## Shifting language ideologies and pedagogies to be anti-racist: a reconstructive discourse analysis of one ELA teacher inquiry group

By: Melissa Schieble, Amy Vetter, Kahdeidra Monét Martin

**Made available courtesy of Emerald:** https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-03-2022-0033

## Abstract:

**Purpose** This paper aims to present findings from a three-year qualitative study that used a model of teacher learning referred to as teaching as inquiry (Manfra, 2019). Teaching as inquiry centers the teacher as a learner in a prolonged and "systematic process of data collection and analysis focused on changing teaching" (p. 167). Findings from the larger qualitative study demonstrate the work of collecting transcripts and using discourse analysis to analyze classroom discourse fostered high school English teachers' knowledge and skills for facilitating critical conversations (Schieble et al., 2020). For this paper, the authors highlight Paula, a white, female secondary teacher who is dual certified in English Language Arts and ESL. Findings from Paula's case demonstrate the ways the teacher inquiry group disrupted Paula's language ideologies of linguistic purism, an ideology embedded in white supremacist and colonialist, hegemonic language policies and practices (Kroskrity, 2004), and transformed her instructional practices over time.

**Design/methodology/approach** The research used qualitative methods for design and scope to generate an information-rich instrumental case study (Stake, 1995). Case study is a form of qualitative inquiry that concentrates on experiential knowledge of the case. This study used case study methods to construct an instrumental case to understand how participation in the teacher inquiry group shaped Paula's facilitation of critical conversations. Data analysis used inductive and deductive qualitative coding procedures and discourse analysis (Gee, 2004; Rogers, 2018) to address the research questions.

**Findings** Findings demonstrate that prior to meeting with the teacher inquiry group, Paula's teaching practices embodied linguistic separatism by emphasizing that standardized English was the "appropriate" way to participate in critical conversations. Through studying her classroom discourse, the inquiry group supported her to critically question these instructional practices and ideologies. Findings demonstrate that the work of the inquiry group supported her embodiment and articulation of a translanguaging ideology that supported her facilitation of critical conversations.

**Originality/value** Findings from this study contributes to scholarly and professional knowledge about how models of teaching as inquiry (Manfra, 2019) demonstrate a positive or reconstructive impact on teacher and student learning. This study highlights the potential for reconstructive shifts in the context of how teachers learn together and the tools that support them in doing so.

**Keywords:** discourse analysis | translanguaging | language ideologies | teacher inquiry groups

**Article:**

ELA teachers often operate from monolingual perspectives that keep many students from leveraging their full linguistic repertoires beyond "standardized English" (Metz and Knight, 2021), and scholars argue such practices are rooted in systemic racism (Alim, 2005; Baker-Bell, 2020; Lippi-Green, 2012). Teachers who embody language ideologies associated with language plurality and translanguaging can face backlash from more dominant views in schools. White teachers, in particular, need professional learning spaces to gain knowledge about language ideologies and pedagogies that engage students' linguistic repertoires and reconstruct languaging practices in schools to be anti-racist. We attempted to address that need in a teacher inquiry group that is the focus of this article.

We present findings from a three-year qualitative study that used a model of teacher learning referred to as teaching as inquiry (Manfra, 2019). Teaching as inquiry centers the teacher as a learner in a prolonged and "systematic process of data collection and analysis focused on changing teaching" (p. 167). Findings from the larger qualitative study demonstrate the work of collecting transcripts and using discourse analysis to analyze classroom discourse fostered high school English teachers' knowledge and skills for facilitating critical conversations (Schieble et al., 2020). For this article, we highlight Paula, a white woman who is a secondary teacher dual certified in English Language Arts and ESL. Findings from Paula's case demonstrate how the teacher inquiry group disrupted Paula's language ideologies of linguistic purism, an ideology embedded in white supremacist and colonialist, hegemonic language policies and practices (Kroskrity, 2004), and supported her to reconstruct anti-racist instructional practices over time.

**Languaging practices in school**

In schools, "standardized English" is unquestionably positioned as "appropriate" and "correct" in school and society (Schieffelin et al., 1998). Teachers with knowledge about language ideologies that emphasize the intersections of language, culture, identity and pedagogy face a tension to disrupt dominant views in schools (Hornberger and Link, 2012; Martínez, Durán, and Hikida, 2019). Language ideologies are defined as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein, 1979, p. 193). Kroskrity (2004) developed two key tenets associated with language ideologies:

1. that they are plural; and
2. they can be both articulated (in discourse) and embodied (in practice) (as cited in Martínez et al., 2015, p. 28).

