Impacts of Positioning, Power, and Resistance on EFL Learners' Identity Construction through Classroom Interaction: A Perspective from Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis

Wenwen Tian
King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, wenwen.tian@mail.kmutt.ac.th

Remart Padua Dumlao
Muban Chombueng Rajabhat University, dumlaoremart25@gmail.com

Impacts of Positioning, Power, and Resistance on EFL Learners' Identity Construction through Classroom Interaction: A Perspective from Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis

Abstract

In this study, we explored how positioning, power, and resistance might have possible impacts on learners' identity construction. We conducted this study in a 6-month language and culture program from August 2018 to January 2019 involving one teacher and 24 English major undergraduate students at a public university in Thailand. Using Kumaravadivelu's (1999) Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) as an analytical framework and Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach to analysing data , we found three themes that illustrate how participants demonstrated positioning, power, and resistance: (a) learners' choice of code as passive resistance, (b) circulating power in interaction and struggles of power, and (c) multiple positioning in classroom interactions. The findings suggest classroom context serves as a learning space to shape the contours of learners' identity positioning and dynamics of power negotiation. This study contributes to the growing research on language learners' identity in classroom interactions from a CCDA perspective. It suggests that EFL teaching should incorporate learner identity as an explicit goal that serves as an interpretive frame for learners' on-going academic growth as English users within and beyond classroom contexts.

Keywords

Learner Identity Construction, Positioning, Resistance, Power, Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA), Thematic Analysis

Creative Commons License

Acknowledgements

Impacts of Positioning, Power, and Resistance on EFL Learners' Identity Construction through Classroom Interaction: A Perspective from Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis

Wenwen Tian
King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand

Remart Padua Dumlao
Muban Chombueng Rajabhat University, Ratchaburi, Thailand

In this study, we explored how positioning, power, and resistance might have possible impacts on learners' identity construction. We conducted this study in a 6-month language and culture program from August 2018 to January 2019 involving one teacher and 24 English major undergraduate students at a public university in Thailand. Using Kumaravadivelu's (1999) Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) as an analytical framework and Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach to analysing data , we found three themes that illustrate how participants demonstrated positioning, power, and resistance: (a) learners' choice of code as passive resistance, (b) circulating power in interaction and struggles of power, and (c) multiple positioning in classroom interactions. The findings suggest classroom context serves as a learning space to shape the contours of learners' identity positioning and dynamics of power negotiation. This study contributes to the growing research on language learners' identity in classroom interactions from a CCDA perspective. It suggests that EFL teaching should incorporate learner identity as an explicit goal that serves as an interpretive frame for learners' on-going academic growth as English users within and beyond classroom contexts. Keywords: Learner Identity Construction, Positioning, Resistance, Power, Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA), Thematic Analysis

Introduction

Earlier work in the broader literature of learner education has emphasized the crucial role of learners' identity, not only the view of learners' learning and growth, but also in enacting their knowledge, positioning, resistance, and power in the classroom (Crystal, 2013; Kramsch, 2014; Tong & Cheung, 2011). In this view, the learner acknowledges the essence of how knowing a different language implies their "understanding" and "knowing different cultural perspectives" (Chiesa et al., 2012, p. 134). Gómez Lobatón (2012) highlighted that there is no doubt that "English has become not only the language to learn, but also, the language to use" (p.61), and "language to communicate with other cultures" (Crystal, 2012, p. 12). In order to understand how the classroom interaction helps EFL learners to construct their identity, we shall look at different lines or elements that certainly compose the dynamics of not only a language occurring within the classroom (Early & Norto, 2012), but also the dynamics of life itself in the "teaching and learning interaction" (Baker, 2014, p. 141). Given the fact that non-native English speaker (NNES) dichotomy in language learning has been subjected to massive research, there is still an increasing concern about understanding identity construction processes among NNES while learning the language. Norton (2001) argued that English not only influences learners' views of who they want to become, who they are in certain social

configurations, and their desires to belong to imagined communities, but also construct the learners' identities in a dynamic learning community (Wenger, 1998) and shapes power relations among them.

Learning a foreign language and culture is a dynamic process and it is not easy, particularly in non-native learning and teaching contexts. In Thailand, English was introduced and is still used as a foreign language. This means English is not used as a medium of instruction, rather an additional language in instruction when it comes to teaching English in Thailand. Thailand's new constitution, adopted in 1997, has established the National Education Act with the most radical education reform. The Act urges both teachers and learners to not only learn and use English in classroom contexts, but also strive to gain a positive attitude to appreciate the English language and its culture and use English for lifelong learning. However, the promotion of using English widely in Thai schools and universities has been more sluggish than that of its neighbouring countries (Wiriyachitra, 2002). As Wiriyachitra noted, the Thais are proud that they have never been colonized and Thailand has always been a country with one official language which helps to ensure the concept of national stability. For Thai learners, the controversies are, they wish they could speak English fluently. But most of them think that English is too challenging for them because of interference from their mother tongue (Thai), lack of opportunity to use English in their daily lives, being passive learners, and being too shy to speak English with their classmates. As a result, it is worth investigating the phenomenon regarding learners' positioning, power negotiation among teachers and learners, and resistance to power in Thai EFL classrooms because the traditional Thai culture which embeds imbalanced power relations between teachers and learners.

In this study, we investigate language learners' identity construction by analysing how learners' identity construction might have possible impacts on positioning, power, and resistance of language learners using Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) (Kumaravadivelu, 1999) as an analytical framework and Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach to analysing data. In the following sections, we will present philosophical underpinnings and related studies of learner identity, notions of positioning, resistance, power, and CCDA. Then, we will dwell on the study method. After that, we will interpret our findings with exemplars by referring to the relevant literature and earlier studies. Finally, we will draw some conclusions with reflections on our research practice and make some implications for future research.

Philosophical Underpinnings

Learner Identity

Generally, identity refers to a sense of self, or who a person is. Terms which are commonly used to describe aspects of the notion of identity include "self," "role," "positioning," "subject position," and "subjectivity" (Man, 2008, p. 121). When it comes to the concept of learner identity, in literature, it is generally perceived as a process of becoming and being a learner. Bernstein and Solomon (1999) defined learner identity as "resources for constructing belonging, recognition of self and others, and context management (what I am, where, with whom and when)" (p. 272). A slightly different view of learning identity was put forward by Kolb and Kolb (2009) holding that "people with a learning identity see themselves as learners, seek and engage life experiences with a learning attitude and believe in their ability to learn" (p. 5). This describes one's whole identity as a learner rather than part of one's identity being that of a learner.

From a sociocultural point of view, a person's speech is a linguistic symbol of identity. Poststructuralist and social constructivist researchers, who perceive "classrooms as a social and

cultural space where power negotiations and ideological conflicts are in constant interplay," pointed out "the interweaving relationship between identity and contextualized use of language in the classroom" (Kumaravadivelu as cited in Man, 2008, p. 873). In this study, the term language learners and EFL learners were used interchangeably. Since we are concerned with the sociocultural factors that may have impacts on individuals' feelings about themselves as learners, our definition of learner identity is in line with Lawson's (2014) definition, that is, how an individual feels about himself/herself as a learner and the extent to which he/she positions himself/herself as a learner. This may be affected by personal motivation, a sense of belonging, other-support and encouragement from peers and teachers, as well as his/her previous experiences of education. Next, we will review literature on how learner identify might be impacted by power and resistance in language classrooms.

Power and Resistance in Language Classrooms

Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001) pointed out that "in many contexts of learning, certain identities may not be negotiable because people may be positioned in powerful ways which they are unable to resist" (p. 250). Man (2008) noted that students' agency and power in classroom discourse often emerge as forms of resistance to the authoritative and socially valued institutional discourse. Learner's resistance in classroom interactions, drawing on Foucault's (1980) notions of institutional discipline and human resistance, is "not to one's teacher per se, but rather to the patterned, normative, expected rituals in classrooms" (Brooks, 2016, p.353). Numerous studies have attempted to explain the concept of resistance in language learning, particularly when learners attempt to negotiate their participation in the classroom interaction (Dufva & Aro, 2014; Wassell et al., 2010). As noted by van Lier (2008, p. 76), classroom interaction may vary to some extent depending on the nature of the subject content being taught and learnt and the classroom contexts where the interaction happens. This may result in different ways of recognizing the "inequality," "neutrality," or "equality" of power relations as well as learners' agency.

