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This paper presents research that applies the properties of reflection (uniting theory, practical reasoning and personal experience) to a specific educational context, classroom discourse. Discourse analysis will be used as a tool to explain the existence of the variety of codes in the classroom setting: teaching code, behavioral code, student code, spoken and textual codes. This project also attempts to fill in the gap that currently exists in the scholarly discussion on teaching code-switching strategies in monolingual discursive situations. Review of literature situates the general topic in an historical context and critically analyzes the most relevant published research through summary, classification and comparison, and promotes reflexivity upon language choice in educational settings. Theoretical framework composed of the synthesis of findings in discourse analysis, ethnography of communication and critical language awareness focuses attention on classroom discourses, especially those pertaining to the analysis of written textbooks. Furthermore, the theory serves as a solid foundation for building awareness of how language functions in written texts, and it has the potential to make teachers and students more aware of the effects of code-switching techniques in a text. The third chapter applies this theoretical framework to the textbook *Crafting Authentic Voices* by Tom Romano. This theory and its application has a potential to make contributions to the development of curriculum, pedagogy, instructional planning in the English Language Arts classrooms.
INTRODUCTION

One of the peculiarities of teaching is that it requires educators to constantly make informed decisions in different educational discourses. According to Silcock, “Pedagogic decision making as a reflective practice, [is] a process guided by ethical considerations as well as the requirements of the craft” (Silcock 276). Part of what constitutes the ethical considerations and nature of the craft is the developmental change that includes growth in knowledge and skill, achievement of educational goals, transformation that entails ongoing restructuring of ways of thinking, learning and teaching. These acts of “transforming” or “bridging” are only possible if educators are cognizant of the power they possess to determine the possible outcomes of each discursive situation. Being aware and pondering over not only the actions, and thoughts (metacognition), but choosing appropriate language code should become an intrinsic component of reflexive teaching.

This paper presents research that applies the properties of reflection (uniting theory, practical reasoning, personal experience) to a specific educational context, classroom discourse. The aim is to contribute to the scholarship on the value of understanding the nature of codes and code-switching in monolingual written texts. Discourse analysis will be used as a tool to explain the existence of the variety of codes in the classroom setting: teaching code, behavioral code, student code, spoken and textual codes. This project also attempts to fill in the gap that currently exists in the scholarly discussion on teaching code-switching strategies in monolingual discursive situations. So far, most of the research on code-switching, conducted with the help of discourse analysis
strategies, has focused on the shifts from one language into another; therefore, analysis of shifts in style, register and voice in written language (Buell 99) in monolingual discourses provides an interesting niche to explore.

The Overview of the Project:

The thesis starts with a review of literature, which analyzes areas of discourse analysis, critical language awareness and new literacy studies in their relevance to the study of code-switching in educational discourses. The purpose of the review is to situate the general topic in an historical context and critically analyze the most relevant published research through summary, classification and comparison. It is the first step in procedural knowledge, knowledge concerned with how to manage available means to achieve certain goals; in this case, various linguistic and rhetorical devices serve as tools that help to strive towards reaching an educational goal – informing how reflexivity upon a language choice has the potential for “progressive restructuring” (Silcock 280). Second, the subsequent chapter identifies the conceptual framework around teaching discourse analysis and code-switching in a monolingual classroom. The methodology focuses attention on classroom discourses, especially those pertaining to the analysis of written textbooks. Furthermore, the theory serves as a solid foundation for building awareness of how language functions in written texts, and it has the potential to make teachers and students more aware of the effects of code-switching techniques in a text. Lastly, the third chapter applies this theoretical framework to the textbook Crafting Authentic Voices by Tom Romano. This theory and its application has a potential to make contributes to the
development of curriculum, pedagogy, instructional planning in the English Language Arts classrooms. For the purposes of this study I have to limit the scope of the theoretical framework and its application in order to reach a conclusion. I view this project as a precursor for longitudinal doctoral research project that will involve a more in depth study of code-switching that will comprise a variety of texts (written, spoken, visual), as well as offer a more detailed discourse analysis that will contain chapters with very thorough linguistic textual analysis.

In order to better understand how a power-knowledge relationship operates in classroom discourse, the thesis will focus on the study of language using a three-dimensional perspective: local, institutional and ideological. The ideological/societal domain includes the study of the concepts that shape and are shaped by the institutional and local spheres. The particular institutional domain examined in this thesis is the Discourse surrounding education; Discourse refers to “socially accepted associations [about education that include] ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting and interacting” (Gee 26). Lastly, the project offers a textual approach to discourse analysis; therefore the third chapter includes the description, interpretation, and explanation of discursive relations and social practices in Tom Romano’s book.

Multilingual writing studies provide an interesting description of the use of code-switching in written and spoken texts in the classroom situation; however, hybridity of the codes and voices in one and the same language has to be given more attention. Conducting discourse analysis of code-switching in written texts can help to examine how public code, linguistic code and rhetorical code, embedded in texts, shape thought
processes and impose certain worldviews on the readers. Identifying these codes, where
the code-switching occurs, functions and implied meanings of codes can help uncover the
hidden ideologies of texts.

As the outline demonstrates the scope of this study is quite narrow and specific,
but the outcomes of the act of reflection upon code-switching in monolingual discourses
will inform the purposes for another project, more a complex and bigger one in its scope.

**Basic Concepts**

The term code-switching is often associated with a “phenomenon in which
speakers switch back and forth between two separate languages or dialects to include or
exclude other participants, to portray a particular nuance or to establish solidarity” (qtd.
in Buell 98). This concept is rooted in the multilingual writing research that investigates
discourses around the literacy development of bilingual (multilingual) students. Dell
Hymes extends the definition of the term and characterizes it as an “alternative use of two
or more language varieties of a language, or even speech styles” (Hymes 103). Buell
develops this interpretation and includes “shifts in style, register and voice, whether
spoken or written language” into the broad definition of code-switching (Buell 99). In
this thesis I will use code-switching in the broader sense that incorporates the term
“variety shifting” proposed by Saville-Troike. This term includes “any patterned or
systematic differences in language forms and use which are recognized by native
speakers as being distinct linguistic entities, or different from one another in some
significant way” (Saville-Troike 48). Even though, as she admits, its use is intentionally
vague and contains various kinds of linguistic shifts, including code-alteration, style-shifting; for the purposes of this study I will refer to code-switching as shifts in language means through style, tone, voice, register, genre. Conducting discourse analysis will help to unveil multiple meanings of the text; and code-switching will be used as one of the tools to examine how authors and readers “struggle to make texts speak and work for them, struggle to make and exchange meanings” (De La Piedra and Romo 48).

Conducting discourse analysis of code-switching in monolingual classroom situations also requires clarifying the definitions of discourse analysis and the term discourse itself. Before I will introduce various studies that use discourse analysis as a tool to explore various linguistically, culturally, socially, politically, economically charged issues, I would like to clarify the use of the term discourse. I will be borrowing the definitions from James Paul Gee who distinguished between “discourse” with a small “d” and “Discourse” with a capital “D”. According to Gee, “Discourse” encompasses “socially accepted associations among ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting and interacting, in the “right” places at the “right” times with the “right objects (associations that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a “socially meaningful group” or “social network”), whereas “discourse” means language-in-use” (Gee 26), “language used on site [that] enacts activities and identities” (Gee 7). Sometimes the context will be adequate for the use of both terms; in that case I will be using discourse (with a small “d”) as a type of a social practice (Fairclough 1995), dependent of the purposes and functions which linguistic forms are designed to serve in human affairs (Brown and Yule 1983).
Discourse Analysis and Switching Codes and Discourses

Studying code-switching in a situated context through means of discourse analysis contribute to the understanding of various teaching moments, like critically assessing the ways ideologies of writers are revealed in conveying the message of the text, understanding how these hidden agendas are shaping readers’ interpretations, curriculum development and classroom pedagogies. Understanding textual codes will enable the reader to more clearly see power relationships established in the text, where the author can play different roles and invite readers to build discursive relationships that will involve various degrees of ideological hegemony. Thus, discourse analysis may help to examine how written discourse does ideological work.

Theoretical foundations of discourse analysis are based upon the notions of self-criticality, self-conscious methods of inquiry and meaning making. Discourse analysis is open to finding evidence that might go against our views and results of discourse analysts. Conducting discourse analysis of the classroom situations helps to incorporate the theories of discourse analysis and critical pedagogy to demonstrate that at the core of teaching and learning in the classroom setting is reflexivity, thinking dialectically. When all these reflexive components are united in deciphering the rationale behind certain linguistic code choices in texts, the analysis becomes even more intentional, reflection happens “on purpose and with purpose” (Silcock 275).

The value of the critical study of language codes will be fostered with the help of several approaches to the study of language in the classroom. In An Introduction to
Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method by James Paul Gee, the two primary functions of human language are singled out, they are “to support the performance of social activities and social identities and to support human affiliation within cultures, social groups, and institutions” (Gee 1). The author argues that all human beings are to a certain degree designers, artists, who with the help of language create themselves and the world around them. People utilize the resources of phonology, morphology, grammar, syntax, vocabulary, semantics, and other branches of language study, consciously or unconsciously, to design their sentences in spoken and written forms of communication in ways that render “their perspectives on reality, carry out various social activities, and allow them to enact different social identities” (Gee 5). Those who are reading a text need to see the role linguistic counterparts play in this creation process, because the ability to understand “why”s and “how”s of the ways language works when it is put into action will lead them to another level of critically looking at texts. This next level of reading is insulated with reflective acts and mainly focuses on detecting the places where the codes change, mutate, transform.

The choice of using discourse analysis research tools in this thesis is intentional, the theory and method of this discipline could serve as a means “for linking social knowledge-contexts, and for translating one sort of experience (e.g. academic) into another (e.g. practical) (Silcock 274).

Discourse Analysis studies language as it is fully integrated with other elements that go into social practices, “ways of thinking or feeling, ways of manipulating objects or tools, ways of using non-linguistic symbol systems” (Gee 9). This symbolic system of
meaning making in language considers the text in its multimodal application, the text is no longer a static, written combination of symbols, and it becomes a phenomenon that incorporates other means of communication like visuals, audios, graphics (other semiotic systems). The limitations of this research only allow focusing on the conventional definition of the text as the “verbal record of a communicative act” (Brown and Yule 6). But as the research unfolds it is necessary to keep in mind larger dimensions of the term, because the inferences of studying code-switching in written texts will have implications for developing research on examining shifts in code in spoken texts, for example classroom dialogues, students responses, language of instruction.

Some people might associate discourse analysis with studying specific grammatical features of a particular text under investigation. However, the scope of this discipline goes beyond decoding syntactic, pragmatic and lexical aspects of language; discourse analysis integrates gathering information, synthesizing, advancing hypothesis, assessing them and then choosing the most credible, relevant ones out of an array of options. This systematic methodology through interpretive and explanatory analysis presents a multitude of inferences of code-switching that one can investigate to mark the boundaries, language habits, ideologies. Knowing the strategies of discourse analysis equips one with abilities to decipher not only the meaning of each particular sentence, but also “to embed them in the conversational sea in which sentence one swims” (Gee 46). Thus, comprehending distinctive social practices, where this code-switch might occur, how that discursive situation shapes the meaning of the sentence and how it changes “the voice, identity of people who speak, write and think and act and value and live that way
for a given time and place” empowers members of a discourse to be more aware of power of linguistic codes in creating a certain meaning (Gee 42).