Researchers maintain that teachers' language ideologies must shift away from dominant monolingual and monocultural views rooted in white supremacy and instead support students to

leverage their full linguistic repertoires beyond the standardized forms of English expected in school (Alim, 2005; Martinez et al., 2017; Metz, 2018; Seltzer and de los Ríos, 2018). Referred to as linguistic purism, such notions connote language separation – an ideology undergirding restrictive language policies and practices that "reify the boundaries between languages" (Martínez et al., 2015, p. 33). García (2011) supports translanguaging as an embodied practice that fosters ideologies of linguistic pluralism in response to this central tension. Translanguaging applies to both the intricate ways that multilingual individuals and communities use language in their everyday lives and also pedagogical practices that draw on the ways students use their full linguistic repertoires to learn in school (García et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2019). Translanguaging implies that language is action and practice and not a system of structures and decontextualized skills. It "emphasizes the action and practice of languaging bilingually" (García, 2011, p. 1) and is "part of a moral and political act that links the production of alternative meanings to transformative social action" (García and Li Wei, 2014, p. 57). As a pedagogical response to tensions teachers experience to uphold academic or standardized English as the right or preferred way to use language in school for social and economic mobility, García notes that translanguaging challenges "monolingual assumptions that permeate current language education policy" (p. 1) and instead positions linguistic pluralism and flexibility as a goal for teaching and learning. Instead of perpetuating schooling as subtractive (Valenzuela, 1999), a translanguaging approach builds on learners' sociocultural identities, ways of knowing and ways of drawing from their full linguistic repertoires to learn in school. Martínez et al. (2015) used the construct of language ideologies as both articulated and embodied in their study of two Spanish–English dual language elementary classrooms in Southern California. Findings from their study demonstrated that the teachers' embodied pedagogies both aligned and contrasted with the language ideologies they articulated and that more support and understanding about language ideologies is needed to help teachers align their practices with a translanguaging approach.

**Discourse analysis and teacher learning**

Teachers need support in gaining knowledge about the intersections of language, culture, identity and pedagogy, and they need support in navigating the tensions they face when disrupting dominant views about language use in schools. Our inquiry group attempted to provide that support by focusing on an examination of the critical conversations they had with their students in secondary ELA school classrooms. We define critical conversations as discussions about power and privilege that help students critically think about the world and their place in it. Such work draws from the overarching goal of critical theory, which is to confront issues of power, privilege and hegemony as oppressive forces (Kincheloe et al., 2011). From our research in this area, we developed a framework related to theories and practices that each play a role in supporting or hindering teachers' enactments of critical conversations. The interrelated key factors of the framework include the following:

- taking on a critical learner stance;
- gaining knowledge about power;
- exploring critical talk moves;
- engaging in critical pedagogy; and
- practicing vulernability. (Schieble et al., 2020)

During our inquiry group sessions, we used these elements as a way of examining transcripts of critical conversations. For example, we read chapters from Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies (Paris and Alim, 2017) to build knowledge about power and examined inquiry talk moves (e.g. questions) from Paula's classroom transcripts that led to more meaningful student participation. Such work helped to uncover and unpack the language ideologies that shaped Paula's teaching practices. We highlight how over time, with support from her teacher inquiry group and tools such as readings and transcript analysis, Paula shifted her language ideologies and pedagogical practices to support her multilingual learners.

To open opportunities for English teachers to cultivate the critical conversations necessary for social change, we (Melissa, Amy and Kahdeidra) studied how discourse analysis can be used as a tool for teacher learning. We took a teaching as inquiry (Manfra, 2019) approach to teacher learning to understand how six ELA teachers used the tools of discourse analysis to study their teaching practice when facilitating critical conversations in their classrooms. We define discourse analysis as the study of how people use language and signs for a purpose and to position themselves in strategic ways to belong to a particular social group (Vetter and Schieble, 2020; Gee, 2004; Schiffrin et al., 2008). Research about language and discourse tells us that talk (and nonverbal communication), "changes the material circumstances in the world as discourse moves back and forth between reflecting and constructing the social world" (Rogers and Wetzel, 2013a, 2013b, p. 51). Thus, analyzing, revising or reimagining classroom discourse holds potential for changing people's material circumstances.

In education research, discourse analysis has been primarily applied as an analytic method for examining teacher and student talk through analysis of classroom transcripts and ethnographic methods (Rogers and Wetzel, 2013a, 2013b; Rex and Schiller, 2009). To date, research on the affordances and constraints of discourse analysis as a tool in teacher learning is emergent. Rex and Schiller (2009) support that encouraging teachers to study their own classroom discourse contributes to their ability to be interactionally aware of their practice. There is a gap in the research, however, about how discourse analysis can be used to foster critical conversations. Thus, discourse analysis holds potential to provide ELA and literacy teachers with tools to improve how they facilitate critical conversations during literature-based discussions and other language-focused pedagogies and the work of engaging in critical conversations with each other.

Reconstructive discourse analysis (RDA) represents a change in analytic focus from how discourses are dominating to ways that everyday instances of talk and text create spaces for agency and liberation (Bartlett, 2018). This approach addresses a critique of discourse analysis studies in that for too long they have focused on the discursive reproduction of oppression (Rogers, 2018). Thus, RDA helped to provide us with insight into how teachers worked together in an inquiry group to examine language and work toward future acts of pedagogical change. The following research questions guided our inquiry:

RQ1: How does one teacher inquiry group engage in RDA of classroom transcripts of critical conversations related to language ideologies?

RQ2: How does this work shape one ELA teacher's language ideologies and pedagogical practices over time?

Two analytic frames inform our construction of this case study. First, we took a reconstructive discourse analytic lens to our overarching approach to the construction of Paula's case. The case

is reconstructive in highlighting how the teacher inquiry group's collaborative analysis of Paula's transcripts led to positive changes in Paula's teaching practices; we also used a reconstructive lens as we undertook our own analysis of the data. Thus, we frame Paula's case as reconstructive due to our analytic focus on what was done "right" and show how shifts in discourse opened spaces for student learning.