In language classrooms, however, Walsh (2011) noted that one of the most striking features of any "classroom is that the roles of the participants (teacher and learners) are not equal, they are asymmetrical" (p. 138). Commenting on this perspective, McCloskey (2008) argued that "power, knowledge and truth - this configuration is essentially what constitutes discourse" (p. 11). The evidence presented in this section suggests that discursive formations make it difficult for individuals to think outside of them; hence they are also exercises in power and control. Resistance is a strongly deterministic understanding of power relations, Wiseman (2012) reported that when learners insist on their opinions in the middle of discourses or interactions, learners then dogmatically impose power on others resulting in resistance to some of the members of the learning community. Tananuraksakul (2011) and Edwards (1991) further noted that resistance may decrease or increase language production at the interaction stage. As a result, learners' resistance in classroom interactions became a core topic of investigation in the field of Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) (Kumaravadivelu, 1999). In next section, we will explain why and how CCDA is philosophical and analytical useful to investigate positioning, resistance, and power in classroom discourse.

Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA)

Dissatisfied with previous models of classroom interaction analysis, Kumaravadivelu (1999) criticized conventional classroom interaction and discourse analysis approaches in terms of their definition of discourse, scope, and methods. For instance, regarding the discourse definition, he believed,

> If, simplifying the poststructural and postcolonial perspectives presented above, discourse can be seen as a three-dimensional construct consisting of a (socio)linguistic dimension, a sociocultural dimension, and a sociopolitical dimension, then classroom discourse analysts may be considered to be involved with the first, interested in the second, and indifferent to the third. (p. 469)

Critically, Kumaravadivelu (1999) proposed using CCDA to explore classroom discourse as socially constructed, politically motivated, and historically determined reality by learners. Although he did not explicitly underscore power in using CCDA to unveil power circulations in classroom interactions, his view is in line with the core concept of Foucault's (1972) notion that power and knowledge are socially constructed through human interactions. It is believed that learners can be empowered or disempowered either with privileges or marginalization during social discourse processes. Foucault (1980) further argued, discourse process "allows us to recognize that there can be multiple sources of power and to understand that power is not always oppressive" (p. 117). That means power relations are pervasive in human interactions and always involve an element of resistance (Rau, 2004). Foucault's notion of power-as-a-relation explicitly postulated that "a constructive and dynamic way of exercising power to enable students not only to be reactive by acting out the supervisor's powerful commands but also to be active and proactive by acting upon supervisor's empowering guidance" (Tian & Singhasiri, 2016, p. 656). When it comes to classroom interactions, teachers should encourage learners to "deconstruct dominant discourses as well as counter-discourses by posing questions at the boundaries of ideology, power, knowledge, class, race, and gender" (Kumaravadivelu, 1999, p. 476). The poststructural and postcolonial discourse perspectives lay the ground for formulating the nature, scope, and method of CCDA.

In this study, we chose CCDA as an analytical framework for two reasons. First, we were interested in looking at the utterances of the participants during the classroom interaction as well as the underlying reasons behind these actions (Kumaravadivelu, 1999). Second, we were also keen to determine the process of interaction in which participants were "temporally co-present (though they may be spatially distant) and jointly engaged in some kind of social action" (Jones, 2012, p. 1). The following philosophical and analytical principles of CCDA frame our study:

a) Classroom discourse is socially constructed, politically motivated, and historically determined.
b) English as a second or foreign (L2) classroom is not a scheduled, self-contained mini-society; it is rather a constituent of the larger society in which many forms of domination and inequality are produced and reproduced for the benefit of vested interests.
c) The L2 classroom also manifests, at surface and deep levels, many forms of resistance, articulated or unarticulated.
d) The negotiation of discourse's meaning and its analysis should not be confined to the acquisitional aspects of input and interaction.
e) Teachers need to develop the necessary knowledge and skills to observe, analyze, and evaluate their own classroom discourse.

Adapted from Kumaravadivelu (1999, pp. 472-473)

Related Studies

This study explores language learners' identity construction with a focus on how learners' identity construction might have possible impacts on positioning, power, and

resistance of language learners in classroom discourse. In this section, we will review related studies on learners' identity in L2, contexts, Thai contexts, power and resistance in language classroom, and critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA) respectively.

Learners' Identity in L2 Contexts

Prior researchers explored various dimensions of learner identity in the context of L2. For instance, Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001) explored and discussed "various aspects of the ongoing construction, negotiation and renegotiation of identities in multilingual settings are beliefs about, and practices of, language use" (p. 243). Their key argument is that interaction in multilingual contexts is always subject to societal power relations. Previous studies also found that learner identity is an interplay between individual learners' investment, values and priorities, expectations, and social, cultural, and institutional demand and expectations (Philp et al., 2013). Poplack et al. (2012) investigated whether preposition stranding, a stereotypical non-standard feature of North American French, results from convergence with English, and the role of bilingual code-switchers in its adoption and diffusion. It was found out that preposition stranding is visible in the last segment of the sentence.

Some studies specifically focused on language learners' experiences or how they constructed their identities in certain language learning contexts. To begin with, Early and Norton (2012) conducted a narrative inquiry study to better understand English language learners and their imagined identities. This work foregrounded the language learner as a participating social agent with complex and changing identities. It is this agentive sense of self that is linked, in narratives, to larger socio-cultural and historical social practices. It was noted that migrated learners demonstrated a range of identities and made sense of their belongingness through practice. In a related study, Skinnari (2014) explored the multitude of ways in which Finnish 5th grade elementary school pupils experience and present their agency in English lessons, with a special focus on pupils' silence and resistance. It shows that the pupils' experiences and presentations of agency may be contradictory and the expressions of agency cannot always be interpreted in a straightforward manner. Nonetheless, these studies do not only focus on learners' positioning in classroom interaction, but also resistance and power within classroom discourse. As for the researchers, positioning, power, and resistance are all interconnected and interplayed in classroom interactions to fully unveil their identities within discourse.

EFL Learners' Identity in Thai Contexts

Although growing research on language learner's identities provided empirical evidence to illuminate learner's preparation and development of learning from an identity perspective, there is a paucity of research on the identities of learners who learn English as a foreign language in Thai contexts. The exceptions are the studies by Tananuraksakul (2011, 2012, 2013). Using classroom observation, Tananuraksakul (2012) explored EFL learners' identity concerning psychological and linguistic aspects and found out that learners seemed to be passive due to their lack of knowledge about particular topics and also problems with regards to learners' limited vocabulary in English language. Another study conducted by Tananuraksakul (2013), investigated the power distance reduction and positive reinforcement through interview and classroom observation. He explored 14 Thai EFL learners' confidence and linguistic identity with the notions of Hofstede's power distance (PD) and Skinner's positive reinforcement. Developed by Hofstede (1997),

> PD is linked to classify a county's cultural attitudes or work-related values and refers to the degree a society accepts differences in power. The society with high PD culture practices a high regard for authority while the one with a low PD culture tends to exercise personal responsibility and autonomy. (p. 105)

Referring to Hofstedes' (1997) assumption, PD culture in Thailand is relatively high, which is affirmed by Hipsher's (2010) observations that in general Thai teachers hold a position of authority over their students and they are highly respected in the society (Tananuraksakul, 2013). Reducing PD between a teacher and the students may facilitate English language learning and maximize learning outcomes. In Tananuraksakul's (2013) study, to reduce PD, the teacher called his students by their nicknames. In doing so, the teacher could give positive reinforcements with encouraging words upon learners' efforts at speaking either correctly or incorrectly, such as "okay but you need to work it on a little more," "pretty good," "good," "excellent," and "well done." It is believed by behavioural psychologists that giving praise can promote EFL learners' attitudes towards and confidence in use of English (Skinner, 1954). Tananuraksakul's (2013) findings suggest that competent learners seemed to be dominant in classroom discourse. However, he also found out that positive reinforcement was essential in letting low proficiency learners participate in classroom interaction. In his findings, it was noted that the level of PD in Thai culture or the authoritative position of teachers may have impacts on EFL learners' confidence building and the teacher's positive reinforcement can be a tool to influence or determine the construction of learners' identities. Language learner identities constitute a distinct area of research focus because of the context, political, cultural, and educational particularities of English language teaching in Thailand. Realizing the significance of learner identities in teaching and learning processes, little is actually done in the classroom settings to make learners and teacher aware of the identity repertoires available to them when interacting using English language as a medium communication. The language classroom, Philp et al. (2013) argued, "requires interaction within learners to promote meaningful communication towards [the] target language" (p. 147), which could also enhance their understanding and interpretation of a new concept about the target language. Knowing the significant contribution of EFL classroom discourse to language learners' identities, in this paper, we argue that to understand learner identity construction in certain spaces, we need to further understand how learners position themselves when they interact with their teachers and peers in the classroom as a unique learning space in terms of positioning, resistance and power. In next section, we will briefly review earlier studies on classroom interaction investigating positioning, resistance and power by using critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA).