As discourse constitutes society and culture (qtd. in Rogers 2), doing discourse analysis helps to acknowledge the reciprocal relationship between language and person, and language and society. Meaning becomes an entity that is equally determined by the social practices that are dominating the time, place, and actions; as well by people themselves, who assign certain value and significance to the words combined in meaningful utterances. As James Gee argues, “Words have different specific meanings in different contexts of use. At the same time, (...) the meanings of words are also integrally linked to and vary across different social and cultural groups” (Gee 53). Consequently, discourse analysis helps to expand one’s vocabulary not by teaching unfamiliar words with unknown definitions, but by providing contextual meanings, meanings that have been in passive, subconscious repertoire of a person. Activating and validating these new vocabulary items in a new setting enhances students’ skills in reflecting upon the situated meanings and reflexivity between language and reality.

Ways in which language and reality mutually exert influence on one another could be analyzed through juxtaposing various discourses students bring into the classroom. Discourses are social, analyzing which kind of language (style, register, genre implied) prevail in which context and how to be better prepared to fit that discursive situation could be studied in English classroom as well (Gee 178). For instance, a teacher could bring up several examples from his/ her professional discourses. The special knowledge of the discipline is required in the classroom, being familiar with institution’s
regulations and policies is necessary at the departmental meetings, and practical experience of presenting at the conferences and teaching history is preferable overall. Not only the linguistic choices will be different in each of these discursive practices, but also each category would require certain adjustments based on the audience. The kind of language an educator considers appropriate in teaching a literature course to freshmen, for example, varies from the set of communication systems eminently suitable in methods course for pre-service teachers. Thus, by bringing real life examples from teaching experience into the classroom, teachers can encourage students to see that particular discursive classroom situation is shaping and shaped by the knowledge, and unique practices students bring into the classroom. Using examples of code-switching from familiar discourses, home, school, recreation, can facilitate acquisition of language skills and can teach members of discourse to interrogate one’s own practice in order to develop self-awareness and self-control, which ultimately will help them to more effectively function as members of hybrid discourses.

Another reason for choosing discourse analysis strategies in assessing code-switching in written texts is that this discipline not only encourages students to bring knowledge from discourses outside the classroom, it also validates all the varieties of language, their dialects. Examining how different “social languages are used and mixed is one of the tools of inquiry in discourse analysis” (Gee 20). The acknowledgement of other variants of one and the same language enables members of discourse to conduct a more thorough investigation of how language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and locations altogether place a person into a certain social
standing, assign a particular type of identity, analyze him/her engaged in a peculiar activity. James Gee calls this approach “recognition”, which takes into account the background of each person, encourages scholars to work within those peoples’ milieu, recognizes what people bring to discourse analysis and how it changes who they are. The recognition of someone’s identity starts with the recognition of their language, dialect; thus, purposefully studying the relationship between behavioral, ideological, symbolic codes and linguistic choices has a potential to enhance teaching and learning practices in a classroom discourse.

Using discourse analysis to analyze code-switching in written discourses was also prompted by the fact that this theory is shaped by certain social, cultural, academic, and other expectations. Discourse is historical (Fairclough) and therefore keeping in mind the history of what is being known, implied, and assumed about teaching English in institutions is an essential component of while doing discourse analysis. In “The Changing Discourse of Language Study”, Marylin Wilson claims that socio-cultural issues and stereotypes surrounding English classes, English teachers and the use of certain varieties of language should be embedded into curriculums (31). She investigates attitudes towards language and asserts that there are many internalized myths about language that have persisted for centuries: the slang is incorrect, the language of the teachers is correct, the standard use of language is right, vernacular dialects are wrong, and many others. One of the tools of combating these misconceptions is explaining that all users of language are “developing language learners”, and that “(equating) Standard English with moral virtue and intelligence, and (considering) a narrow band of prestige
usage rules as more worthy of study than the richness of language among all speakers” is a deficit model (32). The analysis of these diverse discourses, these complex systems of communication values, their inherent flexibility and fluency in language or languages discloses the importance of learning about “stylistic choice, flexibility in use, ability to shift styles from one context to another” (32).

One of the positive implications of Wilson’s research to the study of classroom discourse was that one of her students commented that “she was no longer ashamed of her dialect” (35). Recently, many other scholars have completed thorough investigations of linguistics systems of most of the prominent dialects of the English language and have proven that “dialects are all complete linguistics systems, and thus structurally equal” (Wilson 34). Wolfram, Adger, Christian, in *Dialects in Schools and Communities*, have constructed knowledge about how valuing the language each student brings to classroom affects curriculum and instruction, assessment and productive learning environment. They also acknowledge the importance of language variation and provide teachers, who are motivated in teaching for social justice, with tools to gain a more profound understanding of the languages, cultures and other social backgrounds of their own students.

Teaching code-switching from the perspective of dialect variation is the first place to start challenging social evaluations intrinsic to its status. According to Wolfram, Adger, and Christian, “views of a relative merit of a language variety are based on social, not linguistic, grounds” (Wolfram et al 2). The reason for this peculiarity is that social standing of some people who make judgments about language are more influential than
those of others, so what is acceptable according to the standards of the dominant group becomes the “correct” way to communicate in society. Furthermore, the scholars point out that

For the most, there is more shared structure in the grammar of Standard English speakers across communities than in pronunciation, but there are still some regional differences that keep us from concluding that a single set of standard grammatical features exists. (Wolfram et al 16)

It is interesting to note that the Standard is itself not quite “set” due to the regional differences. Therefore, doing discourse analysis in the classroom becomes even a more useful tool to decode which ideologies prevail in setting up the standards for that region. Being cognizant of code-switching strategies, students and teachers will note subtle shifts that occur in communication and interaction; and speakers will realize that “their actual usage is more variable, flexible, creative, and organic than their professed beliefs about usage are” (Wilson 33). The more students reflect upon their inherent knowledge of the language and how they utilize it in different discourses, the more flexible Standard English will become.

In order to better understand power relations in classroom language and other literacy events it is necessary to see how discourse analysis as a discipline has been evolving and incorporating not only “power relations among teachers and students, administrators, school boards, politicians and so on, but also relationships of social institutions such as schooling, business, government, and educational research” (Bloome 166). According to the data given in The Linguistic Encyclopedia, edited by Kirsten Makmkyajer and James Anderson, “The term discourse analysis was first employed in 1952 by Zellig Harris as the name for a method for the analysis of connected speech, i.e.,
for continuing descriptive linguistics beyond the limits of a single sentence at a time, and for correlating culture and language” (Malmkjaer and Anderson 100). These initial pursuits of new understandings and meanings of language were isolated from the context, and the dynamics of language in use demanded a more interrelated approach to study language and social, cultural and political Discourses. Therefore, analysis of connected speech in its relation to culture has further been expanded by other scholars who developed the body of material including “the study of socially situated speech untied by an interest in extended sequences of speech and a sensitivity to social context” (qtd. in Malmkjaer and Anderson 101). Different branches of discourse analysis evolved from these studies, conversational analysis, text linguistics and critical discourse analysis. Conversational analysis was heavily dependent upon speech-act theories the aim of text linguistics’ was primarily to focus on the written discourses as the name suggests and critical discourse analysis paid specific attention to the relationship between language and ideology (Malmkjaer and Anderson 101).

The findings of critical discourse analysis turn out to be the most relevant to the study of language codes in a classroom setting, specifically in analyzing code-switching in written texts, because this field encompasses all of the above analyzed components of classroom discourse. Among them are the fact that critical language awareness studies address social problems, acknowledge that power relations are discursive, consider that any discourse constitutes society and culture, this discipline is lastly, a historically grounded socio-cognitive approach. These characteristics are significant to examine the
relationship between language form and function, language code and its meaning, code-
switching and its underpinnings.

The realm of critical discourse analysis has been widely explored by British
linguist, Norman Fairclough, who views discourse as a type of a social practice:

Discourse constitutes the social. Three dimensions of the social are
distinguished – knowledge, social relations and social identity – and these
correspond respectively to three major functions of language (…) Discourse is shaped by relations of power, and invested with ideologies.
(qtd. in Jaworski and Coupland 2)

These interrelations among social, cultural, political formations of language and how they
shape and are shaped by individuals is one of the key aspects of the critical study of
language. Understanding how certain textbooks/ stories/ narratives using certain language
are promoting selling, believing in, accepting, consuming certain services without
questioning their necessity and thinking about the consequences, might be helpful in
developing critical thinking skills. According to Jaworski and Coupland, language, be it
spoken or written, has “become marketable and a sort of a commodity, and its purveyors
can market themselves through their skills of linguistic and textual manipulation”
(Jaworski and Coupland 5). Thus, one of the objectives of advancing discourse analysis
in the classroom is to offer society tools not only to question social inequality that can be
decoded in the texts, but also to challenge power relationships either between individuals,
such as students coming from different social demography, or between social groups; and
looking at code-switching as a way of studying how these inequality are exercised can be
one of the ways to address this issue.
First half of this chapter focused on the practice of conducting discourse analysis with code-switching as the primary lens, the overview addressed the kinds of reflection that occur “in action” in local, institutional and ideological dimensions. These ethical considerations inform practitioners of details of their own craft allowing them to modify and broaden its application beyond immediate circumstances (Silcock 274). If the former emphasizes the importance of reflection on educators’ behalf, the latter (the nature of the craft) informs of the necessity to improve students’ reflective skills. In this case, the notions of literacy, standards, structure and process in studying code-switching in classroom discourse become crucial.

Critical discourse analysis is based on systematic methodology that examines at how relations between text and society are mediated; this relationship often involves ideological hegemony. Therefore, it is necessary to study code switching as means that writers use to exercise their ideologies on the readers. In order to be able to decipher how language is ideologically constructed, members of discourse communities can reflect upon how language use influences them in different ways. Working closely with texts and analyzing multiple meanings of texts can enhance students’ literacy skills not only in reading and understanding, what the actual words mean, but also in interpreting meanings that are implied, ignored, have larger connotations: “Literacy is an empowering attribute if readers and writers become aware of how texts are constructed and how such constructions influence their perspectives of the world” (Fehring and Green 2).
The definition of literacy and empowerment becomes the key in examining classroom power dynamics and in seeing how speech norms are negotiated in concrete speech events (Luykx 34). *Critical Literacy: A Collection of Articles from the Australian Literacy Educators’ Association* offers definitions of each term through a perspective of critical literacy research focused on the classroom discourse. Pam Green posits that literacy “can be seen as a double-edged sword in that it can be enlightening or liberating but also may be restrictive or dominating” (Green 8). On the one hand, critical literacy strives to help people “understand, comment on and ultimately control the direction of our lives” (qtd. in Green 7); on the other hand, literacy can be exploitative, and limiting. Green gives an example of using textbooks that “portray a mainstream view of the world, and (…) traditional literacy practices, which often reduce literacy to copying and the completion of worksheets” (Green 8).