Second, we invoked theories related to language ideologies to support our analysis of talk about language teaching and learning among participants in the teacher inquiry group and also at the level of Paula's classroom. At a more micro level, we show how language ideologies were discussed and disrupted among teacher inquiry group members, and how this disruption supported Paula to change her pedagogical approach.

**Research context**

Data for this paper were culled from a larger, three-year qualitative study of two teacher inquiry groups in the Northeast and Southeast United States. This article draws on the data corpus from the teacher inquiry group that took place in an urban-intensive (Milner, 2012) city in the Northeast (River City). The group consisted of three ELA teachers from different secondary schools across a large urban school district and Melissa, Amy and Kahdeidra. The group met monthly for two years (2016–2018) via video conference.

During these meetings, the group read related scholarship and analyzed transcripts of critical conversations from their classrooms. Each month, one participant (including Melissa and Amy who were also facilitators) volunteered to share a transcript and identified a critical conversation that they wanted to analyze and learn more about with the group. Each teacher identified an excerpt from a transcript of one full lesson that represented a tension spot in the conversation or a problem of practice (e.g. patterns of silence during critical conversations).

For this paper, we present a case study of one English teacher inquiry group member, Paula. Paula identifies as a white, cis gender, lesbian woman in her upper thirties and is certified to teach both secondary English and English as a second language. At the time of the study, Paula taught at a high school that serves a majority multilingual immigrant population. To enroll at the school, students must have arrived in the United States within the past four years. Paula previously worked as a prosecutor in the juvenile justice system in the same city and is an activist for LGBTQ+ rights. She is also an emergent French and Spanish speaker, and informed us that her own experiences with language learning informed her practices. We chose to construct a case centered on Paula because she demonstrably changed her teaching practices in response to our inquiry group conversations. Paula was exemplary in her openness to feedback about her teaching throughout the project. Her case is representative of other cases in the larger study in that each teacher made positive changes to their teaching practice over time, but Paula was unique in how she used theories about translanguaging and culturally sustaining pedagogy to shape her teaching practice, an area we noted is undertheorized in English education. Her case helps us better understand how teachers learn together using scholarship and discourse analysis of transcripts and supports the model of teaching as inquiry as generative for teacher learning.

Melissa and Amy have backgrounds as high school English teachers. Kahdeidra is a former middle school special education Teacher and teaches classes in literacy education and composition. Melissa is a white, cis gender, heterosexual woman who is a Professor in English education and English is her home language. Amy is a white, heterosexual, cis gender woman who is a Professor in English education and her home language is English. Kahdeidra is a black woman who was a

doctoral Student in Urban Education at a university in the Northeast at the time of the study and includes features of African American Language, Gullah Geechee, Kreyòl and Patwa in her home languaging repertoire. In addition to Paula and the author team, Connor and Leslie (both English monolingual) were also group members. Connor teaches humanities at a small, public, community-based middle school in River City with a focus on equity and justice. Connor is a white, trans person and is an activist within the LGBTQ+ community and a parent. Leslie teaches in a comprehensive high school in River City and is an English teacher, teacher activist and mother. She identifies as a white, heterosexual and cis gender Jewish woman.

We frame the diverse positionalities of our inquiry group members as a cumulative asset to the group. Melissa and Amy have extensive experience as teacher educators who use discourse analytic strategies as pedagogy; Kahdeidra brought deep theoretical and experiential knowledge to the group about translanguaging and language ideologies. Each ELA teacher was steeped in critical and social justice oriented teaching practices. We also recognize our individual knowledge and experiential limitations; for example, Melissa and Amy are monolingual and were not able to draw from experience as a resource in these conversations, but are committed to learning about languaging theories and practices, and through conversation about this work with others, their knowledge was broadened. As an inquiry group, our backgrounds and positionalities in part contributed to Paula's shift in her language ideologies and teaching practices over time that resulted in more agentic spaces for her students' learning.

**Methodology**

The research used qualitative methods for design and scope. Data for the Northeast inquiry group were generated during the fall and spring semesters from 2016 to 2018 and began with interviews with each teacher participant to determine specific areas where they were struggling with facilitating critical conversations. Each teacher audio-recorded a minimum of three full length lessons (approximately 60 min) that included whole and small group discussion, and a researcher (either Melissa or Kahdeidra) generated field notes during these discussions. The audio recordings were transcribed to produce a transcript for the teacher inquiry group to engage in discourse analysis. All student work and classroom materials from these discussions were collected. The teacher inquiry group met monthly for 1–2 h via video conference. These meetings were audio recorded and transcribed. After the teacher inquiry group concluded, each teacher was interviewed to gather information about their experiences with the project.

