

PEDAGOGICAL CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: PROMOTING ACADEMIC
LITERACY THROUGH ESOL COMPOSITION

by

JEFFERY LEE ORR

(Under the Direction of Mark Faust)

ABSTRACT

Journals like Second Language Writing and TESOL Quarterly have documented studies on ESOL composition, among other language oriented issues, that evoke the clinical. Student writing undergoes examinations, diagnoses, evaluations, and prescriptions. Textual prognoses include, invariably, the need for students to acquire additional proficiencies whether in the areas of lexicon, syntax, or discrete grammar. Students' texts, accordingly, present as acutely deficient, deficient lexicosyntactically and detached socioculturally.

This study portends, then, the dawning of an alternate model, one bound not toward the annihilation of the evaluative and the prescriptive but cast instead as a proclamation that ESOL students bring, in concert with some linguistic challenges surrounding textual production in English, robust repertoires of social and historical knowledge to composition classrooms. Such student knowledge, when privileged in instructional contexts, particularly the ESOL composition classroom at the university level, reduces the deficit model of learning and reconstructs curricular models for teaching. Recasting models for learning and teaching in ESOL composition warrants a revitalization of academic literacy as a sociocultural affordance. Academic literacy affords students discursive opportunities to integrate their own cultural and

historical knowledge to interpret, evaluate, synthesize and create texts. It contributes to students' ability to textually initiate and reiterate dialogues in context within the academy and additional institutional and social realms.

INDEX WORDS: academic literacy, ESOL composition, cultural affordance, utterance, critical discourse analysis, dialogism, sociocultural theory, identity

PEDAGOGICAL CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: PROMOTING ACADEMIC
LITERACY THROUGH ESOL COMPOSITION

by

JEFFERY LEE ORR

M.A., Jackson State University, 1980

B.S., Mississippi State University, 1978

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

© 2006

Jeffery Lee Orr

All Rights Reserved

PEDAGOGICAL CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: PROMOTING ACADEMIC
LITERACY THROUGH ESOL COMPOSITION

by

JEFFERY LEE ORR

Major Professor: Mark Faust

Committee: Linda Harklau
Betsy Rymes

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2006

DEDICATION

to

Spirit and desire

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To polyphony, a communion of voices affirming this effort:

Ancestral—the Whitfields, the Orrs, the sayers and seers

Familial—Johnnie, Devotie, Joyce, Ashley

Communal—Wanda, John, Linda, Tim, Jeff, Lynn, Kim, Rachelle, Nancy, Paul, Terry

Academic---Mark Faust for cohesion, Linda Harklau for methods, Betsy Rymes for discourse,
and Joan Kelly Hall for Bakhtin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER	
1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	5
2 METHODOLOGY.....	25
Research Context	25
A Pedagogical Critical Discourse Analysis.....	30
Data Collection.....	37
Data Analysis.....	39
3 DIALOGUES WITH BUMPER STICKERS.....	41
Assigning Bumper Stickers	48
Experiencing Bumper Stickers	50
4 CONTEXTUALYZING CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	69
Critical Discourse Analysis as a Pedagogical Practice	69
Thinking Side-by-Side with my Students	73
More Theory, More Pedagogical Possibilities.....	77
Connecting CDA and Issues of Academic Literacy.....	82
5 TEXTS IN CONTEXT	90

Headings in “The Hispanic Challenge”	91
“Early Warnings” and “The Threat of White Nativism?”	100
ENGL 1001 Final Examination.....	109
6 DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY	127
“EASY PREY”	127
ENGL 1102 Final Examination	135
7 DISCUSSION	153
REFERENCES	168

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Joe	26
Table 2: Miguel	26
Table 3: Abrihem	27
Table 4: Carlos	27
Table 5: Bumper Stickers	51
Table 6: Students	52
Table 7: Epistemic Stances	53
Table 8: Affective Stances	53
Table 9: Headings in “The Hispanic Challenge”	99
Table 10: “The Threat of White Nativism?”	108
Table 11: ENGL 11001 Final Examination.....	125
Table 12: “EASY PREY”	135
Table 13: A Venezuelan Identity.....	141
Table 14: A Taiwanese Identity.....	146
Table 15: A Columbian Identity.....	149
Table 16: A Nigerian Identity.....	152

INTRODUCTION

What matters is knowing how to make meaning like the natives do.

-Jay Lemke, 2004

ESOL students who arrive in the United States just prior to beginning their collegiate experiences in American universities pursue academic literacy first by attempting to make meaning in ways their cultures have afforded them. Such affordances, though culturally rich in contexts with which students are familiar, often leave students challenged by institutional contexts that permeate higher education in the United States. A most salient context for undergraduate students, the composition classroom, exists primarily to foster students' acquisition of academic literacy. Some instructional challenges that mar ESOL composition and guide this study, however, are the myriad conceptualizations of academic literacy in English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) composition. These conceptualizations include lexico-syntactic proficiency (Hinkel, 2003; Schleppegrell, 2002; Celce-Murcia, 2002); contextualized "social languages" (Gee, 2002); competencies (Scarcella, 2002); behaviors (Blanton, 1998); and socially and politically contextualized teaching and learning (Columbi & Schleppegrell, 2002; Ramanathan, 2002; Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Leki & Carson, 1997).

The varied approaches to academic literacy affect not only ways instructors construct syllabi for composition courses but also ways students perform in those classes. ESOL students, in any first year writing class, will very likely face challenges including varying degrees of lexiosyntactic competence, particular cultural and linguistic approaches to meaning making, and the above cited myriad of conceptualizations of academic literacy, in theory and in instruction.

They will also face instructional contexts without awareness of course content when they move from one composition class to another, from one instructor to another, from one institution to another. The students in my classes are no exception. I know this to be true because I am an ESOL composition instructor at a university in a suburb of a metropolitan area in the South Eastern U.S. While I have taught composition for twenty years, I have taught ESOL students during the past six years. Within that time, I have become increasingly cognizant of ESOL students' ability; that knowledge informs my teaching. And even though these students did not enter my classes with an awareness of the instructional model they would experience, they soon learned that the knowledge they bring, the cultural affordances they hold, contributed to the instructional model I introduced. They discovered also that the instructional model did not represent an "either or" dichotomy. That is, instruction did not focus *either* on appropriate lexicosyntatic proficiency *or* on language as a socially situated phenomenon; rather, it took on "both and," that is, lexicosyntatic systems and context. Instruction in these classes combined experiences with language as socially situated and culturally bound phenomena with discussion of and practice with precise diction and proper syntax. The students' texts I cited as examples in this study illustrate students' varying degrees of linguistic competence in both areas. The texts do not, however, represent edited versions, though the students did revise regularly and resubmit texts, except the final examinations. I chose the unedited versions because the aim of this study is to present ESOL students' preliminary application of cultural affordances in their ongoing pursuit of academic literacy in first year composition. The preliminary application suggests just that, a beginning of a potentially lifelong process of contextualizing and generating text.

The application of cultural affordances alone will not necessarily prepare students for the academic exercises they face at universities in the United States. However, those affordances,

when applied to university writing assignments in conjunction with attention to grammar and form in context, particularly to ESOL compositions that foreground students' cultural repertoires, situate these students as practitioners of dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984), a mediation of cultural, ideological past with a cultural, ideological present. This mediation is influenced both by "the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 291) and the socio-ideological consistencies of the present and past. From this mediation, schemata emerge which position ESOL students as potentially available to dialogism. Students' availability to dialogic investigations situates them as potentially available as well to a teaching method I propose—pedagogical critical discourse analysis.

This study introduces a pedagogical methodology to assist ESOL students in their acquisition and enhancement of academic literacy despite its multiple, controversial representations. The method draws theoretically upon dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a relatively new and evolving research methodology that requires a historical, contextual interpretation of discourses in relation to power, identity and ideology (Meyer, 2001). This method moves beyond theoretical renderings that characterize academic literacy to a pedagogical approach that simultaneously privileges students' current epistemologies and ideologies and creates opportunities for students to enhance academic literacy through an investigation of "the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual" (Halliday, 1978, 1984) dimensions of language. Students' investigations, for practical purposes, will be analyzed from my student centered framing of Halliday's language dimensions as three basic concepts: First, ideational—ideas-- represents ways students conceptualize their own ideas and interpret ideas of others. Second, interactional—interaction-- represents ways students' relationships influence their ideas and, conversely, students' acquired awareness that others'

relationships influence ideas. Third, textual—text--represents ways ideas and interaction affect students' creation of text and others creation of text. Accordingly, this study asks the following research questions:

1. How do ESOL composition students draw from their social and historical knowledge to interpret media samples as dialogic utterances in (bumper stickers, newspaper editorials and one magazine article)?
2. How can I introduce a contextualized, pedagogical discourse analysis (analysis of power, identity and ideology) as a pedagogical practice to promote academic literacy?
3. How do students use their meta-awareness as a form of critique?

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The preponderance of conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL composition situates first-year ESOL students as negotiators of instructional and institutional contexts about which they may hold little awareness. Instructional and institutional philosophies of academic literacy defy systemization.

Most recently Hinkel (2003) ruminates on academic texts quantitatively by measuring in terms of excess and lack. L2 students' texts when compared to L1 students' texts reveal excessive "syntactic and lexical simplicity" (p. 276) and therefore lack "elegance" (p. 275). While she focuses on sentence level issues of diction and grammar, Hinkel early on relies upon a reification of academic texts within the academy. As such she need not oblige a definition. She begins to restrict academic texts, however, as those containing elaborate words valued by length and "accurate and extensive use of subordinate clauses and appropriate use of articles" (p. 276). She ascribes sophistication as a characteristic of academic texts and suggests such sophistication should be taught through juxtaposing casual conventions of spoken language to the more formal structures of academic writing. Uncontextualized discrete grammar proficiency determined by measuring length of words, complexity of clauses, and syntactic density-- characteristics of sophisticated writing, and at least to Hinkel, academic writing, reduces a focus on the generation and development of ideas and increases the consideration of sentence level conventions. Hinkel surmises, "teachers of academically bound students and researchers of academic prose may find it fruitful and constructive to find out how to improve students' text production skills to yield more sophisticated syntactic constructions and lexis so that the students are at a smaller

disadvantage when they leave the ESL classroom” (p. 299). Thus academic literacy, though not Hinkel’s chosen term, evolves when instructors teach and students learn sets of skills which, when amassed, contribute to L2 writer sophistication. Albeit, as Hinkel diagnoses, this sophistication is sophistication of the disadvantaged. Sophistication produced by a lexicosyntactic density without additional necessary competencies impedes acquisition of a more broadly prescribed academic literacy. In other words, a complete academic literacy curriculum, I believe, should devote ample attention to syntactic and lexical conventions in context, associated with considerable attention to audience and purpose, rhetorical conventions.

Context, for the ESOL students I teach, functions as a mediational tool to incorporate challenging concepts and new knowledge “in relatively automated ways that represent the typical and repeated meaning-making practices of the communities to which we belong, and in ways that are specific to cultures and subcultures, topics, participants, and settings” (Lemke, 2002, p. 22). Accordingly, another approach, albeit broad-based, as outlined in Gee (2002) situates literacy within the contexts of discourses and identities, contexts given far less attention in Hinkel. While discourses and identities emerge within socially situated activities and environments, reading and writing characterize literacy as socially situated, dependent upon and reflective of social rituals. Gee explains:

There is no such thing as language (e.g., English) or literacy (e.g., reading or writing) *in general*. People do not learn *English*. Rather they learn a specific “social language” (variety or register of English) fit to certain social purposes and not to others. They do not learn to *read* or *write*, they learn to read or write *something* (some type of text) within a specific social language used in specific ways by specific groups of people for specific purposes. (p. 162)

Though “academic” does not appear in Gee’s conceptualization of literacy, the skill or discernment implicit in knowing the place and time, that is, knowing and using appropriate language for particular tasks is an academic achievement.

Another tenet of literacy with or without the label “academic,” grammatical competence, resonates differently with Hinkel and Gee. A cursory glance at Shakespeare illustrates. In Hamlet, “the play’s the thing” (III, i). For Gee, “grammar is the *rules* by which grammatical units like nouns and verbs, subjects and objects, phrases and objects, phrases and clauses, as well as various sorts of discourse features, are used to create patterns that signal or index characteristic *whos-doing-whats-within-Discourses*” (p. 163). The actors, the social interactants involved in the context of the situation, use grammar to achieve the intended purpose, to convey the meaning suited to the situation. Context gives way to textual style for Hinkel whose focus on sentence level elegance would likely berate Hamlet as terse (although in deference to Hinkel, I admit Hamlet is speaking, through Shakespeare’s text); the distinction of spoken and written language, however, is of less substance to Gee. Nonetheless, to exact upon Hamlet the requisite removal of the being/stative verb and the ambiguous noun could render him with, “The play shall undoubtedly illuminate my uncle’s guilt,” or “The play shall resolve this dilemma.” or “The play holds the resolution.” Gee and Shakespeare liken situational lexical economy to the establishment of effective situational discourse wherein simplicity embodies immediacy, lyricism, and for some readers, elegance.

Grammar, then, or more appropriately grammars, to Gee can function as tools to perform certain work. That work can be most effectively achieved when appropriate tools match particular tasks. Gee links teaching and learning as integral social actions and calls upon teachers to teach students “how Discourse models and situated meanings work within specific Discourses. Teaching grammar, even in the sense of general form-function mappings, is not

sufficient. One has to teach how grammatical forms relate to very specific functions within very specific Discourses” (p. 173).

So far, then, academic literacy as conceptualized in ESOL presents a binary. On the one hand, academic literacy can be defined as a system by focusing on what it looks like on a textual level (long detailed sentences, transitive verbs, and embedded clauses; on the other hand, academic literacy can be defined as agency, ways one uses language within discourses (knowing what language to use in appropriate contexts). How then, for example, will the discourse of college friends walking on campus and talking, the discourse of the same friends sending instant messages on computers or cell phones, the same friends writing reports for an architecture class be classified? Can they all be considered “academic”? If so, must they all reflect discipline-specific content?

Conflating the binary by viewing writing in academic contexts as an acquired skill, one ESOL students develop over time, Schleppegrell (2002) states, “these students need assistance drawing on the appropriate grammatical elements that present the meaning they intend as they use language in meaningful contexts. Instructors need to engage students in interactive co-construction of meaning and model appropriate and effective ways of realizing intended meanings at the clause level” (p. 140). Schleppegrell presents her theory within the context of a research article advocating the significance of increasing discipline knowledge and grammatical resources of ESOL students. She concludes, “As students who lack a range of grammatical resources focus on presenting disciplinary knowledge in their writing assignments, their infelicitous grammatical choices sometimes present a stance that may be inappropriate or create a text that lacks cohesion or fails to represent intended meanings” (p. 140).

Contextualization provides merit for Schleppegrell who situates the study in a university science class. I include her study in this review in spite of the fact that its focus moves beyond the prescribed scope of ESOL academic literacy as conceived in composition classes. Its relevance is the symbolic

target. What competencies will ESOL students need to function within the academy? Can they write a scientific lab report? The scientific laboratory report, a typical university textual form, serves as Schlepppegrell's data set. One questionable means of presenting the data, however, arises in her description of the standard or model lab report. Instead of using a model lab report with the lexical and grammatical features recognized as successful as the standard, one which happens to be written by a native speaker, and targeting that model as the goal towards which ESOL students strive, Schlepppegrell situates and reinforces a proficient/deficient binary, NS/NNS. The model lab report is composed by a NS without the errors associated with NNS's. Having noted that framing choice, the proficient/deficient binary, I can focus on Schlepppegrell's contribution to demystifying the "academic" in ESOL.

Providing much needed context not only in the form of the lab report but also in calling attention to genre Schlepppegrell (2002) notes, "Each discipline has its own genres that are recontextualized in academic assignments" (p. 119). The element of contextualization thereby draws oftentimes ambiguously, ubiquitously cast ideology from the heavens to a pedagogical principle grounded in real world, albeit academic world practicality. Such situatedness reduces a quality Gee (2002) acknowledges: "Indeed in many colleges and universities, Freshman Writing has become an in-house Discourse all its own with few substantive ties to other Discourses at play elsewhere in the college or university" (p. 174). Conversely, Schlepppegrell claims that the writing students accomplish through lab reports in science classes prepares "them for the real-life writing tasks they will perform when they leave the university" (p. 119). Whether the claim is valid cannot be tested immediately nor is it immediately apparent what Schlepppegrell constitutes as "real-life writing tasks; however, the basis for the claim resides primarily in her desire that ESOL students improve their abilities to make meaning through contextualized, lexico/grammatical proficiency.

Like Hinkel, Schleppergrell situates the clause as the syntactic feature of significance. She suggests, “Constructing particular instances of genre calls for the coherent presentation of meanings at the clause level” (p. 119). Unlike Hinkel’s one-size-fits all, improved grammar equals improved academic discourse, Schleppergrell borrows from Halliday’s (1978, 1994) work with registers, particularly “ideational” which represents experience, “interpersonal” which enacts social relations, and “textual” which presents contextualized messages in text. Each dimension functions in concert with the others to contextualize meaning. Even though Halliday’s theory resides closely connected to grammar, the underlying ideals resemble the discourses in Gee (2002), especially the *whos-doing-whats-within-Discourses*. Inherent in Gee’s argument is the existence of multiple discourses emanating from social languages, yet he, too, would support Schellergrell’s assertion “that ESL students need to adopt the register features that give their work the authoritativeness and textual structure that realize the meanings expected in standard Academic English. (p. 140). Gee, however, would probably be more prone, as I am, to state academic literacy or academic discourse instead of “standard Academic English” because as this review demonstrates polyvocalic interpretations contribute to the conceptualization of “academic” notwithstanding “standard” or “literacy.”

As for literacy, two additional voices contributing to its conceptualization are Scarcella (2002) and Celce-Murcia (2002) who value the role of instruction as a means for students to acquire literacy. Students who do not experience adequate instruction, Scarcella maintains:

may learn to access print and read basic materials, but they will never gain the proficiency in English that they need to access more advanced texts... because there are large and significant differences between the kind of English literacy needed to participate in ordinary, everyday situations and to accomplish daily

communicative goals and the kind of English literacy needed to participate in academic situations and to accomplish... academic goals. (pp. 223-224)

Celce-Murcia contends:

We need to reanalyze virtually all of English grammar at the discourse level in order to be able to teach our students *rules* of grammar that will serve them when they read and write English for academic purposes. Sentence level knowledge and production of a structure are but elementary perquisites to knowing how to use or interpret a structure in written discourse. When to use the structure and for what purpose one might use it constitute critical knowledge for learners wishing to acquire advanced literacy skills. (P. 155)

Each successively iterative theoretical voice of academic literacy calls out to instructors to commandeer literacy as multidimensional and to facilitate multidimensional teaching. For example, Scarcella views literacy as everyday or academic as Celce-Murcia positions grammar into academic discourse and other discourse, and to my delight, relegates sentence level grammar as merely foundational, a primary skill that although important, contributes to academic literacy when coupled with students' abilities to interpret and compose texts for various purposes. To their voices I add, instructors should know the who, what, when and how of literacy-discourse-grammar in order to teach the who, what, when and how and respective "not"—who not, what not, when not, how not and certainly why not. Mediational literacy, survivalist literacy, informed literacy constitute lesser developed dimensions of academic literacy; Colombi & Schleppegrell (2002) observe, "Different uses of literacy are not neutral; they inevitably contribute to maintaining or challenging the way things are" (p. 12).

Advanced literacy can be developed. Scarcella advocates a multidimensional developmental approach. Students should acquire advanced literacy in their first language, acquire oral English proficiency, speak with speakers of standard English, learn basic reading, attain input from academic texts, and attend to textual form (p. 213). When students acquire advanced literacy, they should not merely amass information. Instead, they should develop competencies:

- Summarize texts;
- Analyze texts;
- Extract meaning and information from texts;
- Evaluate evidence and arguments presented in texts;
- Recognize and analyze textual conventions used in various genres;
- Recognize ungrammatical and infelicitous usage in written language;
- Use grammatical devices for combining sentences into concise and more effective ones;
- Compose and write an extended, reasoned text that is well developed and supported with evidence and details;
- Interpret word problems—recognizing that in such texts, ordinary words may have quite a different meaning; and
- Extract precise information from a written text and devise an appropriate strategy for solving problems based on the information provided in the text.

(Wong & Snow, 1999 cited in Scarcella, 2002)

While this list of competencies appears extensive if not potentially daunting, it quite adequately reduces the ambiguousness of academic literacy by naming skills, competencies, behaviors, practices. What Wong & Snow conceive are methods of engagement that require students to grapple with texts by considering texts not necessarily as ends but rather as sources for mediation, for inquiry and for commentary. This list provides context for multidimensionality not only for literacy as a set of competencies but also literacy instruction as polyphonic pedagogy. Teachers and learners are duly charged.

Celce-Murcia (2002), on the other hand, honors multidimensionality in literacy yet focuses primarily on one dimension, grammar, albeit grammar contextualized. She rejects grammar instruction

when it is conceived “primarily as a sentence-level phenomenon” (p. 143) and rejects, as well, Krashen’s (1982) assertion “that explicit grammar instruction is of little or no consequence in facilitating second-language acquisition” (Celce-Murcia, 2002, p. 143). Celce-Murcia approaches the matter of acquiring academic writing skills by outlining three challenges ESL writers face: voice, “there” and connectors. Overcoming these challenges through extensive instruction, students should champion the following competencies:

Linguistic/grammatical competence (i.e., control of syntax and morphology)

Sociolinguistic competence (i.e., knowing what lexicogrammatical form to choose given the topic, the social setting, and one’s interlocutor(s))

Discourse competence (i.e., knowing how to put sentence-level propositions into sequence to form coherent, connected text)

Strategic competence (i.e., knowing how to negotiate assistance/clarification, ect. when one’s lack of competence in any above area impedes communication)

Such competencies as influenced by Hymes (1972) illustrate not only communicative competence but also Celce-Murcia’s assertion that grammar instruction directly influences communicative competence and academic literacy: “The grammar instruction that learners of English as a second or foreign language require if they are to achieve advanced literacy skills must be discourse-based and discourse-grounded so that learners acquire not only the forms but also the meanings and uses of the target grammatical structures” (p. 144).

To lift one word from the previous Celce-Murcia quote, “meaning,” out of its context of grammatical units and apply it to the context of comprehension, namely reading comprehension and its impact on academic writing is to encompass yet another dimension of academic literacy as it is conceived in ESL. For example, Spack (1998) urges teachers to assist students in the comprehension of what others in the academy have written, “perhaps the most important skill

English teachers can engage students in is the complex ability to write from other texts, a major part of their academic writing experience” (p. 96). Though she attributes value to teaching and learning academic writing, Spack admits, “Determining what academic writing is and what ESL students need to know in order to produce it has not been an easy task for researchers and teachers” (p. 86). She cites Johns, 1986; Shaughnessy 1977; Bizzell 1982; and Rose 1985 who question the appropriateness “of a process approach that promotes student-generated meaning and form” (Spack, 1998, p. 88) because much academic writing is writing in response to a particular prompts. These prompts involve texts and data (Scheiber, 1987) and the assignments serve to foster comprehension of discipline content through student invention, drafting, revising and editing (Shih, 1986). For Spack (1998) one goal for teaching ESL students academic writing “is to create programs in which students can learn general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks that transfer to other course work” (p. 95). I support the notion that writing within the academy answers a prompt, oftentimes textually driven, discipline specific. I certainly appreciate writing opportunities that challenge students to invent, draft, revise and edit, the particular processes brought into question here when associated with student-centered writing. I contend that the processes of writing evoked in personal writing do not necessarily mutate unrecognizably when evoked in writing considered discipline-specific. The subject changes. I believe, too, that writing processes learned when students write personal discourse can transfer to future academic endeavors. Consequently, as Elbow (1998) argues “we need nonacademic discourse even for the sake of helping students produce good academic discourse” (p. 147). Academic discourse or as Elbow states “the work of academic discourse...makes arguments, solves problems analyzes texts and issues, tries to answer the hard questions—and usually refers to and builds on academic discourse” (2000, p. 315).

Interaction with texts as central to Spack and Elbow takes preeminence with Blanton (1998) placing it “at the heart of literacy, formal learning, and academic success” (p. 226). Blanton distinguishes between literate behaviors and literacy skills. For literate behaviors, she cites Heath & Mangiola (1991) who suggest that students should:

1. Interpret texts in light of their own experience and their own experience in light of texts;
2. Agree or disagree with texts in light of that experience;
3. Link texts to each other;
4. Synthesize texts, and use their synthesis to build new assertions;
5. Extrapolate from texts;
6. Create their own texts, doing all of the above;
7. Talk and write about doing any or all of the above;
8. Do Numbers 6 and 7 in such a way as to meet the expectations of their audience. (p. 7)

For literacy behaviors, Blanton, by way of Heath & Mangiola, includes skills named previously in this review, mainly the ability to interact with texts. What distinguishes this list, however, are broadened conceptualizations of literacy behaviors such as acknowledging the significance of the relation of one’s personal life to one’s interpretation of texts and the ability to link texts to other texts and other experiences. And, though not stated directly, I would add the ability to attribute to a text an author who interprets and generates text according to personal experiences and interpretations. Blanton contends, however, that “while a student’s literacy skills undoubtedly transfer to other disciplines, we will surely discover that it is behaviors and not skills that make the critical difference for students’ academic success” (p. 227). Like Spack, Blanton challenges teachers to guide students toward advanced literacy. Blanton advises, “we must foster the behaviors of ‘talking’ to texts, talking and writing about them, linking them to other texts, connecting them to their readers’ own lives and experience, and then using their experience to illuminate the text and the text to illuminate their experience. Along the way, L2 students also acquire English” (p. 228).

At the risk of including yet another list, whether a list of skills, competencies or behaviors, I offer Blanton's list of characteristics embodied in ESOL classrooms that promote academic literacy because in addition to the previously cited lists, Blanton's list not only propels students to the forefront of academic literacy but it also moves boldly toward overt politicization of academic literacy. She introduces such concepts as language as a medium instead of a subject, sites of authority, and roles for students and instructors in literacy classrooms. Students, Blanton asserts, may achieve authority when they connect selves and experiences to writing about texts. Academic literacy cannot exist for the student "without the reader/writer's individual and personal involvement or, conversely, without the reader/ writer's involvement of the individual and personal" (p. 231). See numbers 5-10 specifically. Colombi & Schleppegrell (2002) caution, "All texts function socially and politically within communities, and it is important that we understand what the demands of advanced literacy are and the consequences of teaching or not teaching students to engage with certain kinds of texts and contexts and not others" (p. 12).

ESL classrooms that promote academic literacy, according to Blanton (1998), are classes in which:

1. Reading and writing are integrated;
2. Language is not the subject of the class; rather, it is the medium in which students and teachers and students and texts interact;
3. Class work is activity-oriented and collaborative;
4. Language use is necessitated by the need to complete the tasks at hand;
5. Tasks call for integrating with texts—reading them, talking about them, extrapolating from them, linking them to each other, relating one's own experience to them, calling on them to shed new light on one's experience and one's experience on them, synthesizing them, and writing one's own text that do any or all of the above;
6. Texts do not constitute the sole authority on any subject;
7. Students experience is called for and valued in text interaction;
8. Tasks provide opportunities for students to claim authority as they balance their individual responses with a growing awareness of audience;

9. Language use occurs in the context of meaningful communication;
10. The teacher facilitates and fosters the acquisition of literate behaviors; she or he does not serve in the role of 'transmitter' of knowledge.
(pp. 231-232)

In classrooms that promote academic literacy, Blanton explains, students' literacy behaviors evoke language as a medium through which they gain authority. Students gain authority when they learn and practice intertextuality and critical literacy (Blanton, 1999; Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986; Heath and Mangiola, 1991; Salvatori, 1996; Wall, 1986). Authority comes not so much from exposure to and competence in discrete grammatical forms that can lead to functional literacy. Instead authority comes as students engage in intellectual exercises such as intertextuality. On the process of intertextuality, Lemke (2004) explains, "Every time we make meaning by reading a text or interpreting a graph or picture we do so by connecting the symbols at hand to other texts and other images heard, seen, or imagined on other occasions." The authority ESOL students gain in classes that promote academic literacy transcends and transfers to forthcoming educational and personal contexts. For as Elbow (1998) states:

The intellectual practices of academic discourse are not only more appealing to me than its stylistic conventions, they are also more useful. That is, even though there may be differences between what counts as evidence and valid reasoning in various disciplines and even subdisciplines, the larger intellectual activities... are useful in most academic disciplines-and of course in much nonacademic writing, too. (p. 163)

To engage in intertextuality, students must first understand that texts speak to and from other texts (Halasek, 1999), and that as writers they, too, glean from and contribute to the generation and interpretation of texts.

Defining academic literacy as either writing demonstrative of discrete grammatical proficiency, awareness and execution of appropriate discourse for particular purposes, and the ability to achieve intertextuality represent only three interpretations that happen to be ideologically situated—derivative and constitutive—and politically reproductive or transformative. The goals of writing programs, teaching philosophies of faculty who contribute to ways students think about and produce texts, and the texts that students produce which ultimately rate as academic or otherwise inform the oftentimes contradictory and disparate environments of teaching and learning within the academy. Atkinson & Ramanathan (1995) and Leki & Carson (1997) inquire about political and cultural implications of teaching philosophies and teaching practices in L1 and L2 writing classes. Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995) explore the differing cultures of an English Language Program and University Composition Program. They claim:

Although these two different world views may be masked by allegiance to superficially similar paradigms of writing and writing instruction, they are in fact the products of two distinct cultures—with their own oft-contrasting norms of what academic writing is, what constitutes good academic writing, and how the latter can be best communicated in the classroom. (p. 540)

A few characteristics of the English Language Program (ELP) and the University Composition Program (UCP) follow: The UCP and the ELP require new instructors to participate in orientation programs that socialize them into respective programmatic philosophies

and practices. The UPC stresses the processes of writing, critical thinking and academic discourse, although “UCP teachers and administrators generally recognize that academic discourse is not a unitary phenomenon and that the choice of any particular pedagogical model may be open to criticism for that reason” (Atkinson & Ramanatham, 1995 p. 548).