The dichotomy of this “double-edged sword” (Green 8) can be resolved through identifying the importance of not only doing but also effectively teaching discourse analysis in the classroom. Depending on the distinctive features of local, institutional and ideological domains at place, teachers need to be able to choose the most adequate codes and shift from one code to another in a subtle manner. Other members of discourse might perceive or not perceive the use of these certain codes based on their background and identities, but it is the responsibility of a reflective practitioner to enhance these skills in her students and teach them to critically analyze language codes as a key marker of social identities, relations and contexts (Buell 100).
No matter how much students are actively engaged in classroom practices, the power differential enables teachers to build a “metalanguage of criticism” that will “take into account the cultural/political nature of literacy and the ramifications of uncritical imposed curriculum” (Fehring and Green 4). Before students develop their literacy skills in reading texts, it is necessary for teachers to provide them with diverse texts, multiple sources, at times, conflicting sources, because “educators have the potential to critically examine what counts as literacy, the way in which texts are used, and the literacy demands made on students” (Green 10). For example, if teachers focus on issues as simple as word choice or as complex as determining which larger textual or cultural codes dominate (Buell 101), and together with students develop an understanding of why certain vocabulary items can include or exclude some individuals from discourse, then both parties will be able to more consciously unite disparate social, cognitive, spatial and other elements and learn how to use language codes to serve necessary social functions.

In order to give students the capacity to do discourse it is worthwhile examining what goes into this process and how it empowers students to become active members of public. When taught appropriately discourse analysis gives ability to students “to use their own cultural resources and to explain the relationship between students and society”, it alters their perception of themselves and the society in a particular way (qtd. in Green 9). However, as Green argues reading and writing about the meanings of texts is not enough to initiate any change, and become empowered, she posits that:

The term empowerment is overused and often misused. It is misleading in that it creates images of social power, and whilst being able to read and to write enables the individual to function within society, we do not gain
access to the power bases of society just because we can read and write’ (Green 1992: 16)” (Green 9).

Background in understanding underpinnings of critical literacy and its application in the classroom are an essential component in both teaching and doing discourse analysis in the classroom, and both teachers and students need to be cognizant of that. All in all, the interrelations among social and political forces have to be recognized and taken into account by teachers in order to create a fruitful environment to conduct discourse analysis in the classroom.

**Discourse as Structure and Process**

In order to effectively function in any discursive situation members of discourse, in this context, both teachers and students, need to remember that special characteristics of each discourse call for a different kind of reflection that is governed by a specific purpose. In order to distinguish between purposes and kinds of reflection, they need to be able to understand the structure and process of communicative interaction that constitutes a particular discourse. Consequently, discourse community members should investigate other components of discourse analysis, namely who uses language, how and why. To answer these questions, Teun A. van Dijk distinguishes three dimensions: language use, the communication of beliefs (cognition) and interaction in social situations. He furthermore, characterizes them in two modes of discourse: talk and text. For him, “talk or spoken discourse comprises everyday conversations and other types of dialogue (…) Text of written discourse, defines the large set of discourse types comprising for example, news reports in the newspaper, scholarly articles, novels, textbooks and
advertising” (van Dijk 7). His definition of the word text includes more abstract and underlying structures of discourse, or even transcripts of spoken speech. According to Jaworski and Coupland, now discourse analysis claims to include non-linguistic semiotic systems (systems for signaling meaning), those of non-verbal and non-vocal communication which accompany or replace speech or writing. Moreover, if discourse analysis is the set of social practices which “make meaning”, then many of the texts produced in this process are multimodal, i.e., they make use of more than one semiotic system. (Jaworski and Coupland 7)

These different systems of meaning making contribute to the investigation of the language in use, because they incorporate a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of a context under investigation. Texts often are heterogeneous, especially those utilized in the classroom, because they are represented through various examples of essays, samples, instructions, kinds of interaction and communication. Therefore, focusing on code-switching techniques can be a good place to start examining different voices, “which may be released through different modalities, or indeed a single modality, and addressing one or many audiences” (Jaworski and Coupland 8). Explaining the origin of the existence of several voices within a text can enhance students’ comprehension of different discourses, which are socially organized ways of thinking, talking, writing, etc. Sometimes, these voices can be conflicting within the linguistic activity under investigation, for example, some students might have different, even conflicting readings of one and the same story due to the differences in their linguistic, social and cultural background. For instance, portrayal of the first Thanksgiving Day for Native American students will have different connotations and meaning than to the rest of the students, and validating interpretations
of all students, the voices of all individuals will make a difference in the way all students see education as a resource for liberation and social justice.

Another distinctive feature of discourse, according to van Dijk, is that discourse itself does not have much meaning, the meanings are usually assigned to a discourse by the language users: “This process of meaning assignment we all know under such terms as ‘understanding’, ‘comprehension’ or ‘interpretation’. In this case the meaning is rather associated with the mind of language users” (van Dijk 8). This approach brings to the surface the notions of deliberate or unintentional language use, because many times even though the meaning is assigned by the language users, they do not control it; preconceived notions about certain things – socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, geographical location, cultural stereotypes, age – dictate linguistic choices. Therefore, if members of discourse have premeditated ‘understanding’ of the style, rhetoric and schemata – verbal structure – they will be able to assess the situation, the mindset of the audience and recognize which verbal structure fits the communicative situation and choose most effective language code to participate in this interaction.

Discourse analysis, according to van Dijk, also incorporates the study of the text and talk as a process using realistic, “empirical” approach. Doing discourse analysis therefore has potential to empower users of language and to reinforce the self-conscious approach to using language and to comprehend what is happening at each particular discursive moment:

Language speakers speak in order to be understood, and to communicate ideas, and they do that, both as individual persons and as social group members in order to inform, persuade or impress others or in order to
accomplish other social acts in social situations, institutions or social structures. (van Dijk 16)

However, this interpretation is more applicable to the definition of language as a commodity in modern society and as the usage of language in order to achieve various effects in consumer sciences. The value of discourse analysis in the classroom is manifold. Aside from the implications explained in the beginning of the project, discourse analysis can embrace workshops on not only ideology of consumerism, but other dominant ideologies in society. An example of doing analysis of code-switching can be studying the language of a pizza commercial or advertisement. Tools of discourse analysis can help to decode and identify the target audience (for instance younger population, or vegetarians, or people who prefer organic food), what devices are employed to communicate the message, how they appeal to potential clients (price, the quality of produce etc), etc. The example does not only illustrate students the power of language in consumer services, but it enriches their knowledge of how language is targeted and comprehended in certain discourses, and how it contributes to shape decisions about the use of other linguistic structures in the service of larger meaning.

Standards and Code-switching

The standards set by the states or other authoritative educational institutions and organizations play a large role in the way students are prepared for the diverse literacy demands of the current society. Standards offered by National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) acknowledge the importance of knowing the language; they define the purpose of education in Language Arts classes as follows “to ensure students are able to
use language to address their own needs as well as the needs of their families, their communities, and the greater society” (NCTE). However, more attention needs to be paid to how much students are exposed to studying the language itself, not through literature or writing, but through working with the linguistic systems that operate so much of the meaning making process.

Discourse analysis can fill in the gap and provide with a very accessible arsenal of tools to work with language in a meaningful contexts students can relate to, and help them consciously investigate these discourses and become more aware of the possibilities of cognizantly using language clearly, strategically, critically and creatively. Moreover, as Hull and Hernandez argue “it will do little good to value multiple literacies and multiple modalities in classroom, unless assessment and evaluation methods also take new definitions of literacy and learning into account” (Hull and Hernandez 336). As language and the discourses around human interaction evolve standards need to keep on par with these changes and incorporate the findings of discourse analysis and other disciplines into their content. Analysis of code-switching in written texts can offer a clear, empirical evidence of the ideological, social, institutional and local changes and thus enhance the standards to better meet the demands of the current society.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Overview of the Approach

In this chapter I will lay a specific theoretical foundation for conducting discourse analysis of code-switching in a monolingual classroom. I will examine the scholarship of several linguists who work in the areas of ethnography, discourse analysis and critical language awareness. To illustrate the niche where they all intersect, I will highlight similarities and points of divergence in their research in order to show how their research supports my argument. This comparative framework will further be developed with the help of thematic coding used to analyze how their points of convergence contribute to the current research. Furthermore, this method will provide students and teachers with an impetus to identify theoretical connections among these branches of language study and thus solidify new possibilities they create to examine language-in-use in a monolingual classroom.

This thesis represents a potential for future research projects to develop a new synthesis of discourse analysis, critical language awareness, and ethnography of communication with new literacy studies that can shed more light on the questions of effective language instruction in a monolingual classroom. Although many have tried to produce accounts of discourse analysis in the classroom and other educational settings, no research further develops and identifies the importance of analyzing code-switching in monolingual textbooks. More research done on the analysis of written texts can help teachers understand the value of discourse analysis in the classroom, which in turn will
enhance students’ understanding of the power of language by providing the latter with linguistic access to civic life. By critically assessing code choice in different texts readers might reflect upon power relationships in place, and in turn develop skills in better understanding how “the choice of language for school and other functions has major power to include or exclude individuals” (Spolsky 2010).

Using the three-dimensional method which includes local, institutional and ideological domains, I will set up the theory starting with the sector that investigates the kinds of interactions, communication and behavioral patterns that occur at a local level. According to the definition of code-switching, it can also mean shifts not only in the ways people talk and write, but also communicate through gestures, mimicry, signs and other kinesthetic acts. The study of shifts in behavior and interaction can enhance understanding of the context, and can be used to explain behavioral patterns that appear in written texts.

Following the ideas introduced by the founder of the field, Dell Hymes, Saville-Troike clearly examines communicative behaviors in specific cultural settings and linguistic codes, which are an integral part of each communicative act. This interdisciplinary study contributes to “the study of universals in language form and use, as well as to language-specific and comparative fields of description and analysis” (Saville-Troike 8). As my thesis incorporates the study of students’ linguistic repertoire, the findings of ethnography of communication in regards to the studies of students’ linguistic competence in cross-cultural interactions become relevant to the study. The linguistic repertoire of members of discourse influences how successful a person
functions in a particular discourse. Moreover, if members of discourse are cognizant of the limits of their linguistic competence, they will be more likely to realize how to expand it, especially in the areas where they lack necessary means, for example religious vocabulary to effectively communicate in a church or a mosque. The study that focuses on the fluidity of codes and the necessity of acquiring code-switching skills will enable members of discourse to reflect upon the discourses around them, evaluate communicative, behavioral patterns which are distinctive of that discourse, and ultimately subconsciously control their thoughts and behaviors.

Despite the lack of self-criticality and other aspects that Gee’s and Fairclough’s analyses offer, this study is a valuable contribution to my research as it develops an understanding of social life in the classroom “not as something given in advance and a priori, but as having an eradicable aspect of being constituted by its participants in an ongoing, evolving way” (Hymes xiv).