Studies on CCDA

A number of studies have employed CCDA to examine resistance (e.g., Brantlinger, 2014; Charteris, 2016; Wiseman, 2012), power (e.g., Chao & Kuntz, 2013; Reinsvold & Cochran, 2012; Showstack, 2012; Stahl, 2016), and positioning (e.g., Norén, 2015; Pinnow & Chval, 2015) in the language classroom. Together, these studies revealed that classroom discourse affected the nature of students' interactions and their access to learning opportunities in classrooms. However, so far, few studies have been conducted to examine resistance, power, and positioning in second or foreign language (ESL/EFL) classroom interactions, particularly in Thailand, and even fewer have examined CCDA to unveil learner's identities construction. Some researchers have focused on the study of learners' identities through interviews. Kayi-Aydar (2014), for instance, investigated language learning experiences of two talkative students in an academic ESL classroom. A learner can assume a powerful or powerless position

within the classroom environment. These studies have collectively demonstrated the profound link between positioning, power, and resistance of EFL learners when interacting with their peers and teachers. Thus, there is a need for more classroom-based research that explores and reveals this link.

Collectively, the above-reviewed studies paved the way for our justification of choosing CCDA an analytical framework to investigate positioning, resistance, and power in classroom discourse. Yet, we could see the main point is power when talking about classroom interactions. This concept of power and its importance in the language learning process goes way beyond pre-established roles in the classroom where the teachers conventionally hold the power both socially and pedagogically.

The Study

In this t study, we build on previous L2 positioning studies by critically examining the links between positioning, resistance, and power through EFL classroom discourse. We examine how EFL language learners unveil identity construction as language learners, particularly on how they position themselves during classroom interactions. Unlike the majority of studies on positioning, resistance, and power that focused only on the moment-to-moment interactions, we look at these three aspects (positioning, resistance, and power) not only within particular local contexts but also across classroom interactions with the foreign teacher as a mediator of discourse. It is hoped that this study - contributes to L2 positioning research and teaching with a thick description of the process of how learners' positional identities are constructed and how they seek or show their power and resistance through classroom discourse in a Thai context. Furthermore, we aim to understand classroom discourse interaction of EFL students through their participation in an oral academic discussion. The research was guided by two questions: (a) How do EFL learners construct identity in classroom discourse interaction? and (b) How might this identity construction have possible impact on positioning, power, and resistance of language learners in classroom interactions?

Ethical Consideration

With regards to ethical consideration, we could like to clarify that we do not have Institutional Research Board (IRB) for the approval process. At the time of carrying out this study, the Director of Academic Research in the university where we collected data, encouraged and gave all faculty members privileges to conduct research. At the begging stage of data collectionwe informed the participants about the purpose of this research and that if some were not interested in being involved in the study, they had the right not to participate. Meanwhile, we ensured the participants that the data we collected from them would be only used for the research purpose by protecting the confidentiality of the participants' identities.

Method

Research Design

The study was conducted by employing a qualitative observation-based research design in order to gain an in-depth understanding of EFL learners' positioning, resistance, and identity. A naturalistic observation is the most commonly employed approach by qualitative researchers (Angrosino 2016; Creswell, 2014). In principle, qualitative observation-based research was chosen as it involves observing subjects in "natural settings" wherever people interact with one another without intervention (Angrosino 2016).

We used an observation scheme consisting of a finite set of preselected categories to describe certain behaviours of teachers and students in classroom interactions (Kumaravadivelu, 1999). We aimed for a thick description of the phenomena (Geertz as cited in Cho & Trent, 2006) and a holistic interpretation of classroom participation without interfering with the course design and instructional decisions of the course instructor. Jones (2012) highlights analysing discourse and interaction, as a "process of interaction in which participants are temporally co-present (though they may be spatially distant) and jointly engaged in some kind of social action" (p. 1) in order to see the resistance, positioning, and hidden agenda of the discourse or activities. Within a specific scope of one instructional routine (i.e., small-group discussions), our analytical focus was on how EFL learners construct identity in classroom discourse interaction and how this identity construction might have possible impact on positioning, power, and resistance of language learners in classroom interaction.

Research Setting

A purposeful sampling method (Creswell, 2014) was utilized in this study for selecting a potential class, not for its ability to represent, but for its relevance to the research questions, analytical framework, and explanation developed in this research. The sampling criteria were the class had to have heavy instruction on oral discussion or speaking activities, and not engaged in a special class for public speaking offered by the language center. Based on these criteria, we identified one speaking course, a minor subject for 1st year undergraduate students majoring in English language teaching in a public university in Thailand. Before conducting the research, the second author (Remart) asked for the permission of the course teacher to conduct the current study in her class. After Remart secured the approval from the teacher, the course teacher informed her class about the research and all participants agreed to participate. It is also worth noting that these students knew Remart for more than a year since Remart was their lecturer in previous subjects. As Creswell (2014) notes, that in order to avoid discrepancies in doing naturalistic observation, it is important to establish a relationship with the participants. Hence, Remart's role in this class was an observer-researcher during the semester in which the data were collected.

At the beginning of the program, the teacher gave students freedom to choose their group members. Apart from this, the teacher advised them to form groups of three to four people regardless of their gender, age, and proficiency. The reason for splitting the participants was because of the facilities and lack of facilitators to handle other groups.

The course focused on encouraging students to speak and present their ideas in English as much as possible in classroom activities. In this class, the teacher usually began the lessons with a 6-minute lecture and then had students hold a 50-minute small-group interaction on assigned topics. The class discussions were usually followed by teacher-led whole-class discussions in which each group would report their ideas from their small-group discussions and raise issues or questions for whole-class discussions. During all small-group discussions, students had autonomy in terms of turn-taking and the teacher did not interfere except for answering students' questions when students asked for her.

Participants

Participants were of the same cultural background and language, Thai as their mother language, and English as a foreign language to them. The class was comprised of 31 undergraduate students (21 females and 10 males) majoring in English, with ages ranging from 15 to 20s. Of these 31 students, 7 of them did not participate due to their conflicting schedules as they were irregular students. Therefore, 24 students participated in this study.

Data Collection

We used classroom observations, audio-recorded classroom interactions, semi-structured focus group interviews with the students. Data were collected during the first semester of the school year from August 2018 to January 2019.

Participant Observation

The second author (Remart) observed the whole course, as naturalistic classroom discourse is needed in order to gain the real scenario of the phenomena (Kumaravadivelu, 1999). During the class observation, he primarily observed participants' non-verbal behaviours of the learners in the classroom interaction (e.g., manner of speaking).

Audio-recording of Classroom Interactions

For each class period, we audio recorded the entire classroom interaction in each class session. This recording protocol was used to validate our notes and also for reviewing purposes as it is necessary in holding the evidence of utterances occurred during the interaction. For example, we began recording from the moment that the teacher started greeting her students up to the stage that she officially ended her class. In total, we recorded 14 class sessions. Each recording lasted approximately 1 hour and 45 minutes. Each audio-recording was transcribed.

Semi-Structured Focus Group Interviews

After having the transcribed audio records, we developed questions from the audio recordings for the face-to-face semi-structured focus group interview. These questions were purposively designed to ask participants' views of their linguistic and non-linguistic behaviours during the class discussions. To illustrate, Remart asked the participants why they tended to use their mother language in explaining the matter, why they asked for helped from classmates, what made it hard in answering or explaining their opinions, among others. The interview lasted approximately 40-60 minutes each. We only chose 10 informants due to availability and accessibility as other students were irregular students and they had other courses aside from the course in which the current study was conducted.