Conceptualization of academic discourse comes under scrutiny and criticism within the UCP as it states the argumentative essay as its pedagogical model, but holds in disregard the conservative, five-paragraph essay as it seems too predictably structured and contrived. The ELP, on the other hand, claims its mission is “to raise students whose level of English...is not adequate for full-time university work to the level where they can do such work” (p. 551). The pedagogical model for higher level ELP is the five-paragraph essay because it provides much needed structure. The UCP focuses on critical thinking and intertextuality, while the ELP focuses on “simplified writing processes” (p. 559). Atkinson and Ramanathan observe the fact that one type of student, the ELP student, matriculating in this teaching and learning environment falls prey to conflicting institutional values and practices at the same institution which expects the ELP student to move from the ELP to the UCP. In some instances, based upon disparate pedagogical practices in the two programs, ELP students may suffer from the same program geared toward educating them. Chances for such a fate could be tremendously reduced if program planners and faculty from both programs clearly articulate program pedagogy and either attempt program synthesis or revise programs based upon articulation. Faculty and students would benefit from attributing to this dilemma real world implications of conflicting discourses.

Discovering the nuances of academic literacy by analyzing the sources of instruction proved as fruitful for Atkinson and Ramanathan as did interviewing the targets of instruction for Leki and Carson (1997) who asked ESL students about the frequency of their

writing from personal experiences and general knowledge and the frequency of writing from a text to stimulate ideas or to demonstrate source knowledge in their English for academic purposes (EAP) courses and their content courses across disciplines. They learned that students use texts as sources far more regularly in discipline specific courses than in EAP courses in spite of a goal of EAP programs to help students improve writing for, as the name of the program states, “Academic Purposes.” Moreover they discovered “that the primary, almost exclusive site for non-text-responsible writing assignments was the writing class” (p. 52). Students in these writing classes list “grammar, punctuation...organization; use of topic sentences; attention to stylistic issues such as trying to find different words to refer to the same thing or to use long, flashy sentences or stylish turns of phrase” (p. 54) as course goals. A content-focused (non-text based) goal in EAP courses can lead to “the perception that any content will do and that the content does not have to be correct or accurate” (p. 60). Instead Leki and Carson advocate that:

giving students direct acquaintance with text responsible writing in writing classes transforms the class from one that is solipsistic and self-referential into one that becomes central to students’ academic and personal growth because students encounter, manage, and come terms with new information by learning how to integrate it textually with existing knowledge schemes. (p. 64)

Inconsistencies and contradictions characterize the state of academic literacy as exemplified within ESOL; philosophies, practices, and purposes emerge, as I stated at the opening of this section, ideologically situated—derivative and constitutive—and politically reproductive or transformative (Lin, 1999). Ramanathan (2002) situates her ESOL theory framed by the politics of TESOL practitioners, “TESOLers” she call them, TESOLers in training and TESOL training programs. Accordingly, the discrepancies of the writing practices taught to

L2 learners in writing classes and in discipline-specific classes cited earlier in Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995) and the discrepancies between teaching non-text-based writing in EAP and text-based writing in other discipline courses (Leki and Carson, 1997) may be attributed, in part, to the politics of thought collectives (TCs). TCs, Ramanathan claims, center “on the (evolving) professional/disciplinary cognitions of their participants” as contrasted with discourse communities, which center on “texts, places and groups” (2002, p. 59).

TCs dramatically affect the progression of the conceptualization of academic literacy in ESOL, the gravitation from an emphasis on grammar to discourse to text to intertextuality to teaching practices to teacher ideology. Neither Ramanathan (2002) nor I invite all involved with teaching and learning in ESOL, students, teachers, administrators, legislators, family and friends of students, textbook writers and publishing companies alike, to wishfully, and I should add naively combine all existing theory on academic literacy in ESOL and construct the consummate “neotruth.” Ramanathan, instead, assertively broadens perspectives and constructs a template for further reconstruction of approaches to teaching TESOLers—linking what teachers learn to what and how teachers subsequently teach. She advises, “It is crucial that all ESL people—especially educators and L2 professionals—engage in becoming meta-aware of what we bring to the L2 classroom and of the latent sociocultural politics of the texts and teaching practices we employ” (p.128). Meta-awareness, the reflexive quality of assessing one’s values, beliefs, epistemologies which condition one’s will to embrace or reject additional values, beliefs, epistemologies, situations, people. Agha (2003) frames meta-awareness as contemplation “of a series of social processes-processes of value production, maintenance and transformation—through which the scheme of cultural values has a social life as it were, a processual and dynamic existence that depends on the activities of social persons, linked to each

other through discursive interactions and institutions” (p. 232). As Ramanathan contextualizes awarenesses of educational practices in TESOL, she asks, in essence, what agenda drives the decisions to focus mainly on discrete grammar, or personal writing only, or text-based writing only, or five paragraph essays only? What drives the decisions to structure two TESOL training programs as theoretically and disciplinarily distinct (Linguistics and English)? What are the consequences for students matriculating in these training programs? What are consequences of students taught in EAP programs who are later taught by instructors in English departments?

Consequences, as severe as they may be for L2 undergraduate students and for graduate TESOLers, may be less foreboding for graduate students if they learn to exert meta-awareness, of TCs:

- (1) that knowledges and cultures of TCs shape and ultimately shape and ultimately produce particular kinds of participants, text types, and social practices and
- (2) that we as participants, in turn, by engaging in certain social practices and by reproducing particular (dominant) alignments, shape and ultimately produce our TCs. (Ramanathan 2002, pp.129-130)

Graduate student students, those destined to become TESOLers, however, may channel some of the literate behaviors stressed earlier in the review, intertextuality for example, to the meta-awareness Ramanathan outlines for potential TESOLers:

1. Making (TESOL) teachers aware of how their thought collectives function as activity systems.
2. Having teachers recognize how the activities they are engaged in constitute the context, and how cognition gets distributed across various components in their TCs.
3. Having potential teachers recognize persistent and evolving structures in their TCs and having them reflect on their individual and collective roles in the stability and growth of these structures.
4. Having teachers articulate explicit connections linking texts, various domains of reference, and various teaching-learning contexts. (pp. 135-144)

Ramanathan urges us, most simply, to think, then think about our thinking; “viewing the emergence, development, sustenance, and reproduction of cognitions of all TESOLers as being distributed across and aligned with genres, texts, books, research agendas, proposals, conferences, mentoring, and publishing allows us to see how positions of relative power get assigned, circulated and reinforced” (p. 132).

In response to Ramanathan (2002) and Kubota (2003) who solicit respectively meta-awareness of Thought Collectives and meta-awareness of gender, class, and race, from persons involved in TESOL at the levels of programming, instruction, learning, teacher training, I come to this study willing but not necessarily prepared to embrace the consequences of examining my own meta-awareness forthrightly. The work of sociopolitical self-revelation, meta-awareness of social and political processes, may evoke sociopolitical consequences. Not everyone perceives the examination of ideology as an intellectual act. Nonetheless, in Chapter 4, I will describe my language socialization, disclose discourses that influence my ethnic identity, and debunk the myth of safety in silence. I will resist reticence of my own language socialization to reveal an understanding of dialogism, that utterances, others’ and [my own] are epistemologically informed, ideologically based, politically situated, culturally bound, behaviorally induced and inducing, and affectively perceived. Relinquishing my own reticence demonstrates my willingness, albeit reluctantly, to situate myself politically, socially, culturally, racially in this study as I ask my students to situate their language use, to participate in the cultural dialogues.

My exercises in dialogism and my students' responses to media samples convey Bakhtin's (1981) theory of utterance:

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as rejoinder to it—it does not approach the object from the sidelines (pp. 276-277).

“Socio-ideological consciousness” of the utterance as referenced in Bakhtin could just as easily become representative of a theoretical concept rendered in academic literacy, meta-awareness. That is, becoming cognizant of one's socio-ideological consciousness and its impact upon one's language use and becoming cognizant that others' consciousnesses inform their language use including their production of written discourse are tantamount to academic exercises, exercises akin to the contextualizing academic literacy. In order to illustrate the work I took on and I work I asked of students, I ask the following research questions:

1. How do ESOL composition students draw from their social and historical knowledge to interpret media samples as dialogic utterances (bumper stickers, newspaper editorials and one magazine article)?
2. How can I introduce a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis (analysis of power, identity and ideology) as a pedagogical practice to promote academic literacy?
3. How do students use their meta-awareness as a form of critique?

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Research Context

The site of the study was a two-course sequence in Freshmen Composition designed for non-native speakers (NNSs) who studied in a small socially constructed learning environment characterized by intensive peer interaction and instructor/student interaction at an engineering technology university in a southeastern city. Students may select these courses, may be referred to the courses by other composition faculty or register for composition classes with native speakers (NSs). Each course offered three credit hours. The first course, ESOL English 1101 was offered in the fall of 2004, and the second course, ESOL English 1102 was offered in the spring of 2005. Eight students enrolled in each course. Of the eight students enrolled in the course, all were male; two were from China; two from Venezuela; two from Colombia; one from Nigeria; one from Taiwan. Six students self-selected the course during the semester of the study; two were referred by composition faculty.

The study is an investigation of the ways four focal ESOL composition students enhanced their academic literacy by responding to and analyzing media samples: bumper stickers, newspaper editorials, and journal articles. Comprising the student focus group were one Taiwanese, Joe; one Venezuelan, Miguel; one Nigerian, Abrihem; and one Colombian, Carlos. I selected these four students because they consistently attended class and willingly participated in the study. Tables 1 through 4 below indicate student participants' characteristics relevant to the study.

Table 1 Joe

Country	Taiwan
Year in college	1 st
Years in United States	2
TOEFL/SAT	Verbal 460 Math 800
Major	Electrical Engineering Technology
Age	18

Table 2 Miguel

Country	Venezuelan
Year in college	1 st
Years in United States	1
TOEFL/SAT	Verbal 450 Math 490
Major	Management
Age	18

Table 3 Abrihem

Country	Nigeria
Year in college	1 st
Years in United States	0
TOEFL/SAT	TOEFL 253 / SAT Verbal 510 Math 620
Major	Electrical Engineering Technology
Age	19

Table 4 Carlos

Country	Colombia
Year in college	2 nd
Years in United States	1
TOEFL/SAT	TOEFL 250 SAT Verbal 460 Math 680
Major	Electrical Engineering Technology
Age	22

I served as instructor/researcher/participant, and designed the course in my role of ESOL instructor at the university where I have worked as an administrator who teaches since 1993. My involvement with ESOL occurred somewhat inadvertently. During a conversation with the Dean of Arts and Sciences in 1995, the Dean told me he was interested in someone being trained in

reading and in TESOL. He said he hoped to discover two persons who would be willing to earn at least eighteen hours of coursework in either area. After contemplating that conversation for a few days, I volunteered to study TESOL thinking it would be different enough yet related enough to the work I had done for the M.A. in English. Along the process of studying, I became interested in pursuing a Ph.D. When I found a suitable program, I enrolled and simultaneously continued my work as a teaching administrator.

I chose this site because of convenient access to this ESOL population. The study emerged from my desire to make less amorphous the conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL, my desire to document ESOL students' social and historic knowledge that I had witnessed in previous teaching and learning experiences with ESOL students, and my belief that as I privileged student knowledge and created a teaching methodology based upon student knowledge and discursive practices, I could create a teaching and learning atmosphere to promote academic literacy. Through our class discussions, the students and I acknowledged being situated in and informed by culture. Through their compositions, students examined ways written discourse is contingent upon culturally situated dimensions of language rendered through ideology, interaction, text, identity, and power.

The physical configuration of the computer writing classroom influenced positively the quality of socially situated teaching and learning. This classroom, one of two computer writing classrooms in the department, housed within a building completed in 2001, did not contain the traditionally configured row seating structure. The seating arrangement appeared more like a "U" or horseshoe, actually a lower cased "u" within a capital "U." The form of the smaller "u," interrupted at its end, permitted access to the computer stations that form the capital "U." When one entered the 28'x26' room, one faced a wall of windows that spanned one foot below the

10' ceiling to four feet above the floor and provided natural light and a view of trees. Along this wall were six computer stations, on perpendicular walls, there were five. On the opposite wall, the wall parallel to wall with six computers appeared a "smart" board, one student in this engineering technology, computer science based institution knew more about than I. It was from this focal location in the room that two significant activities commenced. First, from the desk, the instructor's station, I, often using a computer assisted learning software package, initiated a text-based dialogue by asking a question or signaling a writing prompt to which students responded, viewed the responses of peers, and commented in spiraling text. I participated more or less depending on the dialogue, depending on the task. So a part of the socially situated learning occurred as we "talked" to each other through text. Second, each student spent time at "the instructor's station" presenting texts--reflections and essays—on the "smart" board. When one student presented, others learned both about content and form.

From the "inner u," I encouraged student commentary by asking them to speak to their peers about textual strengths, weaknesses, and strategies for revision. Over time students depended less on me to keep the discussion flowing, yet when they sometimes did not participate eagerly, I urged them to contribute to the dialogue with a statement like, "The more substantial your comments now, the more successful your peers' writing will be." Each person knew that eventually "he" would be the peer to benefit directly from peer response. That benefit proved motivational for participation in this socially situated classroom. Equally significant to the promotion of dialogue for pedagogical and, therefore, research purposes of the study, no one sat along the outer "U" because, of the eight students, three sat inside the smaller "u" on either side, and one sat on each end of the small "u." All computers and monitors were situated beneath the surface of the stations, under non-glare, tempered glass, so views were not obstructed. The space

within the small “u” accommodated all of us during group discussion. Whenever anyone “presented” from the instructor’s station, everyone, including me, moved to the inner “u” to establish the discourse community. The fact that the chairs had wheels that moved easily over the carpeted floor helped us to move easily into small groups.

A Pedagogical Critical Discourse Analysis

A contextualized, introductory CDA is appropriate in instructional settings for, among others, undergraduate level, first year ESOL composition students. I call it pedagogical critical discourse analysis mainly because I want students to think about language as having a source, an author, a speaker, a purpose and having a target, a reader, a listener, an audience, a purpose, a Bakhtinian approach. Such a dialogic approach to language foregrounds a speaker/listener, a writer/reader, a call, a response in context. Furthermore, by extending Bakhtin’s dialogism, I want students to learn the relationships among text, ideas and interaction (Halliday, 1994) or discourse, cognition and society (van Dijk, 2001) or social activity, representation and performance (Fairclough, 2001). Students should know that language presents multidimensionally and that language users exercise multidimensional repertoires for multiple purposes.

This study represents not another depiction of a multicultural reader. Such readers often sing a celebratory, solicitous “We Are the World” song, calling students to join in the chorus: “We are the world. We are the children. We are the ones that make a brighter day so let’s start giving.” While this study seeks to condemn neither the celebratory nor the solicitous, it invites students to hear evident heteroglossic voices; voices creating, construing, and contesting dialogues in social, historical, political and personal contexts. As this study reports a challenge for ESOL students to hear, to respond, to recreate dialogues represented in media, it

acknowledges their already existent repositories of social and historical knowledge and meta-awareness which enhance the affordance of academic literacy. This study illustrates ways students' thinking about texts-media samples- as discourses in action leads them to produce texts-reflections and essays- that encompass traits associated with academic literacy. Thinking about discourses, that is, applying meta-awareness of social and historic knowledge to texts in first year writing program, and gaining experience with rhetorical and grammatical conventions set students along learning continua that could progress throughout their university experiences and beyond. Just as academic literacy does not begin and end at the university, this study and the instruction associated with it does not begin and end with a singular focus on textual analysis. Rather, it synthesizes student a priori knowledge, textual analysis, and grammar in context.

A pedagogical critical discourse analysis, therefore, considers the discourse-cognition-society triangle as described by van Dijk who maintains, "CDA should be accessible...must be teachable and hence comprehensible. If students do not understand us, they can neither learn from us, nor criticize us" (2001, p. 97). His philosophy coincides with my own because I am as much interested in a teaching method as a research method, contextualized for composition classes. van Dijk cites his work on racism (1991, 1993b) and ideology (1998) as a basis for his method, and although he does not limit his focus to cognition or social issues, he finds intriguing the linguistics of these phenomena.

In order to make the discourse-cognition-society triangle accessible, van Dijk (2001) reduces, tentatively, discourse to communicative events of "conversational interaction, written texts, as well as associated gestures, facework, typographical layout, images and other 'semiotic' or multimedia dimension of significance" (p. 98). For cognition, he names personal and social attitudes, values, beliefs and goals, and "'mental' or 'memory' structures,

representations or processes involved in discourse and interaction” (p. 98). He includes in society local “microstructures...and global, societal and political structures variously defined in terms of groups, group relations (such as dominance and inequality), movements, institutions, organizations, social processes, political systems and more abstract properties of societies and cultures” (p.98). To further reduce these concepts, especially for my context, classroom pedagogy first, and research methodology second, I work with language action and interaction, language thoughts, and societal influence as introductory lessons followed by extended focus on van Dijk’s concepts. For example, examining text-context applies equally well to determining discourse structures that contribute to enacting texts of public policy like redistricting in the state of Georgia or air quality regulations in Atlanta as to discourse structures incorporated within students’ Regents’ Tests illustrating argument or personal experiences.

Finally a pedagogical critical discourse analysis draws upon social practices. All influences on language including history, culture, politics, power, ideology, economics, and identity converge to affect social practice. All social practices include the following characteristics:

productive activity; means of production; social relations;
 social identities; cultural values; consciousness;
 semiosis. (Fairclough, 2001, p. 122)

These characteristics, like the semiosis of identity, power, and ideology, do not exist as entirely separate entities but function interconnectedly, influencing and possibly recontextualizing.

The utility of semiosis, the connectedness of identity, ideology, and power for CDA as a research methodology, can be recontextualized and applied to literacy pedagogy complemented by the texts I selected as media samples and the texts students generated about the

media samples. The text the ESOL students and I worked with most in the study was “The Hispanic Challenge” (Huntington 2004) which appeared in the March/April issue of Foreign Policy. I happened upon Foreign Policy for the first time late April, 2004 in one of my habitual visits to bookstores. I casually, but attentively, panned sections—magazines, newly released books, and travel, one at a time, in no particular order. In the magazine section, on this visit, as in previous visits, textual voices spoke through magazine and journal titles and through titles and captions of featured articles. Those voices, entertaining and informative, polyphonic and heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1986) uttered discourses in action, social practices in production (Fairclough, 2001) and solicited responses from people willing to participate in cultural dialogues. Resonating distinctly articulate, the cover of Foreign Policy asked, “Jose’ Can You See?” Intrigue led me to peruse the article in search not only of answers to the question but also nuances of the question. I purchased the journal because the instructor in me recognized immediate pedagogical opportunities. The question, “Jose’ Can You See?” and the article it introduced embodied academic discourse, intertextual references, discursive representations of U.S. nationalism, immigration issues, and Hispanic identity construction. Bakhtin (1986) describes my responses to the utterance in the bookstore this way:

I understand the other’s word (utterance, speech work) to mean any word of any other person that is spoken or written in his own (i.e., my own native) or in any other language, that is, any word that is *not mine*. In this sense, all words (utterances, speech, and literary works) except my own are the other’s words. I live in a world of others’ words. And my entire life is an orientation in this world, a reaction to others’ words (an infinitely diverse reaction), beginning with my

assimilation of them (in the process of initial mastery of speech) and ending with assimilation of the wealth of human culture (expressed in the word or other semiotic materials). (p. 143)

My responses to the utterance, “Jose’ Can You See?” and my anticipation of the students’ responses to “The Hispanic Challenge” contributed significantly to my plan to collect data for the study. The connection I hoped to glean from those responses and the skills associated with academic literacy in ESOL like evaluation, synthesis, extrapolation, integration of personal experiences with text and text with personal experience, and discernment of authority within text prompted me to introduce “The Hispanic Challenge” to the ESOL English 1101 and 1102 classes. Furthermore, half of the students in the courses of the study were Hispanic; therefore an investigation of the relevance of utterances of immigration, nationalism, and ethnocentrism seemed salient. Therefore, we covered the article during the latter part of the first semester, from October 2004 until the end of the term in December 2004 and again during the beginning of the second course ENGL 1002.

Working within the genres of bumper stickers and editorials first, we progressed to the journal in the first semester and to Fairclough,’s social practices (2001): social activity, representations, and performance. “The Hispanic Challenge” embodied social activity- sounding the alarm against the infiltration of Hispanic immigrants; representations-construing identities of Hispanic immigrants, particularly Mexicans and proclamations of nationalism; performance-evoking the dismal through emotionally, politically charged rhetoric. Fairclough extends the classification of semiosis with genres, discourses, and styles (2004), the framework I used most often in the study.

First, genres are “(ways of acting)...We can distinguish different genres as different ways of (inter)acting discursively” (p. 228). For example, in the ESOL courses of the study, ESOL students wrote within the genres of essay and reflections as they read within the genres of media samples comprised of bumper stickers, editorials, an entertainment magazine, and a political journal. Genres not included in this study include novels, short stories, interviews, and drama. Second, discourses present representations. Representations enact social relations, “social practices—representations of the material world, of other social practices, reflexive self-representations of the practice in question. Representation is clearly a semiotic matter, and we can distinguish different discourses which may represent the same area of the world from different perspectives or positions” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 228). For example, included among the discourses emanating from Huntington’s (2004) perspectives on Hispanics in “The Hispanic Challenge” are rhetoric of freedom, independence, and nationalism. Huntington’s perspectives and my invitation to students in the study to articulate their perspectives on ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power situated an instructional context for synthesis. The intended synthesis included student’s awareness of and participation in Bakhtin’s (1986) dialogism of utterances, Blanton’s (1998) call for experiential involvement with texts as essential to achieving academic literacy, Ramanathan’s (2002) and Agha’s (2003) directive to contemplate meta-awareness of teaching and learning practices and value production respectively. Third, styles demonstrate characteristics of textual performance. Textual performance includes choices in diction, syntax, and transitivity, to present one’s reality.

Investigating and applying CDA constituted personally discursive journeys for my students and for me, journeys to find linguistic structures to place other linguistic structures in

perspective, to recontextualize realities influenced by perceptions of identity, power and ideology. Lemke (1995) states this social practice succinctly:

The texts and artifacts of the past are objects in our present-day world, and it is by way of our present-day notions of similarity and difference, continuity and discontinuity, that we construct their historical meaning in the present day, by construing relationships among these objects and ourselves. (p. 28)

If students' analyses demonstrated their understanding of an interanimation of language ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power, through intertextuality and dialogism, I coded the data accordingly. I did not, however, impose CDA upon the data if it did not appear in students' compositions. To do so would impose, according to Luke (2002, p. 10):

the assumption that all media are forms of centrally controlled interpellation, that the general populace are victims and objects of this ideological interpellation, and that the principle role of CDA practitioners is to act as Gramscian transformative intellectuals in the task of unveiling, countering and consciousness raising around dominant ideologies, with the aim of mobilizing opinion and action against them and their classes.

The study, even at its inception, represented a forum for investigation, not imposition. Toward that end, I took care to ask students questions about their ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power regarding particular media samples for the purpose of creating instructional contexts to foster students' access to prevalent conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL. In spite of the plethora of theory supporting teaching and learning of literacy behaviors and practices, little attention has been given to connect particular theory to explicit instruction. While I took great pains in Chapter 4 to address my own subject positions and their influence on my access to

academic literacy, and to discuss their relevance to teaching that bridges theory and instruction for the purpose of promoting academic literacy for ESOL students, I avoided, perhaps to extremes, a proselytizing pedagogy of my subject positions. Instead, I asked these students to interpret text according to their sociocultural experiences, not mine. I did not espouse that all media contrive interpellation, an Althusserian (1971) hailing, or calling one into a subject position into which one must remain for the benefit of the state.

Data Collection

The primary data for this qualitative study are student assignments and compositions from a two-course sequence in first year ESOL composition that I taught. In the first course, ESOL Composition 1101, I collected data from the third portfolio of the class, Critical Awareness, comprised of bumper sticker assignments, newspaper editorial assignments, and the "The Hispanic Challenge" (Huntington, 2004) assignments. All assignments for this portfolio were compiled during the last 7 weeks of the course, from October 2004 until December 2004.

Bumper Stickers (Chapter 3)

Each student chose seven out of fifteen bumper stickers from the car of a professor who is also employed at the university. They composed an essay on the selection and interpretations of bumper stickers in response to the following prompts:

1. Name the bumper stickers you chose.
2. Explain the reasons you chose the bumper stickers.
3. What do they say to you? What do these choices say about you?
4. Who has the privilege of uttering those words?
5. What are the reasons you did not choose the other stickers?

Next, each student wrote a letter about bumper stickers to someone in his or her country.

Students wrote a letter to the professor who owns the car with the bumper stickers. They turned in the letters to me.

Newspaper Editorials

Students selected 3 editorials and wrote an essay that examines "the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual" (Halliday, 1978, 1984) aspects of the editorials. Though the essays proved resourceful as opportunities for students to analyze discourse in action, they are not included as data for the study because of the broad scope of issues the editorials treated and the similarity of the analyses students generated with bumper stickers.

“The Hispanic Challenge” (Chapter 5)

Students responded in writing to the title of the article, “The Hispanic Challenge” (Huntington, 2004).

Students wrote responses to headings in “The Hispanic Challenge” before they read the actual article.

Students read articles within “The Hispanic Challenge”—“Early Warnings” and “The Threat to White Nativism?” and wrote essays on both mini articles. Only the analysis of “The Threat to White Nativism?” appears in the data for the study because each participant completed the analysis, and the analysis of one mirrored the other. The students analyzed each text according to ideas, identity, and power.

Students read the entire article, “The Hispanic Challenge,” and wrote an essay in which they explored ideas, identity, and power, and interaction.

Discursive Construction of Identity (Chapter 6)

During the second course, ESOL Composition 1102, I collected essays students wrote about identity as constructed in texts. First, they wrote an essay about ways Mexican identity is created in “EASY PREY” (Moser 2005). I selected this text because of its linguistic and geographic accessibility. It appeared in an information/entertainment weekly, Creative Loafing, which is

characterized by writing that appeals to multiple demographic audiences, and is widely distributed throughout the metropolitan area. Second, they wrote an essay in which they created a self-representational ethnic identity, the final exam in ENGL 1102.

Student texts as data constitute significant portions of the study, particularly Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. These excerpts, though lengthy in some instances, support assertions I make about these ESOL students' linguistic repertoires. More concise representations of the excerpts, rendered in summative tables, appear after each data set.

Data Analysis

I analyzed the essays the students wrote to determine whether any evidence indicates ESOL students perceive utterances in media samples (bumper stickers and editorials) as dialogically, socially situated and whether they interpret them through their cultural affordances of social and historic knowledge. I determined whether students analyze the journal article, "The Hispanic Challenge" (Huntington, 2005), and an article in a weekly circular, "EASY PREY" (2005), according to an introductory, contextualized Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) influenced primarily by Hallidayan dimensions of language, "the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual" (1978, 1985) which I name for pedagogical purposes ideas, interaction and text; and Faircloughian social practices (2001, 2004). Using Fairclough's social practices as domains of analysis to place students' contextualized analyses of the final media samples "The Hispanic Challenge" and "EASY PREY" into perspective, I analyzed according to genres/textual—ways of interacting; discourses/interpersonal—ways of representing; and style/ideational—ways of being.

It is important to note that in my ESOL composition classed, I did not devote time to teaching Critical Discourse Analysis by that name; thus the reference to an introductory,

contextualized CDA. Instead, the students and I worked with the dimensions of language by first considering ideas, interaction and text. I added identity and power as dimensions for their analysis of “The Hispanic Challenge” by introducing the terms and opening a discussion on meanings associated with identity and power. I did not, however, teach explicitly the terms “genre,” “discourse,” and “style,” nor the approaches to CDA that follow (though they inform my own analysis), for I believe discussions and applications of ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power as dimensions of language are appropriate to freshman composition and constitute a basis from which ESOL students may demonstrate academic literacy. Consequently, promoting academic literacy, as I conceive it, at the undergraduate level in a first year writing class does not necessitate a formal course in Critical Discourse Analysis; however, promoting academic literacy as a cultural affordance requires discussions of and experience with texts that convey social, cultural, historical characteristics. Each text chosen for analysis, that is, each media sample in the study, embodied those characteristics. Crucial to the study, a contextualized pedagogical CDA then, and the analyses of texts that resonate cultural, social, and historical influences are the “cruces” or sites of tension among ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power and the “cruces” among genres, discourses, and styles; the former dimensions of language drawn from Halliday and the latter, social practices drawn from Fairclough.

CHAPTER 3

DIALOGUES WITH BUMPER STICKERS

The teacher facilitates and fosters the acquisition of literate behaviors; she or he does not serve in the role of 'transmitter' of knowledge. -Linda Blanton, 1998

The questions I constantly asked myself before beginning this qualitative study centered on the traditional characterization of ESOL language learners as being deficient, as having problems that need to be resolved are: What knowledge have the ESOL students enrolled in the composition classes I teach amassed before they enter the university? How can they use this knowledge to facilitate their development of academic literacy?

