People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Oran-2 Es-Sénia
Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts
Department of English

The Construction of Gender Identities through Discourse: The case of EFL and Architecture Students.

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of
DOCTORAT ès-Sciences in **SOCIOLINGUISTICS**

Defended by   **Mrs. Amina BABOU**

Board of examiners

Miliani Mohamed	Professor	University Oran 2	Chairman
Abdelhay Bakhta	Professor	University of Mostaganem	Supervisor
Benhattab Abdelkader Lofti	Professor	University Oran 2	Examiner
Negadi Mohamed Nassim	Doctor	University of Tlemcen	Examiner
Bénabad Ammar	Doctor	University of Tiaret	Examiner
Aoumeur Hayet	Doctor	University of Mostaganem	Examiner

2019-2020

Dedication

To my sweethearts **'MAMA'** and **'PAPA'**
To my darling husband **KHALIL**
To my Poppet daughter **INES**
To my beloved siblings **HADJIRA, ABDELKADER** and A**BDELMADJID**

Acknowledgements

Abstract:

Adopting feminist post-structuralist analysis (FPDA), this study seeks to challenge the modernist myth that girls/ women are universally and uniformly depicted by a patriarchal order as powerless. This approach heralds a distinct move away from the notion of essentialist identities to the recognition of the multiplicity of gender identities and the acknowledgment that there are different femininities and masculinities which are often historically and culturally determined. This study opts to focus on the EFL and architecture Master classrooms at the university of Hassiba Benbouali (Chlef) as 'sites of struggle' to explore how male/female students always adopt multiple subject positions as they accordingly negotiate their identities, relationships and positions. This echoes the notion that the relationship between language, gender and discourse is always fluid and context-bounded. Feminist post-structuralism seems to search out maintaining the discourse of gender differentiation and unequal power relations which have traditionally served males' interests. This makes it easier to shackle women's opportunities and exclude them from education and other professions. Against this tangled background, FPDA theoretical approach offers me means of unveiling the ways in which female students, in both communities of practice; may be simultaneously powerful within certain subject positions, but as plainly powerless within other subject positions. FPDA puts us away from considering females as 'victims' of the patriarchal order and males as 'villains' in the scenario. Rather, male/female students are multiply positioned according to a grid of competing discourses which I identified along the observation journey. Albeit the fact that some female students may encompass the 'double bind' when they openly compete to adopt authoritative positions as speakers, they appear to resist certain social and institutional discourses. In a subliminal manner, I explored that there are conflicting realities of the teachers' assessment of the students' oral performances. This indicate that criteria for 'effective speech' in classroom public contexts is a relatively undervalued pillar within the Master curriculum for both contexts. What I recognized is that most assessors seemed to praise self-confidence, popularity and outspokenness for their oral skills' judgments, which can be stereotypically deemed masculine. This study directs a limelight on the need to teach students how to deconstruct the gendered power relations presupposed within any social and   educational   discourses.

Keywords :   classroom-discourse- females- feminist post-structuralism gender identities- males.

الملخص:

لقد أظهرت مراجعة الدراسات اللغوية و التربوية أن التمييز القائم على أساس الجندر هو خطاب وثيق الصلة بالبحث في الكلام داخل أقسام الدراسة من خلال الإهتمام بالعلاقة بين الجندر و استعمال الطلبة لكلام يتسم بالثقة و التحكم. في هذا الإطار، تبين أن الطالبات الإناث تتجنب اتخاذ مواقع تحكمية بصفتهن متحدثات في مجتمع يعتبر فيه الصوت الذكوري المتحكم هو المعيار. من خلال تبني مقاربة ما بعد البنيوية قائمة على فكرة المساواة بين الجنسين تهدف هذه الأطروحة إلى تحدي الفكرة المعاصرة الزاعمة أن الفتيات/ النساء تصور من طرف النظام الأبوي بشكل شامل و موحد. فتكشف هذه المقاربة عن مدى الإبتعاد عن فكرة الهويات الأساسية إلى الإعتراف بتعدد هويات الجندر و الإقرار أن هناك فئات أنوثة مختلفة و أنواع ذكورة متباينة و التي غالبا ما تتحدد تاريخيا و ثقافيا. يركز هذا البحث على أقسام الدراسة لطلبة الماستر في كل من تخصصي اللغة الإنجليزية و الهندسة المعمارية بجامعة حسيبة بن بوعلي بالشلف– الجزائر باعتبارها مواقع صراع، وذلك بغرض استكشاف كيفية تبني الطالبات/ و الطلبة دوما مواقع متعددة بحكم مفاوضتهم لهوياتهم، علاقاتهم و مواقعهم. مما يردد فكرة أن العلاقة بين اللغة، الجندر و الخطاب هي دوما مائعة و محكومة بالسياق.