One of the ways discourse analysis can be used to explore the relation between language and society is through understanding writing, “exploring the practices that people engage in to produce texts” and understanding “the ways that writing practices gain their meanings and functions as dynamic elements of specific cultural settings” (Bazerman and Prior 2). As any text is heterogeneous and contains various disparate elements that are united with help of a guiding idea, it is worthwhile studying the impact of cultural, social, economic influences shaping writing and seeing how the places where the code-switch occurs are the places that indicate shifts in social identities, cultural contacts, economic standings.
James Paul Gee in *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* advances the study of social activities and social identities as the primary center of social theory of domain, which “helps to explain how and why language works the way it does when it is put into action; and [contributes] in terms of understanding and intervention, to important issues and problems in some ‘applied’ area [e.g. education] that interests and motivates the researcher” (Gee 8). Thus, “analyzing the language as it is fully integrated with all the other elements that go into social practice (ways of thinking or feeling, ways of manipulating objects or tools, ways of using non-linguistic symbol systems, etc)” becomes important to the study of classroom discourse (Gee 9).

James Gee accentuates the importance of meaning making processes in language through social practices, and claims that theory of language has to be a theory of practice. The analysis of specific examples of code-switching in Romano’s textbook is part and parcel of the research as it clearly illustrates how the theory can be applied in practice. This practice-oriented method of conducting discourse analysis does not only show the importance of resisting complicity in a world shaped by dominant bodies/ societies, it fosters the attempt to make sense of them and if necessary transform them. Furthermore, the tools of inquiry, “building tasks”, that he develops and illustrates with the help of numerous applications provide a very specific strategy to analyze almost any discursive practice, the thematic codings will used as “building tasks” to examine the process that are taking place in the textbook.

Despite the valuable contribution of discourse analysis tools, the study of code-switching in written texts in monolingual discourses requires a more critical perspective.
The texts are filled with hidden ideologies that often manipulate the readers into thinking, seeing, and feeling a certain way, and more so, in such a subtle manner that readers take the information at face value. Therefore, further study of the field brought me to the research of a British scholar, Norman Fairclough, who specializes in the critical study of language.

The critical language awareness approach offered by Fairclough will be used to identify the impact of power and ideology in relation to self-identity in education in contemporary society. This ideological domain offers an analytical framework for researching language and power relations in politically, ideologically, culturally and socially charged situations; classroom discourse is one of them. It is important to note that in this context the meaning of code-switching expands and integrates the shifts in ideology; these shifts are often crucial in conveying the message of a text. In *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, Norman Fairclough advocates for the use of textual analysis in critical discourse analysis as a method of social research that challenges prescribed ideologies. The investigation of ‘texture’ of the texts, their form and organization, as well as content is very similar to the building tasks of James Gee. Both linguists interpret texts not in the isolation from the discursive situation itself; they approach them from the perspective of socio-cultural as much as linguistic analysis. Because a text is the primary material in this research, textual analysis that focuses on the parts, which might contain confusing ideological standpoints or areas where the writer switches from one ideological front to another, can be demonstrative of the changes in meaning writers unconsciously or consciously impose on the reader.
In order to more effectively analyze what is happening in classroom discourse, specifically what a text means as a communicative event where local, institutional/social and ideological domains intersect, thematic coding will be used to reveal the forms of ideological hegemony (through linguistic strategies) and how these forms are reproduced in the language of the public sphere (Smith and Schryer 123).

**Thematic Coding**

In the following close contrastive analysis of the three main theories I will include specific themes and terms that are the key in examining code-switching in the classroom. The choice of the codes is determined by several factors. First, while reading the books, articles, and other published materials of numerous scholars in the areas of education, critical literacy, discourse analysis, composition, sociolinguistics, grammar, bilingual education, I identified the issues that are most relevant to classroom discourse. Here are some of the main topics: language in multicultural classroom, ELL teacher training, hybrid discourses of teaching, questioning as a discursive practice, role of rhetoric (persuasion, audience, and argument) in the classroom, language policy planning and its impact in the classroom, code-switching (from one language into another), dialogue, genre, standards (Montana, NCTE, European Union), discourse community, ethical pedagogy (that emphasizes social understanding and cooperation), dialects, politics of language, language function (interpersonal, ideational, textual), meta-communication, reader response theory, identity (teacher, student), praxis (reflection and action) etc. Out of this multitude of topics I chose the ones that have direct influence on discursive
practices which take place in the classroom. The first subcategory of themes contains power, ideology and hegemony; second, discourse community, communicative competence; and the last one hybridity. This is not an exhaustive list; however, it encompasses aspects of classroom discourse that I find most problematic and therefore it is given the priority in my research.

**Power**

Any discourse has some properties that could be regarded as having power differential among its members, which could be identified through the choice of vocabulary, metaphors, genres, grammatical conventions, and topic appropriateness (Rex and Green 579). What is problematic is that readers in many cases do not approach a text from a critical standpoint to analyze how writers set up the power dynamics in the text. Members of classroom discourse need to cognizantly examine why writers make certain choices, who has access to these choices, for what purposes and how their decisions are consequential for social naturalization of language and identities. With a focus on code-switching strategies which examine the legitimacy of assigning certain forms of knowledge over others and restricting access to valued knowledge, readers can wield power (Heller 374).

In *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* James Gee illustrates ways in which language choices within the school reveal the processes of symbolic domination that favor professors, and higher ranked school staff. He resorts to the term power “notating status and power differences”, when analyzing the data which
includes people belonging to various social and/or professional standings, and the tension this distinction creates in one particular problematic sample (a history professor interested in having access into a school to gain information for a project) (167). The last situation becomes a problem, because participants of the discursive situation – university professor, curriculum coordinator, school teachers – react “in terms of how status and power do and will function in the project” (81). The adherence to competing and conflicting discourse models shows one way “in which more powerful groups in society, [in this case, university professor], can influence less powerful groups through discourse models (81). Discourse models can be described as theories, unconscious knowledge that a society holds to make sense of texts and the world (71). Thus, Gee examines discourse samples from the perspective of how power shapes experiences normed by the social/cultural group to which the participants belong. He frequently points out how interactions happening in the crossing of the levels, micro (local) and macro (larger levels, e.g. that of institutions) “create complex patterns of institutions and cultures” of which they are a part.

Analyzing two excerpts from a talk by a school teacher (Karen) and a university professor (Sarah), it is clear how both speak different languages, and how the collision of codes they use to interact intensifies misunderstanding, hostility and further alienates members of this group from working productively in a fruitful and safe environment:

“Karen: My mother used to talk about in the 40s, you’d hang around at Union Station and anybody would just pick you up because everybody was going down to dance at Bright City whether you knew them or not”. (179)

“Sarah: Well, actually street, street cars had just come in in this and as I recall um from a student who wrote a paper on this Bright City and Park
was built by the street car company in order to have it a sort of target
destination for people to go to and to symbolically make money off of
this”. (180)

James Gee explains that the lack understanding of the appropriate code during the
meeting was of the reasons that created these competing discourses due to effect of
different power status, histories and other tensions.

The relationship of discourse and power, ideology and hegemony in classroom
interactions and texts is further developed in the 1990s by scholars studying critical
discourse analysis (Rex and Green 579). From these perspectives power can be viewed as
“conceptualized both in terms of asymmetries between participants in discourse events,
and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and
consumed (and hence shape texts) in particular socio-cultural context” (Fairclough 1-2).
The juxtaposition of language codes can illuminate the relationship between institutional
relations of power that exist among a writer and a reader, a teacher and a student.
Understanding the sources that create incommensurability existing among the
participants of discursive situations can shed light on the origins of power, and thus can
help members of discourse to use the appropriate language code that will not collide with
the semiotic system of other members in engaged in the same discourse.

Fairclough extends the definition of power by emphasizing that this category has
two dimensions: first, “making sense of the ordering and dominance relations between
practices” and second, “how people select from amongst available practices on specific
occasions” (Fairclough 12). So, if readers of a written text can consciously see the way
writers construct the ordering and dominance relations with their reader through the use
of certain linguistic code and effective code-switching, then they can have a better control of the situation and not be swayed by the authority of the author. Consequently, members of discourse become entitled, according to the British linguist, to comprehend complex structures of power relations, critically assess them, and then to come to a determination about the most appropriate behavior, speech, actions.

Similar to James Gee’s view, Fairclough ties power to social class and domination, however they differ in the degree of importance each attributes to its value to the problematic nature of language and power in the classroom. The latter investigates the term power from dichotomous perspective, in terms of how equality and inequality shape the exchange of information, which in turn deepens the analysis of origin of power distribution, and the consequences of distinct predetermined conditions in the interactions. Lastly, Fairclough concludes that in:

developed capitalist countries (...) power is predominantly exercised through the generation of consent rather than through coercion, through ideology rather than through physical force, through the inculcation of self-disciplining practices rather than through the breaking of skulls. (Fairclough 219)

Here the scholar looks at the implications of equal/ unequal power distribution in society in general. Having this encompassing interpretation of its influence through various rhetorical, political, periodic enforcement, helps the scholar prove the significance of studying power in a language classroom, because classroom is one of the discourses where “consent is achieved, ideologies are transmitted, and practices, meaning, values and identities are taught and learnt” (Heller 374). Thus, it is clear that individuals use
language choices, and when necessary code-switch to exert, aggravate or mitigate their power and to exercise it in a way that would impose their world view on others.

Ethnographers of communication also acknowledge the communicative influence of power in their studies and incorporate its importance through the analysis of language in context. The communicative patterns represent the “ways with words” (Heath 1983) that characterize a certain member of a discourse community. The inclusion of cultural differences into the study of language contributes to the analysis of code-switching in written discourses by analyzing how specific linguistic devices are representative of a certain cultural behavioral pattern for example, and how these various linguistic means set up the power dimensions in discourse. Saville-Troike, for example, constructs the discussion of power focusing on “power dimensions of politeness and how patterns of language use relate to political factors” (250). She recognizes the growing body of research which adopts different theoretical frameworks to study the issues of power, and adds that her research aims at “the betterment of human condition” (252), in this respect her scholarship is similar to the role Fairclough’s assigns to the linguistic and discursive power of discourse, which is to enable “to develop capacities of people for language critique, including their capacities for reflexive analysis of the educational process itself” (Fairclough 221). Becoming conscious of language use, code choice, through actions and thoughts makes possible the revision and restructuring needed to challenge existing power differentials in discourse.

The term power is studied in ethnography of communication in “sociopolitical contexts within which culturally situated language use takes place” (253). In her
discussion of power in cross-cultural communication, Saville-Troike refers to critical discourse analysis, and compares its findings with the ethnography of communication. The most noticeable difference is in the roots of these studies; CDA examines language through social and political constructs, whereas, ethnographers focus on the nature of language in human communication. The differences that stem from the distinctions in theoretical foundations of both disciplines are important to reflect upon, compare and contrast, because the synthesis of their findings allows juxtaposing economic, cultural, political practices and also connecting social and ideological domains through analysis of codes that are distinctive of each discourse.