While the literature reflects challenges ESOL learners face with second or additional language acquisition, particularly in the creation of L2 written texts associated with academic literacy, no studies reflect the cultural affordances that situate ESOL students as particularly proficient in the ability to mediate multiple cultures, an ability, that I maintain, is applicable to the enhancement of academic literacy. Abilities to compare, contrast, evaluate, and synthesize invite dialogues devoted to analyses of the L1 culture and L2 culture. The purpose of this study and the pedagogy associated with it, a methodology of pedagogy, is, therefore, to foreground and document ESOL students' ideologies and epistemologies informed by social and historic knowledge, that is, cultural affordances; and to create educational opportunities that promote students' dialogic interpretation and critique, and therefore promote academic literacy.

In order to create opportunities for students to enhance academic literacy in an ESOL classroom that privileges students' a priori knowledge, I developed a series of pedagogical practices that encouraged student interaction with various texts, bumper stickers in Chapter 3 and articles in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 representative of a myriad of ideologies prevalent in the culture of the United States. I adapted Chapter 3, with permission from Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, from Orr (2005).

By complementing students' a priori first language cultural awareness with exposure to U.S. cultural contexts presented through rhetorical strategies ranging from dialogue to critique, I availed to them moments to mediate how "What matters is knowing how to make meaning like the natives do" (Lemke, 2004). Ascribing to this quote as I do, it is important to note that I do not prescribe ways students should think, nor suggest that their thinking or meaning making should emulate "the natives." Instead, I espouse awareness, an intercultural competence that can be honed by dialogic mediation of their culture and culture in the U.S. Such cultural mediation, which I believe occurs often as students interact in the new environment, can be applied to their enhancement of academic literacy. Cultural mediation, then, within the academy as a socially situated practice of teaching as learning grounded the pedagogical methodology I introduced in the ESOL composition courses of this study. That is, meaning-making opportunities through assignments foregrounded by language in action, discourse imbued with cultural and political ideology, engage students in activities that propel skills, behaviors, and competencies that literature on ESOL academic literacy conceptualizes as meritorious. Consequently I asked the following research question:

1. How do ESOL composition students draw from their social and historical knowledge to interpret media samples as dialogic utterances in (bumper stickers, newspaper editorials and one magazine article)?

Framing this study generally, then, I integrated Bakhtinian notions of utterance and addressivity to reinforce the reciprocal sociocultural nature of language. Bakhtin's theory of utterances seems particularly appropriate for ESOL composition instruction at the university level because inherent in the theory is the social situatedness of communication. When considering communication as a social entity, ESOL students and instructors may experience the utterance as "a link in the chain of speech communication of a particular sphere" (1986, p. 91). Students may learn to make connections between their experiences in L1 speech spheres, especially if they have several years of L1 experience, and their developing L2 experience in speech spheres. They may learn that speaking in various contexts or locales, e.g. recreational settings with peers, educational settings with peers or instructors, religious ceremonies with family, and interviews with immigration officials situate them as both contributors and respondents to speech, as speakers and listeners. "The speaker" notes Bakhtin, "with his world view, his evaluations and emotions, on the one hand, and the object of his speech and the language system (language means), on the other—these alone determine the utterance, its style, and its composition" (1986, pp. 90-91). The listener, affirms Lahteenmaki (1998), "should be able to relate the position that the speaker's utterance represents to other positions expressed in a given discourse community" (p. 79).

Bakhtin's theory and students' increasing ideological development intersect in activities that require students to consider various language spheres and strategies of mediation of those spheres. Of note is socio-political ideology embodied in various media. One prevalent medium Americans choose to illustrate ideology and frequently advocate social change is the bumper sticker. Documenting bumper stickers as mediational in ideology and identity, Case

(1992) and Norton-Meier (2004) cite theoretical and instructional value respectively. Case contends that through bumper stickers, people offer myriad communicative possibilities to:

(a) interject one's own perspectives, values and statements into the environment of mass-mediated messages; (b) proclaim a unique personal identity through symbols and statements representing one's interests, affiliations, values and claims to glory, thus attempting to escape the anonymity which characterizes much of modern life; and (c) observe new, often creative messages, symbols and usages being introduced into the culture of environment of ideas. (p.107)

Similarly, Norton-Meier delineates multiple perspectives for literacy instruction. She considers in visual literacy the value of design to compliment images and text, in critical literacy, the author's intended messages and reader reception; in personal literacy, the production and evaluation of knowledge about self; and in media literacy, instruction of malleable institutions and societies.

Bumper stickers, then, serve as significant sources for analyses of utterances, for bumper stickers in their ubiquitous representations enact "various spheres of human activity and communication" (1986, p. 62). Those who speak through or write bumper stickers and those who respond or listen can attest to Bakhtin's assertion that "language enters life through concrete utterances (which manifest language) and life enters language through concrete utterances as well" (ibid., p. 63). Jacoby and Ochs (1995) reinforce the relevance of utterances to dialogic processes: "Utterances are also viewed as multivocal or heteroglossic in nature, informed by the ideas and representational styles of others" (pp. 173-174). A greater understanding of utterances warrants further consideration to response, the anticipated reaction to utterances. Utterances such as bumper stickers and utterances in newspaper editorials, particularly editorial headings,

and journal articles, exist not to resonate singularly in a vast chasm but in dialogic relation to additional voices, additional cultures, representations, speakers, hearers—interlocutors, interpreters, privileged members of various communities. Such interlocutions render students as:

agents of culture rather than merely bearers of a culture that has been handed down to them and encoded in grammatical form. The constitutive perspective on indexicality incorporates the post-structural view that the relation between person and society is dynamic and mediated by language ...while person and society are distinguishable, they are integral. Person and society enter into a dialectical relation in that they act on each other, and transform each other. In such paradigms, while society helps define a person, a person also helps to (re)define society (Ochs, 1993, p. 416).

The dialectic surrounding person and society, i.e. compatible and oppositional forces unlike interpretations of dialectic as purely oppositional, affects one's ongoing awareness of multiple subjectivities (Weedon, 1987). Subjectivities, or subject positions (Burr, 1995), invariably drawn from and bound to discourses through which social practices emerge and influence students; for example, social contexts affect language learners, and language learners affect social contexts.. Students in this study, therefore, claimed subject positions including student, immigrant, citizen, and familial positions such as son, cousin, nephew, and grandchild. That reciprocal quality, then, of the dialectic between subject positions and society resembles closely Bakhtin's notion of dialogism: the associations between speaker and utterance, utterance and addressee, speaker and addressee, and utterance and response. The dialogic quality of bumper stickers discursively, contextually, and intertextually draws upon "languages of heteroglossia...specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing in words, specific

world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values” (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 291-292). Therefore, ESOL students in the composition classroom I taught in the fall of 2004 and the spring of 2005 who extol and represent bodies of ideologies, sometimes static, sometimes fluid, often resonant of the discourses of their environments and of their cultures are, in some aspects themselves, cultural artifacts. As cultural artifacts, that is, beings informed, propelled, and constricted by not only by their cultural heritage and its inherent social languages (ibid., p. 275; Hermans, 1999; Wertch, 1991) but also by increasing awareness of U.S. culture, these students, then, investigate media samples-bumper stickers, editorials, and journal articles-exemplars of U.S. social language, by contemplating, troubling, and interpreting them as vehicles of visual rhetoric, utterances originating from and contributing to culturally influenced subjectivities. Significant among these subjectivities is that of student in the U.S.

ESOL students, like L1 students, in first year writing courses in typical U.S. universities negotiate academic literacy (Zamel and Spack 1998; Spack, 1988; Zamel 1988), whether thought of as discipline specific (Spack, 1988; Bridgeman & Carlson, 1983) or as competencies (Gajdusek & vanDommelen, 1993) or as behaviors Blanton(1994), in composition classes and throughout the academy. They encounter additional ways of knowing-epistemological stances-and additional ways of thinking about new knowledge-ideological stances (Ochs, 1993). These ESOL composition students begin to negotiate academic literacy as defined by competencies and behaviors of interpretation, evaluation, synthesis and extrapolation, mediated, in this instance, through socio-cultural text of media samples. Media samples, initially bumper stickers, those sometimes amorphous, polysemous miniature, mobile billboards, traversing theoretical trajectories, offer students in this writing class opportunities to decipher what language can do, how language not only presents and (re)presents messages, messengers and targets but also

communities, societies and philosophies in harmony and in discord, monologically, dialogically and in ever-evolving rhetorical manifestations. Analyzing bumper stickers, editorials and subsequently a journal article as culturally saturated text, these readers investigate the polyvocal qualities of utterances by exploring addressivity, audience, and intent to discover:

the utterance is related not only to preceding, but also to subsequent links in the chain of speech communion... from the very beginning the utterance is constructed while taking into account possible responsive reactions, for whose sake in essence it is actually created. As we know, the role of the *others* ...for whom my thought becomes actual thought for the first time (and thus for my own self as well) it is not that of passive listeners, but of active participants in speech communication. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94)

In the spirit of the dialogic, this study foregrounds, first, strategies of response, informed by Bakhtinian notions of utterance and addressivity, students in this ESOL composition class evoke to analyze media samples and participate in the cultural dialogues rendered through them. Then utterance/response and speaker/listener contribute to the dialogism of social situatedness of written and spoken language and therefore align in theory with social constructionism, “the view that all knowledge, and therefore meaningful reality as such is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (Crotty, 1998, p. 42). From the observance and participation in dialogism over the two-term study duration, the students in the study applied their awareness of language in its social context to experiences with the discursive construction of identity and meta-awareness as critique. Those experiences will be described in Chapter 5.

Students, early on in the study, however, responded to utterances of others,' the speakers of the bumper stickers, by oftentimes calling upon intertextual references to interactions with people and ideologies of their L1 culture. The students in this study communicated initial responses to utterances primarily through indexicality (Ochs, 1996; Cappelen and Lepore, 2002; Glenberg and Robertson, 1999) by pointing some linguistic form to some immediate context (Ochs, 1996). Indexicality, according to Cappelen and Lepore (2002), is the use of "linguistic expressions whose meaning remains stable while their reference shifts from utterance to utterance" (p. 271). Glenberg and Robertson (1999) assert that "indexing, that is, referring words and phrases to objects (or analogical representations of objects) is required for comprehension" (p. 1). Their responses mediate cultural context and demonstrate increasing competence for dialogic participation. The first research question is "How do ESOL composition students draw from their social and historical knowledge to interpret media samples (bumper stickers, newspaper editorials and one magazine article)?"

Assigning Bumper Stickers

The students and I walked from the classroom to the parking lot where the car with the bumper stickers was parked. I did not provide a handout explaining the assignment before we began our discovery. I said only that they should get a notebook and a pen and come with me. This proved a dubious directive because they had become so accustomed to computer generating text for the class that some did not have paper. With that matter resolved. They walked rather curiously and I delightedly as we approached our discursive destination. Upon arrival, I asked them to read all fifteen bumper stickers, select seven, and write them down. When everyone had finished, we began the return walk to the computer writing classroom. Students talked among

themselves about the bumper stickers and other matters, and some asked me what we were going to do next. When we returned, I asked the students to answer the following:

1. Name the bumper stickers you chose.
2. Explain the reasons you chose the bumper stickers.
3. What do they say to you? What do these choices say about you?
4. Who has the privilege of uttering those words?
5. What are the reasons you did not choose the other stickers?

The students began typing responses but did not complete this assignment until the next class meeting. When they finished the computer generated texts, we discussed their responses.

In the next assignment, students organized the information from their reflections and wrote a draft of the bumper sticker essay based upon the following prompt:

Write an essay that includes each of the five responses you wrote about the bumper stickers.

Each student drafted his essay in class. In the following class, the students began the process of presenting essays to the class from the “instructor’s station.” The presentation format consistently included a student illustrating his essay on the “smart board” followed by class discussion of strength, weaknesses, and suggestions for revision. Depending upon the text under discussion, we could take up to thirty minutes of a seventy five minute class. I explained early on in the class that when we talked about text, we would talk about text, not despairingly about peers, and that everyone could benefit by offering constructive criticism. I always mediated when mediation was necessary.

Students revised their drafts and submitted them to me.

Next, the students wrote letters to someone in their country of origin and to the professor.

I gave them the following general writing prompt:

Write two letters explaining your experience with the bumper sticker assignment. Write one letter to someone who lives in your country. Write the other letter to the professor who owns the car with the bumper stickers.

Experiencing Bumper Stickers

Evidence of students' preliminary response occurred immediately: Students walked outside their composition classroom to a campus parking lot and observed a car with at least fifteen bumper stickers. They looked at the car, looked at one another, looked at me, and asked, "Is this your car?" With one initial question, the students began the work of debunking the "*fictions*" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 66) of a one dimensional flow from speaker to listener and thereby intuit a far more dynamic communicative system such that "when the listener perceives and understands the meaning (the language meaning) of speech, he simultaneously takes an active, responsive attitude toward it. He either agrees or disagrees with it (completely or partially), augments it, applies it, prepares it for execution and so on" (ibid., p. 68). If "this" car belongs to me, they have identified me as the speaker of particular utterances, exaltations of particular ideology and, in this instance, attribute significance to consequences of ideological agreement or disagreement with me as evaluator of the work they will soon generate. Before they began the written work of response, however, they considered not only the utterances-objects of communicated thought-and their reactions to them, but also objects derived from a source, in this case, me, their instructor wrought with socio-political, cultural ideology. I informed them the car does not belong to me. Instead, it belonged to a professor in another department at the university.

Within that very revelation, the students exercised reciprocal discursive adaptation. They took the two ascertained answers, the "who" and the "where," began to ponder the "what," "when," and "why" in a basic journalistic approach, no longer encumbered by their initial assumptions about car ownership but now taken by what will later be evidenced in their writing – the awareness that "any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive,

although the degree of this activity varies extremely. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or the other: the listener becomes the speaker” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 68). Before they spoke, however, they considered the speaker(s) of the stickers culturally, politically, historically situated source(s), inspired by ideology and agenda. They made inferences and assumptions and constructed their responses accordingly. Hence reciprocal discursive adaptation, the implementation of a listener’s customized communicative strategies contextualized by the listener’s socio-political stances in response to a particular speaker’s utterance. The listener, when generating a response, attempts to contextualize the speaker(s)’ ideology and intent and, ultimately, the listener takes on the role of speaker and anticipates a response. In other words, when these students asked, “Is this your car?” they asked not merely the question of car ownership but indexed their attribution of the car owner as speaker and the stickers as utterances, the messages spoken to them awaiting their responses. Their responses evolved through their implementations of reciprocal discursive adaptation. Tables 5 and 6 below show the bumper stickers the students selected, the students, and their countries.

Table 5 Bumper Stickers

Selected Bumper Stickers	Students
1. What wisdom can you find that is greater than kindness?	2, 3
2. I love my country, but I think we should start seeing other people.	1, 2
3. You cannot simultaneously prevent and prepare for war.	3
4. EQUAL RIGHTS ARE NOT SPECIAL RIGHTS.	1
5. A patriot must be ready to defend his country against his country.	1
6. GET INVOLVED... The world is run by those who show up.	1, 2
7. EVERYONE DOES BETTER WHEN EVERYONE DOES BETTER.	3, 4
8. Well-behaved women rarely make history.	1, 2, 4
9. Hatred is not a family value.	2, 3, 4
10. Change is inevitable. Growth is optional.	1, 4
11. If you surrender to hate, you have already lost.	2, 3
12. Courtesy is contagious.	1, 2, 4
13. One people, one planet, one future.	3, 4
14. If we don’t change directions, we will end up where we’re going.	3, 4

Table 6 Students

Student	Country	Stickers
1. Carlos	Columbia	2,4,5,6,8,10,12
2. Joe	Taiwan	1,2,6,8,9,11,12
3. Abrihem	Nigeria	1,3,7,9,11,13,14
4. Miguel	Venezuela	7,8,9,10,12,13,14

From the various bumper stickered utterances displayed on the car, the students collectively selected 14 (See tables 5 and 6 above). Their selections initiate response while the reasons accompanying the selections perpetuate dialogism. Equally salient to the answer to the “who” question, i.e. “Who is speaking?” within and through the stickers is the answer to the “what” question. What is the utterance? What is its significance? What behavior does one associate with it? What are “the overtures of the style...dialogic overtures” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 92)? What are the “echoes and reverberations of other utterances to which it is related by the community of the sphere of the speech community” (ibid., p. 91)? Such questions signal Halasek’s (1999) reading of Bakhtin: “The utterance, then, is defined in Bakhtinian terms by the interrelationships between and among speaker and subject, speaker and audience, and the audience and subject” (p. 63).

The reasons students offered in support of the stickers they selected index the students’ epistemological/ideological, behavioral and affective stances (See Tables 7 and 8). They repeatedly proclaimed: “I know.” “I understand.” “I do not understand.” “I believe.” “I think.” “I want.” “I like.” “I dislike.” These proclamations indicate the students’ instantiations of meta-awareness in initial reciprocal involvement with utterances aligns with Halasek (1999): “The audience’s role is not, therefore, defined solely, or even primarily, by its position relative to the author,...but also by its perspective on the subject of the discourse” (p. 63). Thus, the

students contemplated the utterances and the speakers' relation to the utterances and form their own reactions which all "may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically" (Bakhtin, 1981 p. 292).

Table 7 Epistemic Stances

Student	Knowledge of Experience and Desired Behavioral Modification
Carlos	When I treat somebody nice, they treat me the same way(12)--I have learned that most of the Americans are afraid of expanding their horizon (2).
Joe	If you try to be polite, you will get the same(2). I believe that every culture has its own specialty and talent, so I really enjoy the diversity in America.
Abrihem	We all have to learn to live in peace and harmony-- What I believe, in respect to the bumper stickers is that if we don't change the way we act towards one another, we will end up just hurting ourselves (14). It tells us to be our brother's keeper and to love one another(13).
Miguel	If people treat me in a nice way, I am going to be in a good mood...I am going to have courtesy (12). We have to stop polluting the earth because we have no place else to go

Table 8 Affective Stances

Student	
Carlos	I can't stand people who are always complaining ..., but don't take a part in the solution of the issue (6)--Personally, I don't like bumper stickers. I think they say a lot about the person... people will read it and stereotype the owner of the car.
Joe	I was glad to see it (2) since I am a foreign student here--Why I chose those stickers mainly is because I agree with what they are trying to tell us.
Abrihem	No response
Miguel	I don't like it (9) and I agree with the sticker-- My reasons to choose them are that I feel described by them or at least say some things that I have as my moral values.

First, students' responded according to epistemology and behavioral modification: Volosinov contends, "Language, in the process of its practical implementation, is inseparable from its ideological or behavioral impletion" (1973, p. 70). Students indexed what they knew and behavior they desired. With "Courtesy is contagious," Carlos, Joe, and Miguel drew from

social awareness to elicit behavior modification. Carlos said, “I picked this sticker because it has happened to me several times. I am a really kind person, and when I treat somebody nice, they treat me in the same way. It tells me in other words, if somebody is nice to you, you should be nice too.” Joe affirmed, “If you try to be polite to the others, you will get the same way return. I always have the most complicated cases in the financial office, but if I am polite, I can see that they will also try to be patient.” Miguel added, “If people treat me in a nice way, I am going to be in a good mood and, therefore, I am going to have courtesy with other people.” Each student affirmed the significance of social graces based upon respective social histories. Their experiences informed their expectations; when they present kindness, they receive kindness. Carlos and Miguel revealed their conclusions in general terms, whereas Joe cited specific challenges he tempered with kindness.

In addition to appreciating people who are courteous, Carlos and Joe advocated getting involved: “Get involved...The world is run by those who show up.” Joe cautioned, “Don’t be anti-social. Nobody is going to know you if you do not do some interaction with them.” Detached social experience qualified Joe’s interpretation of “Get involved.” He explained, “I usually stay away from the things I am not interested in, and that has made me missed many valuable experience. I should get more involved with other people.”

Carlos, in a socially situated external gaze, admitted, “I can’t stand people who are always complaining about all the stuff that is going on around them, but don’t take a part in the solution of the issue. This sticker encourages the reader to go out and do whatever is necessary to change the wrong things that are affecting this world.” Carlos sounded a call to action, the more people, the better.

Demonstrating desire for behavior modification through social awareness of being students in the US, Joe and Carlos selected, “I love my country, but I think we should start seeing other people.” With a positive affective stance, Joe stated, “I was glad to see it since I am a foreign student here. I believe that every culture has its own specialty and talent, so I really enjoy the diversity in America. However, everyone should be proud of his or her own country. Joe celebrated diversity but not at the expense of losing his ethnic awareness. He explained, “I have some Chinese friends, who were born in the United States, but some of them are not proud of China. Instead, they think American culture is the best of all. In my opinion, there is no best race.” Carlos said, “I picked this one because I am an international student in this country, and I have learned that most of the Americans are afraid of expanding their horizon. They know a lot about their own country, but it is hard to believe they are clueless about the rest of the world...it told me to go ahead and explore other cultures.” Both Joe and Carlos encouraged everyone to see “other people” because they value their socialization in US educational contexts and cultural dialogues with countries, including their own.

Like Joe and Carlos, Abrihem and Miguel have been socialized to consider everyone; they pleaded desperately for preservation in “One planet, one people, one future.” Abrihem cautioned, “We all have to learn to live in peace and harmony. The more we hurt one another the more we hurt ourselves. Also, the more we destroy our environment, the more we hurt ourselves.” And Miguel advised, “We have to stop polluting the earth because we have no place else to go, and it is not only our planet that we are jeopardizing, is also ourselves and our future in this world.”

A continuance of global concern characterized initial response to “Hatred is not a family value.” Miguel said, “I think that hate has a lot of the fault of what is going on in the world these

days so in other words I don't like it and I agree with the sticker." Abrihem's response began globally but moved to a specific contextualized one. He stated, "I don't believe anyone was brought up to hate. I see no reason why one should wake up one morning and decide to kill a fellow human being. I see no reason why Osama should want to take the lives of hundreds of human being." With a response focused closer to home, Joe explained, "The family is created to support each other. Just like most of teenagers, I would have some arguments with my parents, but I found out that my family is the only thing that would never betray me."

In addition to revealing what they think and what they know, students revealed affective stances (Table 8), how they feel, and what they like or dislike about the messages communicated in the bumper stickers. Carlos admitted, "Personally, I don't like bumper stickers. I think they say a lot about the person who puts them on. When one puts a sticker, one has to be very careful because the rest of the people will read it and stereotype the owner of the car." Joe added, "What wisdom can you find that is greater than kindness. It is saying that a person without kindness can not be called wise. Sometimes I can see that smart people become arrogant and unwelcome because of their knowledge. This reminds me that arrogance is the killer of wisdom." One reason for choosing particular bumper stickers, Joe explained, "Why I chose those stickers mainly is because I agree with what they are trying to tell us. I also enjoy the humor hidden in those words" while Miguel said, "My reasons to choose them are that I feel described by them or at least say some things that I have as my moral values."

Ideas, Interaction, and Text

Students offered the following responses when I asked them to move beyond their initial responses to bumper stickers to consider ways people present ideas through language, ways people's interaction with others affect their own utterances and their responses to the utterances

of others, and ways text represents language. I call ideas, interaction, and text dimensions of language based on “ideational, interactional, and textual” (Halliday, 1978, 1994).

Abrihem closely observed the textual structure:

It starts to have meaning when you link those three clauses together. The ‘one people’ represents each and every one of us acting as one, acting as a family. The ‘one planet’ represents the world as being like our home. And the ‘one future’ kind of represents our tomorrow. The whole idea behind this sentence is to all live together as one and we would all have a better future. It tells us to be our brother’s keeper and to love one another, so as to attain peace and harmony in our lives.

Abrihem linked meaning to the “three clauses.” Though they are not clauses in structure, the three units do collectively create for him a meaningful whole, meaning bound closely within the text. He noticed the poetic parallelism. He read, “one people”- a global family, “one planet”- a global home, “one future” – global harmony.

Abrihem offered multiple interpretations of text regarding “If we don’t change directions we will end up where we are going:”

When an individual reads this sentence, he or she can think about it in different ways. One might think of it as not walking the righteous path and end up going to hell. Another person can interpret it to simply mean that if we don’t change the course or road that we are going, we’ll end up at the wrong destination. What I believe, in respect to the bumper stickers is that if we don’t change the way we act towards one another, we will end up just hurting ourselves. The idea of this sentence is to let people know that the more we hurt ourselves when we fight,

curse, and have war, the more we tend to destroy our community and the world at large. The sentence on the sticker tells us to love one another and that we should be aware of the end results of war, fighting and things related to it.

Abrihem moved beyond an analysis that reveals meaning as primarily situated in the text to addressing various perspectives for various people including himself. He introduced interpretive options as, “One might think,” “Another person might interpret,” and “What I believe” The diverse interpretations led him again to awareness of global cause/effect and an invitation to harmony.

Carlos revealed the importance of the contrastive coordinate conjunction “but” in “I love my country...but I think we should start seeing other people:”

There is a really powerful word in the text that makes the reader stop and think about the fact. I am talking about "but". The opinion of the writer is clear, the reader loves his country, but he also is inviting to meet other people. The idea is really clear, the sticker clearly invite the reader to experience new cultures, to meet people from other part of the world, to expand their knowledge. I strongly agree with this writer. I have had that awesome opportunity of meeting people from all over the world and I thing it is one of the best learning experiences I ever had. I have meet people that are afraid of traveling, experience new cultures, so that's why I agree with the writer.

Carlos responded immediately to lexical choice. In spite of an expression of nationalism, a citizen of the world may urge compatriots to enter other worlds and contemplate other ideas. Carlos connected his textual interpretations and affective stance to his global interactions.

Joe conveyed a personal perspective with appreciation for increased interpersonal interaction in "GET INVOLVED...The world is run by those who show up:"

Nobody is going to ask our opinion if we don't try to find a way to say ourselves.

I used to stay quiet and wait for a chance to express my thought, but I realized that is useless. I rarely get a chance to say anything because everyone is trying their best to speak. My opinion can be much better than theirs but it just stays in my mind. So I tried to change and be more open, and I believe I receive more attention everywhere. The sentence is simple enough. It tells us to get involved, which is capitalized to emphasize the importance, and use "The world is run by those who show up." as a motivation.

Joe, in perhaps the most introspective reading, based his interpretations on his interpersonal communicative history. Having previously demonstrated reticence and having experienced isolating consequences, he equates more social, verbal interaction with more involvement.

Addressivity

Students' stances toward bumper stickers varied according to interactional context. When students in this composition class wrote a letter to someone in their country, they engaged as authors of a particular text, the letter, to an addressee whom they viewed almost as "an immediate participant-interlocutor in an everyday dialogue" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 95) though they do not experience face-to-face interaction. The absence of immediate spatial proximity does not, however, negate the familiar. That awareness of familiarity affected textual discourse markers students used to communicate their own experiences of having previously enacted the role of addressee, one of the masses to whom the bumper stickers hail. What students wrote, what they said, how they spoke to their addressees reflected their understanding. "Understanding" for

Bakhtin (1981) “comes to fruition only in the response. Understanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other, one is impossible without the other” (p. 282). Understanding for these students, however, emerged synergistically as they contemplate the call--the speakers’ utterances as voices with intention—their own responses based on social, cultural, political, and interactional stances as juxtaposed to stances of others, and the responses these utterances may stimulate from their addressees, people whose ideologies have varyingly constituted schemata.

Dialogism emerged as students responded to having been addressed, hearing a speaker—an author of a bumper sticker—whose “orientation toward the listener is an orientation toward a specific conceptual horizon, toward the specific world of the listener” (ibid., p. 282). In response to the speaker, the students ventriloquated the speaker to his/her addressee(s) just as the car owner ventriloquates the sticker writers when she displays the stickers on her car. These reflexive reciprocal instantiations constitute heteroglossia.

Students began the letters to someone in their country with greetings that indicate close emotional proximity despite the geographic distance from their addressees: “Dear,” “Hey! How is it going?” “Hi how are you?” and “Hello.” When students wrote a letter to the car owner, however, they hailed an addressee whom they viewed not as a casual everyday interlocutor. They greeted with “Dear Sir/Madam,” “Hello,” and “Dear Professor.” In the letters home, students generally used discourse markers to index familiarity, dialogic history, and intent; whereas, in letters to the car owner, students generally indexed identification, intent, and evaluation. To both addressees, students called upon intertextuality and heteroglossia as they expanded dialogism.

Familiarity, Dialogic History, and Intent

First and foremost, when writing to someone in their countries, students indexed familiarity, dialogic history, and intent. Miguel, after greeting Juan Carlos with “Dear Juan Carlos” recalled previous conversations with Juan Carlos about change:

The bumper sticker reads, “Change is inevitable, growth is optional.” I’m sharing this thought with you because you have told me that since I left Caracas things have changed in every way. For me, since I left, everything has change in every way, that’s why I feel so related to it. Hopefully you can also take advantage of this wise thought and learn to accept things and to squeeze them as much as you can so you can become a better person.

Miguel explained his reason for sharing by offering the following advice: “I’m telling you this ... since I think that it can help you to go through life a little bit easier.”

Carlos opened with “Dear Sebas” and demonstrated familiarity, “How have you been man? He followed with a summary of his recent busy schedule, activities, and explanation of the bumper sticker exercise. Like Miguel, Carlos offered advice based on his social knowledge that, generally speaking, people tend to be uncomfortable with the unfamiliar, and, particularly speaking, his friend Sebas fears immigration to the U.S. Carlos appealed:

I want to share with you 1 of them that make me think about you. It said: “I love my country... but I think we should start seeing other people”. Man, I have been trying to tell you to come to this country at least for 6 months, experience the culture, you can leave in my house, improve your English and get to know a lot of people from different countries. I know we will have fun together, don’t be scare

of leaving your home, you know more than anybody else how hard it was for me, but you also know how this experience have changed me. So please consider this option again and don't be scare, it will help you to grow up a lot.