يبدو أن مقاربة ما بعد البنيوية القائمة على فكرة المساواة بين الجنسين تسعى إلى الإبقاء على خطاب التمييز على اساس الجندر و علاقات عدم تكافؤ القوة التي طالما خدمت مصالح الذكور. و من شأن هذا أن يحد من فرص المرأة و حرمانها من التعليم و من وظائف أخرى. على هذه الخلفية المتضاربة، منحتني المقاربة النظرية لما بعد البنيوية القائمة على فكرة المساواة بين الجنسين وسيلة لكشف النقاب عن الكيفية التي بموجبها يمكن للطالبات في كلا التخصصين أن يكن في الوقت نفسه قويات في مواضع معينة. ومجردات كليا من القوة في مواضع أخرى. تنأى بنا مقاربة ما بعد البنيوية القائمة على فكرة المساواة بين الجنسين عن فكرة اعتبار الإناث ضحايا النظام الأبوي و أن الذكور بمثابة أشرار. و الأحرى أن الطلبة الإناث/ الذكور يتموقعون بشكل متعدد وفق شبكة من الخطابات المتنافسة و التي وقفت عليها طيلة فترة الملاحظة. على الرغم من حقيقة أن بعض الطالبات لديهن ربط مزدوج حينما تتنافس علنا لتبني مواقع متسلطة التسلط كمتحدثات يبدو أنهن يقاومن بعض الخطابات الإجتماعية و المؤسساتية.

بطريقة لاشعورية استخلصت أن هناك حقائق متضاربة بشأن تقويم الأساتذة للآداء الشفوي للطلبة. و إن دل هذا على شيئ فإنما يدل على أن معايير الكلام الفعال /الناجع في القسم هي مغيبة نسبيا في منهاج الماستر لكلا التخصصين. و ما توصلت إليه هو أن أغلب المدرسين على ما يبدو يفضلون الثقة في النفس، الشعبية، و الصراحة للحكم على المهارات الشفوية للطالب. و هو ما يعتبر نموذج ذكوري محض. و بالتالي فإن هذه الدراسة تسلط الضوء على ضرورة تعليم الطلبة كيفية كسر علاقات القوة المحكومة بالجندر المفترضة ضمن أي خطابات اجتماعية أو تربوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: حجرة الدراسة ـ الخطاب ـ الإناث ـ الهويات الجنسية ما بعد البنيوية ـ الذكور

List of Abbreviations

CAT   Communication accommodation theory
CDA   Critical discourse analysis
Cofp   Community of Practice
DP   discursive psychological
EFL   English as a Foreign Language
ELT   (English language teaching)
F_1 EFL female student.
Fa_1 Architecture female student
FPDA   Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis
L2   Second Language
M_1 EFL male student
Ma_1 Architecture male student
MA   Master (LMD)
SAT   Speech accommodation theory
SIT   Social identity theory

CONTENTS

Chapter Four : Data Analysis: Denotative and connotative analysis

General Introduction

General Introduction :

Gender and education thread of research has been proliferated so tremendously and rapidly in recent years. In education research, "gender" has become a significant category of analysis which serves to unveil the multiple identity positions revealed by the poststructuralist and constructivist perspectives. Much research delving into the role of gender and its influence on classroom practices references the influence of the masculinist discourse which estimates what is male or masculine over what is female or feminine. This sustains discourses of gender differentiation and unequal power relationships which have traditionally served the benefits of males over females. This tends to grease the wheels to confine opportunities and ostracize girls and women from education, and more senior positions in business and other professions.

Adopting feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis, I investigate the complex and often ambiguous ways in which EFL and architecture students are simultaneously positioned as relatively powerless within certain discourses, but as relatively powerful within other alternative competing discourses. I shall explore how language constructs gender identities, how speech is produced, negotiated and contested within the classroom which is deemed to be a community of practice where dominant hegemonic, subordinate and oppositional masculinities and femininities are constructed and sustained. By this token, The classroom can be seen as a public context comparable to the workplace.