Melissa and Amy began data analysis with broad research questions related to how the teacher inquiry group used discourse analysis to analyze transcripts and what (if any) shifts occurred in their teaching practice over time. We read and re-read the data corpus for the Northeast teacher inquiry group using inductive and deductive qualitative coding procedures and discourse analysis (Gee, 2004; Rogers, 2018). Deductively, we read line by line across the transcripts from the teacher inquiry group meetings to identify discourse analytic strategies that were generative for teacher learning, such as examining student questions. During this initial phase, codes associated with our theoretical framework related to critical literacy and our experience as English teachers and teacher educators were also assigned to segments of talk. These coding schemes were also applied to transcripts from teachers' classrooms after inquiry group meetings to determine if and what changes occurred in teachers' facilitation of critical conversations. Characteristics of classroom discourse were examined for changes over time to document the influence of teacher inquiry group discussions on instructional practice. For example, we identified inquiry talk moves

(Vetter et al., 2022) participants used in the group meetings to pose questions or disrupt commonplace notions. We then analyzed classroom transcripts generated after inquiry group meetings to note any shifts in classroom discourse patterns. Analytic memos were created throughout the data analysis process to cross reference transcript data with interviews and field notes and develop insights about patterns and themes (Maxwell, 2005).

One pattern related to disrupting commonplace notions included how translanguaging theories were used to disrupt standardized languaging practices evident in Paula's early classroom transcripts. Thus, we refined our research questions (noted earlier) and selected excerpts of data from the corpus that related to this issue for closer study. We went back to the literature to search for related research to help us make sense of this phenomenon. The notion of language ideologies helped us analyze our data further and make sense of our interpretations from our first round of data analysis that showed the inquiry group conversations shaped Paula's teaching practices in ways that were more just and equitable for her students.

We drew on the data excerpts and language ideologies frameworks to construct an instrumental case study (Stake, 1995) centered on Paula. An instrumental case study positions the researcher as seeking greater insight into an issue in a certain place and time to generate an information-rich case (Stake, 1995). We sought insight into the particularities of Paula's discourses (Gee, 2004) related to language ideologies over time; thus, an instrumental case study aligned with our goals. Constructing an instrumental case about Paula helped us "to understand something else" (Stake, 1995, p. 3), which was how the work of inquiry groups might support ELA teacher learning.

To analyze the data excerpts, we invoked Martínez et al.'s (2015) use of the language ideologies of linguistic purism and translanguaging as deductive codes for our second phase of data analysis (see Appendix for a sample of the coding chart). Analysis occurred at two levels that included how the teacher inquiry group analyzed the transcripts; and how we analyzed their analysis as reflected by our research questions. The teacher inquiry group worked together to make sense of the languaging practices documented in Paula's two transcripts (e.g. language use occurs in context). For our analysis, we sought to understand how the teacher inquiry group supported Paula to reconstruct her pedagogical practices by invoking theories about language ideologies.

We generated a deductive code for each language ideology and returned to the data set to code for instances when these language ideologies were either articulated or embodied (Kroskrity, 2004). For example, the language ideology of translanguaging was coded as articulated when it surfaced within discussion among teacher inquiry group members, and language ideologies were coded as embodied when they surfaced in Paula's classroom transcripts. We created a data chart for these deductive codes and selected raw data that was illustrative of each code. These codes were then used to generate themes or findings for our research questions. Paula read our draft manuscript and provided feedback as a form of member checking.

**Findings**

Findings demonstrate that early in the project, Paula's teaching practices embodied linguistic purism by emphasizing that standardized English was the "appropriate" way to participate in critical conversations as demonstrated in her classroom transcript ("stifled dreams"). During observations, Paula's assistant principal insisted that teachers and students use English, and this shaped Paula's sense of autonomy over what was "appropriate" classroom language. Through studying her classroom discourse and building knowledge about power by reading related scholarship, the inquiry group supported her to critically question these instructional practices and

ideologies. Paula's second classroom transcript ("dual cultural positions") and exit interview demonstrate that the work of the inquiry group supported shifts in her embodiment and articulation of language ideologies that supported her facilitation of critical conversations. We provide a timeline of when these critical conversations occurred in Paula's classroom and when they were analyzed by the inquiry group (Appendix) to emphasize the process of teacher learning over time.

**Languaging "appropriateness": critical conversation about "stifled dreams"**

Paula taught a unit on The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian by Sherman Alexie in late fall of 2017. To start the critical conversation, she posted an open-ended question in English on the white board ("What happened with Junior's parents? Why did no one pay attention to their dreams?"). Her questions were designed to help students develop a critical understanding of how Indigenous characters' lives in the book were shaped by oppressive historical policies and social practices. However, the pressure to participate in critical conversations using only standardized forms of English disrupted opportunities for students to contribute meaningfully to the discussion. The following excerpt is characteristic of how early on in Paula's classroom, standardized English was positioned as the correct way to enter the conversation. The critical conversation in this instance focused on how students were making connections between oppression in the book and arranged marriages in Bangladesh, a country where many of the students in the class were born. One student, Rafia (female student), compared Junior's parents' stifled dreams due to poverty to girls in Bangladesh who face arranged marriages, thus stifling their dreams to work or attend college. In the following excerpt, Paula aims to facilitate students' responses to Rafia's claim:

> "Paula: Who wants to respond to what Rafia said [that] some girls don't have a choice they have to get married in Bangladesh? So let's respond to that. Either "this reminds me of" or "I agree with"[…]."

> "Meena: I know someone, but it's fine."

> "Aaraf: She don't want to share it."

Here, we see Paula prompting students to engage with one another about a connection they were making to the book about no one paying attention to Junior's parents' dreams. As a critical conversation, students were drawing from their background knowledge to engage critically with issues related to poverty, oppression, agency and opportunity depicted in the book.