Data Transcription

Recordings from classroom interactions and interviews were transcribed verbatim by Remart and all participants were assigned with pseudonyms through the study. We assigned transcription symbols to provide readers clues to understand our data and address our research purpose to capture how learners position, resist, and show power during classroom interaction (see Appendix). Some of the transcription symbols are self-specified by the researchers for this particular study. Most of them are taken from conventional discourse transcription symbols (e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Edwards & Lampert, 2014). It should be noted that since some of the learners' utterances were in Thai. Remart asked his colleagues who are experienced Thai lecturers having been teaching Thai-to-English translation course for years to help in translating Thai to English at the transcribing stage. To ensure the validity of the translated data, Remart then asked another Thai lecturer to re-check the meaning, form, and clarity of the translated data. Finally, Remart asked each participant to check the transcription and translation of the quoted data for further data analysis.

Data Analysis

To analyse data, we used Kumaravadivelu's (1999) CCDA as our analytical framework and Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach. Taking into account that Kumaravadivelu has not yet proposed a detailed methodology for data analysis, and given the fact that we combined it with thematic analysis, we analyzed data and interpreted findings inductively and recursively to identify categories, themes, or patterns evolving along the analytical process rather than imposing them a priori.

CCDA as Analytical Framework

Adopting Kumaravadivelu's (1999) CCDA analytical principles, we firstly viewed the Thai EFL classroom as a socially constructed learning space with participants of different learning motivations in Thailand as a specific sociocultural context. We then examined participants' utterances to interpret their underlying reasons in terms of how they position themselves and how power and resistance came into play in manifesting domination and inequality during the classroom interaction. Thirdly, we explored the process of interaction in which participants temporally co-present or jointly engaged in classroom discourse.

Thematic Analysis as Analytical Method

Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six phases of thematic analysis, we conducted an iterative and reflective data analysis process.

Phase 1: Familiarizing ourselves with the data. We immersed ourselves with the data (i.e., field notes from the classroom observation, transcripts from audio-recorded classroom interactions and semi-structured interviews) to familiarize ourselves with the depth and breadth of the data. We also made notes about ideas for coding that can be referred to in the subsequent phases. For instance, we documented our data by using an Excel spreadsheet to log all raw data and word files to detail the research progress in collecting and converting raw data to text that could be conveniently and subsequently tracked.

Phase 2: Generating initial codes. During this phase, we worked systematically and independently to identify interesting segments of text and attach labels to index them in terms of their relations to potential themes in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Creswell, 2014; King, 2004). Then, we brought our initial codes to compare iteratively in the sense of generating good codes. Boyatzis (1998) suggested that a "good code" (p.1) captures the qualitative richness of the phenomenon under study.

Phase 3: Searching for themes. This phase involved sorting and collating all the potentially relevant coded data extracts into themes. In searching for themes, we firstly developed a list of different codes identified across the data set. Then, being guided by CCDA analytical principles, we started with a few predefined codes, namely, "positioning", "power", and "resistance". Meanwhile, we also created a "miscellaneous" theme to temporarily house the codes that did not seem to fit into the main themes. We created a provisional template to justify the inclusion of each code, and to clearly define how it should be interpreted for a possible theme. Table 1 below illustrates an excerpt of the coding template.

Table 1. Excerpt from coding template

Input	Exemplar	Note	Initial Code
Audio-recorded Classroom interaction	S_3: I want to ask. So what do you think is the disadvantage of social media. S_5: Oh ** Very hard (0.05). Uhhh. I think (0.23). ผมไม่ทราบ *** I do not know! S_7: You can speak and I will translate na. S_5: ผมคิดว่าพวกเราไม่ได้ตรวจสอบข้อมูลอีกครั้ง พวกเราเห็นในโซเชียลมีเดีย *** S_7: I think we do not re-check the information we saw in the social media S_3: Oh (0.3) But how can we make sure it is true or not. S_5: ผมสามารถพูดภาษาไทยได้ไหม *(Can I speak Thai?)* S_7: No na. S_5: I do not know the คำตอบ *** answer na. ผมไม่สามารถอธิบายเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้*** I can't explain in English.	S_5 Resists to answer S_3's question. S_7 offers help. S_5 speaks Thai. S_7 refuses S_3. S_5 resists to talk more.	Resistance to peer power Positioning as a translator Positioning as a less competent EFL learner Power Resistance to peer power by positioning herself as a less competent and less powerful learner

Phase 4: Reviewing Themes. During this phase, we reviewed the coded data extracts for each theme to consider whether they appear to form a coherent pattern. As King (2004) suggested, we did not consider the identified themes final until all of the data had been read through and the coding scrutinized at least twice. The themes from different research instruments were considered to determine whether the themes accurately reflected the meanings evident in the data set as a whole. In the course of theme reviewing, inadequacies in the initial coding and themes were revealed. For example, we identified a relevant issue in the interview data that was not covered by an existing code, therefore, a new code named, "Asking for help," was inserted through member checking. In contrast, we also collapsed codes that substantially overlapped with other codes.

Table 2. Excerpt for an added initial code: Asking for help

Input	Exemplar	Note	Initial Code
Interview	**Nut:** I asked my friends who are good in English to help me answering the question of my classmate. **Researcher**: Why did you ask him? **Nut:** Oh! because (0.4) he knows the answer more than me ผมไม่รู้คำศัพท์บางตัว *** *and I did not know some words* in English. **Researcher:** Why did you help Nut? **Pakon**: Because I know the answer and I know the vocabulary to use.	Asks for help Limited language proficiency Competent learner	Positioning as a less competent EFL learner Positioning as a less competent EFL learner

Phase 5: Defining and Naming Themes. As Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that naming themes needs to be punchy in order to give the reader a sense of what the theme is about. During this phase, we considered how each theme fits into the overall story about the entire data set in relation to the research questions. We determined what aspects of the data each theme captured and identified what was of interest about them and why. We revisited our theoretical constructs (e.g., identity, positioning, power, resistance) to see whether the data could answer our queries. We regularly met and debriefed our personal insights of the identified themes to ensure that all aspects of the data were thoroughly analysed. Working collectively, we organized and reorganized the themes until consensus was reached, and ensured the data were represented in a meaningful and useful manner. For example, we combined and renamed *"Positioning"* and *"Resistance"* to *"Positioning and resistance through language mechanism,"* which was finally categorised as a main pattern of "*learners' choice of code and as passive resistance.*"

Code	Theme
- Code switching - Silencing to resist - Resistance to empowerment	Learners' choice of code as passive resistance
- Bi-directional interaction - Knowledge - Power	Circulating power in interaction: struggles for knowledge
- Leadership position - Positioned herself as translator - Cultural identification - Passive	Multiple positioning of EFL learners

Phase 6: Producing the Report. Lastly, we reported direct quotes from the participants embedded within the analytic narrative to aid in the understanding of specific points of interpretation and demonstrate the prevalence of the themes. We interwove literature with the findings to generate plausible interpretations. The exemplar below unfolds an extract of reporting themes.

Exemplar

Theme: Learners' choice of code as passive resistance

> **Code: Positioning and resistance through language mechanism**
> 1. S_3: I want to ask. So what do you think is the disadvantage of social media.
> 2. S_5: Oh ** Very hard (0.05). Uhhh. I think (0.23). ผมไม่ทราบ *** ***I do not know!***
> 3. S_7: You can speak and I will translate na.
> 4. S_5: ผมคิดว่าพวกเราไม่ได้ตรวจสอบข้อมูลอีกครั้ง พวกเราเห็นในโซเชียลมีเดีย ***
> 5. S_7: I think we do not re-check the information we saw in the social media
> 6. S_3: Oh (0.3) But how can we make sure it is true or not.
> 7. S_5: ผมสามารถพูดภาษาไทยได้ไหม *(Can I speak Thai?)*
> 8. S_7: No na.
> 9. S_5: I do not know the คำตอบ *** *answer* na. ผมไม่สามารถอธิบายเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้ ****I can't explain in English.*

This exemplar illustrates a theme of "positioning and resistance through language use." In this extract, S_3 initiates a classroom interaction (Line 1) through asking S_5 about the disadvantage of social media. However, in Line 2, S_5 demonstrates a resistance by saying that that the question is hard for her (*I do not know*). Moreover, S_7 volunteered to translate the utterances of S_5 (Line 3, Line 5). In doing so, S_7 positions himself as a more competent and confident EFL learner than his peers. S3 continues to press for S_5's opinion (Line 6). Upon S_3's refusal (Line 8) to take her request to speak Thai, S_3 once again demonstrates a resistance by saying, "*I do not know*" and reasoning that she *"can't explain in English"* (Line 9).