Paralleling how effective speech in public contexts is defined by masculine characteristics such as verbal bravado and competitiveness, success in the classroom is accessible through confidence and aggressiveness (Baxter, 2003). Thus, the fear of gender transgression and social marginalization is one potential elucidation to accord why female leaders encounter quandary in asserting their authority. (Baxter, 2006b). By this token, Holmes (2006) postulates that women who strives to claim their authority can be seen as facing a double bind. The crux of this research is to explore how EFL and architecture students construct their gender identities, and how they negotiate authoritative positions and challenge disempowering subject positions.

General Introduction

As an EFL teacher, I have always tightened the value of developing students' capacities to speak effectively in public contexts. Speaking in public is not just about the business of conveying a formal speech or getting involved in a political or academic debate, skills which perhaps only few students may require routinely in their future lives. It also entails, to some extent, the ability to convince other people to consider your point of view, to be able to resist and talk on the "spurious arguments" (Baxter, 2000a) of others, to confront people who may attempt to trifle with your voice, and to make an impact on public opinion. I believe that being able to speak out and being heard can empower EFL students as being future teachers, and architecture students who will be architects, a profession that requires speaking out and effectiveness to run to leadership positions. Coates (1988) maintains that language learning involves the identities of learners. Every time, language learners speak, they are not merely swapping information with their interlocutors, but joining in the process of identity construction and negotiation through re (organizing) a sense of who they are and how they are connected to the social world (Bourdieu, 1977).

In this scrutiny, I employed feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA) to analyse student's construction of gender identities through the grid of competing discourses that one discursively produce in the classroom as a community of practice. I will discuss how students construct their gender identities when they attempt to perform leadership and their use of effective speech, with a particular focus on how female students experience contradictions and tensions as subject / speakers in the classroom, and how they are multiply positioned.

The original quest of the examination mainly arose from two interconnected perspectives. From a feminist perspective, I was interested in studying issues of gender in the classroom to whether gender is a significant factor in developing identities through the learning process. I had a keen interest in unveiling the ways in which many female students (and certain males as well) are being silenced and overlooked by particular classroom practices. My line of research inquiry is buttressed by wondering whether "effective" talk is seen to be constituted through metaphors of command and control that are stereotypically associated with masculine speech. Despite many females' doubtless oral efficiency, it has bewildered me as a teacher why these voluble speakers appeared to be more reticent and less sprightly than their male counterparts, particularly in small group discussions.

General Introduction

Albeit the fact that the bedrock of this inquiry is feminist, it has an educational stance in which I direct a spotlight on "effective speech" in the classroom as a public setting. I have always considered that agency to speak effectively in public contexts is often the best passport to more higher-ranking career roles and responsibilities. At a more profound level, it is argued that being "effective speakers" can confer social and professional prestige for future EFL teachers and architects. For this very reason, I underline the need to make students recognize how to meta-analyze their own classroom behaviours and discuss the discursive constructs and practices that construct effective speech.

Drawning on the belief that language learning is a "feminine domain" (Soars & Soars, 1989); and that engineering is a stereotypically "masculine domain" (Bergvall, 1996), what I will be doing through this research is to inquire into the paradoxical positioning to negotiate identities and meanings which are entrenched in gender stereotypes and the discursive practices enacted by the students in their classrooms.

As this study is influenced by Baxter's (2003) feminist post-structuralist discourse-analysis, I adopt this supplementary approach to discourse analysis, as a theoretical framework, to analyze live and spoken interaction of EFL and architecture students. FPDA has its roots in "third move" or feminist post-structuralism, which does not share the emancipatory agenda of "second wave" or modernist feminism. In conformity with poststructuralist principles, this type of feminism does not universalize women as a distinct social category, dichotomize gender unless strategically indispensable, or make "big picture" assumptions about patriarchy and female subservience. (Baxter, 2018). Rather, FPDA concentrates on the diverse viewpoints, contradictory voices and fragmented messages that research data almost symbolize. It foregrounds the finding of a feminist focus upon a particular issue or asking questions about gender that might engender in the study of communities of practice. Feminist post-structuralism (eg. Butler 1990: Weedon, 1997; Baxter 2003) is at odds with the traditional feminist view that, for instance, female students are informally vilified and disempowered. FPDA aims to leave room for individuals such as women where their voices are being ignored or silenced. This perspective nevertheless argues with the attempt to stereotype women as role models or victims, and men as villains preferring to foreground the diverse, and intersectional elements that constitute people's identity.