Paula's insistence, however, that the listening subject (other students) take up the language of school to frame the response positions standardized English as the only "appropriate" or "correct" way to engage in the dialogue ("So let's respond to that. Either 'this reminds me of' or 'I agree with'[…]"). Her facilitation practices as evidenced from her classroom transcript embodied linguistic purism by prioritizing the separation of standardized language usage rather than encouraging students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires. Thus, students may have been reluctant to participate during the whole-group discussion. Meena, a student who is fluent in Bangla but still learning English at the time of this conversation, began to respond to Paula's question but quickly shut down, perhaps because she did not yet have the standardized English language skills she assumed her teacher wanted to hear. She says, "I know someone, but it's fine,"

and then, another student (Aaraf) jumps in and tells Paula that Meena does not want to share her example.

The teacher inquiry group met in early December of 2017 to analyze Paula's classroom transcript. Paula began the discussion by commenting on what she noticed and what questions she hoped the group could help her think through. Paula noted that the academic language sentence starters seemed to be making the conversation awkward ("Either 'this reminds me of' or 'I agree with'[…]"). Paula also observed, and field notes confirmed, that throughout the critical conversation, students were having more energized side conversations in their native languages. She asked the inquiry group to help her think through the dilemma that the whole group conversation in English was shutting down student participation; noticing that students were enthusiastic with one another in their own languages, she questioned how she might leverage students' different language repertoires as a way to tap into that energy. Two members of the group, Connor and Melissa (both monolingual), suggested that Paula form language groups that students could participate in for small group discussions to develop their ideas further before holding whole-class discussions. Connor responded to her dilemma with the following suggestion:

> Connor: I wonder what it would be like if you embrace that. Have you ever done that? Maybe do little turn and talks in native languages to feed the large group discussion? 'Cause it seems like, I felt there's a lot of really positive energy here, where kids were breaking into chat because they had a lot to say.

After further discussion, Melissa also provided a suggestion:

> Melissa: Because one of the things I noticed [while taking field notes] was that […] when the conversations started in English […] students became very excited and passionate about that [conversation], then I noticed that after that initial discussion in English, then students really started translanguaging and using their home languages to really be able to, I think, develop their thoughts. Because their home languages, they have more resources in their home languages to share complex ideas, than they may have in English at this point in time of their development.

Thus, the inquiry group used critical talk moves to provide a "loving critique" (Paris and Alim, 2017) of Paula's embodiment of linguistic separatism; as a solution, the group brainstormed how Paula might shift her pedagogies to focus more on students' flexible use of their full linguistic repertoire, an articulation of linguistic plurality. However, as the data shows, the group also upheld notions of linguistic separatism in their talk by suggesting students use their preferred languages in small groups, and then use English during whole class discussion; these practices do not fully embody translanguaging ideology. We note that this represents a straddling of ideologies, and that more reading and discussion was needed at this point to fully embrace translanguaging ideology (a point we will return to throughout our findings). The inquiry group concluded with Paula's commitment to try out some of these strategies with her class, record the class discussion and follow-up with a new transcript in early spring to revisit these ideas and reflect with the group on whether or not a shift in her pedagogy resulted in more student enthusiasm and participation.

**Critical conversation about "dual cultural positions": Paula's next classroom transcript**

Paula audio-recorded another whole class critical conversation on February 5, 2018 ("dual cultural positions"), and Kahdeidra generated field notes. For this recording, she tried out different pedagogical strategies to support students to use their language resources to talk about the book to deepen their comprehension. Two weeks later, the teacher inquiry group met to talk about Paula's new transcript. Melissa asked Paula to choose one chapter from Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies that most aligned with her classroom transcript for the group to read to support transcript analysis. The group agreed to discuss the reading first and then move to analyze Paula's new transcript together. Connor began the discussion about the reading:

> Connor: I felt like a lot of the concepts were really important to examine and to hold as a teacher, like not listening in a stigmatizing way, not positioning students' home languages as less appropriate or less valuable, not creating a white speaking subject.

> Kahdeidra: In reality, multilingual speakers, they use features from their entire linguistic repertoire. They use features from what would be considered Spanish or English, African American Language, whatever is spoken in their speech community. We teach this ideal [standardized English], but it's not actually what happens in reality. In reality, people speak using words, sentence structures and all kinds of features from everything that they know. That's devalued in the classroom.

> Paula: I guess when I think of code switching, it's not, necessarily, like one language to the other, but the type of language that you're using within a single language or within multiple languages […].

> Kahdeidra: For students, who don't have an easy facility with what we would consider to be the standard, a lot of times they're silent because they can't express themselves in that way, right? It's just like we want them to be able to use their full repertoire to express themselves, so focus more on the content than the structure.

Kahdeidra articulated translanguaging ideologies in her analysis of the chapter. She framed the need for teachers to view languaging practices from a stance of linguistic pluralism to support students to use their "full repertoire to express themselves," noting that the "standard" can have a silencing effect as seen in Paula's earlier transcript. Paula likened Kahdeidra's articulation of translanguaging to code-switching; while not fully articulating translanguaging ideology, her discussion of code-switching shows a growing awareness of the fluidity of language use in context. In our analysis, we noted this as a place where more discussion and readings about translanguaging ideology were needed to support Paula to fully embrace translanguaging. But we also noted that the teacher inquiry group conversation served as a disruption of ideologies related to language separatism, and was reconstructive in offering new lenses for Paula and all group members to articulate and embody translanguaging as a pedagogical approach.