Both Miguel and Carlos indicated immediately their close emotional ties to Juan Carlos and Sabas respectively by referring to social situations that constitute familiarity. Both writers showed their familiarity by offering advice. Miguel urged Juan Carlos to accept change because "Change is inevitable, growth is optional; Carlos invited Sabas to travel to America to see "other people."

Familiarity, dialogic history, and intent presented immediately in letters Joe and Abrihem wrote. Their greeting stated Hey Mom and Dear Mum respectively. Joe announced, "This is your son. Remember me?" He explained the assignment by saying, "We went out of class and found a sample car whose rear bumper was covered by lots of stickers. Although I can see that the car isn't an expensive one, it is really new. The bumper stickers make the car too colorful, which I think it is not a good choice to put on a new car." He indicated an affective stance with, "I like those because I think what they are saying is right" when he explained the reason he chose the seven stickers he named in the letter. He showed the dialogic history he and his mother share when he explained the reason he did not choose other stickers on the car: "There were also some political ones but you know I am not interested in that field so I didn't choose any of them." Dialogic history took priority for Abrihem as well in the letter to his mother: "Last time, you asked me to learn more about the people and the culture in America and try to talk to people. I am learning to do that everyday and I found something interesting here." In the second paragraph

of the letter, Abrihem not only situated ideas, interaction, and text, but also demonstrated an authoritative stance as he communicated newly acquired social knowledge. He wrote:

I remember you always said that human-beings love peace except American. It is wrong. I found some bumper stickers that attached on a professor's car which say that "I love my country but I should start seeing other people." I think that you will be shocked at this and suspect it. I am sure it is definitely true. America is a diversified country, so people have quite different opinions on even the same thing. This case is a good example that demonstrated for some Americans hate the war like you. However, USA is a democratic country where people choose their president and policies by vote. Sometimes, the majority may choose the wrong while the minority holds the right. Just like you always said that the democratic decisions are not always right but democratization will never be wrong. Maybe we should respect the American people's decision just like we pity the people in the war.

Abrihem took a stand against anti-Americanism espoused by his mother. He told her that her idea of America as a country without respect for peace was wrong and introduced heteroglossia with the explanation that multiple perspectives exist on ideas. Abrihem's stand and his support for his positions authoritatively drew from intertextual, dialogism to embody traits of academic literacy. He certainly did not attribute authority to text, even the text of conversations he and her mother shared. He interprets and evaluates his ideological past with his ideological present.

Identification and Intent

When the students wrote letters expressing their ideas about the bumper stickers to the professor who owns the car, the most salient device they used to establish the rhetorical context was a statement of self-identification, which preceded their intent.

Joe and Abrihem opened their letters by identifying themselves first and establishing context through expressions of intent. Each commented affectively. Joe named the seven stickers he chose and explained, “I chose those mainly because I agree what they are telling us, and I like the way people use bumper stickers to express their thought. The exercise was fun and thank you for the sample car.” Abrihem said, “I was excited because I liked what the bumper stickers were talking about. I also like the fact that you put them on your car and drive around them. People need to read them and understand that there should be peace and harmony in our society.”

Miguel and Carlos bypassed identification to state intent directly. Both expressed appreciation of the bumper sticker display even when they disagreed with either the messages or the actual display. Miguel said:

I write to you the following letter to let you know how grateful I am for you sharing those deep thoughts with everybody. I am talking about the bumper stickers that you have on the back of your car. It is something that I wouldn't do; consequently, I think that is very brave from you to express yourself in that way. We both share a lot of beliefs from what I can see from several bumper stickers that I had the opportunity to read.

Carlos took the most interactional stance with the professor in his letter. He opened with:

It's almost the end of the semester and I know you must be really busy. I just want to let you know about some ideas that came to my mind when I read the bumper

stickers you have on your car. First, let me tell you that I admire you a lot. You are a person who is not afraid of exposing to everybody your personality.

Carlos developed his letter with inference and offered an alternate reading, which he supported strongly, for one of the bumper stickers. Citing inferentially acquired social knowledge, he said, “While I was reading the stickers, I realized that you are a feminist, I am not saying anything bad about it, I am glad you fight for that cause.” Then he stated his case for presenting an alternative reading of a sticker and took a stand to express disagreement:

There was a sticker in particular that made me wonder why you have it. It says: “Well-behaved women rarely make history”. For me, it is very hard to understand this sticker. It all depends in each one definition of well behaved; there is a lot of woman out there changing the history of this word by behaving well, by using their brain, by being smart. We have some presidents around the world who are women; there are a lot of female doctors, politicians, writers that had change the history in the last few years. I just wanted to let you know that it’d fine if you think that, but I don’t agree with you.

In the next paragraph of the letter to the professor, Carlos aligned ideologically as he advocated for the social construction of knowledge. He said:

Another sticker that I want to mention in this letter is the one that cites: “I love my country... but I think we should start seeing other people”. I think it’s awesome you think this way. It gave me the idea that you are a really open minded person; a person who is not afraid of experience new cultures, a person who likes to grow intellectually by meeting people from different places. That’s a

really nice way to learn about others and allows all human beings to not label others by their country or place of birth.

Carlos and Miguel end their letters similarly by offering advice. Carlos said, “Well, I won’t take anymore of your time; I just needed to share my thought with you. I hope you continue putting bumper stickers on your car and share your thoughts with all the readers. And Miguel offered, “I really advice you to keep sharing this thoughts with everybody and to add some if you can.”

Carlos wrote, in the concluding paragraph of his essay on bumper stickers, what I have claimed as a postlude to the bumper sticker assignments because his conclusion surpassed the goals I set for bumper sticker: 1. Construct assignments through which students will showcase cultural affordances, social and historic knowledge, as they interpret texts. 2. Select a genre constituted by enough variety so that students could select among them and participate with them dialogically. In fact, Carlos and his peers demonstrated cultural affordances through a multitude of dialogic iterations of interpretations. Carlos, however, not only conveyed his interpretations of bumper stickers, as did the other students based upon their ideological and epistemological stances, he also initiated the speculative process of discursively constructing the identity of the university professor whose car displayed the stickers. He deduced:

Now, analyzing all this statements I have an idea of the personality of the professor from my own point of view. This person is a really open minded person with strong believes, is a fighter and is nor ashamed of showing everybody what she things.

Carlos tempered his conclusion with the qualifier, “from my own point of view.” He added, “As I mentioned before, for somebody else these ideas can mean something different.” Without a directive from me in the form of a writing prompt, Carlos displayed characteristics associated

with ESOL conceptualizations with academic literacy and Bakhtinian theory. He attributed characteristics to the professor based upon his analysis of her role as speaker of bumper stickers. He recognized in the professor, connections among ideology, utterances, and identity, that is, the semiosis among how one thinks to what one says to who one is. Similarly, he recognized in himself the ability others possess, discursive competence. He noted, “That’s why they are bumper stickers, so everybody can read them and interpret them in their own way.”

Students in this ESOL composition class, therefore, interpreted bumper stickers as utterances, cultural artifacts produced in context, derived from social semiotics, which varyingly coalesce, collide or locate intermittently upon the continua within their own social semiotic repertoires. They subsequently mediated context to forge their responses. Students, given enough opportunity to write within different interactional contexts, enacted reciprocal discursive adaptation, applying particular linguistic tools to contextualize utterances to create contextualized responses. When they responded to the car owner, they enacted one set of strategies—statements of identification and intent, which led them to statements of evaluation. When they responded to someone in their country, they enact another—statements of familiarity, dialogic history, and intent. They closed the letters in a similar form, solicitation of response. From these exercises on bumper stickers, students demonstrated abilities to evaluate and participate in the social construction of language and, increasingly, considered that communicative stances presented reciprocally among speaker, listener, author and interpreter. Students learned too that “intertextuality, like heteroglossia and dialogue, is the natural condition of language interaction and interanimation. Every utterance is created in response to and in anticipation of other utterances, past and future” (Halasek, 1999, p. 65).

Students, who read utterances dialogically, who heard utterances, who spoke rhetorically to texts, who communicated textual salience to others within and outside the academic community, articulating agreement, disagreement, empathy, compassion, and outrage, created additional ways of knowing, ways of being. Consequently, as Blanton (1999) asserts, “Reader-writers with individual responses to public issues speak with certainty about something they own” (p. 135). What they own are ideologies-“an individual’s languages, discourse, and rhetoric ... conditioned and defined by complex, fluctuating social relationships” (Halasek, 1999, p. 4).

CHAPTER 4

CONTEXTUALYZING CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Tasks call for integrating with texts—reading them, talking about them, extrapolating from them, linking them to each other, relating one’s own experience to them, calling on them to shed new light on one’s experience and ones experience on them, synthesizing them, and writing one’s own text that do any or all of the above.

-Linda Blanton, 1998

Critical Discourse Analysis as a Pedagogical Practice

In response to the multiple conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL as delineated in Chapter 1 and the students’ dialogic analyses of bumper stickers as reported in Chapter 3, I constructed a methodology, a methodology of pedagogy by answering the second research question: How can I introduce a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis (analysis of power, identity and ideology) as a pedagogical practice to promote academic literacy? This question posed compelling duality: in one iteration it asked by what instructional means might I put into motion a pedagogical practice, as in the structure of a course syllabus; in another instance, it asked how can I contextualize a pedagogical method I espouse, a pedagogical critical discourse analysis. I contend that I, in academic literacy experiences of my youth concerning the tacit bumper sticker-like utterance, “We hold these truths to be self-evident...,” troubled the morass of sociocultural ideology in ways I could not have if it were not for all of the cultural affordances that over time shaped the student and teacher I am.

Being cast peripherally yet self-casting a centered gaze, I learned about language in its myriad dimensions. I learned about the world through ideas circulated in various contexts, ideational; through interactions stemming from interpersonal relationships, interaction; and from texts that informed me who I was or was not, textual. Therefore, answering research question number two requires ample measure of “I” and “I.” “I” citizen of the world and “I” ESOL instructor function not *either or*, but *both and*, contingent, evolving, and aware that “teachers must make explicit inter(con)textual connections between what and how they learn and what and how they teach is crucial to their seeing the constant interplay linking theory, practice, and the individual’s evolution as teacher and learner” (Ramanathan, 2002, p. 143). I framed the response to research question number two by situating CDA as a pedagogical practice, synthesizing CDA theory with meta-awareness of my own Thought Collectives in the section labeled Thinking Side-by-Side with my Students, continuing theoretical synthesis in More Theory, More Pedagogical Practice, and by linking CDA to academic literacy in Connecting CDA to Academic Literacy.

Situating CDA as a pedagogical practice, I acknowledge first, a semiotic interdependency or interanimation among language use and identity and power and ideology in everyday language, in research on language and society, and in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), reflected in the issues analyzed and in the motivation of the analysts. CDA is “fundamentally concerned with analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language” (Wodak, 2001 p. 2). Second, I acknowledge that CDA, therefore, requires a historical, contextual interpretation of discourses in relation to “such extralinguistic factors as culture, society, and ideology” (Meyer, 2001, p. 15). Third, I acknowledge that CDA is a semiosis of “the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual” (Halliday, 1978, 1994). These three acknowledgements situate an introductory, contextualized

CDA that I contend holds promise as an instructional rubric to potentially contribute to ESOL students' acquisition or enhancement of academic literacy.

This introductory, contextualized, pedagogical CDA invites a mediation of language and concepts theorists use when conceptualizing academic literacy in ESOL with the language and concepts researchers attribute to CDA because I have discovered that the goals of CDA can foster the tenets of academic literacy. I demonstrated this assertion through my personal literacy experience later in this chapter.

Although theorists of academic literacy do not assign preeminence to negotiations of power in general, they do, however, increasingly, raise issues of authority. Authority presents, in one instance, as the ability students acquire to create textual precision at the microdiscourse level of the sentence (Hinkel, 2003, Schleppegrell, 2002). In another instance authority presents in the capacity students demonstrate to discern the appropriate grammatical structure for a given task (Gee, 2002, Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002). In yet another instance, authority emanates from a learning environment in which teachers deliberately teach students the grammar of academic literacy (Celce-Murcia, 2002, Scarcella, 2002). The most salient alignment between exercising authority as conceptualized in academic literacy and negotiating power as conceived in CDA, however, emerges in appeals from Spack (1998), Blanton (1998), Elbow (2000, 1998) , and Halesek (1999) who state that students should participate in dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981) by interacting with texts within the academy, that is, reading and responding to academic texts. Blanton (1998) maintains the dialogic involvement with texts as literacy behaviors evokes authority in students. Students gain authority by responding to texts not only through affective stances but also through evaluation and synthesis, informed by their sociocultural influences, the influences that affect not only their reading and responding but also the relationship between

reader/respondent or speaker/listener or writer/reader. Holquist (1990) explains “that dialogue is not, as sometimes thought a dyadic, much less a binary phenomenon... it can be reduced to a minimum of three elements...an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two. It is the relation that is most important of the three, for without it the other two would have no meaning” (p. 28). The relationship becomes important to students when they situate themselves socioculturally in texts and when they consider ways authors may be socioculturally situated within the text they produce. A particularly effective *entrée* to the triad of dialogism, bumper stickers, provide ESOL students immediate exposure to polophony in U.S. culture. The ubiquitous presence and the concise textual space make bumper stickers optimal resources for ideological mediation. What CDA does to elevate bumper stickers from apparent cultural artifacts to an instructional artifact is provide language to invigorate students’ meta-awareness as they mediate the discursive content and form of the utterances in bumper stickers.

Introducing CDA into ESOL composition pedagogy extends the recent forays of critical approaches into ESOL: (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Ibrahim, 1999) address identity issues for non-native English speaker teachers in TESOL—the perception of never being quite as proficient as NS teachers--and students who choose blackness—the politics of choosing an identity perceived as subordinate—respectively. Nelson (1999) considers Queer Theory and sexual identity—the challenge and advantage of disrupting silence. While Lin (1999) troubles reproduction and transformation in English lessons—seeking *habitus* in EFL classrooms in China, Kumaravadivelu’s (1999) work comes closest to what I propose:

By recognizing and respecting various forms of cultural capital that participants bring with them, by seriously engaging them for learning and teaching purposes, and by analyzing the resultant classroom discourse by means of critical

ethnography, teachers can open themselves to alternate meanings and alternate possibilities.” (p. 480)

My work differs, however, for I conveyed the language of CDA and asked students to contextualize according to their experiences. In this instance, I asked them to consider ideas, interaction and text as dimensions of language when they analyze bumper stickers and editorials. Later in the spring semester 2005, I asked students to explore identity and power and the cultural affordances that inform such notions when they analyzed the last media sample, “The Hispanic Challenge” (Huntington 2004).

Thinking Side-by-Side with my Students

As I am not exempt from the processes of language contextualization from a pedagogical perspective of a teacher investigator in particular or as a citizen of the world in general, I feel compelled to answer the questions I ask students. Accordingly, I consider my own spatially, temporally induced interpretations of language. As an African American adult, who by the way certainly was not an “African American” youth, I reflect upon elementary school history class in the segregated South, the lessons of U.S. history containing the ever-present “we.” “We the people,” “We hold these truths,” and other “We’s” kept me bewildered. The historical documents referred to a “We” somewhat different than my concept of “we” as evidenced in the hallways of school, in church, and at home. In junior high school and high school in the integrated South, however, “we” in the hallways manifested more heterogeneously, while “we” at church, home, and community remained homogeneous. A word so simple in its textual representation, so clear in its grammatical purpose, a two-letter, first person plural pronoun defied my need for consistency in language. “We” disrupted my childhood assurance that I had learned my language lessons well.

The bewilderment of language I experienced as a colored youth first and later as a Negro youth led me, as an adult graduate student, curiously to discourse analysis and subsequently to Critical Discourse Analysis. My curiosity about language analysis, in a temporal sense, coincides with significant theoretical development in the field. CDA arose, in part, as a means to move beyond the analysis of lexiosyntactic features of written texts, that is, discrete sentence-level grammatical features, often the focus of a Chomskian linguistic approach. The move from Chomskian linguistics was a move toward systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978, 1985). For example, the discourse sample, *We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal*, could be analyzed structurally as a complex sentence, one independent clause (first person plural pronoun + transitive verb + direct object + objective complement) followed by a dependent clause (relative pronoun + collective noun as adjective + plural noun + being verb + predicate adjective). However, when the same utterance (Bakhtin, 1986) is troubled functionally through CDA, it troubles identity—Who are included in “We”? It troubles power—Who embodies the capacity to “hold”? It troubles ideology—Who produces and reproduces beliefs in these “truths to be self evident”? It troubles race, ethnicity, Diaspora—Who constitute “all”? It troubles gender—Who are understood to be “men”? It troubles ontology—Who are “created equal” and therefore privileged to be equal?

Troubling identity, power, and ideology, then, situates three influential impetuses for critical discourse analysis of written text. To begin, though, it is essential to acknowledge that even though the three impetuses named above are stated separately, they do not function independently. A recursive connectedness among identity, power, and ideology or identity, power, and ideas—the terms used in this ESOL class—permeates the various theoretical approaches to CDA and the discussions of textual analysis in this class. The work of CDA

infuses issues shot through with power at the macrodiscourse level even when it centers at the microdiscourse level more categorically on identity, for example. Yet, it is the ways social actors perform and are acted upon that create identity negotiations along semiotic intersections that typify explorations through CDA. When Lemke (1995) ponders his vantage, he does so in prelude to self-characterization:

Perhaps if I were more centrally a member of the power-wielding groups in our society, I would not be as critical of the commonsense of their traditions. I would not resent the symbolic and material pressures to accept their point of view about gender, logic, science, truth and social relationships as natural, correct and inevitable. (p. 5)

After having claimed to having been raised middle class by middle class immigrant Europeans, Lemke claims a liberal stance on religion, masculinity and sexuality. He states, “The identity I construct for myself remains that of a mostly masculinized male with a strong dislike for the excesses of traditional masculinity and for the limitations of exclusive categories of gender and sexuality” (pp.5-6). He claims, “I fit the profile of our society’s dominant caste closely enough to have been able to gain a fair understanding of how it sees itself.” (p. 6).

Like Lemke, I will ponder my vantage in prelude to self-characterization:

Perhaps if I were more centrally a member of the power-wielding groups in our society, I would not be as critical of the commonsense of their traditions. I would not resent the symbolic and material pressures to accept their point of view about gender, logic, science, truth and social relationships as natural, correct and inevitable. (p. 5)

I claim having been raised by descendants of an African Diaspora though somewhere along the way, post-slave ship, the gene pool embodied at least two continents. I claim to be less (far less than Lemke) ‘centrally a member of the power-wielding’ and perhaps, perhaps not, more ‘critical of the commonsense of their traditions’—alas the excerpt from the Declaration of Independence. I share Lemke’s views when he declares, “I do not read the social world from dead center, however; my viewpoint is displaced from that of the sorts of people I would consider the true power brokers. They would probably consider me somewhat alienated or just slightly perverse in my views” (p. 8). Off-centeredness resonates with me though instead of a luxurious position of not reading from dead center. I or those from whom I descended, as bequeathed by the Declaration of Independence, can not read, that is, literacy was prohibited. I have, consequently, neither centered language nor brokered power. I believe, nevertheless, that Lemke would probably be more comfortable envisioning himself instead of me within the commonsense construct of the Declaration of Independence. That is, I contend Lemke can see that folk like him, not folk like me, were included in the centrality of those safeguarded by such declarations.

I situate Lemke and myself not to perpetuate what seems an obvious dichotomous contestation—a claim of less power vs. a claim of no power (less power vs. even less power), but rather to illustrate the far-reaching potential for CDA. Anyone who wishes to investigate intersections of power may do so without regard to the conditions or qualifications of eminent power, for as Giddens (1999) affirms, individuals must, “in order to preserve a coherent narrative of self-identity” (p. 416) negotiate various dilemmas, among them the dilemma of powerlessness versus appropriation.

Even though Lemke and I may claim different power negotiations and negotiate those claims differently, CDA provides each of us a viable theoretical frame. Lemke, others and I must remember, moreover, that our critiques “are not situated outside the discourse” we analyze; we base them on “norms, laws and rights...themselves the historical outcomes of discourse” influenced by biases, not truth representing “a position that in turn is a discursive process” (Jager, 2001, p. 34). I find the Declaration of Independence intriguing and comprehend the commonsense, normalization (Luke, 2002) of excluding property of African descent from the collective “we” imbued with the inalienable rights, for in this context of declaration, man of European descent and adult African male elude lexical appropriation as synonymously homo-sapien. As a consequence of such “norms, laws, and rights” inalienable, indivisible, and impenetrable, I find myself socialized to be a willing participant in the hegemonic processes (Fairclough, 1992) of institutional subjugation enacted in 1776. I do not rally for 40 acres and a mule because I have learned to not seek emancipation. I do seek, however, the knowledge “to illuminate *how* people make sense of their reality and understand their social positions” (Rogers, 2003, p. 30) and to connect the intersections of power, control and socially constructed realities (van Leeuwen, 1993). People, in order to come to terms with the reality of peripheral or centered social positions, mediate power and control. To do so, “we are constantly and intently on the watch for reflections of our own life on the plane of other people’s consciousness, and, moreover, not just reflections of particular moments of our life, but even reflections of the whole of it” (Bakhtin 1990, p. 15).

More Theory, More Pedagogical Possibilities

In search of a more clearly defined sense, commonsense and otherwise, I further analyze my own self-reflection, ESOL as a discipline, and CDA as pedagogy. I look then to van Dijk

(2001) who upon clarifying CDA insists, “It is not a method nor a theory that can be applied to social problems. CDA can be conducted in, and combined with any approach and subdiscipline in the humanities and social sciences” (p. 96). He further explains, “CDA does not provide a ready-made, how-to-do approach to social analysis, but emphasizes that for each study a thorough theoretical analysis of a social issue must be made, so as to be able to select which discourse and social structures to analyze and to relate” (p. 98). Rogers, (2004) on the other hand, states “CDA is both a theory and a method...it includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation of why and how discourses work” (p. 2). In yet another instantiation, Luke contends:

To treat CDA as a formalized corpus of analytic and methodological techniques thus might be to miss the point altogether. Critical discourse analysis is more akin to a repertoire of political, epistemic stances: principled reading positions and practices for the critical analysis of the place and force of language, discourse, text, and image in changing contemporary social, economic and cultural conditions (Luke, 2002, p. 97).

When considering discipline, discourse and analysis a semiotic repertoire, I infused CDA not only as a research method but also an instructional tool in my dissertation and in ESOL composition instruction respectively. In the dissertation I analyzed data comprised of students’ analyses of media artifacts that address personal, cultural, historical, political issues of significance represented in bumper stickers, newspaper editorials, and journals which illustrate the cultural production and reproduction of knowledge. I posited that students, too, may analyze public discourse through their own compositions. They may explain their personal, cultural, historical responses to media, thereby approximating the work of CDA, and paramount to this

study, demonstrating academic literacy by analyzing utterances within which negotiations of power evolve. Such analyses of power, according to Apple (1996), “are not only concerned with the active production of institutional power through a politics of meaning-making. They are also concerned with the ways in which knowledge is reconfigured, how new meanings are produced that challenge institutional regimes of power” (p. 131).

Furthermore, I demonstrate multidisciplinary (van Dijk, 2001) associated with CDA by combining narrative, academic discourse and CDA in this instance. I contend that such analyses approximate the rigor often associated with the labels “academic discourse,” “academic literacy.” More significant than the labels, however, are the “academic practices” or “literacy behaviors” (Heath & Mangiola, 1991; Blanton, 1998) characteristic of academic literacy that may also enhance students appropriation of analytic methods of CDA, intertextuality and interdiscursivity (Fairclough, 1992) for example. When students analyze media samples, they will likely reveal relevant details that, I believe, will invariably convey their ideologically discursive situatedness, informed by mediations of fluctuating stances on identity and power. I base these assertions upon a belief I share with Fairclough (2003), “that texts have social, political, cognitive, moral and material consequences and effects, and that it is vital to understand these consequences and effects if we are to raise moral and political questions about contemporary societies” (p. 14). Textual mediation, for my students particularly, complements local mediation; most have just arrived in the U.S. to attend the university. The students and I, then, by virtue of our presence at the university have come to privilege it as a significant site for learning:

Learning is a type of social interaction in which knowledge is distributed across people and their tools and technologies, dispersed at various sites, and stored and

links among people, their minds and bodies, and specific affinity groups. Such a view of learning allows an integration of work in CDA, situated cognition, and sociocultural approaches to language and literacy. (Gee, 2004, p. 19)

Like Gee, the students in my ESOL classes and I draw upon social interaction as a catalyst to learning, and I, teacher and learner, appreciate Gee's claim that focusing upon the social presents possibilities for a synthesis of CDA, situated learning, sociocultural pedagogy and literacy, one goal of this study. Unlike Gee, however, I resist the appropriation of a distribution model as characteristic of learning because knowledge is not merely distributed to these students in my classes; I certainly do not function in a role of distributor of knowledge. Instead, I provide opportunities for students to make meaning through their experiences with tools, technology, situations, knowledge, relationships, and texts. For example, students mediate new locales, new literacies, new people, new social practices; consequently, "the transformations of place and the intrusion of distance into local activities, combined with the centrality of mediated experience, radically change what 'the world' actually is" (Giddens, 1999, p. 415). They will have come from locations replete with culturally instantiated notions of identity, power and ideology to a locale likewise replete with its own culturally instantiated notions of identity, power and ideology. Students' movement along spatial and temporal boundaries affects their means to situate themselves along semiotic intersections. For example, if I were able to chart students' ideological coordinates as longitude and latitude along geographic terrain, I would be interested in ways place and time contribute to students interpretations of ideas. I would want to know whether these students attribute place, for example, their country of origin (All of them were born outside the U.S.), people there, and ideas common to that region, as influential to their ways of thinking. I would want to know whether the geographic move to the U.S. represents an

ideological move as well. Can students demonstrate discursive evidence of ideological evolution through intertextuality and or interdiscursivity? It is their documentation of ideological movement, ideological steadfastness, or on-going ideological mediation I wish to chronicle in this qualitative study.

I want the knowledge, and I want for my students the knowledge that “All events have discursive roots; in other words, they can be traced back to discursive constellations whose materializations they represent” (Jager, 2001, p. 48). Accordingly my excerpt from the Declaration of Independence with my agenda for Pedagogical Critical Discourse Analysis could be analyzed thematically as a nationalistic discourse strand, textual manifestation of patriotic documents like the Pledge of Allegiance operationalized on a discourse plane of recitation in schools. Its discourse position could be considered the ideology of freedom. As nicely concise as that outline for analysis appears, Jager cautions analysts to expect “entanglement and complexity” (p. 50) of social discourse related to presumed homogeneity and inevitable heterogeneity.

In my first year ESOL writing class, I invite students to consider analysis of text as analysis of language practices, actions and materials because I need students to focus on how language works, how it is historically situated and materially constructed. I would ask them to consider ways they interpret their analyses. Essential to this undertaking are the questions: “Who am I?” “What do I believe, value, understand?” “What role does power have in the construction of my identity?” “What texts do I recognize as establishing, reinforcing or disrupting such power?” Morgan (1998) suggests, “Language does not simply report or transmit reality. Language ‘conditions’ our expectations and desires, and communicates what might be

possible in terms of ourselves-our identity-and the ‘realities’ we might develop” (p. 12). CDA may equip students with tools to affect both ‘conditions’ and ‘realities.’

Such issues of personal agency when juxtaposed with social practices (Fairclough 1999, 2000, 2001, 2004) provide sites of investigation ripe for CDA in general and in the context of ESOL for teachers and students. For example, English Only proposals in the state of Georgia and throughout the country, current focuses on Mexican immigration and unemployment, the increase in U.S. population of Spanish speakers (persons from Mexico, Colombia and Ecuador) and the prohibition of immigration of Haitian refugees. Issues like these or “problems” as stated by Wodak (2001) become the subject of CDA only when they so incite some discourse analysts and become the source of investigation. Therefore identity surfaces as textually and personally salient, for issues analysts treat reflect their semiotic mediation of identity, power, and ideology. Accordingly, I would not enter an ESOL class and tell my students they have ‘problems’ emanating from issues as stated above. Instead, I would encourage them to look at “the possible configurations between texts, ways of representing, and ways of being and to look for and discover the relationship between texts and ways of being and why certain people take up certain positions vis-à-vis situated uses of language” (Rogers, 2004, p. 7).

Connecting CDA and Issues of Academic Literacy

Everything that pertains to me enters my consciousness, beginning with my name, from the external world through the mouths of others (my mother, and so forth), with their intonation, in their emotional and value-assigning tonality. I realize myself initially through others: from them I receive words, forms and tonalities for the formation of my initial idea of myself.

-Bakhtin, 1986

As I encourage students to see connections among ideas, language use, and identity, and to evoke practices, behaviors, and competencies associated with academic literacy, for example intertextuality and interdiscursivity, I challenge myself to make those connections. So, at the intersection of teaching and learning, I work as a university administrator. Somewhere on the university organizational chart my name and an administrative title share space. A truer representation of who I am and my work would read administrator who teaches, voluntarily. Truer still would read the title, teacher administrator. “The whole truth and nothing but the truth,” however, would read teacher. The need for clarity rests not only in lexical veracity, but also in labeling rights or on correct labels.

Labeling rights, that is, who gets to label and labeling right, affixing the appropriate label to the appropriate “person, place, or thing” and “idea” as I would later learn in my early school language lessons on nouns preoccupied me. I remember nouns and other parts of speech and the definitions I learned for them just because I liked saying words like “infinitive” and “preposition.” I said them mostly to myself outside of the classroom, but I enjoyed hearing them in my head just the same. As my competence increased and the lessons intensified, I became enamored with words like “subtle,” “façade,” and “nuance,” in part because neither sounded to me as I eventually learned it should be spelled, and in yet another part because each found its way to the recesses of my mind, happily housed until I, at a moment’s notice, chose word play.