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is one way researchers can persuade themselves and readers that their research findings are worthy of attention (Creswell, 2014; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Nowell et al. (2017) argued that trustworthiness criteria should be pragmatic choices for researchers in terms of the "acceptability and usefulness of their research for a variety of stakeholders" (p. 3). The pragmatic choices we took to establish the trustworthiness is two-fold: how we triangulated our data sources; and how we attempted to conduct a trustworthy thematic analysis. To ensure rigor and trustworthiness of data analysis, we worked independently and then collectively in conducting a systematic thematic analysis sequentially. We detailed the methodological description to enable the readers to determine how far the data and constructs emerging from it may be accepted. We did member checking, triangulation, detailed transcription, systematic thematic analysis. We emphasized the role of triangulation to reduce the effect of investigator bias. For instance, we collected different sources of data, such as classroom observations, audio-recorded classroom interactions, semi-structured focus group interviews. We provided practical examples and insiders' interpretation of the data. It is our hope that the process of conducting a rigorous and trustworthy thematic analysis has been illustrated in this study may provide some insights into interpreting and presenting textual data of classroom discourse.

Findings and Discussion

Three themes emerged from data analysis reflecting how learners constructed their identities through positioning, resistance, and power in classroom interactions: (a) learners' choice of code as passive resistance; (b) circulating power in interaction and struggles of power; and (c) multiple positioning.

Learners' Choice of Code as Passive Resistance

Through the data analysis, it shows that EFL learners demonstrate resistance in responding to teachers' questions. As shown in the excerpt data below, learners tried to use other codes to convey their thoughts during the interaction; their language alternation can also be viewed as verbal and nonverbal indexical signaling at a classroom of interaction, just as monolingual speakers or other speakers rely on style, register, or intonation (Kalliokoski, 2011) to fully convey their ideas within discourse. The mix of the two codes was often observed in Thai learners' language use in this study. They often interjected Thai words and phrases into English sentences or vice versa, presumably due to their limited ability to produce, spontaneously, full sentences in Thai or English. This is in line with Wiriyachitra's (2002) notice of being passive learners, and too shy to speak English with classmates. Extract 1 is an excerpt of a classroom conversation in which they demonstrate their resistance through choices of codes.

Extract 1

123 S₅: Δ it's er...Impo ° rtant for Thai people, right ↓
124 T: So we need to learn English right?
125 S₄: มันก็สำคัญ (0.10) to know the language *** *It's important*
126 S₁: แต่ถ้าเขาไม่ใส่ใจ *** *But they did not pay attention*
127 S₂: เด็กก็จะไม่ได้อะไรเลย *** They can't get anything (0.3) ใช่ถูกต้อง ↓
128 S₅: (0.3) It's funny... funny (())
129 S₃: It's important ─ but Thai student are always bored when we are forced (0.9) to learn//ใช่ถูกต้อง ↓ *** Yes, right ↓
130 S₄: เมื่อเราบังคับมากเกินไป ****When we force them too much*
131 T: Oh, so how did you learn English then?
132 S₃: You mean… (0.6) like reading books?
133 T: Yes, kind of.
134 S₁: เรียนภาษาอังกฤษจากการ์ตูน//Teacher to know more words in English (()) ****study English from cartoon*

This account shows that learners' intent to speak from Thai to English and other learners begin from English to Thai. Line 125, for instance, S₄ begins in Thai language switches to English. The strategy is not used purely to assert "Thainess" as against "Englishness," but to construct a response that teachers could understand, as the stand of teacher in the study was a "foreign lecturer." This phenomenon can also serve important identity-related functions as a means to construct identities among learners as either bilingual or as a way to struggle with the learning of a second language from a monolingual perspective. In the context of ESL/EFL, the four general categories of code-switching in classroom interaction were highlighted, namely, evaluation and self-regulation skills, sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence, metalinguistic insights, and use of code switching to indicate a shift in topic, person, or syntactic form. The extract above shows that most learners tried to continue their statements by adding the preposition "to" [Thai "to" English] or [English to Thai] during their interaction. This finding conflicts with Poplack's et al. (2012) results about convergence with English and the role of bilingual code-switchers in its adoption and diffusion. Contrary to expectations, this study shows that when learners switch the language, it means that they attempt to continue the discourse by using preposition "to" at the middle of the sentence. Although it can be seen that there is "*silencing*" happening every time the learner switches from Thai to English and vice versa. Silencing, in this case, can be viewed as the stage of thinking or continuing. Some learners in the extract, on the other hand, demonstrate code switching when they asked for emphasis, followed by clarification "ใช่ถูกต้อง↓ ". In Line 129, for instance, S₃ tried to explain the importance of English for Thai learners, however, after 10 seconds, she continued emphasizing ending with [to learn//ใช่ถูกต้อง ↓ *** Yes, right ↓], as a way of clarification. In Line 130, S₄ shows understanding through inserting his idea to S₃'s (Line 129) statement; however, S₄ (Line 130) spoke "Thai" to express his sentiment towards the issue that being discussed. This means that S₄ appears he could understand English language, but he was not able to produce comprehensible messages during the classroom interaction. In Extract 1, most of the language learners used "↓" (falling speech) in their utterances. This pattern suggests that language learners demonstrate attitudinal meanings conveyed by intonation contours either to emphasize their arguments or to show their uncertainty. The pattern thereby shows how they constructed their identities as learners in interacting with the teacher in classroom contexts (Early &

Norton; 2012; Skinnari, 2014) as they see themselves as learners with a learning attitude (Kolb & Kolb, 2009) The behaviour of the learners then was found in the consultative code label of agreements. This is evident in Line 123 and Line 129, where the learners ended their utterances by asking "right" in falling speech mode. In addition, teacher gives positive reinforcement (Line 133) upon S_3's answer as a confirmation checking (Line 132) to the teacher's question (Line 131). This can be considered as means of power distance reduction between the teacher and the learner (Tananuraksakul, 2013) through teacher-learner interaction in classroom settings,

It is somewhat striking that learners further establish "resistance through pausing and silencing," a kind of resistance strategy to think before continuing the statements during the interaction. This suggests that learners resist to be empowered by or give power to others, where they intent to impose social meanings that marginalize or subordinate. Consider the example in **Extract** 2 below.

_____

Extract 2

178.T: So. Why do you want to become English Teacher?

179.S_2: (()) … (0 .13) because ฉันต้องการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศของผม //Ajarn *** *I want to teach English in my country Teacher*

180. T: (0.11) what about you?

181.S_4: Ahh (0.4) Why I wanna be teacher English right?

182.T: Yes.

183.S_1: Umm (0.13) I wanna teach students because ฉันต้องการพูดได้เช่นเดียวกับเจ้าของภาษา // Yes that's it. *** *I want to speak like native speakers.*

184.T: How about you?

185.S_3: Same⌋⌋ (.14) Teacher //ก็เหมือนกันน่ะ ก็ๆแบบถ้าพูดไป ก็เป็นภาษาไทยเหมือนเดิมอะ ก็แบบเกี่ยวกับการสื่อสารอะไรพวกนี้ *** same sentence, because it's just like communication.

186.T: How about you?