Following a discussion about the chapter, the group turned to the transcript to see if any changes in Paula's discourse practices shaped the critical conversation differently. Paula's classroom transcript began with an open-ended question about students' experiences balancing

dual cultural positions similar to the main character in Alexie's book. Daniela (female student) begins by sharing how it took her time to adapt to going back to the Dominican Republic from the USA. Note that Paula left the question open-ended and did not place standardized language demands on students to respond with "this reminds me of" as evidenced by the following excerpt from her classroom transcript:

> Paula: All right, I want to go back to the first question, and this idea about being in two different worlds because we talked about why Junior doesn't fit in on the reservation […] When do you feel like you're living in two different worlds or who might else live in two different worlds? Daniela?

> Daniela: So, I felt like I was in two different worlds last year, like two years ago when I went back to the Dominican Republic. I felt really like strange at first when I was there, but it took me like three days to know how it feels to be back.

> Paula: It really is different worlds like geographically, the environment, your family. Rifat, what were you saying?

> Rifat: Also, it's real different when you go home because only if you don't speak […]. For example, in my language, I speak Pahari in my home, but when I come to school I only speak English. So, it's kind of a different, like two environments […].

> Paula: What is that like to have to switch when you get to school in the morning? What does that feel like? […].

> Rifat: First, it's difficult to switch […] here [school] people only care about like you speak English. So, it was difficult.

Students continue to pick up Paula's initial question and talk openly about how it is difficult to navigate the demands in school when standardized English is positioned as the only language people at school "care about." This critical conversation engaged students in critical thinking about language, power and context; students effectively drew from their knowledge and engaged in everyday reflective talk about language usage to participate in "citizen sociolinguistics" (Rymes, 2020). Throughout this transcript, Paula let go of her embodiment of standardized "English" and applied what she learned during the inquiry group. Her transcript is evidence that she shifted her pedagogy and placed less demand on students to use academic sentence starters to respond; she also provided instructional spaces for students to use their languages to learn together (straddling language separatism and language pluralism). During the teacher inquiry group discussion, she talked about what she noticed was different about the classroom discourse in this transcript:

> Paula: So this is the same class that we recorded before. And last time we [the inquiry group] were talking about translanguaging and giving them more opportunities to speak in their native languages maybe before or during the conversation. So before we had this discussion, they spent about half the class preparing, looking at the questions, and talking, and they were in their native language groups for that […].

Melissa: Have you found that that's been working to help them develop conversation for the whole group?

Paula: I felt like this discussion was not as disjointed as the last one where they were stopping and interrupting each other and trying to figure things out. I felt like they were a little bit more […] they were definitely more prepared. They were definitely more comfortable.

Referencing the classroom transcript, Paula explained to the inquiry group some of the strategies she had used to reposition languaging practices as fluid in the classroom, including grouping students into native language groups for support and giving them the questions ahead of whole class discussion to discuss using the languaging practices they prefer. Paula noted that the effect of embodying practices that brought students' languages into the classroom as resources, and moving away from strict languaging practices related to standardized English, improved the flow and clarity of the conversations and students were more comfortable speaking.

**Post interview: Paula's articulation of translanguaging ideologies**

The inquiry group meetings concluded at the end of the school year. Six months later, Melissa conducted interviews with each teacher to get a sense of their experience with the project and how it shaped their perspectives on their facilitation of critical conversations. Paula noted the conversations the group had about translanguaging had an important and lasting impact on her instruction:

Paula: We had so many conversations last year about allowing students to use their native language within the conversation, like translanguaging. I feel like I have really embraced that since then, and that has added to richer conversations because students are […]. I think before I was like, "Alright, you can speak in your native language and then switch completely to English. This is your warm up and now you're ready", and that's not how they're processing. It's not how they're communicating.

Paula's articulation of a translanguaging ideology is clear in her final interview. She emphasizes that the conversations with her teacher inquiry group colleagues and readings on culturally sustaining pedagogy helped her "embrace" a new way of articulating and embodying language ideologies; rather than emphasizing language separation, Paula shifted her practice to provide space in the classroom for students to learn using their languages in a more fluid and natural expression over time. In particular, she reflects that ideologies of linguistic purism were embodied in her former teaching practices, such as using students' preferred languages as a "warm up" to speaking exclusively in English. As a follow-up, Melissa asked Paula to share some specific examples of how her teaching practices have changed as a result of this shift in language ideologies:

Paula: Yeah, in the moment [of a discussion], like, "Use your native language. How would you express it in Spanish? How would you say it in Arabic?" Then, if

someone in the classroom can help, and translate for the other students, and for me, that's great. If not, sometimes just to state, you know, articulating it in a native language and they can think of the word or we can use a bilingual dictionary or we can do something [to figure it out]. I think I was shutting down conversation, and participation, and thinking, and sharing by this insistence of first, like, "Yes, we will support native language", but [only] in this context, instead of more broadly.