And then there were labels, not so much associated with language lessons teachers taught at school, but labels that affected schooling nonetheless. Simultaneous to my felicitous language experiences came others, foreboding, yet intriguing. I remember being called “smart,” and I remember being labeled one of those, as in “You think you’re smart.”

I remember, too, at the morning rituals in elementary school I was “allegiant,” “American,” “proud,” “Southern,” and “colored.” Even though I was “colored,” I had “liberty and justice” and it was “for all,” for all of us: for my colored classmates, for all my colored teachers, and I imagined for all the white folk on the other side of town. It had to be because my colored classmates and I pledged to our colored teachers every school day in the segregated South of my elementary school days. Being colored then, in my parents’ house and in school, felt right, like being a son to my parents and a brother to my older sister.

Around the time I went to junior high in the newly integrated South, a song, popularized by James Brown, became the talk of my community. “Say it Loud, I’m Black and I’m Proud” propelled colored people, some colored people, that is, into a quandary. While some preferred to be calm, cool, collected, and colored, I, in youth and irreverence, however, remained colored until “Black” caught on. I could not resist Nina Simone’s “To Be Young, Gifted and Black” not so much because I felt gifted or black, but because of the oh, so new allure of references to connections between being black and proud and the co-occurrence of being black and gifted. Only now, as an adult student of discourses can I comprehend the contributions Simone and Brown made towards the discursive construction of a positive black identity, an identity I and members of my immediate community desired.

The connections I made, as an adolescent, concerning ideas, language use, and identity emerged from my social experiences including home, church, and school and government. I learned about being colored, black, African American, and American through heteroglossic voices, voices in oration and voices in print. Voices that spoke louder or clearer resonate today, still, because as Lemke (2004) states, “Which connections we make (what kind and to which other texts and images) is partly individual, but also characteristic of our society and our place in

it: our age, gender, economic class, affiliation groups, family traditions, cultures, and subcultures” (p. 72). Consequently, if I were holding out for a mule, an interdiscursive reference to reparations, a reference I can make perhaps more readily than some because of the characteristics Lemke names, because of the cultural affordances I hold. Having and holding cultural affordances, as I do, make available to me the discourse of reparations. My availability to the ideology of reparations is neither confined to belief nor desire: it presents, instead, fundamentally at the level of awareness of historical contexts. I attribute this awareness to spatially, temporally induced discursive processes that contribute to who I am and who I can be. So, again, if I were holding out for a mule (I am not), I might take on the discourse-historical approach of CDA. In it Wodak (2001) contends discourse is a “form of social practice ...from a particular perspective” (p. 66).

She adds:

On the one hand the situational, institutional and social settings shape and affect discourses, and on the other, discourses influence discursive as well as non-discursive social and political processes and actions. In other words, discourses as linguistic social practices can be seen as constituting non-discursive and discursive practices, and at the same time, as being constituted by them. (p. 66)

In order to take the Declaration of Independence as discourse first, I must gauge, among other factors, the situation, a proclamation of separation from Britain; the institution, the ongoing formation of a government, the United States of America; a social setting, a gathering of men exercising language, affirming political policies sanctioned by Christianity. Wodak claims, “For CDA, language is not powerful on its own – it gains its power by the use powerful people make of it” (p. 10). Of the matter of power/knowledge “it is necessary first to deal in more detail with

the relationship between discourse and societal reality, and second, to ask more precisely how power is anchored in this societal reality, who exercises it, over whom and by what means it is exercised” (Jager, 2001, p. 36). In one document, then, those in power stated their authority and set about the enactment of a newly formed societal reality imbued in textual, material production of truth (Fairclough, 2000). As discourse “forms consciousness” (Jager, p. 35), CDA critiques:

The (dominating) discourses can be criticized and problematized; this is done by analyzing them, by revealing their contradictions and non-expression and/or the spectrum of what can be said and what can be done covered by them and by making evident the means by which the acceptance of merely temporarily valid truths is to be achieved. Assumed truths are meant here, which are presented as being rational, sensible and beyond all doubt. (Jager, p. 34)

The Declaration thrived as political discourse and social action because its “systems of discourse are closely associated ideology, hegemony and with the enactment of power” (Martson, 2002, p. 85). Slavery thrived as well economically and ideologically because of the convenience of negating civil and human rights of particular people for the benefit of others.

When working with historically situated, politically, culturally charged, nationalistic discourse, as I have with the Declaration of Independence, analysts must acknowledge bias and reduce it. Wodak (2001) advocates triangulation when she proclaims, “the discourse-historical approach attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which the discursive ‘events’ are embedded” (p. 65). The discourse-historical approach considers discursive actions conveyed through discourse genres “subject to change” and includes “social theories to be able to explain the so-called context” (p. 65).

The discourses of history when rendered through proclamations of freedom and equality in the U.S. as exemplified in a document like the Declaration of Independence reflect a material document whose existence and lexical content can not be denied. Unlike the matter of existence, however, textual interpretation and textual analysis defy fixed, concretized systemization. The commonsense acceptance of “liberty and justice for all” the people who authored documents and all whom they represented situates such documents as awe inspiring, patriotism inducing “presumed truths” (Jager, p. 34). For those excluded from such liberties, the desire, that discourse “influence discursive as well as non-discursive social and political processes and actions” (Wodak, 2001, p. 66) to produce another all encompassing, ubiquitous freedom thereby constituting an all encompassing, ubiquitous truth, seems commonsense. The very commonsense applied in theory and practice to the development of the Declaration of Independence, enjoyed by its constituents, belied its circumscription. Even though one commonsense iteration neither negates nor eliminates another, one prevails in accordance to contextualized linguistic and extralinguistic factors. To over simplify, the Declaration of Independence was written by particular people for particular people to accomplish certain goals they deemed reasonable and commonsense. Some people were excluded. Some of those excluded felt violated and deemed that reaction commonsense. Consequently, at least two distinct commonsense conceptualizations developed from one discourse sample because utterances and responses must reflect the semiotic relationship of speaker/respondent, for the conceptualizations of commonsense one attributes to discourse directly reflect the sociocultural influences including race, class, gender, sexuality, politics, and economics of persons who participate in a dialogue within the discourse.

Accordingly, Iddings, Haught & Devlin (2005) surmise:

... it is through the dialogue between mind and world that, according to Bakhtin, the artificial dualisms between the inner and outer spheres of being are dismantled. Within these theoretical parameters the human activity of meaning is inextricably connected to the social interactions, which occur in a particular social, cultural and political context and at a particular point in history. (p. 34)

How, then, can the commonsense of production, interpretation, and analysis of discourse contribute to language teaching and learning in an ESOL context? To start, ESOL teachers and learners can observe discourse in society in myriad manifestations that demonstrate language at work in society. Teachers, therefore, may utilize discursive artifacts like bumper stickers, editorials, and journal articles as instructional opportunities in spite of their inherent inconsistencies because addressing discursive inconsistencies reinforces the heteroglossic nature of utterances and contributes to discursive competence. Students may experience multiple textual genres, varied registers within those genres, and tropes apparent in U.S. discourse. Their experiences need not be restricted by instructors' perceptions of students' ability to appropriate and reinstate cultural norms. Students may gain discursive competence, over time, cumulatively through mediation of language within lexicosyntactic and sociocultural domains, domains already associated with academic literacy.

In order for ESOL students in university composition courses to readily apply the meta-awareness they bring to cultural, historic, and political dialogues to their development of academic literacy, teachers must create learning opportunities to integrate these dialogues into their pedagogy in learning environments characterized with expectation and acceptance of a priori student knowledge. Teachers must admit, first, at least to themselves, reasons they

participate in cultural dialogues that may or may not coincide with the cultural dialogues their students mediate. Moreover, teachers must assess ways their cultural dialogues affect and reflect their Thought Collectives, their social positions and, eventually, their pedagogy, the self-assessment I developed in this chapter.

I, having moved beyond my socially induced reticence, revisited cultural, historic, educational episodes to demonstrate the salience of social positions to cultural dialogues. I have observed the inextricable connectedness between authority as hailed by theorists of academic literacy in ESOL to authority that emanates from the ability to analyze texts according to CDA. I have introduced a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis and have observed these ESOL students' literacy behaviors as they participated in academic dialogues. I have done so even at the risk of being essentialized as unpatriotic by some readers. Such readers, perhaps, could justify essentialization as their commonsense reading of this text. To those readers I say "I, Too, Sing America" (Langston Hughes) and still believe "in liberty and justice for all" especially in classrooms that privilege student knowledge. That belief does not compromise the analysis, and the analysis does not compromise the belief.

CHAPTER 5

TEXTS IN CONTEXT

“The Hispanic Challenge”

All texts function socially and politically within communities, and it is important that we understand what the demands of advanced literacy are and the consequences of teaching or not teaching students to engage with certain kinds of texts and contexts and not others.

-Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002

On December, 02, 2004, I handed to the students in my ESOL composition class the article, “The Hispanic Challenge” (Huntington, 2004), which appeared in Foreign Policy , a journal co-founded by Samuel Huntington, author of “The Hispanic Challenge” and Chairman of the Harvard Academy of International and American Studies. On the “About the Magazine” page of the Foreign Policy website, the journal is described as “the premiere, award-winning magazine of global politics, economics, and ideas. Our mission is to explain how the world works—in particular, how the process of global integration is reshaping nations, institutions, cultures, and, more fundamentally, our daily lives” (foreignpolicy.com). Its “Academic Subscription Program” website link reads, “**FP** draws on the world’s leading journalists, thinkers, and practitioners to analyze and debate the most significant international trends and events of our times. And does so across a wide spectrum of academic disciplines, without political bias.” Citing its potential as an instructional resource it adds, “Rigorous and accessible, indomitable and irreverent, **FP** is an unparalleled educational tool in the classroom.” **FP**’s statements of value and purpose along with my desire that these ESOL students interact with

intertextuality and interdiscursivity, within academic discourse, led me to bring this text to the class.

Headings in “The Hispanic Challenge”

As an introduction to “The Hispanic Challenge,” I asked the students to read all of the headings first. It is important to note that the students had not read the article. I deliberately asked them to consider only the headings because I was interested in the cultural and linguistic resources they might bring to the headings as utterances and, therefore, the responses those utterances might evoke. With that goal in mind, I asked them to select at least three headings and respond to them. I did not, however, stipulate the content or form for their responses because I was interested as much in their approaches to dialogue as the content of their responses. The responses these ESOL students would give to these headings would be robust, I anticipated, based upon their previous responses to the bumper stickers and editorials, which they conveyed through discussions on dimensions of language—ideas, interaction, and text. These ESOL composition students discovered that utterances, others’ and their own, are epistemologically informed, ideologically based, politically situated, culturally bound, behaviorally induced and inducing, and affectively perceived. This discovery proved ideologically consistent with the Bakhtin’s theory of utterances (1981):

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all the utterance arises out of this dialogue as

a continuation of it and as rejoinder to it—it does not approach the object from the sidelines (pp. 276-277).

Building upon students' demonstrated utility in the analysis of ideas, interaction, and text with bumper stickers and editorials, I introduced, in the latter part of the first semester of the study, the concepts "identity" and "power" as additional dimensions of language, for these concepts would move the students and me towards a more comprehensive textual analysis, drawing from a contextualized CDA. The discussions of identity and power began like the discussions of ideas, interaction, and text. First, I asked, "What is identity?" Initial looks from students that could be described as puzzled followed by what I consider revelations that support the assertion that what students know sometimes surpasses their own expectations. The understanding students achieved about identity evolved from their responses and prompts from me like, "What do you say about yourself when you describe yourself?" "What have you learned from your family that helps you say who you are?" "What sources outside of family influence identity?" These discussions occurred before students worked on "The Hispanic Challenge" because I wanted to situate a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis in order to discover I wanted to discover (1) the degree to which social and historical knowledge inform their reading and (2) whether meta-awareness stimulates critique.

I report the responses of two students, Carlos from Columbia and Abrihem from Nigeria, and my analysis of their responses. I sought insight to ways students interpret the headings without having read the entire text, for I believed they would bring cultural affordances to their reading early in the process of engaging text. I began my analysis of their responses with Fairclough (2004) social practices or orders of discourse—genres (g), discourses (d), and

style(s), and I contend their responses revealed evidence of their social and historical knowledge and meta-awareness. See Table 9 for a summative synthesis of student analysis of the headings.

All of the headings, in the order they appear in the article, are listed below: I assigned numbers for the purpose of organization in the study. The numbers do not appear in the article.

1. The cultural division between Hispanics and Anglos could replace the racial division between blacks and whites as the most serious cleavage in U.S. society.

2. From Diversity to Dominance

3. A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE

3. There is no “Americano dream.” There is only the American dream created by an Anglo-Protestant society.

5. SPANGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

6. Failure to Assimilate

7. Early Warning

8. **One index foretells the future: In 1998, “Jose” replaced “Michael” as the most popular name for newborn boys in both California and Texas.**

9. The Threat of White Nativism?

10. BIENVENIDO A MIAMI

11. CONTEMPT OF CULTURE

12. IRRECONCILIABLE DIFFERENCES

The article in Foreign Policy exemplifies the genre (g) of journal article and the linguistic resources that comprise it; the students’ responses exemplify an informal, in-class textual reaction, a class assignment. The genre, then, would remain constant, while the discourses (d) and style (s) would embody the students’ individual linguistic resources.

Carlos' Responses

Carlos selected headings 8, 10, and 1 from the twelve headings included in the article, and classified each heading with a dimension of language—text, interaction, ideas, identity, and power—that appear in chapters one, two, and three in this study.

8. Text: **“One index foretells the future: In 1998, “Jose” replaced “Michael” as the most popular name for newborn boys in both California and Texas.”**

Just by reading the header you kind of understand what the article is talking about. As we all know, Michael is a typical American name, and the fact that it is being replace by ‘Jose’, a common Latino name, implies that the Hispanic population is increasing in those two states.

Carlos responded with a conversational style (s), “you kind of understand.” His understanding alluded to a meta-awareness, he considered generally pervasive, that is what he knows, “we all know.” His meta-awareness manifested through his social knowledge that though the effect may be that the name “Jose” has surpassed “Michael” in California and Texas, the cause as he stated, by implication, is the increase in the Hispanic population. At the syntactic level, Carlos repeated the passive voice in the form of the being verb “is,” and constructed a rather complex sentence containing dependent and independent clauses to make an inferential assertion.

10. Interaction **“BIENVENIDO A MIAMI”**

I have been traveling to Miami since I was 4 years old. I was living in Columbia but I had 2 uncles living in Miami, so several summers and Christmas I visited them. They lived there for 20 years, and believe it or not, the only two word they knew how to say in English were “Hello” and “Bye Bye.” They were wealthy

and lived fine there; they never needed to speak English there. As soon as you get out of a plane in Miami, even though is an American city, the first thing you see is a big sign that says “Bienvenido a Miami.” So like it or not, Miami has become a Spanish speaking city.

In this response, Carlos created a lexicosyntactic style (s) comprised of passive voice and active voice verbs embedded within verb phrases of independent and dependent clauses, largely delineating time. By noting the passage of time and associating to it particular familial events, he supported emphatic assertions and illustrated the discourse (d) of Hispanic nationalism. He based the assertions on interactional evidence, rendered through the genre (g) of narration, characterized by repeatedly using “I” and “they” to tell that his uncles thrived in Miami without English language competence, or as he asserted, with minimal competence in the form of “Hello” and “Bye Bye.” He boasted, “They were wealthy and lived fine there; they never needed to speak English there.” Carlos asserted, as well, not only the ubiquitous quality of Spanish but also its linguistic cache’ as evidenced, in varying degrees, by institutional sanction as illustrated in the banner displayed in the Miami International Airport. Language ubiquity—the regional concentration of Spanish as a spoken language—and the intermittent institutional sanctions—the pervasiveness of Spanish as informational text in a governmental jurisdiction such as the airport, “like it or not,” he stated do not necessarily equate language acceptance. Regardless to ways people view Spanish as a language in the U.S., Carlos, displaying social knowledge, maintained, it is the language of Miami.

Power “The cultural division between Hispanics and Anglos could replace the racial division between blacks and whites as the most serious cleavage in U.S. society.

This statement is really heavy. It has a lot of power due to it's a political issue and I think the writer needs to be aware of how deep he is going in here. The racial division in the US and in the entire world has been a really heavy point over the years. We have had wars, crime, segregation and a bunch of other stuff because of the racisms. In the US though, the fight has been between blacks and whites. Times have changed and the racial division is tending to disappear between both razes. The Hispanics is something relatively new in the US, and there is a cultural division there between Anglos and Hispanics, but I think it won't ever replace the history the blacks and whites racial division; That's something that marked the US before human rights came out, before the abolition of slavery. The Hispanic-Anglo division is strong, I have to admit that, but I thing it won't go that far because all of the laws and education of the people in this country.

Carlos began this response by establishing a style (s) characterized by an affective stance, the strong feeling about the serious nature of the heading. He proclaimed, "This statement is really heavy," and he ascribed power to it as "a political issue." Contributing to his style, (s) meta-awareness of historic knowledge concerning racial discourse (d) of blacks and whites in the U.S. emerged as a warning that Huntington (2004) might disrupt the volatile nature of racial discourse, by commenting, "I think the writer should be aware of how deep he is going in here." Carlos also developed his style with assertions that racial tensions between blacks and whites are lessening, and tensions between whites and Hispanics will not become as severe as the history of strife between blacks and whites. He supported the latter assertion by stating that laws and education will prevent the escalation of strife. He used active voice to show a cause and effect

relationship of slavery and U.S. racial discord. He used passive voice often to describe the heading and issues surrounding it. Also of note, Carlos, in the referential subject position, fluctuated from “I” as a person responding to the heading to “We” as people in the U.S., implied self-inclusive, to “The Hispanics is something relatively new to the U.S.” without directly stating self-inclusion.

Abrihem’s Responses

“The Hispanic Challenge”

I believe that the Hispanic challenge is their inability to be fully accepted in America. I have heard from people the problems that Hispanics that live in the US have. I and my cousin were talking about me living in the US. During our discussion he warned not to even think about being a permanent resident there. He said I wouldn’t be accepted there the same way other Americans are. He also told me for example that the Chinese, Mexicans and other Hispanics who live there are going through the same thing now. I always ask myself why aren’t they really accepted in America? I guess my answers will come soon enough but I believe a possible reason would be that Americans are afraid of invasion that would lead to a division of America into two cultures.

Abrihem chose the title of the article as the subject of his first response. He demonstrated his style (s) by revealing meta-awareness of social knowledge with at least three levels of attribution: first by awareness of his own cognition, “I believe;” second through dialogic interaction, that is, he has “heard from people;” and third through intertextuality, the incorporation here of the narrative genre (g) highlighting a conversation between him and his cousin about “the problems that Hispanics that live in the U.S. have.” Abrihem considered their

challenge to be “their inability to be fully accepted in America.” He also introduced the discourse (d) of xenophobia as a possible reason that “the Chinese, Mexicans, and other Hispanics who live there are going through the same thing now.” Abrihem complimented meta-awareness, intertextuality, the genre of narration, and the discourse of xenophobia with an introspective question, “I always ask myself, why aren’t they really accepted in America?” and an expectant, if not speculative response. He wrote primarily in active voice and repetitiously involved himself very personally in the textual response with the first person “I.”

1. The cultural division between Hispanics and Anglos could replace the racial division between blacks and whites as the most serious cleavage in U.S. society.

What I believe this talks about is how cultural differences between Hispanics and Anglos could become even a bigger issue than racial differences between whites and blacks in the past years. I personally don’t see why there should be any cultural division between the Hispanics and Anglos. This is probably because I don’t know much about them.

Abrihem responded with a style(s) based upon tentatively summarizing the heading, making an assertion, and by admitting what he does not know.

2. From Diversity to Dominance

I believe this talks about how diversity between the cultures of the Hispanic, Mexicans and Anglos and even Africans is gradually becoming dominance. I say this in the sense that more and more foreigners immigrate to the US and the rate at which it is going, there would soon be more Hispanics or Mexicans than Americans. During a seminar I had like six months ago, a professor was talking

about how the total population of foreigners in America would succeed the population of Americans in their own country.

In this response, Abrihem juxtaposed speculative meta-awareness that immigrants collectively may become the majority in the United States. He supported that speculation with the rationale based upon his social knowledge of the ever escalating current rate of immigration. He added support to this notion through an intertextual experiential anecdote to show that someone else of repute, namely a professor, advocated the proposition as well. With this student/teacher example Abrihem's showed participation in dialogically amassed social knowledge.

4. There is no "Americano dream." There is only the American dream created by an Anglo-Protestant society.

These words could only be that of an Anglo. What I believe he is trying to say, from the way he composed his sentence, is that in America the rights that all Americans have is not as much as what they, the Anglos have.

In his response to the last heading he selected, Abrihem made an empathic assertion to establish style (s). Coupling the modal "could" with "only," Abrihem most authoritatively asserted his response, and supported the authoritative stance with a speculative stance querying "Anglo-Protestant" nationalism.

Table 9

Headings in "The Hispanic Challenge"

Student	Genres	Discourses	Styles
Carlos	narrative intertextuality	Hispanic nationalism, race	meta-awareness social and historic knowledge, passive & active voice, complex sentences, cause/effect, assertions / support

Abrihem	narrative intertextuality	Xenophobia	meta-awareness social, assertion / support, authoritative stance, active voice, complex sentences
---------	------------------------------	------------	---

“Early Warnings” and “The Threat of White Nativism?”

On December 9, 2004, informed by the responses students wrote about the headings that appear in “The Hispanic Challenge,” I assigned the first substantial reading from the article, two smaller passages, “Early Warnings” and “The Threat of White Nativism?” that appear on half a page of page 39 and the entire page 41 respectively. These passages, I believed, would extend opportunities for these students to experience the dimensions of language. Moreover, I believed these passages would invigorate students to participate textually, that is, read, respond, critique, in ways that promote academic literacy. Accordingly, I asked them to consider ideas, identity, and power. The latter two dimensions broadened the dimensions we originally discussed: ideas, interaction, and texts.

In the actual writing prompt, I asked, “In no more than one page each, consider the passages, “Early Warnings” and “The Threat of White Nativism?” and explore ideas, identity, and power.” I document responses to “The Threat of White Nativism?” The students responded to the prompt in a computer writing classroom in one class session. Two students, Miguel and Carlos, wrote multiple paragraphs, one for each dimension of language and included one dimension as a heading for each paragraph. Carlos was the only student to extract a quote from the passages and use it as a sub-heading for each of his paragraphs. Conversely, Abrihem and Joe wrote extended paragraphs in which they covered each dimension of language.

To analyze the students' responses, I drew again from Fairclough (2004), genres, discourses, and style and conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL, particularly Spack (1998), Blanton (1998), Colombi & Schleppegrell (2002), and Ramanathan (2002).

A summative synthesis of student analysis appears in Table 10.

Ideas

Humans are animals as well, but there is a big difference, no matter how you look, black, yellow, brown or black, we are all the same specie, we are all humans "self-preserving" from other humans.

-Carlos

When I asked students to consider ideas explored in texts, I sought to learn about their ability to read, comprehend, and report the substance of their reading. The students demonstrated various styles to convey the ideas presented in "The Threat of White Nativism?" Miguel alluded directly to the "the main point of the article," which he stated to be "the white race is getting scared or feels threaten by the growing of other races in the States." He used comparison to support his assertion: "The Hispanic race is the one that the author talks more about rather than the black race and it's because the Latin population is growing so faster than the black population." In support of his claim that whites experience fear, Miguel cited an example of whites moving from areas where they are minorities to "other areas where the Latin concentration is much less crowded." To a separate matter, but one worthy of note as a significant idea, Miguel stated, "Another point of the article says is how white people don't have organizations to promote their interests like Hispanics or black people."

In a less direct style, Joe wrote, "The author is trying to say that non-Hispanic whites might start taking action to protect their own right soon, especially in the areas like California where white has become a minority. While his statements like "is trying to say" and "might start

taking action soon” exemplified a tentative style, they also attest to Joe’s awareness that “the author” is speaking, that the ideas emanate from a source; and according to this source, the ideas present provocatively enough that they may incite action. In this instance utterance/response evoked cause/effect. Shifting from the tentative, Joe moved toward a more assertive stance with “What they are doing is not to support white racial supremacy but to preserve their own culture.” The assertive stance adopted here is an example of taking authority with text, a characteristic of academic literacy (Blanton, 1998).

Naming self-preservation as an idea central to this text, Carlos extracted a quote from the passage, “*These new white nationalists do not advocate white racial supremacy but believe in racial self-preservation and affirm that culture is a product of race.*” He, however, unlike Joe, demonstrated authority by first attributing the passage to “opinion” and second by qualifying the concept of self-preservation universally as “something that any animal on earth is looking for.” He elaborated, “Humans are animals as well, but there is a big difference, no matter how you look, black, yellow, brown or black, we are all the same specie, we are all humans “self-preserving” from other humans.” With the repetition of “we,” Carlos leveled humanity, a perspective that, for him, no doubt, represented commonsense. He supported the elaboration with an authoritatively stated assertion that demonstrated not only his understanding of context as a concept but also his ability to refute a premise in the article and support the refutation. He exclaimed, “Now, in the context the statement was cited, I don’t agree with that self-preservation stuff. In fact I think the white nationalists advocate for the white supremacy. As an illustration, just take a look at American government. How many black or brown presidents has the US had? How many are in the congress right now? Not too many.”

Privileging self-preservation as a paramount idea too, Abrihem attributed an informative, persuasive stance to the author, by saying, “The author tells us that this anti-Hispanic and anti-black movement is not as a result of whites believing that they have racial supremacy; he tells his readers that the whites are just trying to preserve their culture and their race.” The repetition here of references to the author’s telling not only commented on the dialogue between author and reader, but also foreshadowed Abrihem’s forthcoming statement of disagreement revealed in the next section on identity. Abrihem did, however, elevate the idea that white nativism is a movement “by the whites in America... to protest against the immigration of Hispanics and blacks into America.”

Identity

We know how our world works.

- Miguel

Diplomatically situated, Miguel began his thoughts on identity with concessions to both whites and Hispanics. He said, “Since I am an Hispanic who emigrated to the States I can really understand both points of views and agree with some points that both express.” Having professed objectivity in his comments on his own identity, Miguel’s proceeded to introduce of the discourse of Hispanic ethnocentrism, a discourse he used to build and support a persuasive stance. He avowed “I understand that white people would feel threaten because of losing their culture or traditions or even their own race, but Hispanics are here to stay and they are going to keep coming.” In explanation and support of Hispanic ethnocentrism through a style characterized by expressions of a cohesive community, stated repeatedly with first person plural pronoun, “we” he stated:

By my Latin point of view it is a big sacrifice that we do to come here. We come to the States looking for a better life quality for us and our family, and it’s not easy all what we have to do to achieve that goal. That’s the thing that Americans

don't see. We have to leave, our family, friends, the things that make us, to start a whole new life in a totally different world. That's the reason why is very easy for Hispanics to hang out with other Hispanic groups. We know how our world works. That is the reason for all these Hispanics organizations in which only goals are to make life easier for the Latin community.

When considering identity, Joe introduced the threat of anti-immigrant discourse by foregrounding his immigrant status. He said, "Although I am in a position that is not directly involved in this battle of white and Hispanic, I hope the situation will not turn bad and produce some negative immigration policy toward us. In addition to his concern for immigration policy, he introduced a counterpoint, a strategic resource for argument, "I think it is right and normal for American to self-protect. After all, it is their country and they are losing their jobs and culture."

Highlighting dialogism, that ongoing "conversation" between the author of the text and himself a reader once again, Abrihem revealed a bifurcated structure for his identity, being black and being a student, and thus his interpretation of the text according to that bifurcation. He claimed:

The author tells us about U.S. demographics foretelling the replacement of white culture by black culture and they say that the black culture is intellectually and morally inferior. The statement made by the U.S. demographics in this article forms a kind of a racial attack on the blacks. Being a "black" person I find it insulting for someone to put that blacks are intellectually and morally inferior to the whites.

By using analysis, evaluation, and meta-awareness as critique, Abrihem in addition to commenting on ways his identity affects his reading of the article, also made a conclusion about

the inferiority statement that impacted his assessment of the self-preservation assertion in the article. He revealed, “That statement completely changes the whole scenario of whites trying to preserve their culture; the statement shows that racism also has to do with these protests and “anti” movements.” Adding to his sense of identity and to his interpretation of the text is the fact that he is a non-U.S. resident student subject to potential cause/effect consequences of “The Threat of White Nativism?” He critiqued:

I can imagine what would become of our generation if we were banned from schooling here in the U.S. Most of our best doctors and engineers in Africa are those who have come here to U.S to get a university degree in what ever field they want to specialize in. If you are looking for the best University education, you find it in America. We who live outside the boundaries of America shouldn't be deprived of this because a particular race fears that their culture is going to be dominated. We need America to make our own countries better for us to live in.

Like Abrihem, a salient aspect of identity for Carlos was that of student. His student status, as stated in the apposite below, and his concern of the consequences of immigration restrictions led him to select the following quote from the article: “As more Hispanics become citizens, white groups are likely to look for other ways of protecting themselves” In response to the quote, he stated in critique:

I, as an international student in United States, have suffered the consequences of this ways of protections. A really close example is tuition. Most of the people who write the laws and take the State decisions are white; they don't like students from other countries going to school paying as their own kids. They charge us 3 times more, and in additions, they prohibit us to work.

Carlos ended his response by strategically participating in a dialogue with himself and the reader of his text. He asked, “Doesn't it sound like they don't want us here?”