187.S_5: (0.12) รอก่อนค่ะครู ดิฉันกำลังคิดอยู่ค่ะ //Ajarn ****Wait I will think first teacher.*

188.S_6: (0.15) มีความรักในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ ละก็แบบอยากจะใช้ส่วนนี้ไปให้เด็กเข้าใจภาษาอังกฤษมากขึ้น เพราะภาษาอังกฤษมันเป็น center เป็นศูนย์กลางที่ใช้ในการสื่อสารทั่วโลก //Ajarn *** *I love English language and would like to teach to any children and know more, as English language likes a center of global communication teacher.*

_____

It can be seen from the extract above that learners in this particular task tend to employ "silencing" as part of resistance. Line 181, for example, S_4 demonstrates "resistance through silencing to confirm." It seems possible that these results are due to EFL learners' resistance to answer the lecturer's question immediately by taking a 4-second silence for thinking. Afterwards, S_4 repeats the lecturer's question to confirm his understanding towards the matter without giving any answers. Similarly, S_3 demonstrates the resistance pattern with her choice of silence and code switching from English to Thai and then to English again (Line 185). This finding is in agreement with Skinnari's (2014), where it highlights that silencing is way of resistance, in which, learners tend to employ particularly when they cannot find words or vocabulary that would support their thoughts during the interaction.

Circulating Power in Interaction: Struggles for Knowledge

One impressive finding was that some learners struggle for knowledge whereas others possess capability during the classroom interaction. This result may be explained by the fact that learners who do not have enough knowledge might find themselves incapable of interacting, while learners who have fair knowledge could stand or insist on their sentiments during the classroom interaction. This finding is in agreement with Foucault's (1980) concept of power circulation, namely, learners who have inadequate knowledge might struggle to position themselves in the classroom discourse. Extract 3 below is about how learners talk about the language and culture of other countries. It illustrates that learners who have a lot of knowledge dominated the interaction and some learners who do not have ideas to share avoided participating in the discussion.

_____

Extract 3

220. S_4: (0.4) I like ↑ watching movie (()) I think ↓ I learn more about others culture and also (0.5) their language.
221. T: Wow! That's good, I like also watching series (())
222. S_5: Bumblebee (0.4) from America↑.
223. S_4: [I also watched that] (()) ↑
224. T: What did you learn?
225. S_5: มันเป็นหนังเกี่ยวกับรถ// Teacher *** *It's a movie about cars*
226. S_4: I learned some//คำศัพท์ *** words (0.3) like speed ↓...Easy-to-drive ↓...cars ↓ (())
227. S_5: Yes, I learned vocabulary // เกี่ยวกับรถ *** *about cars*
228. T: What about you Naris (S_4)
229. S_4: I// ฉันไม่รู้จักอาจารย์คนนั้น *** *don't know about that teacher*

_____

Extract 3 indicates that S_4 and S_5 employed "*bidirectional interaction*," which means that the interaction was $S_4 \rightarrow S_5$ or vice versa. A possible explanation for this might be that these two learners are capable of handling the topic being discussed. The presence of S_1, S_2, S_3, S_6, however, seem invisible in the interaction. When the teacher asks S_4 about the topic, S_4 refuses to answer by saying "ฉันไม่รู้จักอาจารย์คนนั้น" ****I don't know about that teacher*. It seems possible that S_4 in the interaction is not well-informed about the topic which leads to him struggling for knowledge and ideas. This finding corroborates the of Foucault's (1972) notions that every individual utterance is embedded in and controlled by discursive field of "powers or knowledge" (p. 134) resulting in both "privilege or unprivileged" (p. 176).

_____

Extract 4

230. T_1: Ok how about you?
231. S_1: ฉันไม่รู้จักหนังพวกนั้น, ฉันดูแค่หนังไทย (()) *** *I don't know any movie, I only watch Thai*
232. S_6: Princess hours Korean.
233. S_4: Yes, teacher I like that also (())
234. S_4: Matters are further complicated with the return of Lee Yul and his mother//ผู้หญิงคนนั้นดีเป็นเจ้าหญิงก่อนที่สามีของเค้าจะตาย *** *Lady Hwa-young, who was once Crown Princess before the death of her husband, the late Crown Prince Lee Soo, and older brother of the reigning Emperor*

235. S6: I learnt 안녕하세요 (()) *** Hello

236. S4: 반갑습니다 (()) ****nice to meet you*

237. S2: I don't know Korean teacher (0.4) I know Japanese (0.5) like "Our Little Sister".

238. T: Wow, what's that?

239. S2: Hirokazu Kore-eda's moving family drama

240. S1: I like it too…

241. S4: (()) I don't know that teacher (0.4) I only watch Thai

242. T: (()) You have to watch

243. S1: …Uhh I sometime (0.4) I watch with Thai sub and English sub.

244. T: Umm so how about you?

245. S2: Umm I like to watch Animation from Japan they call Anime.

246. T: Umm what did you learn.

247. S2: Umm I learn from daily life Japanese example (0.4)
ก่อนที่คุณจะทานอาหารเช้า หรือ อาหารกลางวัน คนญี่ปุ่นจะพูดว่า
อิตาดะกิมาสุ ****before you have a dinner or breakfast Japanese people say ltadakimasu and eat*

_____

Surprisingly, in Extract 4, it can be seen that the transition is not absolutely an insertion or conflict of learners' knowledge, as the teacher tries to empower other learners by asking them [how about you?] (Line 230). Learners (S1, S2, S3, and S6) accommodate the interaction by not giving their knowledge on the previous topic, rather introducing other topics that other learners do not know. This result can be explained by the fact that "every learner has uniqueness." Even though the teacher asked S1 about his opinion, S1 still refused to share by saying that "ฉันไม่รู้จักหนังพวกนั้นเลย ฉันดูแค่หนังไทย" [*I don't know any movie, I only watch Thai] (*Line 71). This discrepancy could be attributed to the claim of this study that S1 is an "in-context" learner, where he inserted [I *only watch Thai*]; this identity of construction might lead to "intercultural incompetence." With the same vein of intercultural communication, the findings suggest that some learners are competent with another culture and even language. Line 235, for instance, inserted the Korean language by imposing examples [*An-nyeong-ha-se-yo*]. This phrase means "Hello" in Korean. It is a very common greeting that people use when talking to a Korean or someone who knows Korean. This finding has important implications for identity construction of EFL learners, as we could see that they are becoming aware of other's contexts.

Extract 4 suggests that power can be drawn from multiple sources and power is not always oppressive (Foucault, 1980). These results are partially in line with the findings of other studies, in which they found that to generate interaction, a teacher should try to ask others learners' opinions (Chao & Kuntz, 2013; Reinsvold & Cochran, 2012; Stahl, 2016).

Multiple Positioning of EFL Learners

This section of data analysis describes how ELF learners positioned themselves during the interaction, especially with silencing, validating, and comparing/juxtaposing. Extract 5 shows that learners have positioned themselves in different ways.

Extract 5

67. T: Yeah, English is really important
68. S$_4$: Yes, teacher... especially in Thailand. Right? ↓
69. S$_2$: Yeah, a lot of farang like (0.5) farang ⌐ teachers and..and ⌐ tourists
70. S$_4$: What about you Sawat? Ajarn said (0.4) English so important
71. S$_1$: Krub, it is important // ฉันไม่รู้จักอาจารย์คนนั้น *** *I don't know teacher* (())
72. S$_4$: When we find Job, we need to write in English, Right? ↓
73. S$_4$: And if we will go abroad we need to speak English
74. T: Do you think that every Thai student should English or should learn English.
75. S$_2$: (0.5) Yes
76. S$_4$: Yes, teacher, it is important
77. S$_4$: When I play games I have global friends everyone uses English for talking with each other together.
78. S$_3$: I always use English when searching in Google (())
79. S$_4$: Oh คุณสามารถใช้ภาษาไทย *** *you can use Thai*
80. T: How about you?
81. S$_4$: แล้วคุณล่ะ *** *How about you?*

In Extract 5, we can see recurring *leadership positions*; it seems that S$_4$ is strictly in control of the conversation. S$_4$ not only shares opinion about the importance of English, but also asks his fellow learners questions in the interaction. S$_4$ does not allow others to share their opinions regarding the matter. Although S$_2$ tries to join the conversation, S$_4$ ignores her contributions (lines 75 and 76). S$_3$ joins the conversation only once with minimal contributions. However, S$_4$ tries again to suggest that S$_3$ can use Thai in searching information in Google. After an activity in which S$_1$ mentioned that she cannot speak English language, S$_6$ volunteered to translate. In this view, S$_6$ *positioned herself as translator* as well as *a more competent EFL learner*, which is exemplified in Extract 6.