Paula explained how her practice has shifted toward encouraging students to fluidly move between their languages in the construction of meaning "in the moment"; she also described that her earlier practices reinforced separating languages, such as using students' native languages in small groups for support and then moving to the "real" conversation in English is "not how they are processing" and "not how they are communicating." Thus, Paula articulates that a translanguaging ideology undergirds students' languaging practices in the moment that are more organic and natural for students as they navigate their linguistic resources throughout their lives. Importantly, she critically self-reflects that her previous insistence on practices informed by language separation were limiting students' thinking, participation and sharing with one another during critical conversations.

**Discussion**

Findings indicate that with support from her teacher inquiry group, Paula both articulates and embodies a shift in language ideologies over time. Her insistence that students use standardized English or "academic" language to participate in critical conversations reinforced a hegemonic and colonialist ideology of linguistic purism that maintains the linguistic repertoire of white, monolingual speakers who hold power in the United States. Reading about culturally sustaining pedagogies and the "loving critiques" (Paris and Alim, 2017) from her teacher inquiry group resulted in a reconstruction of Paula's language ideologies. As evidenced from her classroom transcript and her final interview, Paula both articulated and embodied language ideologies associated with language plurality and translanguaging that promoted more natural and fluid languaging practices that drew on her students' full linguistic repertoire rather than using native languages as a bridge to more valued Standardized English; and supported student learning. Thus, Paula engaged a more culturally sustaining approach by implementing translanguaging pedagogies and as a result she and her students experienced more authentic and meaningful discussions. This study teaches us that inquiry groups can open opportunities for teachers to engage in reconstructive analysis together. For example, the group helped Paula, a white woman, to reconstruct her language ideologies which helped her enact teaching practices over time that are anti-racist.

Paula's teacher inquiry group colleagues disrupted her language ideologies and presented her with alternate ideologies associated with translanguaging that reconstructed her articulation and embodiment of language ideologies from linguistic purism to translanguaging. Indeed, researchers' maintain that "in order to change teacher practices, one must address the language ideologies that mediate teacher practices" (Razfar, 2005, p. 404). How does one come to know the language ideologies from which they are operating? We argue that findings demonstrate that using discourse analysis with classroom transcripts provided tools for teachers to analyze their language usage and instructional practices. These tools served as crucial empirical artifacts of teaching and learning that supported the teacher inquiry groups to engage in such analysis. Also, more specifically, reading about Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies and having a group member with deep

conceptual and practical understanding of translanguaging as a language ideology resulted in a reconstructive orientation to Paula's practice. Engaging in discourse analysis of transcripts with supportive yet critical colleagues supported Paula to embrace students' full linguistic repertoires as a resource for meaning making rather than "inappropriate" for school. Thus, this study taught us that engaging in DA of transcripts with critical friends in an inquiry group is one significant way to focus on reconstructive orientations. In other words, DA and the inquiry group discussions allowed teachers to identify problems of practice they wanted to change and to implement those changes in their classrooms. As a result, they were able to see reconstructive shifts over time. Findings from the study also contribute to scholarly and professional knowledge about how models of teaching as inquiry (Manfra, 2019) demonstrate a positive or reconstructive impact on teacher and student learning. Our study highlights the potential for reconstructive shifts in the context of how teachers learn together and the tools that support them in doing so.

More empirical research is needed to illuminate the ways that teachers and students resist the white gaze that positions the speaking and listening subject as "correct" only when participating in standardized languaging practices of schooling as a form of linguistic justice (Baker-Bell, 2020). Part of this work includes building teachers' and students' critical consciousness about language, power, identity and context to develop interactional awareness (Rex and Schiller, 2009) about language use in communicative contexts. More work is also needed to examine how and why white teachers make reconstructive shifts toward anti-racism with the goal of providing more spaces for teachers to do that work. In Paula's classroom, when linguistic pluralism and flexibility were positioned as resources, students' showed greater participation and also engaged critically with one another about how language use is fluid and context-dependent. We conclude by emphasizing the value of teacher inquiry group spaces, in conjunction with tools such as readings and knowledgeable others, to support teachers to make reconstructive shifts in their pedagogies over time to support student learning.

**Table A1.** Data Analysis Chart

| Language ideology | Embodied or articulated | Data excerpt |
|---|---|---|
| *linguistic purism* | *Embodied* | *Paula:* Who wants to respond to what Rafia said [that] some girls don't have a choice they have to get married in Bangladesh. So let's respond to that. Either "this reminds me of" or "I agree with"… |
| *Translanguaging* | *Articulated* | *Kahdeidra*: …In reality, multilingual speakers, they use features from their entire linguistic repertoire. They use features from what would be considered Spanish or English, African American Language, whatever is spoken in their speech community |