General Introduction

My initial theoretical bias was, *de facto*, on Lazar's (2004) feminist critical discourse analysis in which gender is employed as the focal point of analysis to examine the various ways which discourses enact and perpetrate negative gender norms and foster inequalities between women and men. Feminist CDA theorists attempt to chart the difference between ideological knowledge and what actually people do. The fulcrum of this theoretical framework is to describe representations of practices formed from particular perspectives in the interests of maintaining unequal power relations and dominance (Lazar, 2005a). The critical component of feminist CDA was first introduced over three decades ago through traditional version of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Van Dijk, 1993). The term "critical" is referred to by Rogers (2004) as the study of power relations in text and speech.

In reviewing my rudimentary observational notes from the classroom's presentations and debates, I become acquainted with the significance of adopting FPDA which particularly gives insights into means of describing, analyzing and interpreting an aspect of spoken interactions perhaps overlooked by CDA (Baxter 2003) – such as the continuously shifting ways in which speakers, within any discursive context, are positioned as powerful or powerless by competing social and institutional discourses.

To go beyond the analysis of inequality and the way that discursive means are used to sustain the *status quo*, Baxter (2003, 2006a) has developed feminist CDA further to differentiate a form of analysis (FPDA) as an alternative methodology in which the interrelationship of text and context are conceptualized in terms of the workings of competing discourses. Both CDA and FPDA are concerned with the workings of power through discourse, although they conceptualize this in rather diverse ways. CDA deems discourse to work "dialectically" (e.g. Fairclough and Wodak, 1997) in so far as the discursive act – text or talk – is shaped by, and thereby constantly reconstructs, "real" or material events, institutions and social structures. By way of contrast, FPDA adheres to an anti-materialist stance in its views that discourses operate as practices that systematically shape the objects of which they speak. (Baxter, 2003). Accordingly, social "realities" are continuously reconstructed and open to redefinitions through discourse, not outside it.

General Introduction

Accordingly, Foucauldian (1984) notions of discourse are always in a tangled connection with concepts of power, not as negative and oppressive force, but as something that constitutes and invigorates all discursive and social relations. In my occasional reference to spoken or written discourse, it mainly indicates the relatively straight forward, conventional sense of language above the sentence. This understanding of discourse almost definitely nips up and intersects with another conventional linguistic definition of discourse as "language in use" : That is, any talk between people, and groups of people, in everyday contexts such as the classroom, the boardroom, the shopping center or the law courts (Baxter, 2003).

With regard to the term "power" which is used in this thesis, it is conceptualized in the Foucauldian (1980) sense, in which individuals are always in a position of jointly undergoing and exercising power. This means that power is not a possession of individuals, but as a "net-like organization" which interweaves itself discursively through social organization, relations, meanings and the construction of speakers' identities and subjectivities. Baxter (2003) considers that there are always, from an FPDA perspective, plural and competing discourses constituting power relations within any field of knowledge or particular state of affairs.

In the classroom study, for instance, it cannot be presumed that there is solely one discourse which determines gender. There may be predominant discourses shaping stereotypical assumptions about hegemony, masculinity, femininity and binary gender differences, but resistant or conflicting discourses may dwell in the discursive practices.

My field observation records that discourse of gender does not operate in discrete isolation but it is competing with other institutionalized or less formalized discourses within the classroom. In practice, I count on feminist CDA when showing how male hegemony is accomplished through discursive means, but eschewing from any generalizations about the inequality of women and the consensual acceptance of male dominance in the community. The objective of this quest is to unveil male dominance assumptions and discourses of gender differentiations in light of the possibilities for resistance and reinterpretation of the social practices. My analysis is not bounded only to uncovering the ways ideological assumptions are continuously re-enacted and prevailed through discourse as natural, as it is argued by Lazar (2005a).

General Introduction

Along feminist focus to post-structuralist discourse analysis, I must inevitably cast aside the old issues of the oppression and subordination of women, and the rigid effects of gender upon the speech patterns of the students. This framework permits to single out key discourses on gender as they are negotiated and performed within specific, localized contexts. It celebrates and highlights the significant moments of strength in women's interactions with others.