Power

From what I have read, the power behind this article is a contest of culture in which each race seeks domination.

-Abrihem

Joe recognized as powerful the use of examples, a means recognized to support assertions in academic literacy. He said, “The power of this article is that the author uses some examples to direct the reader to accept his opinion.” Conversely, as a supportive example of the power Huntington (2004) used Joe stated, “I was convinced when he says that if there is organization that helps colored people, why not an organization promoting white interests?”

Miguel introduced race, particularly the discussion of race immediately, and attributed to it issues of power. He declared, “This article is very powerful because talks about a very delicate subject which is racism.” He articulated the tenets of utterance and response, (Bakhtin, 1984) when he concluded, “The way that the ideas are express and stated could foment the hate of white people towards Hispanics.” Miguel communicated awareness that the way information is communicated affects not only textual content but also intended response. On the consequences of utterance/response, in this instance, he asserted, whites “could and will eventually feel threaten by the races that are crowding their country.” Miguel, citing Huntington, the author of “The Threat of White Nativism?” contended, “The most powerful stimulus to such white nativism will be the cultural and linguistic threats whites see from the expanding power of Hispanics in US society.” In conclusion, Miguel said, “It just creates a division of races, and in America there is a lot of racism, a thing that shouldn’t happen. We should all learn to live with each other and help us to go trough life. That would make it easier.”

Abrihem evaluated power based upon a causes/effect analyses, more precisely, causes and effects. At the sentence level of grammar, he drew from a precise lexicon to construct

effective phrase and clause structures, for example, “contest of culture” and “each race seeks domination.” He said:

From what I have read, the power behind this article is a contest of culture in which each race seeks domination. The whites fear that over time, with an increase in the number of immigrants that come into the U.S, there will soon be dominance by other cultures. White nativism really is a threat, if these protests are met and immigration in to the United States becomes hard or furthermore impossible, a lot lives will be affected. People all over the world depend on the United States in the sense that it is easier to make it here.

Carlos demonstrated awareness of social knowledge that “cultural power,” as he stated, is not fixed, and accordingly he can mediate it. He situated the following quote from the article to contextualize a diplomatic, multiculturally informed perspective on power: “The most powerful stimulus to such white nativism will be the cultural and linguistic threats whites see from the expanding power of Hispanics in US society.” He stated meta-awareness through critique with a point/counterpoint argumentative approach that included acknowledgement of white nativism as commonsense, rapid growth of the Hispanic population, U.S. multiculturalism, the threat of Hispanic ethnocentrism, the diminishing American society, and his personal acculturation to the U.S.:

In my opinion, this idea of white nativism, defending a culture and a language is important and respectable. The increase of the Hispanic community in the US in the last few years is titanic. US has been a multicultural country since the discovery of the Americas, putting together strong points from different cultures and creating a specific new powerful culture that is what we have now. Then the

Hispanic population increases, but they don't try to by part of the American culture, they want to preserve their own culture. So as the author said, this becomes a threat for the American society, it reduces the cultural power and society already established. I am an immigrant, and I respect the culture that is offering me a better quality of life, call it education if you want, but I do my best to fit in the new culture that surrounds me.

Table 10

“The Threat of White Nativism?”

Ideas

Student	Genres	Discourses	Styles
Carlos			assertion / support; attributes ideas to author; meta-awareness as critique
Abrihem			author attribution
Joe			Tentative; attributes ideas to author; cause / effect; assertive; authoritative
Miguel			assertion of fear / support; authoritative

Identity

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos		Hispanic identity; student identity	meta-awareness as critique; rhetorical question
Abrihem		Student identity; non-resident identity	meta-awareness as critique; analysis; evaluation; cause / effect
Joe		anti-immigration discourse; immigrant identity	presented point / counterpoint argument; meta-awareness; social knowledge
Miguel		Hispanic ethnocentrism	presented point / counterpoint argument

Power

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos			social knowledge; meta-awareness as critique; point / counter point argument
Abrihem		racial domination	power in clauses and phrases he wrote
Joe			power in author's linguistic structure-examples
Miguel		race	cause / effect; awareness of dialogic intent-utterance / response

ENGL 1101 Final Examination

Between December 02, 2004 and the end of the term, I assigned portions of *The Hispanic Challenge: Jose' Can You See?* namely "Early Warnings" and "The Threat of White Nativism?" because each can stand as a small but complete article. I asked students to respond to each "mini article" before assigning them the entire article. After they had read and written about segments of the article and subsequently had read the entire article, we met on December 14, 2004 for the final exam of the ESOL Composition course, ENGL 1101. The writing prompt follows:

Write an essay using "The Hispanic Challenge" Consider the ideas in the article, the power the author uses to communicate the ideas, and the ways that power affects your identity. How does your identity affect the way you interpret the article? A summative synthesis of student analysis of "The Hispanic Challenge" appears in Table 11.

Ideas

Carlos introduced the essay with a direct interactional approach to audience by evoking subjunctive modality. He speculated about the responses he might get to hypothetical questions he posed. He even followed his hypothetical questions with appropriate responses stated through meta-awareness, assertion, and the discourse of Mexican nationalism:

If I ask you right now to name all the Mexican restaurants you know and their locations, I am pretty sure you will come out with a list. But what if I ask you the same about a Greek, Nigerian or Iranian restaurant? I am pretty sure there wouldn't be too many names on that list. Why is this? The main reason is that there are a lot of Mexican immigrants who won't forget their culture, their food, and the Americans are getting use to live with that and even love these places, their food and music.

Abrihem, on the other hand, demonstrated an appreciation for situating the historic context of immigration to the United States in his introduction. He expressed a conceptualization of commonplace, universalized immigration. First, he characterized the act of immigration as an experience shared by people from various countries. Then, he characterized immigration as an act of assimilation. He further demonstrated the ability to communicate the exception to universalized assimilation, Hispanics. He stated:

America has been the most prosperous and successful country in the whole world ever since the 17th century. It was the Anglos and British that made the country what it is today. Ever since the 17th/18th century, America has become a magnet for people from other cultures and from other countries all over the world.

America presently has people from almost all countries and cultures dwelling in

here. Ever since World War 1, America accepted so many immigrants to live on their soil. When people from other cultures immigrate into the United States there is a tendency that the American culture assimilates into those peoples cultures causing them to now become somewhat American. This isn't the case for most Hispanics that now dwell in the United States. Most of the populations of Hispanics that live in the United States aren't yet Americans." In fact they do not even want to assimilate into the American culture.

Miguel, unlike Abrihem and Carlos, focused on an ideational context to introduce his essay by referencing Hispanic immigration as a subject, yet he focused, primarily, on the author of the text, Huntington. Miguel, speculated specifically about the Huntington's identity and ways the Huntington's identity affects the text. He surmised:

The article presents a perspective about the Hispanic emigration to the United States, which is mainly conform by Mexicans. By reading the text we can have an idea of who the writer is, and how that person feels toward the Hispanic crowding of the States. The author is mainly a Non-Hispanic white; we can notice this just by the way that expresses the facts and how presents an alarming perspective. The writer talks in a warning tone, he is worried about losing his language, culture, race, and the most important of all his country. It explains how is even possible to loose physical territory if the Mexican emigration keeps its high rate.

Finally, Joe created a concise thematic summary as a statement of context for his introduction. He stated, "This article is an excerpt from a magazine called *Foreign Policy*. It is mainly about how Hispanic immigrants threaten to divide the United States into two people, two, cultures, and two languages."

As students progressed from introductory paragraphs to develop the essays, they chose, as I expected, multiple representations of ideas in “The Hispanic Challenge.” Carlos developed the historical context as Abrihem did in his introduction. Abrihem privileged geography, while Joe focused on the author’s point of view, a focus Migel evoked in his introduction.

Carlos said:

United States has been a multicultural country since its origins. Massive immigrations were the beginning of this country. People from all over the world arrive to the US looking for something, maybe religion, political or economical freedom, or just to adventure. Different cultures were settled in the US territory, the fusion together and as a result a whole new culture was created. After this culture was settled, immigrants who arrived in the country adapted to this culture. But in the 1960’s a new immigration started without being noticed, the Mexican immigration. At the beginning the government didn’t see it as a problem, they saw it as an economic benefit; cheap labor. But with the years, it became a big challenge (or problem, depending how you see it). The Mexican population is increasing really fast and it is very hard to stop it.

Geography as Ideology

Both Abrihem and Joe situated land as a means Huntington used to express ideas.

Abrihem said:

It is surprising to see that most of these Hispanics, which are usually Mexicans, are now forming their own ground on American soil. A lot of Mexicans can be found in Texas, California and most of them in Miami. The population of

Mexicans that have illegally or legally immigrated to Miami is very alarming for Americans.

Joe stated:

In some part of this country, we can see that Spanish replaced English in commercial or entertainment area. Furthermore non-Hispanic whites are not the majority anymore in places like Los Angeles and Miami, and Hispanics will take this place in many parts of South United States in a few decades. Besides the Cubans in Miami, the Mexicans are the most threatening group, even among all Hispanics.

Abrihem observed, “It is probably easy for Mexicans to immigrate into America because the American – Mexican border comprises of a thick line that extends several kilometers and a shallow river.” As Joe and Abrihem continued to develop the ideas presented in the article they increasingly moved from stating ideas generally to attributing the ideas to the author. Joe stated generally, “The main idea is the challenge Hispanic immigrants give to America and American should not ignore this problem.” Then moving to attribution, he commented, “The author said the immigrant group is not like other ones, they have failed to assimilate into the mainstream American culture. With rapid growth of population here, Hispanic is gaining their power in politics and daily life.” Crediting the significance of geography to the ideas the author raised on Hispanic immigration, Joe said, “The author said some of the reasons of their immigration and how concentrated and resistant they are, such as Mexico is adjacent to the United States, they lost some territories in the wars to America, and the economic and political conditions.” With a similar approach to illustrating author attribution, Abrihem observed:

The author of this article tells his readers that Miami has now become the home of most Mexicans that live in America and it was found out that most of them there don't even speak English in their homes. There was even a time way back in the past when Americans had to vacate Miami because of the way they were treated by the Mexicans. In the article, there was a quote on a bumper sticker saying: "will the last American to leave Miami, please bring the flag". That statement meant that the Americans there were ready to give up Miami, their own state, to the Hispanics that lived there. Miami is not the only state that is being "invaded" by Hispanics. Texas and California are also gradually being filled with these Hispanics. There was a time when the name given to new born baby boys in those states was Michael but ever since the continuous flow of Mexicans into them the most common name has now become Jose. This just shows how Mexicans are gradually becoming more dominant in those states.

Rounding out references to the author that broaden perspectives beyond the significance of geography, Carlos and Joe described the structure of the article and the rhetorical strategies associated with it. Carlos stated:

The problem here is not that this population is increasing; the problem is that they don't want to assimilate the American culture and be part of it as the early immigrants did, and instead, as they increase, their culture gets stronger and harder to dissolve or integrate with the native culture. As the author in the article said, this immigration is different from the other immigration that took place in the US due to a combination of six factors: *contiguity, scale, illegality, regional concentration, persistence and historical presence*.

Joe observed, “The author used two separate articles, “Early Warning” and “The Threat of White Nativism” to show the importance of this problem. He wants to urge the government to take some actions before it is too late.”

Power

One part of the writing prompt for the final examination was to address the way the author used power to communicate ideas. Taking a general approach, Abrihem considered threats and consequences of Hispanic immigration to the United States. He said:

The problem here is not that this population is increasing; the problem is that they don't want to assimilate the American culture and be part of it as the early immigrants did, and instead, as they increase, their culture gets stronger and harder to dissolve or integrate with the native culture. As the author in the article said, this immigration is different from the other immigration that took place in the US due to a combination of six factors: *contiguity, scale, illegality, regional concentration, persistence and historical presence*.

Alluding to the Huntington's six factors that differentiate Hispanic immigration as Abrihem did, Carlos, however, associated power to Huntington's lexical precision. And Carlos elaborated with examples that illustrated power as rhetoric:

These powerful six factors are not isolated at all; they go hand by hand. Let's take as an example the regional concentration. If we look at a city like Los Angeles; there is a huge population of Mexicans, taking Spanish and having their own culture around the city. Then, if you are a new immigrant, missing what you left in your country, where do you prefer to go? Salt Lake City or LA? Then, the scale factor will be involved. There are thousands of Mexicans crossing the border

everyday, and they will choose to go to places where they know a cousin, a brother or a friend. Latino culture really believes in family, and as a Catholic culture, they believe in big families, so this aspect scales the population of Mexicans as well. Then, due to the contiguity of the two countries, it's really easy to cross the border, even do the US immigration patrol is always around. So many illegal Mexican crossed the border every day.

Joe took an even more specific approach to the evaluation of power in the article by addressing content such as data and structure. He observed:

The powers of this article are lots of facts and studies, impressive sentences, and the powerful ending. There are many numerical studies, even charts and graphs, which show the seriousness of the Hispanic challenge. Some examples are the outbidding numbers in population in Los Angeles and some parts of the United States, the Hispanic immigrant education level compared to all Americans, incomes, and many more. Those give a strong support to the ideas the author is trying to express. There are also many powerful sentences enlarged next to the text to catch the readers' attention. One of the best is "In 1998, 'Jose' replaced 'Micheal' as the most popular name for newborn boys in both California and Texas." This sentence is interesting, meaningful, and also matches the opening sentence of the magazine, "Jose Can You See?" The ending is also a good one. The author spent the whole time to be objective in this article, but he totally denied the Lionel Sosa's book, Americano Dream, in the end of his article. He said that Mexicans do not flourish in America, and only few of them will succeed here.

Miguel took a different approach to address power, that of observing not only the veracity of textual content but also his assertion that the text discriminately and pervasively targets

Hispanics. He said:

Even though the text portrays and states facts that are true and real, it doesn't reflect the racism or discrimination towards any emigrant, mostly Hispanics.

Everybody can see what is happening, Americans know what is going on. They just have to go out and look around and see how common that brown skin is.

Identity

Another part of the writing prompt for the final exam in ENGL 1101 asked the question, "How does your identity affect the way you interpret the article?" Asking the question as generally as I did, situated the notion of inquiry as open-ended, open to myriad possibilities that analyses of identity present. It was not necessary to ask the question even more generally, as in "Does your identity affect the way you interpret the article?" Theory already supports individual's coalescence of social situatedness and textual mediation. To reiterate from Chapter 4 Theorizing Pedagogy, "we are constantly and intently on the watch for reflections of our own life on the plane of other people's consciousness, and, moreover, not just reflections of particular moments of our life, but even reflections of the whole of it" (Bakhtin, 1990, p.15). Textual mediation, then, in a Bakhtian sense encompasses dialogic ideological mediation including, but not limited to, thoughts expressed in speech and written texts. In other words, as Holquist (1990) explains, textual mediation requires an examination of "an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two. It is the relation that is most important of the three, for without it the other two would have no meaning" (p. 28). The mediation of the relation of the two, the negotiated third space, becomes most salient to students as they interact with texts experientially (Blanton, 1998),

considering ways their experiences affect their textual mediation, a process Blanton contends contributes to their acquisition of academic literacy.

In response to “How does your identity affect the way you interpret the article?” Abrihem revealed the social knowledge of experience:

In some parts of America, there have been people protesting that the immigration of Hispanics into America should be controlled, reduced or even brought to a halt. Some Americans even go further by protesting that even the number of Africans that immigrate into the United States should be reduced. Being an African I wouldn't want the American government to comply with these protests. We Africans don't pose a threat to the American culture and furthermore, the population of Africans here in the United States is not even up to half of that of Hispanics here. Why should we Africans be deprived of free access to the United States because of the threat that another nation poses on it. From the way things are, the cultural difference between the Hispanics and Americans could replace the racial differences between the Whites and Blacks in the past. I have just come to find out that even some of the African-Americans and Africans that live in the United States don't really accept the Mexicans. I was in the car with my older cousin one day and a Mexican drove carelessly in front of us. My cousin kept on telling me how Mexicans can't drive well and how they have become a burden on the United States. I understood what he told me and from the research I have done on Mexicans in the United States I have come to realize that most people do take them as a burden. But then and there, when we were in the car, I wanted to ask him to imagine himself in the shoes of the Mexicans. If it were we African

inhabitants of America that were rejected or unwanted because of one reason or the other, we would look at the whole thing from a different perspective.

Abrihem repeated effectively the rhetorical strategy he evoked in the introduction of the essay, deductive reasoning, as he reflected on identity. He wrote generally of the angst Americans feel toward Hispanic immigration and concluded that Africans as immigrants suffer similar disparagement. With statements like “Being an African,” which, to Abrihem, is, in this context, synonymous to being an immigrant, but not a Hispanic immigrant, and “We Africans,” which he stated three times in the section on identity, Abrihem articulated difference and solidarity respectively. He self-identified as an immigrant but does not want to be perceived as a threat: “We Africans don’t pose a threat to the American culture.” He asked, “Why should we Africans be deprived of free access to the United States because of the threat that another nation poses on it.” In spite of not using a question mark to punctuate the question, Abrihem’s question contributed significantly to the effect his identity has on his textual mediation. He developed further the effect his identity had on his interpretation of the text by introducing a personal anecdote, an intertextual reference. He concluded this section of the essay with the realization that experiential mediation may lead one to “look at the whole thing from a different perspective.”

Miguel commented on the social knowledge of solidarity:

I am a foreign born who immigrated to the United States. I speak Spanish and I am catholic, just like any other Hispanic. Those are the only things that we, as Hispanics, have in common. We can’t even say that we are all Catholics since we differ in our points of views, therefore; we are not all part of the same religion. The article have some influence on me and on my identity because of who I am,

been a Venezuelan in the States it is not easy, we really are a minority as an emigrant group. Our assimilation to the American culture is much faster and easier because our community is out numbered by other races. This make us be involve with Americans more time each day. I have a little more than a year since I moved from Venezuela, by now I would say that I can speak English fluently or at least very well, also for writing and reading. I speak Spanish at my house and with my friends, but is the same thing with English because, I go to school, I watch TV and I have American friends. English is as part of my daily life as Spanish is. Mexicans don't have the tendency to mix with any other race than Mexican, not even any other Hispanic type. They are very close with their race, consequently; they aren't dealing with English speakers often. This means that there are some of them that live here in the States for years and never learn a word of English.

Solidarity and difference characterize Miguel's approach to the effect of identity on textual mediation. For solidarity, he claimed language and religion as common traits for Hispanics, but immediately reduced the common bond by adding, "Those are the only things that we, as Hispanics, have in common." As a Venezuelan, Miguel viewed Venezuelans, "a minority as an emigrant group" bound to assimilate "faster and easier because our community is out numbered by other races." He attributed language proficiency in both Spanish and English to his ease in socialization with Spanish speakers and English speakers. Conversely, he cited the lack of English proficiency and limited socialization with speakers of English and speakers of Spanish from other ethnicities as deterrents for Mexican assimilation.

Joe said:

As being an Asian immigrant, I hope America not to be divided into two languages and two cultures. If Spanish becomes another necessity here, I would either have to learn more or lose some of my value in the society. Also it will be much harder to be familiar with the culture here. The America could be one of the best places to live in the world, and that is why we came here. However, the illegality and chaos Hispanic immigrants might have brought here will probably change it. Furthermore, as the goal of this article, the government will pay more attention to immigrants and immigration policies. All immigrants can lose some of the rights they have here, or have to stay longer to be naturalized. In either ways, we do not receive any benefit from Hispanic immigrants.

Threat impacted Joe's identity. First, the threat and consequences of an impending cultural divide with linguistic implications most affect Joe. His options, as he concluded, would be learn Spanish or "lose some of my value in the society." Second, the threat of "the illegality and chaos Hispanic immigrants might have brought here will probably change it." "It" for Joe indexes a U.S. refuge for immigrants; the threat, a loss of status for all immigrants. Changing "it," Joe determined, is "the goal of this article." He concluded, "In either ways, we do not receive any benefit from Hispanic immigrants."

Carlos wrote:

There are some strong points in this article that I identify with. I am an immigrant myself and most of my friend are Colombian or Venezuelan, I think this is because the similarity in our cultures. We all try to keep our traditions and believe or not, Americans love this. They love our dances, music, food, families and a lot

of these American are adapting to our culture. Personally, I have adapted to the American culture very well; I live with an American lady who opened the door of her home to me, and likes to learn about me and my culture, but I have to adapt to her family and culture. My interpretation of the article is from the point of view of an immigrant, but being really objective and realistic. I am aware of the big challenge the US has with immigration, but not only with Mexicans but will all kind of people.

Carlos, on implications of his interpretation of the article based upon his identity, called upon immigrant status and solidarity with friends from Columbia and Venezuela. He considered solidarity as cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991). He said, “We all try to keep our traditions.” Americans, Carlos explained, “love our dances, music, food, families and a lot of these American are adapting to our culture.” Carlos’ ethnocentric stance provided a counter commentary to assimilation in the U.S. Taking on an individual stance, however he revealed, “Personally, I have adapted to the American culture very well.” While Carlos admitted his interpretation relied heavily upon his immigrant status, he claimed that status did not render him singularly focused. He concluded, “I am aware of the big challenge the US has with immigration, but not only with Mexicans but will all kind of people.”

A Mexican Perspective?

The last component of the ENGL 1101 Final Examination is a spoken prompt. I asked the students to state whether their interpretation of “The Hispanic Challenge” would change if they themselves were Mexican. Their responses demonstrated meta-awareness, affective supposition, and ethnocentrism.

Miguel cited meta-awareness, interestingly enough, his own and Mexicans in general. A reading of this article from a Mexican perspective would render little added value for Miguel because he believes Mexicans maintain a cultural meta-awareness that surpasses the content of the article. He based this belief on experience with Mexicans and Mexican cultural narratives. He said:

If I were a Mexican emigrant, I don't think that the effect of the article in me due to my identity would be that important. I think that Mexicans already know all this things; they may even know more than what the article describes. When I talk to Mexicans, they describe me their stories. They tell me how they did to achieve and accomplish everything that they have now that they live in the United States. It is amazing all the things that they have to go through just to cross the border. Once they are here is the easy part compare to what they had to do.

Joe chose affective supposition, revealing an emotional response which prompts solicitation of compassion and an observation that linguistic maintenance contributes to identity maintenance. He suggested:

It is not their fault to leave their country, but it would be their fault if they do not try to be successful in the United States. However, if we try to read this article with a Mexican point of view, it would be very different. I would be very sad if I were a Mexican and I read this article. It is human nature to try to improve one's life. They came here for a reason, either, either economy or life condition. They want to stay with their people and speak their language because they can be discriminated outside of their community. They are not as rich as other immigrant groups when they come, so they have to work harder for living.

Sometimes they have no choice but to smuggle drugs in order to have money to support their family. It is not always their fault to break the peace in the United States.

Carlos situated ethnocentrism, and neo-nationalism as mediational, that is, balancing one's appreciation for one's culture of heritage and one's appreciation for the culture of the new nation.

Carlos said:

If I were a Mexican I will react the same way I did, because I am an immigrant and I love to show everybody my culture, but as I said before, I will respect the new culture in which I am living right now.

Abrihem, like Joe, chose affective supposition, juxtaposed with meta-awareness of nationalism in the United States. He wrote:

If I was a Mexican immigrant, I would really feel bad and unwanted to have read such things about 'us' in an article. At the same time I understand that Americans are just trying to preserve their culture. The Mexicans ought to realize that no nation would like their culture or country to be divided, especially not by foreigners.

Table 11
 “The Hispanic Challenge”
 ENGL 1101 Final Examination
 Ideas

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos		Mexican nationalism	meta-awareness social knowledge; hypothetical questions; subjunctive modality; historic context; multiple perspectives; author’s rhetorical style
Abrihem		Immigration	Situated historic context, privileged geography; author’s point of view
Joe		Hispanic immigration	Summary; author’s point of view; privileged land; author’ rhetorical style
Miguel		Hispanic immigration	speculation of author’ identity; attributes warning tone to author

Huntington’s use of Power to Communicate Ideas

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos		Hispanic immigration	classified six immigration factors as powerful rhetoric,
Abrihem			threats and consequences; comparison to other immigration patterns; naming six factors
Joe			Facts; studies; impressive sentences; powerful ending-rhetoric; visual presentation of internal mechanisms; intertextual reference
Miguel			acknowledges facts but claims facts as used discriminatorily

How Student's Identity Affects Interpretation

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos		Immigrant identity; Hispanic solidarity	adapted well to American culture
Abrihem	Narrative intertextuality	African identity; no threat	meta-awareness social knowledge; hypothetical questions; advocates multiple perspectives
Joe		Asian identity threatened by	critique of Hispanic immigrants
Miguel		Venezuelan / Hispanic solidarity	proficiency in Spanish and English promotes smooth assimilation

CHAPTER 6
DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY
“EASY PREY”

Having asked students to write the final exam “How does your identity affect the way you interpret the article?” on December 04, 2004, in English 1101, the first course in a two-course sequence, I wanted to continue the work on identity as a discursive construction in the second course, 1102. Instead of continuing to pursue “The Hispanic Challenge,” from Foreign Policy, I introduced the article, “EASY PREY” (Moser, 2004) on March 31, 2005. It appeared in a widely-read weekly city circular, Creative Loafing (February 24- March 2, 2005), known as much for its entertainment section as its news section. The selection was deliberate. Creative Loafing proved far more accessible to students. It is distributed to a vast demographic in the metropolitan area, and it is free. The fact that “EASY PREY” made the cover made its accessibility irresistible to me, for I habitually observe discourse in action. This practice of constant observation makes effortless the process of situating language in context as an instructional medium because discourses in society reflect dialogues in society.

As societal dialogues compete for preeminence, they seldom remain fixed. Consequently, I never need to create an issue for discussion or analysis, I merely look to society. Looking to society and introducing the cultural and historic dialogues into the pedagogy for academic literacy, I provide ESOL students opportunities to experience, interpret, analyze, and critique the discursive production of information in their first year of university study, and situate themselves as potentially more capable participants in prevalent cultural dialogues throughout their careers

as students first, as professionals second, and as citizens finally, whether citizens of the U.S. or of other countries.

As interest in immigration matters grew in 2004 and escalated in 2005 both in Georgia and nationally, textual representations of the politics of immigration flourished. Accordingly, the writing prompt for this assignment “How is a Mexican identity created in this text?” grew from the dialogues of the time. The choice of “Mexican” identity instead of “Hispanic” or “Latino” reflected the common practice in the U.S. of using “Mexican” to refer holistically to a people, whether they, the targeted people, call themselves Hispanics or Latinos. I asked a simply stated, open-ended question to encourage the students to create a framework for their essays.

Carlos contextualized his essay by explaining the inappropriate practice of making synonyms of the words “Mexican” and “Hispanic,” and displayed meta-awareness as critique with the intent to disrupt the practice. He stated authoritatively:

Let me start by stating that Mexico is a country, and Mexicans are people born in Mexico. If you have Mexican roots and were born in another country, you can consider yourself a Mexican if you want. But there is a big difference between Mexicans and Hispanics; Mexicans are Hispanics but not all Hispanics are Mexican. Hispanics is the name given to people whose first language is Spanish but not necessarily share the same roots and culture.

Commenting on the tendency that Americans use generalizations towards Hispanics, Carlos attributed such generalizations to Moser, the author of “Easy Prey.” In addition to citing what Carlos considered to be generalizations and assumptions in Moser’s text, Carlos attributed

to Moser a role in the construction of the identity of Mexicans as laborers, an identity Carlos critiqued. Carlos affirmed:

In this article and in the United State, there is a generalization of the Hispanics and for a lot of people –I will say ignorant people- all of the Hispanics are Mexican who came here to do the heavy labor. There is an identity created by the author that a reader will assume about Mexicans and Hispanics while he is reading the article. The author starts talking about the immigration of people from Guatemala to the southeast of the US in the 90s and kind of tells the reader about how they were invading places where it used to be only people with a southern accent. Then he talks about how this guy after loosing his job in construction starts working as a day laborer, and tell us how the guy sits all day with other Hispanics outside of a 7-Eleven all day waiting for some work. So by now, the reader has an image of the Hispanic of being an invader and a lazy person.

Carlos faced some specific commentary from his peers in the “inner u,” the space in the computer writing classroom dedicated to student presentation and peer evaluation of computer generated texts, the site of discussions of grammar in context, textual coherence, and idea development. His peers overwhelmingly valued the distinction he made between Mexicans and Hispanics; however they warned him about what could be perceived as a biased perspective on “ignorant people” he presented often in his essay on “EASY PREY.”

Like Carlos, Joe considered the creation of the identity of “day laborer” in his introductory paragraph. Joe’s consideration, however, acknowledged a textual conflation of “day laborer” and “illegal.” He suggested:

The Mexican identity created in this text, even in many American’s minds, can be described as this term, day laborer. Bob Moser used a very objective point of view in “Easy Prey;” he quotes many people’s opinion, including both Hispanics and Americans. By reading this article, it is not hard to see that American think Hispanic brought here disorder, such as higher crime rates, littered streets, gang activity, and most important, the money spent on health care and education for illegal immigrants. It is not a recent problem, “white residents began complaining as early as 1992 about the ‘terrible, filthy people’ standing on their street corners.” These people gradually create the image of Mexican identity in Americans’ eyes.