According to Saville-Troike three social theories need to be applied to investigate the relations between language and power. The first view is that “power resides in the structures of language itself” (254). This perspective coincides with Fairclough’s accounts on how language shapes and at the same time is shaped by the power and ideological formations. Her second view is that “power is created in the process of communicative interaction” (254). Whereas Saville-Troike offers a dualistic perception that includes the social role participants play in the interaction as well as the discourse processes themselves, Fairclough’s take on the force of agency that drives the interaction is discourse itself (254). Her last view incorporates historical processes of domination and subordination as the place where the locus of responsibility lies (254). All these views are later contrasted to characteristics of CDA taken from Kress (1991), but the only well developed comparisons between the two fields that she establishes are those highlighting the fact that CDA primarily studies texts (in a multimodal meaning) within
the structures of power and domination, while she compares that to the fact that ethnographers put primary emphasis on language as a communicative practice rather than language in social contexts. Working more closely with language Saville-Troike uses linguistics structures as her main tools of inquiry (lexical, morphological structures, active and passive voice, expression of modality etc), which are similar in a way to James Gee’s “building tasks”, but are more language oriented compared to socially oriented devices Gee employs.

Ideology

Another category intrinsically connected and related to the concept of power is ideology. Neither James Gee nor Muriel Saville-Troike extensively analyze the term in their studies, but only briefly mention it referring to power. The focal point of including ideology into the study is to examine the origin of ideologies which are imposed on members of discourse community in such a subtle manner that they are no longer perceived to be imposing, thus the aim is to find ways to “denaturalize” (Fairclough 1995) these dominant ideologies and be cognizant of their affect. In the context of monolingual educational discourses, overt use of codes and code-switching might have a threatening effect (Heller 374). First, this code choice might introduce into official classroom discourse illicit language forms, second, it challenges the very notion of education as a liberating practice.

The term ‘ideology’ coined by Fairclough means to “determine properties of discourse, and how discourse in turn determines social structures” (Fairclough 27). In any
discursive situation one or more ideological formations is/are clearly dominant. However, they are usually so embedded into that particular discourse that they are no longer perceived as having a political (or any other kind of) objective; therefore, the majority of members of a discourse community are unaware of its underpinnings. Including ideology critique into current study will help to more critically analyze code-switching instances in texts and minimize such ‘natural’ effects and “maximize the conditions for judgments of truth” (Fairclough 19).

Clearly, ideology invests language in various ways at various levels. First of all, ideological practices shape the unequal distribution of power, discoursal and pragmatic rights and obligations in classroom discourse (Fairclough 46). Second, ideologies also reside in texts. Even though some disciplines, like History of the Book, examine the ‘archeology of the text’, physical aspects of a book, they cannot provide a full explanation of the ideologies that embed the texts. One reason is that “meanings are produced through interpretations of texts and texts are open to diverse interpretations” (Fairclough 71). Each reader approaches a text with a load of their doctrines, myths, beliefs, and thus they begin interacting with the author(s) of the text. Moreover, ideological processes “appertain to discourses as whole social events, they are processes between people” (71). Lastly, according to Fairclough “language is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology” (73). Consequently, embracing all these facets of ideology thus will help to ‘denaturalize’ opaque ideologies and enable participants of classroom discourse to investigate the language with a more critical lens.
Hegemony

In order to be able to see the influence of hegemonic forces in written texts, ultimately to wield them and to resist them, members of classroom discourse community need to carefully examine the impact of symbolic domination through the choice of language and code-switching techniques used in a text. Discourse analysis of code-switching enables readers to critique the abilities of the author, publisher, editor to maintain control over others by establishing their view of reality and their cultural practices through ascribing social significance to the chosen linguistic and rhetorical codes. Members of classroom discourse should see how hegemony cuts across and integrates economy, politics, power, culture and ideology, yet ascribes a place to each of them within an overall focus upon politics and power, and upon dialectal relations between classes and class fragments (Fairclough 76). As Fairclough points out:

Hegemony is about constructing alliances, and integrating rather than simply dominating subordinate classes, through concessions or though ideological means to win their consent. Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which take economic, political and ideological forms. Hegemonic struggle takes place on a broad front which includes the institutions of civil society (education, trade, union, family), with possible unevenness between different levels and domains. (Fairclough 76)

Analyzing the meaning of hegemony through the lens of code-switching complements and extend the learning processes of those who are members of classroom discourse. The specific cases of code-switching in a written text can show the heterogeneity of multiple codes being presented in a text (Buell 102). Thus, understanding the nature and origin of hegemony can scaffold the analysis of discursive practices in the classroom: if members
of the classroom discourse community reflect upon how leadership or predominant influence of members of discourses in the classroom discourse shape each context and change it, they can reconstruct the whole situation and empower themselves, especially if they turn out to be the least powerful in a given context.

Overall, all three scholars, James Gee, Norman Fairclough and Saville-Troike, have each presented a quite substantial examination of the reciprocity of power and language relations in Discourse; employing the contribution of each scholar to the study of language, specifically in the classroom discourse, will enhance understanding of how power and status are enacting certain roles and identities, how different social and power relations control discourses, how roles of more or less powerful participants are sustaining “discursive practices with particular ideological investments in dominance over other alternative (including oppositional) practices (Fairclough 1-2), and lastly how ways of speaking and behaving, assumed to be ‘natural’ or ‘logical’, are in fact “as culturally unique and conventional as the language code itself” (Saville-Troike 3).

Ultimately, code-switching offers a way to analyze texts that can critique bodies of social, political, institutional doctrine incorporating these tools and ‘naturalizing’ the existing discursive practices.

Discourse Community

Despite the importance of analyzing the role of institutions and social classes, ideologies and power in place, studying their impact on the classroom discourse cannot fully reveal ‘why’ s and ‘how’ s of the language use in this educational context. Similarly,
focusing only on the notions of language and correctness might have the same effect. Here the study of the realities of speech or discourse communities and language-in-use become a mediator; it bridges the gap between the ideological and discursive formation and concepts of textual analysis. Being ‘sandwiched’ by these norms, discourse community is simultaneously affected by both, and is constructed and limited by them at the same time.

Saville-Troike studies expressions such as speech community, discourse community, community of practice in their relation to language. According to her, it is language that serves to create certain identities of people who belong to one of more speech communities. She postulates that individuals who live in big societies become members of several, sometimes even overlapping speech communities. The ‘members of public’, as Fairclough would call them, each time depending on the given moment, and a particular discursive situation orient themselves so that they fit that context. They do so by choosing the set of rules – strategies of communication – that are appropriate to that moment. The presence of these skills implies that each member of a discourse community is inherently equipped with appropriate verbal or kinesthetic means of expression. Thus, she concludes that “it is therefore essential to identify the social categories recognized in a community in order to determine how these are reflected linguistically, and how they define and constrain interpersonal interaction in communicative situations” (Saville-Troike 17). Moreover, understanding the social categories will further help to examine how people code-switch when going from one speech community to another, and how consciously reflecting upon the linguistics, social and ideological shifts that they make,
might help them to create more effective communicative processes each time they take
place.

It is also worthwhile to compare how Saville-Troike establishes differences in
talking about discourse and speech communities, because the analysis of code-switching
in discourse community will be largely influenced by the governing practices in a related
speech community. She defines discourse community as a “group with similar social
characteristics and/or academic or professional orientations, as well as a shared set of
rhetorical norms and conventions” (Saville-Troike 145). This quite contextualized
definition focuses on different styles for particular discursive situations. For example, a
discourse community might focus on different styles “for pedagogical purpose of raising
students’ awareness of effective strategies, or compares usage across genres and
academic disciplines for the purpose of teaching situation-specific appropriateness of
different writing conventions” (Saville-Troike 145). Even though this interpretation is put
into a specific discursive situation, it is clear that it comes from her definition of speech
community itself, in which she emphasizes not only speaking the same language but a
sense of belonging (membership) to the community. She also delves deeply into the
notion of community and states that it essentially should include “some significant
dimension of shared experience”, and for speech community it is the use, value and
interpretation of language” (Saville-Troike 15). Moreover, the linguist claims that speech
communities don’t necessarily have to be homogeneous or geographically contiguous, or
have similar identities, however a certain degree of similarities will depend on “the nature
of bounding features and attitudes concerning their permeability” (Saville-Troike 15-16).
For the purposes of this study, the term discourse community will be used as it best fits the analysis of the classroom discourse.

By looking at the way groups of people think, believe, behave and most importantly express their thoughts using language, linguists can develop a more dynamic understanding of norms of interaction, social roles within these communicative practices, cultural, ideological and other influences. This intermediate concept, discourse community, can be used to study classroom discourse. Identifying boundaries, codes and other elements which are intrinsic aspects of discourse community might preclude ‘denaturalization’ of certain institutional doctrines and provide members of discourse with ways of ‘talking’, ‘seeing’ and challenging certain conventional institutional orders with the help of knowledge about possibilities of language in each particular discursive practice.

**Communicative Competence**

In order for members of discourse to orient themselves in a specific discourse community, more specifically which sets of communicative, social, cultural, ideological rules to follow, they need to reflect upon not only which segment of their linguistic knowledge fits the best the situation, but which interaction skills are the most effective, and thus which aspects of their ‘knowledge about the world’ they need to activate (Saville-Troike 21). This purposeful deliberation upon language choice can therefore reveal the micro-processes of symbolic domination (Heller 374) and inform members of discourse community of the language practices that are conventional in each discursive
situation. These skills can be further developed with the help of the term ‘communicative competence’. According to Saville-Troike:

Communicative competence involves knowing not only the language but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in a given situation. Further, it involves, the social and cultural knowledge speakers are presumed to have which enables them to use and interpret linguistic forms. (Saville-Troike 18)

Communicative competence thus integrates a wide range of knowledge about the language: linguistic knowledge (verbal elements, nonverbal elements, etc), interaction skills (selection and interpretation of appropriate forms, discourse organization and processes, norms of interaction, etc), cultural knowledge (status and power, values and attitudes, etc) (Saville-Troike 20). These features summarize broad features of knowledge that are involved in appropriate communication, but most importantly the ability to choose the most adequate means and intentionality behind the choice in code-switching characterize reflexive learning and teaching processes.