Baxter (2003) emphasizes three main principles that constitute the practice of the discourse analyst self-reflexivity, a deconstructionist approach and selecting a specific feminist focus. By being self-reflexive, FPDA practitioner should make their theoretical positions evident and make explicit the epistemological assumptions that are to be applied to any act of discourse analysis. Post-structuralist theory asserts that FPDA practitioners should only temporarily associate themselves with a particular single agenda lest that a "will to truth" will be switched to a "will to power". In keeping with this perspective, FPDA practitioners will be availed with a wider and richer interplay of ideas and viewpoints in the discursive arena.

Besides, FPDA involves being reflexive about establishing a specialist technical vocabulary or foundational rhetoric (Baxter, 2003). This calls for an overt awareness that technical terms cannot describe "objective" realities in an uncontroversial way. A specialist rhetoric is always equipped with a particular knowledge as it becomes more defined, approved and entrenched. Therefore, FPDA practitioners must be geared up to call attention to the assumptions and range of definitions implied in their use of key analytical terms. Arguably, the FPDA approach to self-reflexivity calls for the need to be aware of the choices the researchers make in setting exactly how they are going to analyze texts, and then be prepared to elucidate the effects of their choices.

The second principle is "deconstruction" which calls for challenging "oppositions" such as male/female and hierarchical relations often seen between them. The deconstruction approach to discourse analysis combines the recognition that the meaning of speech, concepts, people, relationships and so on, can never be fixed permanently. This permits the researcher to move away from the conceptual closure, or ultimately fixable structures of reference through the continual application of reflexivity. It is this subtle process of textual interplay with apparently

competing terms and sets of ideas which has distinguished the hallmark of the deconstructionist approach from modernist versions of discourse analysis. The textual interplay between competing terms, methods and sets of ideas provides more multiple, open-ended interpretations of a piece of analysis.

The third principle of FPDA is to challenge many of the fundamental tenets of "second wave" feminism, questioning constructs of gender dichotomy (e.g. Bing and Berguall, 1998) and consider constructs of diversity and complexity as an addendum. Within a post-structuralist paradigm, feminist research is no longer about probing what the "big" sociolinguistic variable of gender imprints on different social groups. A feminist focus is, *inter alia*, a regard of feminist questions and issues that might arise in the study of specific community of speakers, and is therefore convenient to "small-scale, localized, short-term, strategically planned projects which intend to transform some aspects of cultural practice for girls / women" (Baxter, 2003). Matching up with this, this focus may be predetermined and self-reflexively which is, therefore, imposed on the analysis of the data.

As a case in point, I applied a preconceived focus to the architecture classroom (After modifying the central theme which only embraced the EFL community) where I choose to investigate the ways in which female architecture students negotiate their identity and competing subject positions within the context of a male-dominated community of practice. Alternatively, and in spite of my preplanned project to analyze the construction of gender identity in the EFL classroom, I gradually became aware of the dominance of "gender differentiation" discourse which was commingled with other discourses to position females as generally more dominant some of their male counterparts in public classroom settings such as the whole class discussion.

Thus, selecting a feminist focus to post-structuralist discourse analysis elaborates and foregrounds moments of women's empowerment in their interactions with others. Self-reflexively brings to light the jeopardy of becoming complacent about privileging certain (female) voices over those of others. By being self-reflexive, some feminist post-structuralist writers have been criticized for openness and self-reflexivity (Mc William, 1997), because all terms may potentially be multi-accentual, to be read in plural if context-bound ways. In an attempt to "close-down" (Baxter, 2003, p. 60) the range of readings of terms in this way, I shall

explain the apparently quite trenchant terms such as "feminism", "post-structuralism", "power" and discourse, all of which are unlatched to a wide range of potential commentaries and readings.

A fruitful framework for thinking about understanding the relationship between leadership and gender as routinely negotiated through social practices within a range of familiar contexts, is the "community of practice" approach. This framework is compatible with the social constructionist view of gender because of its concern in the practices as the means of constructing communities. The way people use speech may be less dependent on their gender and far more dependent on the community of practice (Cofp) in which they regularly participate (Wenger, 1998). This framework offers means of exploring how the relationship between doing leadership and gender as routinely negotiated through social practices by a student whose *raison d'être* as a group is centered around learning. Individual members can be "core" or "peripheral" depending on their status, and how they are well integrated within the community.