Joe attributed the construction of “day laborer” not only to textual but also cognitive processes. For the textual, he observed Moser’s use of quotes; for the cognitive, he contended that by reading articles like “EASY PREY” he learned that Americans associate disruption with Mexicans. He cited a quote that some Americans view Mexicans so negatively that their protests “gradually create the image of Mexican identity in Americans’ eyes.” Therefore, the construction of Mexican identity, from Joe’s perspective, manifested in text and talk as a dialogic sociocultural production of knowledge. One consequence of this dialogue, utterance/response, is the progression of the constructed identity from “day laborer” to “illegal.” Joe explained:

According to the text, Americans think that Hispanic immigrants came here to waste America’s source and money, especially those illegal immigrants. The

unwelcome attitude affects all Hispanic immigrants, like Moser said, “With so many people illegal, people tend to assume they are all illegal, and it becomes, ‘Yeah, I couldn’t get into the emergency room because of all those illegals there.’ It feeds the prejudice.” Illegality seems to be an important characteristic of Mexican identity the text created besides laborer.

From “day laborer” to “illegal,” yet another affective criterion contributed to textual construction of Mexican identity—hatred. Joe revealed:

The text also shows the hatred some American have toward Hispanic immigrants. Steven Barry, editor of the neo-Nazis Resister magazine said, “We don’t need colors.” The resistance against Hispanic is obvious in this article. Many organizations began to hold rallies to protest against the immigrants. As the flies they gave out which say, “Missing: A Future for White Children.” the American resistance has gone onto the stage, and the problem can no longer be ignored.

Text, cognition, hatred, and according to Carlos, prejudice permeated the construction of identity, especially when one considers more than what one reads and what one says or hears, text and talk. Carlos labeled the media as a source of discursively producing and reproducing Mexican traits. He wrote:

The same prejudice is fed from the news media; they are always talking about how Hispanics are using the US social services, like schools and hospitals and show tables and graphs of how much money it is being spend by the state in these programs; but they never show how much money, this illegal wave of work is bringing in to the state or how many business are successful because of the Hispanic labor.

Introducing an additional positive perspective on Hispanic laborer as a constructed identity, Joe maintained:

There are still some good points that the article has mentioned. Many constructions have been done because of these Hispanic immigrants. Also, an important point of view is given, “They are from the poorest, most rural and impoverished places in Mexico and Guatemala. And they are coming to a place where people are not familiar with migrant laborers, or with Hispanics.” Many Americans judge Mexican with Mexican people who work here, and they would think all Mexicans are like them, which is really wrong and prejudice. Also, these laborers take care of many jobs Americans unwilling to do, and Americans should be grateful for this.

As Joe entreated gratitude as a reaction Americans could offer Mexicans for labor, Abrihem appealed to American’s basic sense of humanity, given his awareness of the multiple goals that motivate people to travel to the U.S. He said:

Mexicans are found all over America especially in Georgia and California. In the text "EASY PREY," Mexicans are tagged as unwanted immigrants into the America that are “staining” the country. There are different reasons why people travel or migrate to America. I for instance am here to achieve a degree in Electrical Engineering. Some other person might be here for vacation, or maybe to attend a wedding. Mexicans are believed to migrate into America mainly to get jobs that will at least put some food on their table. A lot of Americans are not comfortable with this, but they have to consider the fact that Mexicans and all other Hispanics are also human beings.

Following his appeal for humanity based upon various reasons people come to the U.S., Abrihem focused on the predominant identity created in “EASY PREY, that of “PREY.” Abrihem, unlike his peers, put a name to a “Mexican” about whom issues are raised in the article and credited physical acts against Mexicans as critical to the construction of the identity, “EASY PREY.” He summarized:

The text, "EASY PREY" talks about a Mexican, Domingo Lopez Vargas. He is an immigrant from Guatemala who does small jobs in construction. The good thing about his stay in America is that he has a legal status, meaning he is a legal resident of Canton and should be able to work where ever he is qualified to. The text tells us about an incident where Domingo Lopez was brutally attacked by high school students from Cherokee High school. This happened when those same students offered him a job and when they got him to a remote spot, they began their evil acts. I really wonder how someone could decide to brutally beat up a fellow human being just because he is of another race, skin color or because he is an unwanted immigrant. The text tells us that there have been other times that Mexicans have been victims of assaults and robberies on Hispanic laborers in Canton. “In every part of the United States where large numbers of Hispanic immigrants have moved, anti-immigration groups have sprung up in protest.” I believe it is normal for people to protest against something that they don’t want as long as there is no violence involved.

Moving beyond summary to a historical contextualization of race relations that now affect Hispanics in Georgia, Abrihem continued:

It was said in the text that Georgians' anti-Hispanic prejudice was hardening into hate around 1998, courtesy of the Klan. "In Gainesville, the American Knights of the KKK held a Halloween rally on the steps of the Hall County Courthouse, followed by a cross-burning in Winder." The text tells us that this message was now directed towards Hispanics and once, when the KKK did such devilish acts, it was directed mainly to blacks. Does this mean that, there would be racism against any other race that decides to settle down or migrate to the United States of America in large numbers?

Finally with references to the significance of "PREY," Joe alluded to physical strength and legal vulnerability. He said:

Although we can consider Hispanics are physical strong, they are weak and helpless in some way. Bob Moser said, "day laborers are the most visible and vulnerable faces of a phenomenon that is rapidly transforming North Georgia into a diverse, multilingual place that one anti-immigration activist calls 'Georgiafornia.'" Also, they do not normally deal with police, said by Lancer, so people who hate them might hurt them without any penalty, and they don't need to worry about the consequences.

Table 12

“EASY PREY”

Mexican Identity Formation

Student	Genres	Discourses	Style
Carlos			meta-awareness critique, authoritative stance / support; attributes laborer identity construction to Moser; claimed media reproduces hatred
Abrihem		race relations	appealed to humanity; focused on Mexicans as “PREY”
Joe		text as anti-Mexican discourse promotes negative attitudes	cited conflation of “day laborer” and “illegal;” viewed the article objective; persuasive use of quotes; cited dialogic production of knowledge; called for additional perspectives; “PREY” and vulnerability
Miguel	No response		

ENGL 1102 Final Examination

On May 5, 2005, the students and I met as a class for the last time in the computer composition classroom where we had met for the entire term. The day was Thursday. The exam period was 10:10 until 12:10. I gave them the writing prompt, and they individually composed on a computer. When each finished, he printed the essay, turned it in to me and emailed the essay to me. We had followed this procedure throughout the term. It had become ritual.

The writing prompt:

You have worked extensively on the ways various authors constructed Hispanic identity in texts. Now you have the opportunity to construct your ethnic identity. Consider your national anthem, recall when you learned it, and explain reasons the anthem is significant or insignificant to you now. You may use additional texts if they help you to show pride in your ethnicity.

You should write at least a two-paged, double spaced essay. Print the essay, turn it in to me and email it to me.

The assignment in context:

The writing prompt itself contained the rationale for the final exam topic, which symbolized the students' progression of participation in cultural dialogues from a respondent to existing texts to speaker/author of a principal text, that is, progression to creator of text—in this instance, the construction of identity. Many of the composition assignments in the English 1101 and English 1102, the first and second composition courses in the two-course sequence had focused on students' interpretations of textual representations of Hispanic identity, constructed primarily by non-Hispanic authors, categorically, *etic* representations. I chose these texts, after much deliberation, for many reasons, including the following:

1. The selected texts represented language in action, entrenched in current sociocultural politics of the United States. Each was published within a few months of the date I introduced them to the class. One appeared in a national journal, the other in a local weekly news/entertainment magazine.
2. The texts held the potential to demonstrate ubiquitous rhetorical conventions associated with university composition courses—point of view, audience awareness, voice, purpose, (Elbow 1998, Shaunessy 1977, Bishop 2004) and practices associated with academic literacy in ESOL (Blanton 1998, Scheppegrell 2002, Leki & Carson 1997). By introducing these texts into pedagogy, I invited the students to participate in literacy practices (Baynham 1995) and literacy events (Gee 2002). Whether they accepted or resisted the invitation would certainly affect my ability to document their participation, and to contribute to the literature on ESOL writers, literature that heretofore has characterized, documented, and prescribed ESOL writer deficiencies. I hoped to shift the focus of the literature to ESOL writer competencies.

3. They functioned as exemplars of dialogism (Bakhtin 1986). Each clearly situated a speaker-author/ reader-respondent, utterance/response dynamic that I believed would spark some interest in the students because the texts treated subjects such as aliens and immigration in general and Hispanic immigration in particular. Of the four students in the focus group of the study, two self-identified as Hispanic or Latino. The other two, one from Nigeria, the other Taiwan, could relate to the texts, I hoped, as persons who were not born in the US, and as persons who may, at any time, be discursively presented in ways that warrant mediation. Because the students would, as they revealed, very likely become immigrants, each student in the focus group could ideally situate himself, to some degree, in the discourses represented in the texts.
4. Finally, as these texts typified discourse in action, they facilitated my expansion of pedagogy beyond the lexiosyntactic to a macrolinguistic approach, one focused more globally on language in context of sociocultural systems, a semiosis of text, ideas, interaction, identity, and power (Halliday 1984, Fairclough 2001, 2004), and, perhaps most salient to the study, these texts inspired my conceptualization of an introductory, pedagogical CDA.

An Analysis of the Final Exam:

When I asked the students to compose their identities, I hoped to accomplish at least two goals:

1. Create an opportunity for students to present authority, a behavior associated with academic literacy as conceptualized in ESOL. I speculated they could convey authority by communicating social and historic knowledge because they had used that knowledge in the previous assignments included in the study.

2. Discover to what degree students would use meta-awareness as critique.

In my analysis of the identities they composed, I drew from Fairclough's analysis in CDA (2004), *Genres-ways of interacting* – in this case, the essay is the genre I assigned them though I expected some would make use of narrative in the form of intertextual anecdotes as they had when they developed essays previously in the classes of the study; *Discourses-ways of representing* - discourses the students had used in former analyses included ethnocentrism and nationalism among others; and *Style-ways of being* – which in this study includes lexical and syntactic choices.

Genres, within the context of the study, reflected a much smaller unit of macrodiscourse than Fairclough referenced. For, even when referring to genre as text, Fairclough presented an all-inclusive means of engaging textually. A small sampling, for example, could include short stories, newspaper articles, inaugural speeches, drama, and legislative bills. The genres within which these students “interacted” were, for the most part, however, selected for them, that is, I chose the essay and the reflection because they represent genres compositionists perennially hail as instruments students use to convey linguistic competence, and these genres will very likely appear, in some form, in various curricula as students matriculate within the academy. The reflection may become the abstract, the essay the research report. Even though the genres that framed student writing in the study embodied but a fraction of the genres Fairclough described, the students read from a broader spectrum of genres, including, bumper stickers, editorials, articles, peer essays, and peer research papers.

When I asked the students to write the final exam, I prescribed the genre, an essay, for this composition class. I did not, however, elucidate the microlinguistic aspects of an essay, as shown in the prompt, because students have previously written essays in the class, and, therefore,

comprehend the essay as representative of a genre. Consequently, each student composed an essay of at least four but not more than seven paragraphs, including a distinct introduction and conclusion, and each student evoked narrative and description, among other rhetoric recourses, in the construction of his identity. Though each produced his text individually, each drew upon meta-awareness informed by sociocultural affordances. Each student wrote for certain for one audience, me, the instructor, and I hope they wrote for themselves too. A summative table synthesizing my analysis appears after each student's essay. Table 13 represents Miguel's essay—A Venezuelan Identity. Table 14 represents Joe's essay—A Taiwanese Identity. Table 15 represents Carlos' essay—A Colombian Identity, and Table 16 represents Abrihem's essay—A Nigerian Identity.

A Venezuelan Identity

Miguel, a Venezuelan, demonstrated his style—way of being—uniquely than his peers by introducing the discourse (d) of ethnic pride as the dominant aspect of Venezuelan identity construction. He privileged traits of being “known for their easy going personality” and for being “people that love to party” as he constantly reinforced his style by using nouns and pronouns to solidly cast the cultural collective, for example, “we,” “family,” “us,” “parents,” “brothers,” “sisters,” and more. On characterizing Venezuelans he revealed:

We try to have fun out of everything and we also make fun of everything. Our concepts of family and friendship are similar to most Hispanics. They are base on trust, on the trust we have for each other. For us family is not only just our parents, brothers and sisters, but it is our grandparents, uncles, cousins, longtime family friends and so on.

Miguel followed the fun-loving, family oriented pride with a positive work ethic. He said, “Venezuelans have to work really hard every day, since it is a struggle to maintain your job or produce money, because the economic situation is not doing very well, at all.”

In the second paragraph of his essay, Miguel drew upon his meta-awareness of the effect of time on one’s interpretation of discourse. He recalled, “I used to consider Venezuela as a not very patriotic country, but this was maybe around five to six years ago.” He attributed change in that sentiment to the onset of political and economic unrest to which Venezuelans responded with “a love for their country like never before seen, at least by me,” he qualified. Miguel drew again from the cognitive process of memory to express more ethnic pride. He reminisced, “I remember when in first or second grade, teachers taught us the national anthem and all the national symbols. I was really excited about it because I know that Venezuela is a beautiful country, with beautiful people and an incredible amount of resources that enrich that beautiful land.” And he revealed the knowledge that not all readers interpret and respond to texts in the same manner. He observed, “But not everybody felt like me, I recall that some classmates were not interested at all.” Unlike some of his peers in elementary school in Venezuela who did not value the national anthem or other symbols, Miguel maintained the significance of nationalistic discourse by naming the cognitive processes associated with learning the national symbols. Miguel said, “Learning the National symbols is one the most patriotic things that somebody can do for their country because it is what defines you as a citizen.”

Miguel devoted his entire third paragraph to an explanation and description of Venezuelan symbols of nationalism including the bird, the flag, the tree, and the shield. He developed, in most detail the flag, which he described as, “having three horizontal stripes of the same size, on the top we got the yellow which is for the richness of the country, in the middle

we got the blue with seven white stars, the blue is for the beautiful Caribbean sea that surround us and the stars are for each of the countries that our liberator Simon Bolivar liberated. At last, we got the red for the blood spilt by our forefathers.”

In the final paragraph, Miguel concluded by synthesizing the effects of ethnic and nationalistic discourses through critique. He stated, “All these symbols describe a very colorful, cheerful, pride and patriotic people,” and created a style (s) of predominately positive affect. Then he gently introduced economic critique which he balanced with a return to ethnic pride embodied in a resolute spirit of his people. He said, “Venezuela is a country in were every body lives their every day life’s in a constant run because of their busy life, it really is a place where is not easy to put the bread on the table, but people manage to do it one way or another.” Finally, with the use of cause/effect (s), he suggested the celebratory nature of Venezuelans manifests, at least partially, in reaction to the political and economic climate of the country, an escape or distraction mechanism. He surmised, “And this is probably the reason why we party so much, to forget about the job, responsibilities, political situation, etc, just for a little while and just enjoy our family and friends.”

Table 13 A Venezuelan Identity

Genres	Discourses	Style
narrative intertextual anecdote on learning anthem	ethnic pride positive work ethic nationalism	expressions of cultural collective—“we” meta-awareness as critique of time on discourse stance/reevaluated stance multiple representations of text learning national symbols as patriotism description of national symbols social/historic knowledge positive affect meta-awareness as critique of economy cause/effect

A Taiwanese Identity

Joe, a Taiwanese, attributed much of his identity formation, in the introductory paragraph of his essay, to nationalistic indoctrination (d), a process, he claimed, shared by every child in elementary school in Taiwan. He stated, "...they have to go to school half hour earlier, standing under that oven-like sunlight, sweating, and singing our national anthem together, and therefore established an alliterative style (s) of imagery. That is how all of us remember the anthem, and unlike many other countries, it is almost impossible for a person grown up in Taiwan and cannot recite it without thinking." With "sunlight, sweating, and singing," Joe conveyed meta-awareness of the influence nationalistic discourse has upon the people of his nation at institutional and social levels when he said, "It somehow defines our school system or life style, and I believe that it is the purpose of writing this song." He quickly asserted, however, "Because the lyrics are from a poem with many difficult words, not many people really understand what they are singing." Despite lexical challenges with the anthem, Taiwanese generally believe, Joe maintained, "the rule of going to school half hour earlier and the sunlight seem to be telling us that we have to keep discipline all the time, otherwise punishment is necessary." For Joe, discipline and punishment function discursively as nationalistic ideology and practically as a code of conduct.

In the second paragraph, Joe described the perils and promise of the discourse of nationalism inscribed by the anthem: "The lyrics basically tell us what our goals are and what we can do to reach there. The goals are to obey the constitution, to found a free land, and to create world peace." He referred intertextually to the constitution and its author whom he called "our national father, Dr. SunYat-sen," who "had to fight the Communist Party in China and fled to Taiwan." Joe developed the paragraph further by demonstrating meta-awareness, his and others.

He cited the national father's belief "that freedom will eventually belong to Taiwan, and the world will turn into peace if democracy is spread everywhere," but juxtaposed that belief with an assessment of the tentative political and economic state of Taiwanese public affairs. Joe countered the national father's belief with the admission that "People do not believe that we are able to fight back to China anymore. The worst, Taiwan still has not gotten the reorganization as a country in most world-wide organizations." Joe, in addition to analyzing alternate possibilities for nationalism, introduced a cause/effect analysis. He stated, "I would say such an ambivalent position affects people's minds in Taiwan somehow, such as unable to trust people, more greedy, and introverted." Joe ended the paragraph by speculatively critiquing intercultural relations of the U.S. He considered, "Also, maybe because we are trying to make our voice heard by other countries, people from Taiwan really welcome foreigners, unlike in the United States, some people try to preserve their job opportunity and culture, and belittle people from other countries."

Voicing discipline as the discourse of nationalism in the third paragraph, Joe declared, "Discipline is the most important idea the anthem gives us." Repeating the sun and singing imagery to reinforce ritualized discipline in Taiwan, Joe stated, "Just like standing under the sun and singing the anthem everyday, we somehow believe that it is what we need to do, and although we always complain about this, we all know those complaints are useless and would not change anything." He integrated an effective transition to illustrate the pervasiveness of discipline: "It also can be seen in school and at home. " He followed the transition with dialogic intercultural mediation, that is, analytic contrast through which he illustrates the salience of discipline in Taiwan to its absence or less apparent quality in the U.S. He disclosed, "Unlike in America, students are not allowed to argue with the teachers, and if we find what a teacher says is incorrect, we must not forget the politeness when we are correcting them. That is why students

from Taiwan would really enjoy the friend-like relationship between students and teachers in America, and teachers would think we are way too polite.” Joe moved back and forth from school to home to communicate clearly that the discourse of discipline permeates institutions of home and school to inform Taiwanese ethnic identity. He insisted, “It is the same at home, to talk back to parents is strictly prohibited. Every child has a piece of memory that they are beaten because they talk back to their parents.” Joe completed the paragraph by returning to nationalism. He stated confidently, “However, now I would appreciate what the discipline in our anthem has brought to me. I found people from Taiwan are able to endure more than people from other countries. I would say the anthem gives us this identity, and we are proud to be more successful than others because of this identity.”

Joe, in his fourth paragraph, expressed meta-awareness as critique of the anthem by describing it as confusing, by assessing it, and by suggesting a revision. He admitted, “What confuses me in the anthem is that it tells us to found a free land, but at the same time it wants us to obey the discipline strictly.” Though Joe had zealously associated discipline with character, hard work, integrity – all attributes culminating with immense ethnic pride--at this point in his analysis, he sensed ideological contradiction. He advanced to assessment when he revealed:

That is why I think this anthem has become insignificant to us, especially the later generations. The main goal of the song is to make us to believe that Taiwan will succeed one day. However, people in Taiwan do not believe that anymore, and many of them do not even know what they are signing. It was to encourage people at the time when our national father retreated to Taiwan, but it is different now. The government cannot even promise their people peace and freedom, how can we spread world peace and found a free land?

In this assessment, Joe demonstrated his ability to discern the effects of time upon interpretation of text. He provided his interpretation as an elementary student in Taiwan, the prevalence of discipline and the pride associated with discipline expressed through nationalistic ideology as a young adult, and notwithstanding the former viewpoints, introduced an alternate viewpoint, a revisionist one. He said, “Maybe we need an anthem to tell us to be less self-centered, to be more confident, and to improve our reputation world-wide as a country.”

In the concluding paragraph, Joe began the first and the fifth sentence with “Even though” which generally represents a construction of a negative affective stance within an adverbial clause. His usage here is no exception. In the introductory clause in the first sentence, he stated, “Even though the anthem has become past and does not show much pride of our ethnic identities,” and in the introductory clause in the fifth sentence, he stated, “Even though I do not really glorify our national anthem;” he followed each introductory clause with an undeniably affirmative ethnic proclamation. In the first sentence, he added, “I am still proud to be what I am.” In the fifth, he professed, “I am still proud of it.” Between the first and fifth sentences Jack composed a resolute spirit. He said, “I like the last sentence of our anthem, in English translation it is “One heart, one mind, always believe and finish what you have started.” It tells us never give up, and to believe what we have. I would say our ethnic identities are miserable and able to endure, but it also means our minds are strong and we can do much more than the others.” Finally, Joe saluted the Taiwanese anthem by declaring, “...it somehow defines our identities and we have to believe what we have and who we are.”

Table 14 A Taiwanese Identity

Genres	Discourses	Style
narrative; intertextual anecdote on national father	nationalistic indoctrination; discipline and punishment; ethnic pride	Alliteration; expressions of cultural collective; meta-awareness of institutional and social influences on identity; juxtaposition; counter narrative; cause effect analysis; comparison/contrast of classroom discourse in Taiwan and U.S; meta-awareness as critique of semantic density and ideological contradiction; effect of time on text

A Columbian Identity

Carlos began his essay by defining national anthems in a general, global context, highlighted by a definitively positive stance. He stated, “National anthems are one of the most powerful ways to represent a country. It’s a part of the integrity and identity of its citizens; and no matter where one of these citizens is, a patriotic spirit will raise every time the anthem is heard.” Carlos suggested that patriotism transcends geography for citizens, in general, and situated everyone to be as ideologically affirmative to his or her anthem as he.

In the second paragraph, Carlos situated himself as Columbian by foregrounding historical context of the Columbian anthem in a paragraph of purpose and reflection. He stated, “For me, the Colombian national anthem reflects the life of Colombians in the nineteenth century. It claims independence and recognizes the heroes of the war. It talks about death and then it tells how all of this bloody time was necessary; we are now independent.” He began a statement of purpose with the “anthem reflects the life of Colombians in the nineteenth century,” then he shifted to “we are now independent.” Within the temporal progression from the

nineteenth century to present day independence, he identified as Columbian, to being part of the collective “we.” Carlos attributed his awareness of the anthem to his education. He said, “Personally, I learned the National anthem when I was 4 years old. I remember clearly that moment. I had a presentation with my pre-school class for all of the parents; we were going to sing the anthem and dress up with the classical Colombian dress.” Awareness informed early on by instruction, reinforced by performative rituals and family support, celebrated with indigenous attire, culminated in “a nice moment,” an affective stance consistently revealed as he constructed Columbian identity. He recalled, “That was a nice moment; we all put our hands on the chest and started singing. I have been singing this anthem since then and still, being far away from home, every time I hear it, I feel homesick and proud of be Colombian.” Though spatially and temporally distanced from the initial education, Carlos associated singing and hearing his anthem as a four year old to singing and hearing the anthem as a young adult with pride in ethnic identity.

Continuing the positive affective stance followed by a linguistic assessment of semantics in the third paragraph, Carlos disclosed, “One nice thing about the Colombian national anthem is that its words are powerful and actually make sense.” He elaborated by demonstrating historic knowledge of people, events, and places and their contribution not only to his ethnic identity but to the collective ethnicity that is Columbian. Moreover, Carlos credited the anthem to be a textual creation of Columbian identity:

It talks about the precursor Simon Bolivar, Boyaca battle, Cartagena and the land of Christopher Columbus; which are people and places that every Colombian identifies. The writer of the Colombian National Anthem, the ex-president Rafael Nuñez, put in a poem the facts and truths about the Colombian independence and

doing so, creates an identity that makes me, as a Colombian, be proud of my national anthem.

In the fourth paragraph, Carlos repeatedly situated positive affect regarding Colombian culture. He said, “I am really proud of the Colombian topography; I love its mountains, rivers and valleys; I love its coast, its cities and its people.” Following his declaration of love and pride for Columbia, Carlos revealed the awareness of the process by which Colombian citizens discursively construct and reconstruct a pride-filled identity by using economic imagery of production. He stated:

And this is what a lot of Colombian writers and poets, including the ex-president Nuñez, write about. Colombian writers, singers, movie directors and TV producers are the people responsible for selling the nice image of Colombia. The most successful products that these people make are those ones related to Colombian people and circumstances. I would say that this happens because when this producer or writer starts to write about a topic they are proud of, the final result has to be good.

In the fifth paragraph, Carlos developed two intertextual examples of Colombian cultural production of an identity of pride. First, he cited the book, Cien Años de Soledad, by Gabriel Garcia Marquez. Carlos stated, “Marquez writes proudly about his hometown and tells the stories of its people and describe this geographical place in such a way, that the reader can imagine how this place looks like.” He also cited Catalina Sandino’s Oscar nominated performance for best actress in the film, “Maria Full of Grace.” He recalled, “She was playing the role of a “mule” bringing drugs into the US. She got really involve in her character because

she was proud to show all of the innocent young ladies in Colombia and the rest of the world how hard that business is and how the dream of easy money can end in death.”

Carlos ended the essay by evoking intertextual references to the production of Columbian identity through a book, a movie, and the national anthem. He concluded, “they all show the how proud Colombians are of what they have, its land and its people.”

Table 15 A Columbian Identity

Genres	Discourses	Style
narrative intertextual anecdote of anthem; narrative intertextual anecdote of Colombian artists	nationalistic pride in land and people; discursive construction of identity	establishing global context; historical context; positive affective stance; linguistic assessment of anthem

A Nigerian Identity

Abrihem focused on the consequences of independence as a significant influence on the evolution of a Nigerian identity as he opened his essay chronicling a discourse of discontented nationalism. In an exhibition of historic knowledge, he stated, “Nigeria got its independence on the first of October 1963. Before we got our independence, Nigeria was under British rule and our National anthem was given to us by the Queen of England at that time and that is the anthem we have been using ever since.” One consequence of British rule and the inherited anthem is, Abrihem admitted, “It can be said that at that point in time, Nigerians could somewhat be identified as “British” since we were ruled by them....” Post independence, however, he proclaimed, “Nigeria had become their own people, their own country.” Abrihem’s historical awareness informed his cultural critique:

After the British left our country in our hands a lot changed. After Nigeria got it independence, it started to become a better country, even better than how the

British made it during their reign but as we gradually entered the twentieth century, Nigeria began to fall into the hands of corrupted presidents, one after the other. These presidents passed their corruption to the citizens of Nigeria and to Nigeria as a whole.

The cultural critique, Abrihem began in the first paragraph, characterized the second and remaining paragraphs. He developed, through analysis and evaluation, the corruption that shaped the Nigerian cultural climate and therefore Nigerian identity formation. He explained, “Nigeria began to loose a lot of money, money that was entering the pockets of our so called presidents. Since there is little or no money in the economy, we Nigerians have to hustle for every single penny we make.” He speculated on others’ evaluation of this situation when he stated, “A lot of people from other countries in Africa would regard us as hustlers and sometimes they misinterpret this hustling as being greedy or liking money excessively.” He countered this evaluation, however, with this hypothesis: “If they were to live there in Nigeria for a year or two they would understand why we need to be hustlers.” In an acknowledgment of an affective stance qualifying his assessment Abrihem said:

The fact that I support Nigerians for being hustlers doesn’t mean that I support everything about them. Nigerians were identified as one of the most corrupt countries in the world. This was announced on CNN during the late nineties. I must say, I am not proud of this at all, no one should.

Abrihem, in paragraph four, continued his evaluation, more precisely, his critique of the Nigerian culture of corruption by poignantly illustrating the inherent consequences. I cite the entire paragraph below:

The saying that we should be our brothers' keepers doesn't apply to Nigeria. Nigerians show little or no love to one another. In the United States, a man could have problems with his car on the highway and a total stranger would stop to give him a hand in fixing it. In Nigeria, most people don't care about what happens to any other person as long as it doesn't affect them. There are a lot of Nigerians who wouldn't even help a fellow human being if he were to be knocked down by a moving vehicle but still have a chance to survive only if he gets to the hospital on time. I really don't see how people could be so inconsiderate and selfish, but in Nigeria you find them all.

Having in previous paragraphs alluded to the effects time and governance etched upon the construction of Nigerian national identity, Abrihem attributed space as well, conceptual and geographic. He said, "Even in the United States, the image of every Nigerian has been tarnished. When a Nigerian comes to the United States, the first place where he knows that he has been tagged as an untrustworthy person is the airport." He supported the general statement on the effect of place with an intertextual, personal narrative:

When I was traveling to the U.S. from Nigeria, my mom told me to be prepared for the worst. She told me I might not even be allowed into the U.S. and that I may be deported for the fact that I was Nigerian. On getting to the airport, I understood what she meant when she asked me to be prepared. I had to go through series of security checks to ensure that I didn't have any weapons or

drugs on me. I always ask the security officers, “Why do I always have to go through these extra security checks at every airport?” They always tell me that it is just security procedures, but who are they fooling? I don’t blame them at all; they are just doing their job.

Abrihem concluded his essay by synthesizing critique, evaluation, and hope for the future. On his country’s current state of affairs, he admitted that Nigerians “have just made it worse and worse.” Out of the resonant negative affect, Abrihem discovered, “The only good thing that is left for Nigeria now is its national anthem.” He revealed having learned the anthem, “nothing but a song,” at primary school through morning recitations. Though he referred generally to the anthem as he grew older to being “more and more insignificant,” upon further reflection and evaluation, revealed, “The only part that has significance is the second section where we ask God to direct us, guide our leaders and to let us attain great heights.” He speculated that a former leader, the Queen of England, intended more positive nationalism for Nigeria, but lamented, “It is sad to say that right now it isn’t, it is a mere prayer that God would answer one day, hopefully.