**Table A2.** Timeline

| | |
|---|---|
| *November 27, 2017*<br>Paula audio recorded one whole group critical conversation ("stifled dreams") and Melissa recorded field notes | Paula facilitates a critical conversation on the issue of stifled dreams in *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-time Indian* (Alexie) through a discussion about women and arranged marriage in Bangladesh |
| *December 8, 2017*<br>Inquiry group met to engage in analysis of "stifled dreams" | Teacher inquiry group meets to analyze Paula's transcript from November 27, 2017. The group supports Paula to consider ways to open up students' languaging opportunities in the classroom |
| *February 5, 2018*<br>Paula audio records one whole group critical conversation ("dual cultural positions") and Kahdeidra records field notes | Paula facilitates a critical conversation about how characters balance dual cultural positions in the novel and students discuss language use and context |
| *February 19, 2018*<br>Inquiry group meets to analyze "dual cultural positions" | Teacher inquiry group meets to analyze Paula's transcript from 2/5/2018. Paula chose the chapter from *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies* ("Do you hear what I hear? Raciolinguistice ideologies and culturally sustaining pedagogies") for the group to read and discuss for this inquiry group meeting because it aligned with the dilemma she was experiencing in her practice |

# References

Alim, H.S. (2005), "Critical language awareness in the United States: revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society", Educational Researcher, Vol. 34 No. 7, pp. 24-31.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020), Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy, Routledge, New York.

Bartlett, T. (2018), "Positive discourse analysis", in Flowerdew, F. and Richardson, J.E. (Eds), The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies, Routledge, pp. 133-147.

García, O. (2011), "From language garden to sustainable languaging: bilingual education in a global world", NABE Perspectives, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 5-9.

García, O and Li Wei. (2014), Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

García, O., Johnson, S.I. and Seltzer, K. (2017), The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning, Caslon, Philadelphia, PA.

Gee, J.P. (2004), An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method, Routledge, New York.

Hornberger, N. and Link, H. (2012), "Translanguaging in today's classrooms: a biliteracy lens", Theory into Practice, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 239-247.

Kincheloe, J.L., McLaren, P. and Steinberg, S.R. (2011), "Critical pedagogy and qualitative research", in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds), The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 163-177.

Kroskrity, P.V. (2004), "Language ideologies", in Duranti, A. (Ed.), A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 496-517.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012), English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States, 2nd ed., Routledge, New York.

Manfra, M.M. (2019), "Action research and systematic, intentional change in teaching practice", Review of Research in Education, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 163-196.

Martin, K.M., Aponte, G. and García, O. (2019), "Countering raciolinguistic ideologies: the role of translanguaging in educating bilingual children", Cahiers Internationaux de Sociolinguistique, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 19-41, doi: 10.3917/cisl.1902.0019.

Martinez, D., Morales, P.Z. and Aldana, U. (2017), "Leveraging students' communicative repertoires as a tool for equitable learning", Review of Research in Education, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 477-499.

Martínez, R., Hikida, M. and Durán, L. (2015), "Unpacking ideologies of linguistic pluralism: how dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging", International Multilingual Research Journal, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 26-42.

Maxwell, J. (2005), Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Metz, M. (2018), "Challenges of confronting dominant language ideologies in the high school English classroom", Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 455-477.

Metz, M. and Knight, H. (2021), "The dominant school language narrative: unpacking English teachers' language ideologies", Language, Vol. 97 No. 3, pp. 238-256.

Milner, H.R. (2012), "But what is urban education?", Urban Education, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 556-561.

Paris, D. and Alim, H.S. (Eds) (2017), Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching for Justice in a Changing World, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

Razfar, A. (2005), "Language ideologies in practice: repair and classroom discourse", Linguistics and Education, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 404-424.

Rex, L.A. and Schiller, L. (2009), Using Discourse Analysis to Improve Classroom Interaction, Routledge, New York.

Rogers, R. (2018), Reclaiming Powerful Literacies: New Horizons for Critical Discourse Analysis, Routledge, New York.

Rogers, R. and Wetzel, M.M. (2013a), Designing Critical Literacy Education through Critical Discourse Analysis: Pedagogical and Research Tools for Teacher-Researchers, Routledge, New York.

Rogers, R. and Wetzel, M.M. (2013b), "Studying agency in literacy teacher education: a layered approach to positive discourse analysis", Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 62-92.

Rymes, B. (2020), "Watch your language! Students as citizen sociolinguists", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 101 No. 5, pp. 8-13.

Schieble, M., Vetter, A. and Martin, K.M. (2020), Classroom Talk for Social Change: Critical Conversations in English Language Arts, Teachers College Press, New York.

Schieffelin, B.B., Woolard, K. A. and Kroskrity, P.V. (Eds) (1998), Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory, Vol. 16, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H.E. (Eds) (2008), The Handbook of Discourse Analysis, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Seltzer, K. and de los Ríos, C. V. (2018), "Translating theory to practice: exploring teachers' raciolinguistic literacies in secondary English classrooms", English Education, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 49-79.

Silverstein, M. (1979), "Language structure and linguistic ideology", in Clyne, P.R. Hanks, W.F. and Hofbauer, C.L. (Eds), The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL, pp. 193-247.

Stake, R. (1995), The Art of Case Study Research, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Valenzuela, A. (1999), Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring, SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

Vetter, A. and Schieble, M. (2020), "Approaches to discourse analysis in language and literacy research", in Duke, N. and Mallette, M. (Eds), Literacy Research Methodologies, 3rd ed., Guilford Press, pp. 121-140.

Vetter, A., Schieble, M. and Martin, K.M. (2022), "Examining silences in an English teacher inquiry group focused on critical conversations: a facilitator's reflexive analysis", Linguistics and Education, Vol. 68, pp. 1-14.