It is necessary to be careful about the meaning of ‘appropriate’ in this context though. The appropriacy of using a certain language code should be examined and not taken for granted. The concept of ‘appropriateness’ in language and communication is critiqued by Norman Fairclough in “The Appropriacy of ‘Appropriateness’”. He argues that:

In no actual speech community do all members always behave in accordance with a shared sense of which language varieties are appropriate for which contexts and purposes. Yet such a perfectly ordered world is set up as an ideal by those who wish to impose their own social order upon society in the realm of language. So, I suggest that appropriateness is an ‘ideological’ category, which is linked to particular partisan positions within a politics of language – within a struggle between social groups in a
speech community for control of (or ‘hegemony’ over) its sociolinguistics order. (Fairclough 233-234)

In this article, Fairclough analyzes the Cox Report on English instruction that has been implemented in Great Britain. He states that judgments about what is appropriate, when and where are made by the groups with certain ideologies which are “projecting imaginary representations of sociolinguistic reality which correspond to the prescriptive and partisan interests of one section of society or one section of a particular institution – its dominant section” (Fairclough 247). This sociolinguistic hegemony focuses on a competence based model in education due to the growing effects of the rapidly colonizing values of ‘enterprise culture’ (Fairclough 240). Thus, he argues that “competence models of language presuppose unacceptable appropriateness models of language” (Fairclough 241). In order to disrupt this misleading conception of “appropriacy of appropriateness” he indicates that members of a discourse community should be taking an active part in the process of distributing the linguistic resources. Furthermore, he postulates that “contestation and struggle are the absolutely fundamental processes out of which speech communities are shaped and transformed” (Fairclough 247).

Translating the results of this research to classroom discourse community and their relevance in conducting discourse analysis of code-switching in written texts members of discourse, teachers and students need to develop their understanding of the issue around it, and talk about different features of their linguistic repertoire, how program structure, curriculum content, various social realities impact the formation of their linguistic competence. Moreover, being aware of the origin of these linguistic
sources will enable them to transform their theoretical knowledge into practical through practical reasoning and exploration of personal linguistic competence.

Thus, Saville-Troike in analyzing the nature and scope of communicative competence recognizes the fact that to be able to function in a Discourse, members need to have “knowledge of rules for appropriate communicative behavior” but not necessarily to produce them (Saville-Troike 20). Norman Fairclough develops the notion of communicative competence and urges readers to be aware of what is ‘appropriate’ and what is ‘judged to be appropriate’ by particular groups. He does not fully contest the place of ‘appropriateness’ in the English classroom, but he encourages readers to develop their linguistic, communicative competences by assessing what is assumed to be appropriate, evaluating it in terms of social genesis and social function, by being informed by estimates of the possibilities, risks and costs of going against dominant judgments of appropriate usage. Thus, if learners “have a picture of dominant judgments of when Standard English is appropriate, but also of how widely such judgments are shared and followed in practice”, then they can contribute through their own practice (linguistic and communicative competence) to the shaping and reshaping of the sociolinguistic order – reproducing or transforming it (Fairclough 251).

Hybridity

The last subcategory I examine in this thesis, deals with issues pertinent to discourse community and analysis of multimodal texts, hybridity. The analysis of hybridity in conducting discourse analysis of code-switching is based on the notion of the
heterogeneity of texts, and intertextuality that is involved in creating and examining them. The hybridity of codes presented in a text can be studied through code identifications, motivations, and interpretations across texts (Buell 104). The shifts across language codes might occur due to cross-cultural communication differences, ideological shifts, rhetorical accents on certain parts of the text.

Hybridity can be studied through various perspectives, for example, hybrid discourses of teaching and learning, hybrid discursive practices/activities in the classroom, hybrid texts used in classrooms. Because theoretical framework suggested in this thesis is in the third chapter applied to a textbook, I will focus primarily on theory that appertains to textual analysis of hybridity. However, as any text is a product of its cultural milieu, the analysis will still touch upon some of the bigger social applications of hybridity as well.

The notion of hybridity in James Gees *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* largely emphasizes the unstable qualities of Discourses and discourses in various contexts: “there are limitless discourses and no way to count them, both new ones, even quite non-grand ones, can always emerge because boundaries are always contestable” (Gee 31). The scholar introduces a term “borderline discourses” that is a mixture of various discursive practices with some emergent properties of its own (Gee 31). He also claims that in some cases “weaving strands of your multiple discourses together” can result in the creation of a single discourse “whose hybridity may ultimately be forgotten” (Gee 30). Thus, conducting discourse analysis of code-switching it is important to consider the motives for and contexts of such shifts in discourse (Buell 104).
And as he explains the relevance of this hybridity to a bigger social structure, he claims that

The point is not how we ‘count’ Discourses; the point is the performance, negotiation, and recognition work that goes into creating, sustaining, and transforming them, and the role language (always with other things) in this process. (Gee 30)

Therefore, it is necessary to not only acknowledge the presence of hybridity, but also to ponder over its sources of creation, sustenance, constant flux, and the mutual impact of other forces that shape and are shaped by hybridity.

Norman Fairclough’s usage of hybridity is located in the realms of its relevance to the textual/ intertextual analysis. In the chapter on “Discourse and socio-cultural change” British linguist conducts discourse analysis of several advertising articles. In the section called “Marketization of Public Discourse” he illustrates “the generation of new hybrid, partly promotional genres” of advertisement. He states that “sample 1 [Make an Impact on the Next Generation] is interdiscursively complex, articulating together a variety of genres and discourses, including elements of advertising and other promotional genres” (Fairclough 142). In order to do a more close analysis of the text he applies to textual analysis strategies introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Fairclough uses their interpretation of the ‘texture’ – the form or organization of texts – and adds the importance of the content as a category intrinsically connected to the form (Fairclough 188). It is possible to state that the analysis of hybridity (hybrid genres, hybrid discourses) covers

Not only the traditional levels of analysis within linguistics (phonology, grammar up to the level of the sentence, and vocabulary and semantics) but also analysis of textual organization above the sentence, including
intersentential cohesion and various aspects of the structure of texts which have been investigated by discourse analysts and conversation analysts (including properties of dialogue such as the organization of turn-taking). (Fairclough 188)

The connections he makes with the content, form, and other social and historical resources that shape the texts are proving that texts may be and often are linguistically ‘heterogeneous’ – “made up of elements that have varying and sometimes contradictory stylistic and semantic values” (Fairclough 189). These distinct semantic, stylistic, grammatical and lexical values mediate the connection between language and social context, and prove that “plurality of genres, discourses or narratives” (Fairclough 188) is “the drive belts from history of society to the history of language (Bakhtin 1986: 65).

Hybridity on different levels, being a complex, overlapping and constantly fluctuating notion can be better understood with the help of analyzing different language codes and ways of speaking available to members of Discourses. Through studying the communicative repertoire of a member of a discourse community it is possible to better understand why a certain variety, dialect, style or code is chosen in a given situation and how social, ideological, discursive and communicative constraints determine the choice made in each interaction.
Application of Theoretical Framework

Due to the nature of the subject matter, which is studying and reflecting upon language as a social practice, the primary focus of the thesis is a text and the use of language in monolingual discursive situations. Three theoretical foundations, discourse analysis, critical language awareness and ethnography of communication, represent dichotomous study of the language-in-use: ‘top-down’ (critical discourse analysis) and ‘bottom up’ (ethnomethodology) (Rogers et al 376). Specific emphasis is laid on clearly illustrating how these theories work on micro and macro level of analysis of classroom discourse.

To demonstrate how the proposed theoretical framework of thematic coding works in an educational context, Tom Romano Crafting Authentic Voice will be used as a sample of a text under study. The choice of a text was arbitrary and deliberate at the same time. On the one hand, it was one out of very many books used in English writing classroom to improve students’ writing skills, the choice was intentionally accidental – I wanted to examine a text and show that the suggested theory does not cater to specific features of any text, and is applicable to any textbook. I chose this textbook, because there is not enough research done on identifying unintended and deliberate “consequences of educational decisions, policies, and social practices” made in textbooks (Rogers et al 383). Doing discourse analysis of code-switching can turn the attention of the readers to “instances where discourse appears to lead systematically to the
redistribution of wealth and power” (qtd. in Rogers et al 383) and therefore this textbook is a sample, which aims at showing the implications of effective educational decisions in teaching writing, and thus empower students and teachers with the help of the power of their voices in print.

The aim is to make a conscious decision about the parts of the text to be analyzed and to specify what linguistic, discursive, social practices accompany which set of function in the text. As a part of a reflexive process of conducting research, I would make a conscious intention to make every step of the description, interpretation and analysis of the text visible “as a part of the discourse investigation” (qtd. in Rogers et al 381). Despite my attempt to outline most of the analytic decisions quite clearly and accurately, it is essential to admit that it is not possible “for scholars who do critical work to separate their research from their political positions” (qtd. in Rogers 387), in this case from my philosophy of teaching, which is teaching for social justice which will determine the choice of excerpts that I will analyze.

**Linguistic Choices Made in the Textbook**

Before embarking onto very specific analysis of certain linguistic features of the textbook, it is worthwhile looking at the intentional psychological, social, ideological, cultural determinants of language choices made in this book. It is clear that the author contains a vast amount of knowledge about the content – writing, developing voice in expository writing – however the way he applies this knowledge in the actual teachable moment, demonstrates that Tom Romano’s competence and performance are on par with
the goals set up for the book, to show students and teachers how to craft authentic voices. He understands explicitly how language works and what effects it can produce on the reader, but he also acknowledges the importance of students’ understanding of how to make language work in each *writing situation*. Hudson argues, that not only teachers need to ponder over the value of linguistic competence, but also use this internalized knowledge and inculcate it in their students, Hudson claims that students “should be taught ‘knowledge about language’ [KAL] and that they need it for different reasons in different subject areas” (Hudson 55). This notion of KAL can be easily applied to Romano’s methodology who consciously guides the reader through important steps in learning to achieve authentic voices. He first, sets up the foundation of his understanding of what writing with voice means, and expands it throughout the book, then he distinctly explains the choices made and the reasons why, gives the readers tools to understand the most relevant facts, principles, devices necessary in developing the voice, and lastly enables them to extend the functional potential of their language.

Another deliberate choice made by Romano is his language code, choice of genre, register, tone, vocabulary and other language means. He states, “I’ve sought to write this book in a voice that keeps you with me until the final word, which matters as much as the first word and all the words in between” (Romano 9). In this book, he tries to bring together all manifestations of different varieties of language drawn from the same stock – pop culture, society – languages familiar to the readers. The theory of Language Across the Curriculum supports this approach to teaching, it “considers students’ language, especially their informal talk and writing, as the key learning resource in the classroom”
Similarly, Romano’s choice as a teacher is shaped and determined by his target audience due to the author’s attempt to embrace all aspects of students learning process and facilitate the acquisition of new knowledge by using certain discourse features. One advantage of this kind of “language as area of inquiry is that vast amounts of data are easily available either by introspection or observation”, so readers can easily formulate their hypothesis about the meaning of the text, develop their skills and enrich their language systems (Hudson 58). Furthermore, this code choice makes the book accessible to a wide range of audience, from novice, inexperienced writers to teachers of writing, the former can connect to the content faster and can explore their own thought/ writing processes, whereas the latter through a detailed classification and explanation develop their teaching practices by modeling the author of the book.