Extract 6

82. S$_1$: Nothing teacher. I // ฉันไม่สามารถพูดภาษาอังกฤษนะ *** *cannot speak Englsh na*
83. S$_6$: You can speak Thai and I will try to explain to teacher
84. S$_1$: ภาษาอังกฤษสำคัญสำหรับฉันมาก เพราะฉันจะไปเรียนต่อปริญญาโทที่ ประเทศอังกฤษ แต่ฉันพูดภาษาอังกฤษไม่ค่อยได้นัก ****English is important for me because I want to study in UK for my master (7) but I cannot speak English well.*
85. S$_6$: She wants to say Ajarn "English is important for me because I want to study in UK for my master (7) but I cannot speak English well. "
86. T: Oh, you need to practice or learn more
87. S$_6$: Ajarn said "you can practice"
88. S$_1$: ฉันพยายามทสุดความสามารถ ที่จะอ่านหนังสือ *** *I am trying my best Ajarn to read books*
89. S$_6$: Oh she is trying read books Ajarn to understand English well.

In Extract 6, S$_1$ does not make any further efforts to speak English after the utterance "Nothing teacher" in Line 82. S$_6$ takes initiative to encourage S$_1$ to speak Thai and offers to be a translator for S$_1$. In doing so, S$_6$ spontaneously positions himself to be an active, capable, and powerful agent of the knowledge and target language user, whereas, S$_1$ positions himself as a

passive agent, incapable, and less powerful agent during that particular interactional discourse process. In the context EFL learning, it is important to consider why some students do not feel comfortable speaking the target language. One possible reason, especially for teenaged students, is how they position themselves and their peers. Related to this position of students as "passive" agents of knowledge, when students are able to develop their own strategies and meanings for doing what it is expected from them in the classroom, they learn to view themselves as capable members of a learning community.

In some segments of the classroom interaction, the teacher asked the learners how they feel in learning another's culture. In Extract 7, S_5 presented a much about her *cultural identity*.

Extract 7

273. S_5: In Thailand, culture is very important teacher
274. T: Oh
275. S_5: ...Yes, teacher. I am Thai and half Chinese ↑
276. S_4: Δ I like learning culture of Japanese teacher
277. S_5: You can more learn about Thai na
278. T: Oh (())
279. S_5: Sometimes people forgot to respect elders
280. S_1: mmmm (())
281. S_5: Because (0.4) students are now impress with Kpop and BTS teacher
282. T: oh
283. S_4: We like it ↑ (())

In her discourses, S_5 highlights that other learners should learn more about Thai, as she said sometimes people forgot to respect elders. However, as S_4 insisted that they like other cultures also. This interaction may inform us that each learner has different views on learning others' cultures. Findings suggest that the learners' views of culture varied based on their positioning of themselves as learner. As this case vividly demonstrates, it is important that the concept of power as a critical standpoint is culturally operationalized in EFL classrooms. To a certain degree, this interaction unfolds discursive practices which manifest in ritually and culturally organized persistent and unequal power relations. Understanding learners' identity construction as a dynamic entity that is socially and culturally produced can also reveal social arrangements which maintain such power relations which can also be contested and transformed.

Conclusion

In this article, drawing on Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) (Kumaravadivelu, 1999) and notions of positioning, resistance, and power (Foucault, 1972; 1980), we sought to expand the current discussions on the notions of these constructs as a way of understanding language learners' identities in an EFL space. Based on data examples from natural classroom interactions, we argue that it is almost impossible to understand language learners' identities, without dogmatically examining the "positioning," "resistance," and "power" together, as they seem to complement each other in terms of investigating the language learners' identities and their status in EFL space. These EFL learners' identities construct in three ways—positioning, power, and resistance, which are deeply, rooted in learners' struggles in language learning. Positioning refers to how learners show their interpersonal relationships during group activities in classroom interactions. With this, learners could then show resistance and power during the interactions.

The results of this investigation unfold three perspectives on how EFL language learners construct their identity. Firstly, the theme "learners' choice of codes as passive

resistance" shows that EFL learners demonstrate resistance in responding to their teachers and peers. As shown in Extract 1, learners tried to use other codes to convey their thoughts and resistance during classroom interaction. Their language alternations can be viewed as verbal and nonverbal indexical signalling of resistance at a local level of interaction, just as monolingual speakers rely on style, register, or intonation. These findings further support the ideas of Wassell et al. (2010), Dufva and Aro (2014), van Lier (2008), Hunt and Handsfield (2013), Tananuraksakul (2011), and Edwards (1991), who found that most learners whether in ESL or EFL contexts, normally employ this kind of resistance. The second theme "circulating power in interaction: struggles for knowledge" suggest some learners are struggling for knowledge while others possess capability during the classroom interaction. This result may be attributed to the fact that learners who do not have enough knowledge might find themselves incapable of interacting with others. These results are in agreement with the findings of previous studies, in which language learners define their existence or demonstrate their self to others within social configuration or classroom interaction (Baker, 2014; Bernstein & Solomon, 1999; Lawson, 2014; Man, 2008). And finally, the third theme "multiple positioning of EFL learners" indicates that every learner in particular classroom interaction demonstrates his/her own way of positioning him/herself. However, Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001), highlights that "in many contexts of learning, certain identities may not be negotiable because people may be positioned in powerful ways which they are unable to resist" (p. 250).

Implications

This study contributes to the growing research on language learners' identity in classroom interactions from a CCDA perspective with notions of positioning, power, and resistance. It sheds some light on classroom interactions in EFL learning spaces through profoundly understanding learners' identity construction, power manifestation, and resistance in a Thai context. Taking "identity" as how learners know and regard themselves and how they are recognised and looked upon by others provides useful information in teaching and learning. This is because "identity" can help when researching issues of language learning in general such as the experiences of specific groups of learners and issues of equity, or at the individual level when researching learners' relationships while learning a foreign language. In short, rather than giving an account of pedagogical and methodological routes to follow when learning a foreign language or learning strategies to lead a successful process in students, from a CCDA perspective, the pedagogical concern of a study of this nature is to help teachers and students be aware of and rethink the way of relating to each other in classroom interactions and how the analysis of such dynamic classroom interactions might optimize the language learning outcomes.

This study suggests that EFL teaching should incorporate learner identity as an explicit goal that serves as an interpretive frame for learners' on-going academic growth as English users within and beyond classroom contexts. Therefore, it opens up new spaces and possibilities in both EFL and ESL contexts to explore the variety of activities or programs that could help learners to construct their ways of learning. In this sense, it may facilitate language learners' identity construction over time from tentatively adopting a learning stance toward life experience to a more confident learning orientation, and to a learning self that is specific to certain contexts. Similar research can be conducted with learners at different levels (i.e., master or doctoral students) in different sociocultural (i.e. bilingual or multilingual) contexts to look into identity construction of both learners and teachers, power dynamics among peers and teachers, cultural and linguistic diversity in language use, positioning mobility, marginalisation, privilege, and agency.

Limitations

There are at least two limitations worthy of attention. First, with only one researcher (Remart) taking the participant-observation role may have brought bias on data selection. Also, his presence may have created a Hawthorne effect (Landsberger, 1958; Montgomery, 2014) causing participants to modify their behaviors in response to their awareness of being observed. Since Remart used to be their subject teacher, students were familiar with his presence. But, participants might feel constrained of being observed and recorded. Therefore, they may act out rather than naturally perform in classroom interaction. To better mitigate the Hawthorne effect, the observer should develop a rapport with the participants by trailing out at least two sessions until they became comfortable enough with the observer and the recording facilities. Second, it should be noted that both researchers are non-Thai, which limits their understandings of leaners' utterances in Thai in collecting and analyzing data. The fact that we sought for translators at the data transcribing stage reduce the authenticity and originality of data. However, the two translators who are experts with years of teaching Thai-to-English translation courses at universities helped compensate this limitation. Meanwhile, both researchers of this study have sufficient experiences in pursuing degrees, teaching English at universities, and living in Thailand (Wenwen, 8 years; Remart, 2.5 years), which enables them to interpret Thai EFL learners' use of English and behaviours during EFL classroom interactions academically and culturally in reasonable and reliable ways.

