis looks at how the presence of a "non-leading" co-teacher affects the canonical *Initiation–Reply–Feedback* sequence of classroom discourse. She finds that the non-leading teacher fills both student and teacher interactional slots in ways that can support student learning, provided a certain level of coordination exists between the co-teachers. Wang's analysis suggests co-teacher interaction is a complex and important area for further study; while co-teaching is often assumed to benefit preservice teachers' professional development and clearly offers benefits for student learning, further research—and dedicated professional development for preservice teachers on collaborative discourse—could take us even further.

In the final article in our *Classroom Discourse Analysis Special Section*, Schmeltz examines classroom discourse at a different scale, focusing on the circulation of the term *code switch* among teachers and students at an alternative high school. While *code switch* conjures numerous associations for scholars of Educational Linguistics, its use at the school primarily functioned as a reprimand, encouraging students to embody (racialized) notions of professionalism. In particular, Black students at the school "expressed a sense of being asked to switch between two versions of themselves, only one of which is professional enough to belong in school" (p. 103). Schmeltz's analysis confronts our field with another instance of a persistent

problem: Progressive use of Educational Linguistic findings have more often than not failed to produce progressive outcomes (e.g., Lewis, 2018; Smitherman, 1981).

In our inaugural *Note From the Field*, Phuong draws on ethnographic research in a U.S. K–8 dual-language program to raise questions about how special education, and more broadly disability and ableism, are theorized in our field. Her note highlights the tensions involved in situating work on race and disability within Educational Linguistics: While the field's problem-orientation, ethnographic heritage, and emergent study of raciolinguistic ideologies (Rosa & Flores, 2017) are productive for examining the intersection of race, language, and disability, she also draws on DisCrit (Annamma, Connor, & Ferri, 2013) to argue that the field has further to go in theorizing competence and the (racialized and ableist) construction of learner categories within educational institutions. Her piece is a powerful call for research that "speaks truth to power," encouraging scholars to "(re)construct more equitable teaching and learning conditions" by "explicitly identifying underlying assumptions about what is considered normal in our field" (p. 121).

In closing, we want to thank all members of the *WPEL* editorial panel, without whose hard work this issue would not be possible, as well as the generous feedback provided by all of our reviewers. We especially thank Jay Jo and Karla Venegas for their leadership on Production and Design for this issue, as well as Sarah-Lee Gonsalves, Peizhu Liu, and Andrew Wu for their contributions. We join past Editors-in-Chief in thanking Dr. Nancy Hornberger and, new to the *WPEL* faculty advisor role, Dr. Nelson Flores, for their guidance and support as we worked to both uphold and expand the longstanding tradition of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* with this issue.

<div align="right">

Kristina B. Lewis & Gareth Smail
April 26th, 2019

</div>

References

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(1), 1–31.

Hornberger, N. H. (1995). Ethnography in linguistic perspective: Understanding school processes. *Language and Education*, *9*(4), 233–248.

Hornberger, N. H. (2001). Educational Linguistics as a field: A view from Penn's program on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *17*(1), 1–26.

Hornberger, N. H. (2013). On not taking language inequality for granted: Hymesian traces in ethnographic monitoring of South Africa's multilingual language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *28*(1), 1–21.

Jo, J. (this issue). Global citizenship and local social relations in the discourse of self-development: Translanguaging in address terms. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *34*, 47–68.

King, K. A. (2016). Who and what is the field of applied linguistics overlooking?: Why this matters and how educational linguistics can help. *Working Papers*

in Educational Linguistics, 31(2), 1–18.

Li, W., & García, O. (2017). From researching translanguaging to translanguaging research. In K. King, Y. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education* (3rd ed.; pp. 227–240). New York, NY: Springer.

Lewis, M. C. (2018). A critique of the principle of error correction as a theory of social change. *Language in Society, 47*(3), 325–346.

Miele, P. (this issue). Embracing students' diverse communicative repertoires to change English as a Second Language classroom participation dynamics. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 71–81.

Ortega, L. (2018). SLA in uncertain times: Disciplinary constraints, transdisciplinary hopes. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 33*, 1–30.

Phuong, J. (this issue). Note from the field: What is normal in educational linguistics? *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 117–123.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621–647

Rymes, B. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: A focus on communicative repertoires. In N. H. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 528–546). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Rymes, B. (2014). *Communicating beyond language: Everyday encounters with diversity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Schmeltz, D. C. (this issue). *Code switch* at an alternative high school. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 103–116.

Schwab, E. R. (this issue). An inquiry approach to understanding students' learning goals in an adult English for Speakers of Other Languages classroom. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 27–46.

Smitherman, G. (1981). "What go round come round": King in perspective. *Harvard Educational Review, 51*(1), 40–56.

Wagner, S., & Lewis, K. B. (this issue). Complaining as reflective practice in TESOL teacher–mentor post-observation meetings. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 1–26.

Wang, X. (this issue). Analyzing co-teacher turns as interactional resources. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 34*, 83–101.