Despite all the benefits of adjusting the linguistic code to the audience, there are a few areas that remain not fully described. Theories of linguistic anthropology that “studies how signs communicate referential and relational messages as they are used in social and cultural contexts”, would pinpoint four other aspects of language use need to be taken into account to understand how linguistic signs have meaning in practice – these are form, use, ideology, and domain (Wortham 84). The use of certain words or other language features reduces the linguistic repertoire of the text and thus diminishes the number of possible interpretations. Moreover, as one of the main aims of the text does not include developing reasoning via language or “drawing on and reformulating widely circulating stereotypes”, more complex phenomena like power, ideology, hybridity, reflexivity remain mostly untouched (Wortham 88). The choice of some effective verbs
and adjectives illustrates however, that Romano is using grammatical categories to advance readers’ skills in their emerging written voices. But as most critical discourse theorists would state Romano’s decision attends more to the creative potential of language in use, rather than focusing on the power relations bound up with language and education.

Thus, the linguistic choices Tom Romano makes in his textbook “draw on models of linguistic forms and [the readership] that typically uses them” (Wortham 91). Out of an array of options this model becomes salient for a reason; it implicitly reveals a body of knowledge about author’s ideology, background and other salient feature of him as a teacher, writer, citizen, human being. The discourse analysis of several features of the text will aim at describing these linguistic options, why they became salient in the book, and attempt to hypothesize possible interpretations of these codes by the readers.

Power

“The power of their voices” (Romano 7), “the power and pleasure of revision” (Romano 8), “the power of topic choice” (Romano 27), “the power of narrative” (Romano 31), “the power of literature” (Romano 30), “power of their voices” (Romano 90) – these are several examples when Tom Romano is using the word power in the book. Close examination of the discourse model employed in the textbook reveals that Romano expects the readers to bring to the text their own understanding of this complex term, because in no place he gives a detailed definition of its meaning or uses it by itself (without modifying another word, like voice, revision, narrative etc). So, each reader is
induced to use their unconscious knowledge of what society holds to make sense of the
word ‘power’ and how they themselves construct its meaning. This way of incorporating
power into the narrative bears resemblance to Gee’s use of it, which is very
contextualized and is mainly determined by the readers’ perception and comprehension
of it. For example, in the chapter “generative power of parallel language structures”
(Romano 117), the author explicates what he means by that through the example of a
teacher who empowered students by teaching her students generative language patterns.
In particular, “she inspired her students to write letters of protest to whomever they
wished” (Romano 117). Romano states that using this technique starts by teaching
rhythm and repetition, which enable students to “begin, sustain and perpetuate thought”
(Romano 117), it further helps writers “to say more and discover meaning” (Romano
117). However, it seems that it is not so much the “power of generative parallel
structures” that inspires students to express their voices, but the subject matter and the
target audience. The students from the example the author brings up were asked to write
to the president of the USA, congressmen, celebrities, local businesses. Moreover, they
had to actually send the letters and see the outcome. Students had a specific audience in
mind writing about certain problems that they can relate in order to make a difference;
consequently, it was not only the grammatical/ stylistic features of their writing that
empowered students but the social and political context as well. But Romano’s text does
contain and explain all the nuances of how power differential shapes students’
experiences, or how the asymmetries between participants of that discursive situation
(students, their teacher, the addressee, ultimately principal etc) influenced the distribution
of power, and how by empowering students to voice their opinions the teacher urged them to disrupt the way the texts are produced, distributed, and consumed (Fairclough 1-2).

The simplification of the term power in Romano’s textbook leads to the lack of attention to two dimensions of power: making sense of why the discourse they belong to is ordered a certain way, and how they selected from “amongst available practices” and what determined their choice(s) (Fairclough 12). On the one hand, this to a certain degree subversive use of power, the students came to possess, is exercised through consent rather than through coercion. Students consciously realized that they could transmit their practices, values, identities that were learnt in the classroom to make a difference. On the other hand, as Romano’s book does not include the importance of “developing capacities of language critique, including their capacities for reflexive analysis of the educational process itself” (Fairclough 221). It is not clear from the chapter, if students were reflecting upon the consequences of their work, pondering over the impact of teaching on their thinking processes, and assessing how much of what they did was shaped by socially situated, culturally and politically charged language instruction. Clearly, they grasped the idea that “power resides in the structure of language itself”, “the power is created in the power of communicative interaction” (Saville-Troike 254); however, one wonders if they were critical of the very discourse processes that took place in class and whether they were cognizant of how their own ideologies, and the beliefs of the peers changed the dynamics of the power distribution.
There are many other instances where Romano refers to power: “the sound of people talking can be powerful” (95), “the tension in writing is a powerful draw. Tension piques my interest in life and in writing” (208), “I want them [students] to remember me as a teacher who created a classroom in which they were empowered to speak defiantly on the page” (76), “By their attention to the voices of others, by their respect for them, their inclusion of them in writing, Lisa and Amanda increase the power, presence, and democratic stance of their own voices” (Romano 98). But in no place the term is analyzed beyond the “sociopolitical context within which culturally situated language use [a reference to power] takes place” (Saville-Troike 253). The fact that the writer intentionally avoids the investigation of relations among language, crafting voice and power seem to weaken his argument, because relations among the meanings of signs in use (linguistic code), social structures, and socially and politically circulating ideologies all are necessary to “develop students’ knowledge of the self and the social world, and the ways in which these are historically constructed in the context of frequently inequitable relations of power” (McKinney and Norton 192).

Ideology

As I mentioned in the second chapter, the main goal of introducing this term to the analysis of the texts is to “denaturalize”, to examine various ideological and discursive formations and determine which one(s) are dominant and why they are no longer perceived so (Fairclough 19). As Wortham mentions, “any account of the social meanings of language use must describe such models and explain how they become
salient in practice, as configurations of indexical signs come to mutually presuppose one model as relevant” (Wortham 91). The linguistic, social and ideological background of the writer influences particular use of certain linguistic codes. “Language ideology” has therefore become an important concept, as it is capable of promoting, controlling, developing, encouraging or discouraging, and contributing to more conscious and conscientious identification and continued specification of the multiple ways language abilities are put into practice.

In Crafting Authentic Voices Romano adopts a certain identity, the one that he defines as “I am a writer but I am not a writer first. I am a teacher first (…) and I am ever a student” (Romano 7, 9). By drawing attention to the “naturalizing effects’ of his ideology stemming from this peculiar background, readers can develop a set of grammatical and other categories which will help to not only uncover the social identity of the author, but also see how the author’s ideology is shaping their social trajectory.

In the introductory chapter, “Reasons to Read”, Romano briefly elaborates on the origin of the voice:

Voice does not arise from nothing. It’s influenced by much. Our voices are shaped by the places where we learned language – in our parents’ arms, at our school desks, in the neighborhood, on playgrounds and streets. In my case, my dad’s barroom and bowling alleys had me experimenting with spicy vocabulary by third grade. People we play, work, and socialize with influence our voices. (Romano 6)

Romano begins with social and other practices that shape the voices of writers. By pinpointing inseparability of language and culture Romano foregrounds the importance of having a unique identity in the discourse of language and literacy education, which “locates them in the social, historical, political, and cultural contexts in which learning
takes place and explores how learners negotiate and sometimes resist diverse positions those contexts offer them” (McKinney and Norton 192). There is a clear recognition that introducing the notion of identity in the talk about ideologies leads to language learners’ much more sophisticated understanding of the texts and their reactions to them. Consequently, Romano addresses the diversity or difference sources shaping identities – home, friends, work etc, and implies that these multiple levels are not static, but intersect, and will differ according to subjects and specific contexts. However, a careful examination shows that despite the attempt to embrace the concept of multiple identities in his theory, in practice Tom Romano imposes his own versions of which identity categories are salient. The deliberate inclusion of “dad’s barroom and bowling alleys” (6) in his own definition of identity reveals his attempt to include a wider audience into the discussion about writing, therefore his tone is more casual and less academic.

Having established his own identity and setting up the ground to help build readers’ identities through voice, Romano moves on to analyzing how students’ writing reflects ideologies surrounding their daily lives. In the chapter “Appeal of Narrative” the author mentions the significance of the narrative style of writing, “through telling stories I experience the power of my voice and come to understand what the stories mean” (Romano 29). He demonstrates how mastering narrative can help students better understand the discourses they belong to and find ways to confront the existing ideologies, and social stereotypes. For instance, Romano explains that “when students come to Oxford from regional campuses to finish their degrees, they frequently feel that they don’t fit in” (Romano 29). He further mentions a student who shares with his
feelings about “the climate for diversity” on their campus: “my lowest moment came when I was talking to some of my Oxford friends, and someone I’d known from Middletown [regional campus] was waving and shouting my name from across campus (...) I acted as though I didn’t hear him” (Romano 29). However, besides briefly touching on the pressure, the tension of the situation Romano does not give a more insightful and critical analysis of why that is happening and how he can empower his students to start challenging the dominant ideologies that marginalize regional students. What would critical discourse analysts attempt to do in those circumstances is to create “a conducive practice to open a dialogue and learning” by acknowledging the diversity in classroom discourse, by having students share the experiences and by introducing possible resolutions to the issue (McKinney and Norton 201). One of the tenets of critical pedagogies is

Responding sensitively to (cultural) difference while at the same time addressing issues of social inequality; attempting to give learners access to dominant or privileged ways of knowing and doing; while at the same time validating learner’s own knowledge and lived experience. (McKinney and Norton 201)

If one of Romano’s goals is to help readers experience the power of their voices, then giving an account of why social inequalities exist and how they are constructed, but still valuing the authentic background knowledge of more marginalized, alienated groups of people might denaturalize dominant ideologies and thus, reassert their rights of citizenship, and “naturalization”. Romano does achieve success in acknowledging the problem, by “using multimodality to provide learners with creative opportunities for meaning making” (McKinney and Norton 201) with the help of various strategies to
develop voice through some literary, grammatical, stylistic devices. Moreover, Romano takes assessment practices seriously and proposes to learn to use the words and language as fundamental expressions of external and internal realities including linguistic and non-linguistic factors into account. Despite the fact that the textbook does not provide a full explanation of how ideologies are embedded in discursive practices and in the text, *Crafting Authentic Voices* still offers a multidimensional approach to teaching voice, which incorporates the idea that ideological processes appertain to discourses as whole social events and as a processes between people (Fairclough 71).