References

Angrosino, M. V. (2016). *Naturalistic observation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atkinson, J. M., Heritage, J., & Oatley, K. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, A. (2014). Exploring teachers' knowledge of second language pronunciation techniques: Teacher cognitions, observed classroom practices, and student perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(1), 136-163.

Bernstein, B., & Solomon, J. (1999). 'Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control': Basil Bernstein questioned by Joseph Solomon. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20*(2), 265-279.

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 243–57.

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brantlinger, A. (2014). Critical mathematics discourse in a high school classroom: Examining patterns of student engagement and resistance. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 85*(2), 201-220.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101.

Brooks, C. F. (20 16). Role, power, ritual, and resistance: A critical discourse analysis of college classroom talk. *Western Journal of Communication, 80* (3), 348- 369.

Charteris, J. (2016). Envisaging agency as discourse hybridity: A Butlerian analysis of secondary classroom discourses. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(2), 189-203.

Chao, X., & Kuntz, A. (2013). Church-based ESL program as a figured world: Immigrant adult learners, language, identity, power. *Linguistics and Education, 24*(4), 466-478.

Chiesa, B. D., Scott, J., & Hinton, C. (2012). *Languages in a global world: Learning for better cultural understanding*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

(OECD).

Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 319-340.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2013). A global language. In *English in the World* (pp. 163-208). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dufva, H., & Aro, M. (2015). Dialogical view on language learners' agency: Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller, & G. Vitanova, (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning* (pp. 37– 53). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters

Early, M., & Norton, B. (2012). Language learner stories and imagined identities. *Narrative Inquiry, 22*(1), 194-201.

Edwards, J. A., & Lampert, M. D. (2014). *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*. East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.

Edwards, R. (1991). The politics of meeting learner needs: Power, subject, subjection. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 23*(1), 85-97.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Hemel Hempstead, UK: The Harvester Press.

Gómez Lobatón, J. C. (2012). Language learners' identities in EFL settings: Resistance and power through discourse. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 14*(1), 60-76.

Hipsher, S. (2010). *Teaching in an intercultural environment: What are some of the issues facing educators in a foreign land?* Retrieved from http://www.ajarn.com/blogs/scott-hipsher/teaching-in-an-intercultural-environment/

Hofstede. G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hunt, C. S., & Handsfield, L. J. (2013). The emotional landscapes of literacy coaching: Issues of identity, power, and positioning. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(1), 47-86.

Jones, R. H. (2012). Analysis of discourse and interaction: Overview. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (C. Chapelle, Ed). London, UK: Blackwell.

Kalliokoski, J. (2011). *Plurilingual competence, styles and variation. ESUKA – JEFUL, 2*(2), 87-110.

Kayi‑Aydar, H. (2014). Social positioning, participation, and second language learning: Talkative students in an academic ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(4), 686-714.

King, N. (2004). Using templates in the thematic analysis of text. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 257–270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. (2009, November). On becoming a learner: The concept of learning identity. *In Essays on Adult Learning Inspired by the Life and Work of David O. Justice: Learning Never Ends. CAEL Forum and News*, 5-13.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 296-311.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453–484.

Landsberger, H. A. (1958). *Hawthorne revisited, Cornell studies in industrial and labor relations*. Vol. IX.

Lawson, A. (2014). Learner identities in the context of undergraduates: A case study.

Educational Research, 56(3), 343-356.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Man, J. L. C. (2008). Classroom discourse and the construction of learner and teacher identities. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 873-886.

McCloskey, R. (2008). A guide to discourse analysis. *Nurse Researcher, 16*(1), 24-44.

Montgomery, D. (2014). *Positive teacher appraisal through classroom observation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Norén, E. (2015). Agency and positioning in a multilingual mathematics classroom. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 89*(2), 167-184.

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research, 6*(2), 159-171.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1-3.

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2013). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pinnow, R. J., & Chval, K. B. (2015). "How much You wanna bet?": Examining the role of positioning in the development of L2 learner interactional competencies in the content classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 30*, 1-11.

Poplack, S., Zentz, L., & Dion, N. (2012). Phrase-final prepositions in Quebec French: An empirical study of contact, code-switching and resistance to convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 15*(2), 203-225.

Rau, A. (2004). *Supervision: A Foucaultian Exploration of Institutional and Interpersonal Power Relations between Postgraduate Supervisors, their Students and the University Domain.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

Reinsvold, L. A., & Cochran, K. F. (2012). Power dynamics and questioning in elementary science classrooms. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23*(7), 745-768.

Showstack, R. E. (2012). Symbolic power in the heritage language classroom: How Spanish heritage speakers sustain and resist hegemonic discourses on language and cultural diversity. *Spanish in Context, 9*(1), 1-26.

Skinnari, K. (2014). Silence and resistance as experiences and presentations of pupil agency in Finnish elementary school English lessons. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies, 8*(1), 47– 64.

Skinner, B. F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 24*(2), 86-97.

Stahl, G. (2016). White working-class male narratives of 'loyalty to self' in discourses of aspiration. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37*(5), 663-683.

Tananuraksakul, N. (2011). Power relations in pedagogy: A constraint on EFL learners' identity confidence and identity anxiety. *FLLT 2011 Conference Proceedings on 'Strengthening Ties between Research and Foreign Language Classroom Practices'*, 164-170.

Tananuraksakul, N. (2012). Psychological and linguistic identities in a Thai EFL/ELF context. *International Journal of Language Studies, 6*(3), 81-98.

Tananuraksakul, N. (2013). Power distance reduction and positive reinforcement: EFL learners' confidence and linguistic identity. *International Journal of Language Studies, 7*(1), 103-116.

Tian, W., & Singhasiri, W. (2016). Learning opportunities in PhD supervisory talks: A social constructionist perspective. *Issues in Educational Research, 26*(4), 653-672.

Tong, H. K., & Cheung, L. H. (2011). Cultural identity and language: A proposed framework

for cultural globalisation and glocalisation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 32*(1), 55-69.

van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. In J. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 163-168). Sheffield, UK: Equinox.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wassell, B. A., Fernández Hawrylak, M., & LaVan, S. K. (2010). Examining the structures that impact English language learners' agency in urban high schools: Resources and roadblocks in the classroom. *Education and Urban Society, 42*(5), 599-619.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker, 9*(5), 1-10.

Wiriyachitra, A. (2002). English language teaching and learning in Thailand in this decade. *Thai TESOL Focus, 15*(1), 4-9.

Wiseman, A. M. (2012). Resistance, engagement, and understanding: A profile of a struggling emergent reader responding to read-alouds in a kindergarten classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 28*(3), 255-278.

Appendix. Transcription Symbols

Symbol	Explantation
T	Teacher
S	Student
Ajarn	A Thai language term which translates as "professor" or "teacher" at university.
Krub, Ka	In Thai "krub"' (by male) and "ka" (by female) are polite particles added to the end of a sentence.
Na	The polite particle "ná" is extremely common in spoken and informal Thai. It is used to make a sentence sound gentler, softer or more persuasive, when expressing opinions or making statements looking for approval or agreement.
S1, S2, S3, …	Student number
.	One second pause
… (0.3)	More than two pauses
*** + the Italics	Translation
↑	rising pitch
↓	Falling speech
[]	Over lapping speech
(())	Gestures, laughter, etc.
//	Code switching
ɟɟ	Repetition of words
°	Lowered voice
Δ	Turn-taking

Author Note

Wenwen Tian holds her MA and Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics as well as certificates in CELTA and TEFL. She is currently working as an English lecturer in the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand. Over the last 20 years, she has worked as a teacher of English and a coordinator for international affairs in China, Saudi Arabia, and Thailand. She is interested in discourse analysis, academic supervision, intercultural communication, and teacher development. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: wenwen.tian@mail.kmutt.ac.th (working); wwtianpsu@gmail.com (personal).

Mr. Remart Padua Dumlao is a foreign lecturer in the Faculty of Education, Muban Chombueng Rajabhat University, Thailand. His research interest includes cultural studies within EFL classroom settings, discourse analysis, and linguistics. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: dumlaoremart25@gmail.com.

Article Citation

Tian, W., & Dumlao, R. P. (2020). Impacts of positioning, power, and resistance on EFL learners' identity construction through classroom interaction: A perspective from critical classroom discourse analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 25*(6), 1436-1460. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss6/2