Table 16 A Nigerian Identity

Genres	Discourses	Style
narrative intertextual historic anecdote; narrative intertextual personal anecdote	independence; nationalism of discontent; ambivalent identification	historic knowledge; analysis; evaluation; meta-awareness as critique of corruption; negative affective stance; developed anti-cultural collective; cause/effect support for assertions

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

The breadth of conceptualizations of academic literacy presented intriguing opportunities for instruction in ESOL in the context of this study. ESOL instruction on academic literacy, heretofore, emanated from prescriptive foci; that is, focus on either appropriate lexicon, syntax, or other discrete structural units. Focusing upon presenting instructional opportunities that privileged students' a priori literacy experiences as foundations for the enhancement or creation of academic literacy, however, grounded this study. Foregrounding academic literacy as a cultural affordance, socially and historically aligned and contingent, this study invited students to apply their social and historic knowledge and meta-awareness as critique to literacy experiences within the academy, in ESOL composition classes particularly. Looking to dialogism (Bakhtin 1986), then, I solicited from ESOL students in my English 1101 first year writing class, dialogic interpretations of media samples by asking the first research question, "How do ESOL composition students draw from their social and historical knowledge to interpret media samples as dialogic utterances (bumper stickers, newspaper editorials and magazine articles)?"

1. Students drew from their social knowledge of interpersonal relations, cultural collectives, inferences, and constructed knowledge to interpret media samples.
2. Students applied social knowledge to interpret texts across genres.
3. Students used social knowledge more than historic knowledge to interpret texts.

Interpreting Bumper Stickers

When the students entered the dialogue with bumper stickers, they chose the stickers that “spoke” to them. The reasons that guided their choices and the letters they wrote within two interactional contexts, that is, a letter to someone in their home country and a letter to the car owner, demonstrated multiple approaches to interpreting texts. Social knowledge in the form of interpersonal communication, for example, resonated with each student. Revealing social knowledge from personal encounters, Carlos, Miguel, and Joe chose “Courtesy is contagious” because they have treated people well and have been treated well in return. Whereas Joe learned the disadvantages of his detached social experience and advocated, “Get involved...The world is run by those who show up.”

Another aspect of social knowledge revealed in the study is the value of the cultural collective. In “One planet, one people, one future,” Abrihem and Miguel rallied for an environmentally friendly approach to preservation for the enrichment of everyone. In “Hatred is not a family value,” Miguel decried the detriment of hate, especially when it escalates to war, while Joe recalled the stability and support that family guarantees.

Contributing to the construction of social knowledge, family and friends living in the countries where students were born served as addressees in one interactional context of the letter writing assignment. Miguel and Carlos drew from familiarity and dialogic histories with Juan Carlos and Sebas respectively. Miguel encouraged Juan Carlos, yet again, to change with life and grow with “Change is inevitable, growth is optional.” Whereas Carlos urged Sebas to take courage and travel to the U.S. with “I love my country... but I think we should start seeing other people.”

When the interactional context changed in the letter writing assignment to letters to the professor who owns the car with the bumper stickers, students still demonstrated their awareness of the social construction of knowledge by alluding to the dialogic aspect of the stickers and the ideas they evoked. Both Joe and Abrihem said they appreciated the content, that is, what the stickers communicated and the form, that is, how stickers communicate on cars. Abrihem said, “I was excited because I liked what the bumper stickers were talking about. I also like the fact that you put them on you car and drive around them. People need to read them...”

The social knowledge of inference also affected students’ interpretation of bumper stickers. Carlos inferred that the professor is open-minded, receptive to new people and cultures, and consequently new knowledge. He inferred as well that the professor is a feminist because of the sticker, “Well-behaved women rarely make history” and, by that inference, displayed awareness of feminist ideology.

Interpreting the Articles: “The Hispanic Challenge” and “EASY PREY”

The ways students in the study revealed social knowledge when interpreting bumper stickers prompted me to look for ways they revealed social knowledge in the articles. I discovered that students consistently applied social knowledge to interpret texts across genres. For example, when students responded only to the headings in the article, “The Hispanic Challenge,” they demonstrated the ability to apply social knowledge attained through interpersonal relations. Carlos, within a familial intertextual anecdote used in response to the heading, “BIENVENIDO A MIAMI” called upon Hispanic ethnocentrism to illustrate his uncles’ ability to strive in Miami in spite of little linguistic ability in English. Likewise, citing the value of others’ influence on his social knowledge, Abrihem, in response to “The Hispanic Challenge” as the title of the article, alluded intertextually to a conversation he had with his

cousin, who warned him against thinking about becoming a permanent resident in the U.S. In another intertextual reference in response to the heading, “From Diversity to Dominance,” Abrihem demonstrated social knowledge about increasing immigration and supported that knowledge when he cited a professor as a dialogic supporter of the idea that in the future foreigners may outnumber persons born in the U.S.

Social knowledge appeared through the concept of the cultural collective again when Carlos, in response to “*These new white nationalists do not advocate white racial supremacy but believe in racial self-preservation and affirm that culture is a product of race.*” He cited this quote from “The Threat of White Nativism?” to qualify the concept of self-preservation universally as “something that any animal on earth is looking for.” He elaborated, “Humans are animals as well, but there is a big difference, no matter how you look, black, yellow, brown or black, we are all the same specie, we are all humans “self-preserving” from other humans.” With the repetition of “we,” Carlos situated social knowledge of humanity, a common desire to survive.

Social knowledge of a cohesive community affected students’ interpretations of various texts. Miguel, for instance, characterized Hispanic ethnocentrism which he raised in response to some reactions to increased Hispanic immigration in “The Threat of White Nativism?” He said, “By my Latin point of view it is a big sacrifice that we do to come here. We come to the States looking for a better life quality for us and our family, and it’s not easy all what we have to do to achieve that goal.” With a different instantiation of the social knowledge of the experience in a cohesive community from the same text Carlos offered, “I am an immigrant, and I respect the culture that is offering me a better quality of life, call it education if you want, but I do my best to fit in the new culture that surrounds me.” In yet another assignment, the English 1101 Final

Exam on “The Hispanic Challenge,” Carlos introduced social knowledge of the Mexican ethnocentrism which manifests in the preponderance of Mexican restaurants. He observed, “The main reason is that there are a lot of Mexican immigrants who won’t forget their culture, their food, and the Americans are getting use to live with that and even love these places, their food and music.”

Just as the social knowledge of inference appeared in a student’s analysis of bumper stickers, it appeared in the analysis of “The Hispanic Challenge.” Of note, in addition to applying inferential knowledge across genres, students in each instance made inferences surrounding the identity of the speaker—for bumper stickers, the ventriloquating professor; for “The Hispanic Challenge,” the author. Miguel inferred about Huntington’s identity and the impact that identity made on the text in the order of Gee (2002) *whos-doing-whats-within-Discourses*. He said:

By reading the text we can have an idea of who the writer is, and how that person feels toward the Hispanic crowding of the States. The author is mainly a Non-Hispanic white; we can notice this just by the way that expresses the facts and how presents an alarming perspective. The writer talks in a warning tone, he is worried about losing his language, culture, race, and the most important of all his country.

Identity and its salience to social knowledge and therefore textual mediation proved significant to the students whether in regard to inferences of speaker identity—the speaker/author of bumper stickers and articles--or revelations about listener/reader identity—the students themselves. For example, Abrihem revealed the social knowledge of experience when he responded to my question, “How does your identity affect the way you interpret the article?” He

said, “We Africans don’t pose a threat to the American culture and furthermore, the population of Africans here in the United States is not even up to half of that of Hispanics here. Why should we Africans be deprived of free access to the United States because of the threat that another nation poses on it.” The concept of threat affected Joe’s identity when he considered the possibility of his needing Spanish language competence as a consequence of impending cultural divisiveness. Carlos, on the other hand, reiterated the strength of Hispanic traditions and America’s appreciation of them and his ability to adapt to American culture when he recalled the attributes of his identity reflected through social knowledge of experience.

Mediation of the effects of speaker/author identity on textual production and reader/respondent identity on textual interpretation led to mediation of discursive construction of identity in “EASY PREY.” Carlos and Joe revealed social knowledge of the processes of generalization and conflation in the production of a Hispanic identity. Carlos observed a tendency he considered prevalent, that of Americans’ practice of inscribing “Mexican” and “Hispanic” as synonymous. Joe, on the other hand, cited Moser (2004) with conflation of “day laborer” and “illegal” as the dominant identity of U.S. construction workers of “Spanish heritage. Both Carlos and Joe demonstrated not only the ability to link their social knowledge to mediation of constructed identity but also the ability to critique the practice.

Social Knowledge versus Historic Knowledge

Throughout the study, regardless to the genre of texts the students interpreted, their documented application of social knowledge surpassed their application of historic knowledge. Students drew less frequently from historical knowledge when they focused on texts others had written, the selected texts for the study. However, a few exceptions illustrating students’ conceptualizations of historic knowledge follow:

Carlos, in the section on interpreting headings in “The Hispanic Challenge” in the beginning of Chapter 5, demonstrated the impact of his historic knowledge on his interpretation by commenting on the powerful consequences of Huntington’s articulation of racial strife between blacks and whites. In the section on “The Threat of White Nativism?” in Chapter 5, Carlos and Abrihem privileged historic knowledge of immigration in the U.S.

The lesser evident student application of historic knowledge rendered more evident student application of social knowledge. Consequently, early in ENGL 1101 in the bumper sticker assignments, I questioned the transcendent quality of social knowledge across genres and the aspect of replication for the application of historic knowledge. After constructing rubrics to answer those questions, I began considering ways identity and power affect interpretation of texts with the intention of promoting critique as an enhancement to academic literacy; hence, the creation of pedagogical critical discourse analysis and research question number two:

How can I introduce a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis (analysis of power, identity and ideology) as a pedagogical practice to promote academic literacy?

Pedagogical CDA

Even at the onset of the study, I set out to devise and implement a teaching method based first and foremost upon the assertion that ESOL students’ dialogues, mediations of cultural past and cultural present, never cease. Accordingly, my challenge, in the impetus of the study and throughout, remained one directed toward invigorating ESOL students in my first year composition classes to speak, to read, to respond, to write, and eventually to synthesize, evaluate, and critique--to participate in what Bakhtin (1986) called the perpetual “link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances” (p .69).

The Bakhtinian chain of utterances, according to Braxley (2005) “has both temporal and spatial dimensions. In Western thought, the link of utterances stretches back in time to the words (and rhetorical models) of ancient Greeks, Romans, and Hebrews and forward in time to utterances that have yet to be spoken....Bahktin’s insights show us that dialogue ranges far and wide, through space and time (p. 13). Space and time, that is, space, time, and geography, for my purpose of devising a teaching method worthy of the students with whom I situated learning opportunities, affected the dialogic proficiency these students gained through mediation of cultural past-revealed in this study as social and historic knowledge gleaned from myriad interlocutions: familial, social, and institutional. Their proficiency in dialogues of the past, I contended, warranted my acknowledgement as their cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991). This capital, a preexisting discursive “identity kit” (Gee, 2001), prepared students to access and mediate multiple discourses. According to Gee, “Discourses are ways of being in the world; they are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes” (p. 526). Applying discursive proficiency of their cultures to cultural mediation at present, these ESOL students intensified linguistic competence, which I asserted is transferable and applicable to the enhancement of academic literacy. I based this assertion on the progression of my literacy experiences beginning in elementary school and continuing throughout my graduate study as described in Chapter 4. The appropriateness of a contextualized, pedagogical critical discourse analysis to promote ESOL academic literacy can be evaluated more clearly at the end of the study for its controversy, its limitations as well as for its strengths.

For controversy, this study when subjected to criticism could be reduced to a naïve misappropriation of CDA. Such criticism would be just if it charged the study as

ineffective in disrupting power and instantiating liberation, central goals of more traditional applications of CDA to political discourse and public policy, for example. As an adaptive, contextualized pedagogical CDA, however, this study set out to promote academic literacy by asking students to attend voices of polyphony:

For Bakhtin, polyphony is an umbrella-term over all interactive processes among the characters in artistic discourse. The individual speeches, genres and languages with their own voices in a literary work strive for harmony, which unites the structure of the whole. A more abstract term for this interaction, one that embraces the notion of harmony as well is “heteroglossia” (literary: ‘different voices’). (Mladenov, 2001, p. 442)

Polyphony, in its origin, reflected character interaction in the novel, however, in this application, its subsumed element, heteroglossia, “different voices” spoke from the bumper stickers of the car, if one considered each bumper sticker a singularly articulated voice. Yet, if on the other hand, one “read” the car as one voice ventriloquating (Wortham, 2001) the varied messages, then one would attribute to the professor the role of speaker and therefore enter the dialogue. In the early assignments on bumper stickers and editorials, students interacted dialogically as respondents to speakers, to heteroglossia. In their analyses of “The Hispanic Challenge” and “EASY PREY,” they responded, in each instance, to assertions stated authoritatively by one voice, the author. When they became principle authors of texts, essays of constructed ethnic identity, however, students, in addition to conveying a priori knowledge to interpret and critique texts as they had done with bumper stickers, editorials, and articles, made and supported assertions, thereby enacting authoritative stances. Any consequential ideological liberation students found can be attributed, therefore, only to students’ progressive authority.

For limitations, my deliberate attempt as participant/researcher to avoid the perceived negative consequences of an overly prescriptive methodology and an overly proselytizing pedagogy caused me to abridge the representation of CDA concepts in these ESOL composition classes that, at a future opportunity, might prove beneficial not only to language instruction in context but also to research. Future research treating a pedagogical CDA could consider more reflective data from students on the effects of mediation and analysis on their enhancement of academic literacy, a comparative analysis of lexicosyntactic features in multiple drafts of student compositions and, perhaps, a forward glance to assess ESOL students' application of a contextualized CDA beyond the composition classroom in interdisciplinary pursuits within and across curricula. The number of participants could suggest, for some readers, a limitation, that the two-semester study might temper. Likewise, the focus on student knowledge without attention to error correction in the data of the study could prove limiting to some readers. The fact is, however, that within the pedagogy, students benefited from multiple revision opportunities for each writing task.

For strength, the study has begun to address a criticism of CDA levied by Fairclough (2004) and others that CDA had not ventured enough into instructional contexts in education although Fairclough considers learning “a performativity of texts—both spoken and written” (p. 225). Teaching and learning, then, constitute a never ceasing mediation of genres, discourses, and styles manifest pragmatically in myriad teaching styles, learning styles, and classroom discourses. Therefore, an introductory pedagogy that situates semiosis of text (textual analysis and composition) in association with ideas and interaction can promote academic literacy in ESOL because as Fairclough posits:

We also have to recognize that texts are involved in processes of meaning

making and that texts have causal effects (i.e., they bring about changes) that are mediated by meaning making. Most immediately, texts can bring about changes in our knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, values, experience....We learn from our involvement with and in texts, and texturing (the process of making texts as a facet of social action and interaction) is integral to learning. (p. 228)

Fairclough's conceptualization of "texturing" resembles significantly conceptualizations of academic literacy in ESOL, (Blanton, 1998; Leki & Carson, 1997) for example. Absent from both Fairclough's implications for CDA on teaching and learning and conceptualizations for academic literacy in ESOL, however, are praxis, practical pedagogical strategies that guide students' interaction with texts. This study bridges theory of academic literacy in ESOL and a contextualized CDA to produce and implement a pedagogical critical discourse analysis dependent upon student composition, hence the reporting of the robust body of student writing.

Meta-Awareness as Critique

Anticipating the design of the instructional rubric to investigate research question three, "How do students use their meta-awareness as a form of critique?" I reconsidered the degree to which students had demonstrated social and historic knowledge through interpretations of bumper stickers, "The Hispanic Challenge," and "Easy Prey." This general reconsideration of initial analysis led me to reinvestigate the analysis of bumper stickers. When I did, I discovered that even though I had not looked for meta-awareness as critique when I analyzed bumper stickers as dialogic utterances, students evoked it then and throughout the study. The data revealed three ways students used meta-awareness as critique:

1. The students infused meta-awareness as critique not only across genres of their writing, whether in short responses or in essays, but also across interpretations of selected genres of the texts of the study.
2. Their ability to apply meta-awareness as critique did not render meta-awareness isolable from other awareness they hold. Moreover, students conveyed meta-awareness, in many instances, by way of social and historic knowledge of experience and instruction as critique centered on the students themselves, others, and ideologies.
3. Students used meta-awareness as critique to make authoritative assertions, a competence esteemed in ESOL academic literacy literature.

Joe in a moment of self-critique revealed, “I usually stay away from the things I am not interested in, and that has made me missed many valuable experience. I should get more involved with other people.” And Carlos, on critique of others’ inactivity, avowed “I can’t stand people who are always complaining about all the stuff that is going on around them, but don’t take a part in the solution of the issue.” Both based critique on the bumper sticker, “Get involved...The world is run by those who show up.”

In response to “I love my country, but I think we should start seeing other people,” Joe contemplated the ideology of ethnic identity when he critiqued people who lack ethnic pride. He said, “I have some Chinese friends, who were born in the United States, but some of them are not proud of China. Instead, they think American culture is the best of all. In my opinion, there is no best race.” Carlos, on the other hand, challenged the ideology of U.S. ethnocentrism with, “most of the Americans are afraid of expanding their horizon. They know a lot about their own

country, but it is hard to believe they are clueless about the rest of the world.” Finally, on his mother’s anti-American ideology, Abrihem stated:

America is a diversified country, so people have quite different opinions on even the same thing. This case is a good example that demonstrated for some Americans hate the war like you. However, USA is a democratic country where people choose their president and policies by vote. Sometimes, the majority may choose the wrong while the minority holds the right. Just like you always said that the democratic decisions are not always right but democratization will never be wrong.

What I discovered about student knowledge toward the end of the study, as I reflected upon all the data, were not merely the application of social knowledge to bumper stickers and not only merely the application of meta-awareness as critique as completely different data sets representing completely different phenomena; instead, I found the salience of semiosis. A reification of the synergistic musing that characterized the introductory theoretical framing of the study also characterizes the implications. Just as ideas, interaction, text, identity, and power do not exist as discrete entities; neither do social and historic knowledge function separately from meta-awareness. Semiosis, as I introduced in Chapter 2 and revisited in Chapter 4, constitutes “a continuous process of interpretation,” (Mladenov, 2001) neither informed solely by past nor solely by present ideology, neither reduced only to the grammar of the sentence nor only to the abstraction of social practice. Rather semiosis is an amalgamation, an interanimation of “meaning making practices of the communities to which we belong and in ways that are specific to cultures and subcultures, topics, participants, and settings” (Lemke, 2002, p.22); situated literacy contextualized by discourses and identities reflective of social rituals (Gee 2002); and

orders of discourse, genres-ways of interaction, discourses-ways of representing, and styles-ways of being (Fairclough, 2001, 2004).

When students composed their own ethnic identities in the English 1102 Final Exam, they revealed a wealth of social knowledge, historic knowledge, and meta-awareness as critique. For example, Miguel on a Venezuelan identity, conveyed the discourse of ethnic pride, meta-awareness of the effects of time on one's interpretation of nationalistic discourse, the significance of national symbols as they define citizenry. He demonstrated as well the ability to balance the discourse of patriotism with his critique of the Venezuelan economy. Likewise in a proclamation of myriad knowledge, Joe combined the social knowledge of the discourse of nationalistic indoctrination revealed through discipline and punishment, historic knowledge voiced through intertextuality, and meta-awareness as critique of U.S. ethnocentrism with his own expression of ethnic superiority. He, too, communicated the effect of time of the interpretation of text.

Historic knowledge held prominence for Carlos and Abrihem, even more than for Joe and Miguel. Carlos revisited the 1800's of Columbia to herald the victories of a bloody war and the eventually resultant independence, a Columbian ethnic collective produced and reproduced socially and culturally by nationalists in the arts expressed intertextually in the arts, specifically in books, film, television, and the ubiquitous national anthem. Similarly, Abrihem, drew from historic knowledge, this time the historic knowledge of nationalistic shame borne of celebrated independence from England, yet tainted by subsequent corruption known to him through social awareness of present day Nigeria which he authoritatively critiqued.

Implications

The most salient variable, from a sociocultural perspective, that influenced the focal ESOL students' interpretation of texts, that is, textual mediation, a discursal act connected to and drawn from students' a priori social knowledge, invariably manifested in cultural affordances related to their ethnic and social identities. By incorporating textual mediation, then, as situated learning involving "social language" (Gee, 2002) and "social practice" (Fairclough, 2001) into composition pedagogy, instructors privilege academic literacy as a cultural affordance. Accordingly, instructors can create opportunities to promote students' awareness of dialogically constructed ethnic and nationalistic discourses, their own and others with whom they will interact in social and professional environments. Students, in turn, can learn to apply Gee's theory of discourses (2002) and Bakhtin's notions of dialogism (1986) not only to critical discourse analysis, in this instance, a contextualized pedagogical critical discourse analysis, but also to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary mediation. Through ideational mediation, students may discover ways individuals function within discourses and ways authority determines who hail whom. Moreover, students may discover how identity affects speaker/respondent roles, and how familiarity with the interanimation of ideas, interaction, text, power and identity along with proficiency in linguistic forms and conventions can enhance their acquisition of academic literacy.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes toward on investigation. Lenin and philosophy and other essays. L. Althusser. New York, Monthly Review Press: 127-186.
- Apple, M. (1996). Power, meaning, and identity: critical sociology of education in the United States. British Journal of Sociology of Education. 17 (2): 125-144.
- Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. TESOL Quarterly, 29(3), 539-568.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (M.Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M Holquist Trans.). Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). Speech genres and other late essays. (Eds.:V. McGee, Trans.) Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Bartholomae, D. & Petrosky, A. (1986). Facts, artifacts and counterfacts: A basic reading and writing course for the college curriculum. In D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (Eds.), Facts, artifacts and counterfacts: Theory and method for a reading and writing course (pp. 3-43). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/ Cook.
- Baynham, M. (1995). Literacy practices: Investigating literacy in social contexts. London: Longman.
- Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 191-207.
- Blanton, L. L. (1998). Discourse, artifacts, and the Ozarks: Understanding academic literacy. In Zamel, V. & R. Spack, (Eds.), Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures. (pp. 219-225). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Blanton, L. L. (1999). Classroom instruction and language minority students: On teaching to "smarter" readers and writers. In Harklau, L., K. M. Losey & M. Siegal. (Eds). Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL. (pp. 119-142). New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Braxley, K. (2005). Mastering academic English: International graduate students' use of dialogue and speech genres to meet the writing demands of graduate school. In Hall, J. K., G. Vitanova & L.Marchenkova. (Eds.). Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and Foreign language learning:New perspectives. (pp.11-32). Mahwah, N J: L Erlbaum.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. TESOL Quarterly 33(3): 413-431.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality." Critical Inquiry 18: 1-21.
- Burr, V. (1995). An introduction to social constructionism. London: Routledge.

Case, C. E. (1992). Bumper stickers and car signs ideology and identity. Journal of popular culture. 26 (3): 107-119.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). On the use of selected grammatical features in academic writing. In Schlepppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power. (pp. 143-156). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Colombi, M.C. & Schlepppegrell, M. J. (2002). Theory and practice in the development of advanced literacy. In Schlepppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power. (pp. 1-19). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Elbow, P. (1998). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to freshmen and colleagues. In Zamel, V. & R. Spack, (Eds.), Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures. (pp. 145-169). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language. New York: Longman
Fairclough, N. (2004). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In Rogers, R. (ed.) An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. (pp. 225-235). Mahwah, N. J.: L. Erlbaum.

Fairclough, N. (2000). Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform. Journal of Sociolinguistics 4(2). 163-195.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (eds.) Methods of critical discourse analysis. (pp. 121-138). London: Sage

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Friere, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Gee, J.P. (2001). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction *and* What is Literacy? In Cushman, E., E. Kintgen, B. Kroll, & M. Rose. (Eds.). Literacy: A critical sourcebook. (pp.525-544). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Gee, J. P. (2002). Literacies, identities, and discourses. In Schlepppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages:

Gee, J. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical? In Rogers, R. (ed.) An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. (pp. 19-50). Mahwah, N. J.: L. Erlbaum.
meaning with power. (pp. 159-175). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Giddens, A. (1999). Modernity and self-identity: Tribulations of the self. In Jaworski, A & N. Coupland. (eds.). The Discourse reader. (pp. 415-427). New York: Routledge.

Halasek, K. (1999). A pedagogy of possibility: Bakhtinian perspectives on composition. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Halliday, M. M. (1978). Language as social semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985)(1994). Introduction to functional grammar. (2nd ed.) London: Edward Arnold.

Heath, S. B. & Mangiola, L. (1991). Children of promise: Literate activity in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Hinkel, E. (2003). Simplicity without elegance: Features of sentences in L1 and L2 academic texts. TESOL Quarterly, 37 (2), 275-301.

Holquist, M. (1900). Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world. London: Routledge.

- Huntington, S. (2004). The Hispanic challenge. Foreign Policy. March/April: 30-45.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected reading (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity and the politics of ESL learning. TESOL Quarterly **33**(3): 49-369.
- Jager, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (Eds.) Methods of critical discourse analysis. (pp. 32-62). London: Sage.
- Jaworski, A. & Coupland, N. (eds.) (1999). The discourse reader. London: Routledge.
- Johns, A. M. (1986). Coherence and academic writing: Some definitions and suggestions for teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 247-265.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Kumaravadevelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. TESOL Quarterly **33**(3): 453-484.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). 'Completely different worlds': EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. TESOL Quarterly, **3** 1(1), 39-69.
- Lemke, J. (1995). Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics. London: Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Lemke, J. (2002). Multimedia semiotics: Genres for science education and scientific literacy. In Schleppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power. (pp. 21-44). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Lemke, J. (2004). Multimedia literacy: Transforming meanings and media. In Handa, C., (Ed.), Visual rhetoric in a digital world: A critical sourcebook. (pp. 71-93). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-Lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? TESOL Quarterly **33**(3): 393-412.
- Luke, A. (1997). The material effects of the material world: Apologies, 'stolen children' and public discourse. Discourse. 18:343-368. Pienemann, M.(1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), Modeling and assessing second language acquisition (pp.23-77). San Deigo, CA: College Hill Press.
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. **22** (3): 96-110.
- Martson, G. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and policy-oriented housing research. Housing, Theory and Society. 19: 82-91.
- Mladenov, I. (2001). Unlimited semiosis and heteroglossia (C.S. Peirce and M.M. Bakhtin). Sign systems studies. **29** (2): 441-461.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (eds.) Methods of critical discourse analysis. (pp. 14-31). London: Sage.
- Moser, B. (2005). EASY PREY. Creative Loafing 36(42): 32-36.
- Morgan, B. (1999). The ESL classroom: Teaching, critical practice, and community development. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Nelson, C. (1999). Sexual identities in ESL: Queer theory and classroom inquiry. TESOL Quarterly 33(3): 371-391.
- Norton-Meier, L.A. (2004). The bumper sticker curriculum: Learning from words on the backs of cars. Journal of adolescent & adult literacy. 48 (3): 260-263.
- Orr, J.L. (2005). Dialogic Investigations: Cultural artifacts in ESOL composition classes. In Hall, J. K., G. Vitanova & L. Marchenkova. (Eds.). Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and Foreign language learning: New perspectives. (pp.55-76). Mahwah, N J: L Erlbaum.
- Ramanathan, V. (2002). The politics of TESOL education: Writing, knowledge, critical pedagogy. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Rogers, R. (2003). A critical discourse analysis of family literacy practices: Power in and out of print. Mahwah, N. J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Rogers, R. (2004) (ed.) An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. Mahwah, N. J.: L. Erlbaum
- Rose, M. (1985). The language of exclusion: Writing instruction at the university. College English, 47, 341-359.
- Salvatori, M. (1986). The dialogical nature of basic reading and writing. In D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (Eds.), Facts, artifacts and counterfactuals: Theory and method for a reading and writing course (pp. 137-166). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/ Cook.
- Scarcella, R. (2002). Some key factors affecting English learners' development of advanced literacy. In Schlepppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power. (pp. 209-226). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Scheiber, H.J. (1987). Toward a text-based pedagogy in the freshman composition course—with two process-oriented writing tasks. Freshman English News, 15, 15-18.
- Schlepppegrell, M. (2002). Challenges of the science register for ESL students: Errors and meaning-making. In Schlepppegrell, M & M. C. Columbi, (Eds.), Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power. (pp. 119-142). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shih, M. (1986). Content-based approaches to teaching academic writing. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 617-648.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. TESOL Quarterly, 27, 657-676.
- Spack, R. (1998). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? In Zamel, V. & R. Spack, (Eds.), Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures. (pp. 85-104). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Swales, J. (1998). Other floors, other voices. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- van Dijk., T. (1991). Racism and the press. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk., T. (1993a). Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse & Society. 4(2); 249-283.
- van Dijk., T. (1993b). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. London: Sage.
- van Dijk., T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In Wodak, R. & van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis. Discourse & Society. 4(2); 193-233.
- Wall, S. V. (1986). Writing, reading and authority: A case study. In D.

Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (Eds.), Facts, artifacts and counterfacts: Theory and method for a reading and writing course (pp. 137-166). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/ Cook.

Wodak, R. & M. Meyer. (eds.). Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.) (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. (pp. 63-94). London: Sage.

Wortham, S. (2001). Narratives in action: A strategy for research and analysis. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wong, F. & Snow, C. (1999). What educators—especially teachers—need to know about language: The bare minimum. Unpublished paper (<http://www.cal.org/ericcll/teachers/teachers.pdf>).

Zamel, V. (1998). Questioning academic discourse. In Zamel, V. & R. Spack, (Eds.), Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures. (pp. 187-197). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