**Hegemony**

The inclusion of hegemony into the examination of the textbook serves unique goals of teaching with modes of practice particular to the ideology of the institutions involved (Lo Bianco 120). In the chapter “Who Said That” (121) Romano is encouraging his readers to craft their own voices, voices that are not influenced by outside sources; to connect with the reader he starts reflecting upon his own voice:

In writing, just as in everyday life, there are many voices in my head. Not all the voices are uniquely mine. I hear the world influencing me to think what is important. I hear my family pressuring me what to do and to think. I hear my friends thinking about me. And then there are my voices. I have a selfish voice and an unselfish voice. I have a worried voice and a peaceful voice. I have a fearful voice and a hopeful voice. I trust my voices, but not all of the time. I am starting more and more to not trust my voice of the world. What the world thinks is important, I do not. I listen to my family, but I am starting to hear my voice as separate from theirs. (Romano 121)
The question of “Whose voice do I write with” (121) becomes central in this chapter, and it is implicated in the discourse of modern day societies, in the ways social, political, cultural institutions “continually legitimate constructions of Self and Other” (Shin and Kubota 215). More specifically, at the level of classroom discourse these ideological apparatus create new norms and differences, define acceptable standards imposing them on the students and teachers, thus manipulating members of classroom discourse into ways of learning, knowing and being in the academia. What Romano suggests is the existence of multiple voices in the world, some voices are more authoritative, some more intimate, others are alien, but they all in one way or another have an impact on each person’s identity and construction of voice. Romano concludes that with the emerging discourses of colonialism, globalization the boundaries between hegemonic forces become more and more blurred; therefore it becomes more difficult to decode how dominant influences exercise power over less powerful entities. Therefore, he recommends developing own authentic voices with the help of several strategies. First of all, he emphasizes that “Teachers can heighten students’ awareness of sensibility by talking about the perceptions and surprises embedded in the texts of authors they are reading. And all of us then can practice noticing, connecting, and looking closely. By writing with detail we perceive even more about our topic” (Romano 34). Capturing multiple meanings in the texts and critically analyzing various textual levels can raise students’ awareness of the affects of hegemony. Macken-Horarick and Adoniu argue that students “need ‘ways in’ to the textual environment if they are to manage it effectively
and ways of tackling textual demands of particular disciplines within the social environment” (380).

From the ability to ‘read’ the textual world Romano encourages the readers to start developing their own positions, free from ideologies of the books, teachers, and fellow students. However, before developing an understanding about metalanguage, the writer acknowledges the importance of learning from other people’s experiences: “Students must learn to weave other voices into their own texts: the voices of other writers and researchers from previously publishes sources, the voices of others from interviews, conversations, and observations” (Romano 92). This will set up the foundation for “moving across the expanding range of texts and modes” and enable readers to “make use of tools that highlight commonalities across apparently unlike texts and tools that unearth the unique qualities of texts in their particularity” (Macken-Horarick and Adoniu 380). As readers learn to look at the world from the perspective that encompasses the other and the self they will feel more empowered and brave to express their opinions. More so, Romano encourages readers to be courageous and “Tell truths from where you are right now – big truths, intellectual truths, emotional truths – your truths all” (Romano 49). Thus, understanding the semiotics of the worlds around them, linguistic, textual, social, political will enable students to more critically look at the hegemonic forces around them and find ways to confront them.
Discourse Community

In the second chapter “Qualities of Voice” Romano refers to what Gee, Fairclough and Saville-Troike have called discourse/ speech community. In order to give a detailed explanation of the values of information, narrative, perception, surprise, humor in crafting authentic voice, he introduces the term “classroom culture” that the teacher can intentionally establish with student, thus create a fruitful environment to help students master all the five necessary skills to achieve high quality writing. Classroom discourse from critical language awareness perspective focuses on how everyday life in classrooms is constituted in and through the linguistic and discourse choices of participants; how language brought to and constructed in classrooms is consequential of social and academic knowledge construction; and how language use shapes and is shaped by processes, practices, and content demands of the curriculum. (Rex and Green 571)

Romano urges his readers to choose relevant information to “make writing assignments flexible so that students can make them their own and bring both personal and formal education together” (Romano 28). Because modern national educational system and their curricular are more keenly responsive to the cultural conditions of the wider institutional environment rather than specific local conditions (Cha and Ham 325), it is reasonable for Romano to include more student oriented topics for writing and developing authentic voice, since then, linguistic repertoire of each particular class may more effectively capture multiple meanings of surrounding realities and thus become enthusiastic about the content of their writing. Interestingly, Romano suggests that such categories as surprise, perception and humor, which according to ethnographic work might also be
considered components of a discourse community on the same level as settings, participants, goals, topics and so forth (Hymes): “I can’t emphasize enough the crucial role that surprise and specific use of language play in sharpening our perception, which in turn makes our voices more interesting” (Romano 36).

Despite mapping out versatile strategies and examples for crafting authentic voices, Romano’s textbook does not explicitly dwell on the circulation of the resources within various discourse communities. Ethnographers of communication, and Saville-Troike among them, argue for the inclusion of ‘overlapping speech communities’ into the research on classroom discourse (Saville-Troike 17), and Shin and Kubota extend her postulation and add that

Global circulation of linguistic resources has created new identity options performed through language. Furthermore, from this perspective, it is more meaningful to view language learning as a process of building a linguistic repertoire, rather than acquisition of target forms, and to pay attention to how students draw on different kinds of linguistic resources available to them to move between multiple communities where they belong in the current global context. (325)

If Romano more specifically addressed the significance of code-switching in writing, and explained how shifting among the linguistic devices, used to create an authentic voice, contributes to students’ fuller understanding of the power of writing, then the latter would feel cognizant about the multitude of options available in each discursive situation. For instance, they could more productively build their linguistic repertoire, understanding which community it comes from and its context; moreover, as they master vocabulary and learn certain grammatical features that appertain to a particular context, they could more skillfully target their writing towards the audience, and the last, but not the least
advantage of code-switching, is the better comprehension of the world around them as students keep developing their skills in thinking critically, expanding their knowledge by firsthand experience, synthesizing information and making conclusions. What is most striking about the inclusion of studying a discourse community and its members is the interconnection of all its elements and continual growth of all its constituents that happen simultaneously, thus developing students’ knowledge in using language to achieve their goals, produce new knowledge and transform realities that do not serve their social purposes.

Communicative Competence

In Crafting Authentic Voices Tom Romano often illustrates the strategies for improving students’ writing not only using his students’ examples, but also personal stories. One of the experiences the author shares pinpoints the teachers’ necessity for understanding the role of being cognizant of their own communicative competence and the general and contextualized competence of the students in each discursive situation. The lack of understanding the dynamics of the situation can cause many problems and alienate students as well as emotionally and psychologically wound them. In the chapter “How voice is lost” Romano shares in the sorrow at the loss of his father when he was a freshman in high school and was promoted to the adult Sunday school. The teachers and students knew about this tragedy: “I just knew that whenever people saw me enter a room, they thought immediately of my fatherless state” (Romano 54). His Sunday school teacher in the attempt to get Tom involved asked him to read aloud the pious little weekly
lesson. The effect was the opposite, Romano felt as if he was put on the spot, and the fact that “audience did (him) in” augmented his self-consciousness and made him quit Sunday school.

This examples shows that “classroom discourse practices are socio-cognitive and behavioral undertakings” and Romano’s Sunday school teacher was clearly not aware of the fact that content, in this case a lesson plan, involves not only what students hear, see or say in class, but also “what their teacher knows and understands about what is being presented”, under what circumstances and what the possible ramifications are (Bailey et al 611). This teacher lacks what Bailey calls “thinking and acting linguistically” in order to more effectively engage with language as a part of teaching and learning (Bailey et al 608).

Romano’s pedagogy of teaching incorporates the communicative competence which Bailey calls ‘teaching linguistically’. Tom Romano ‘thinks aloud’ and in his books clearly demonstrates that he understands language as integral element in the content he teaches, he moreover values his students’ socio-cultural and educational background and encourages their active involvement in the meaning making process (Bailey et al 611):

Through every step of my writing process, I talked about what I was thinking and why I was doing what I was doing. These children saw what my hand was writing; my talk let them see my thinking. They saw and heard me use information I had brainstormed and planned. They also saw and heard me discover surprises, think of new details, incorporate their participation into my thinking, and change direction in the writing. (Romano 45)

The ‘incorporation of their participation into my thinking’ signals that Romano consciously uses concepts of certain genres and classroom pragmatics to design lessons
and is adamant about making his communicative competence transparent for several reasons. First of all, when students understand and can critically interpret the content, they become engaged in the class and connected to the topic. Second, they see how their active participation has a direct impact on the lesson plan and makes a contribution. Lastly, Romano induces them to see that language plays a mediating role in constructing knowledge and thus his communicative competence in knowing how to use language in order to participate in effective classroom instruction and learning can expand students’ communicative competence to express their thoughts and thus learn from them.

When looking at the bigger picture of the importance of communicative competence in classroom discourse, Spolsky identifies that “whatever else the goals of a school system, there must be a first one: to make it possible for all children to function effectively in the domain of school. Unless the language barriers to education are overcome, a large portion of the world’s population is denied full access to education” (Spolsky 16). In this respect, even though Tom Romano is teaching linguistically, and planning curricular activities “to provide optimal access to concept development and curricular content”, he ignores the value of understanding grammatical features as a means of structuring different genres or types of texts in order to achieve various social purposes (Bailey et al 615). He encourages students and teachers to experiment with rule breaking, and even recommends ‘productive, purposeful rule breaking’. Moreover, he quotes other readers’ responses on grammar; for example there is a quote by Nasdijj from The Blood Runs Like a River Through My Dreams “I know nothing about the technical stuff or where to put a comma. What I know about writing goes beyond where to put your
comma. What I know about writing has to do with where you put your heart” (qtd. in Romano). It comes across that his communicative competence is rooted in his background and beliefs as well as his knowledge gained through professional training that most probably did not focus on the importance of grammar knowledge and discourse analysis in general. One of the goals for this research to demonstrate the teachers and students the possibilities of a more meaningful interaction with the text by understanding the structural composition of the language and the opportunities it can offer if used knowledgeably.

Hybridity

Romano explores the notion of hybridity on different levels. The most obvious is the textual hybridity of genres, styles, narratives, registers etc. Everything he does in the book to illustrate how to craft authentic voices is in one way or another tied to heterogeneous sources or elements of incongruous kinds. The writer experiments with blending different genres together, creates multi-genre narratives, and frequently altering styles even within one and the same piece. All these choices are intentional and they, according to Gee’s theory, by being weaved together create a single hybrid discourse. Even though the discourse of the book is being molded by distinct genres, they are not multiple in their congruence, but interrelated with the help of the common themes, therefore the overall discourse of the textbook is perceived as one whole narrative with its hybrid components rather than a conglomeration of autonomous texts.
Heterogeneous aspect of the book is also revealed on the level of content, form and social analysis. Discourse analysis of the ‘texture’ of some excerpts demonstrates that the last two aspects influence the content at time adding contradictory stylistic and semantic values (Fairclough 189). When Romano analyses the significance of the topic choice, he enumerates several genres which having high stakes make the voice of the writer more interesting and compelling: “That letter to keep the girlfriend. A proposal to gain a spot at a professional conference. A personal statement of my professional accomplishments that accompanies my vita and was read by Promotion and Tenure Committee members. My dissertation. A eulogy for my mother. A letter of recommendation for a former student” (Romano 25).

Analyzing the places where the genres shift, blend or alter can tell the reader about the purpose of these code switches and their affect. With the help of language means Romano creates a certain discourse that impels the reader into thinking a certain way, perceiving the content in a particular manner, and reading the book the way the author deliberately or unintentionally wants it to be read. As analyzed above making certain linguistic choices (the choice of vocabulary), rhetorical choices (the shifts in modality, from declarative sentences to command for example), and using certain public code (avoiding delving into politically/ culturally/ economically charged issues) the ideology of the author is transmitted through the hybridity of his voices, thematic selection, organization etc.
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