It has been demonstrated that effective speakers, both females and males, employ a wide range of socio-pragmatic strategies to enact power in work place interactions. Some of these are considered normatively masculine or "power-oriented" strategies such as issuing relatively "bald" directives, using controlling questions, assertive and confrontational speech styles by contesting the statements of others. Other strategies are deemed as more normatively feminine or "politeness-oriented" such as converging approval, using indirect, supportive, hesitant and collaborative speech style. Baxter (2003) lights that the examination criteria for oral conflate effective leadership with masculinity. Thus, the standards constituting effective speech reflect the masculine characteristics such as confidence and verbal bravado.

In scrutinizing the students' negotiation of authoritative positions through the use of effective speech, I aim to check whether females who attempt to claim and exercise power can be encountering a "double bind" (Holmes, 2006, p. 34) because power is a central component of leadership which is associated with masculinity which by definition opposes femininity.

Drawing on an ethnographic research study I conducted into the EFL and architecture classrooms, I will investigate how students construct their identities as authoritative speakers. There are four points to clear up how my choice of an ethnographic approach to conducting the classroom study has principles likely to be decidedly conductive to a feminist post-structuralist analysis of the data in the classroom study.

General Introduction

First, the epistemological basis of ethnography which often focuses the localized, microscopic, particular, context-bound features of given settings and cultures is intimately connected with tenets of post-structuralist theory. From an ethnographic perspective, the advantage of studying a single case such as "the classroom context" is that it allows for a richly detailed understanding of a particular group of subjects which seek to record the complexity, subtlety and diversity of discursive practices over a period of time. Secondly, combining both qualitative and quantitative techniques makes the ethnographic approach apt to feminist post-structuralist research. In this study, multiple methods are used, as an "explicative mosaic", to round up the divergent voices and complex interactions of my research participants: myself, the students of the research class and the assessors in different speech contexts.

First, observation and field-notes are employed to catch a generic, diachronic impression over ten months of verbal and non-verbal interactions of the class in a variety of speaking and listening activities. By gaining space to seek up diachronic impressions of the data, I was able to set down the ways in which students fluctuate in a continuously shifting positions within and across different speech activities and contexts. Secondly, video-recordings are adopted to gain a collection of insights into the verbal and non-verbal interactions in the classroom. Thirdly, audio-recordings were deployed for students' and assessors' interviews, as well as the teachers' meeting. This is beneficial for transcription purposes when a possible range of different and competing voices would be accurately reproduced.

The third correlation between ethnography and feminist post-structuralism is seen in the notion of reflexivity which becomes the key issue in drawing attention to the authorial power of the researcher over the participants, particularly in relations to decisions about the construction of the research process and the portray of the research accounts (Baxter, 2003). Being reflexive requires me to assure a certain level of honesty, openness and continuous self-criticism between me and my respondents. In other words, the participants are to be considered as research partners where no decision or choice was taken for granted, even though this would cost me a time-consuming hindrance upon the progress of data-collection.

Fourthly, ethnography's accentuation on the inseparability of the "participant-observer" from the research context is also linked with feminist post-structuralism's persistence on the intertextual, interactive and reflexive relationship between traditional dualism such as theory and

practice, male and female, or subjectivity and objectivity (ibid). In the EFL classroom, the role I initially find adequate to adopt most resembles Gold's (1958) second category of participant-as-observer where, as a teacher of the group under investigation, to be thoroughly integrated in the site which offers me a holistic insight into all aspects of the research context.

With regards to the architecture classroom, I choose the role of observer-as-participants. This was because, unlike my tie with teaching in the EFL classroom, I was not part of the architecture world and I had prior connection to this community of practice. In this case, I was aware that I was likely to be more of an observer than a participant according to Gold's (1958) typology for observer-as-participant.

On grounds of space, I focused on four students in the EFL classroom whom I have labelled (M_1, M_2) for males and (F_1, F_2) for females with a particular reference to other students. The research study took place within this classroom, whose English oral presentations' works I observed over a period of six months. The class of (second year of Master) comprised of 34 students was broadly set for the subject of presenting their research proposals for oral assessment. I foregrounded gender for scrutiny because the gist of research is to sketch a comparative analysis of the male / female oral interactions and their negotiation for "effective speech". What I will be seeking to do is to test whether female students are multiply located in discourse and not constituted as prey of males' dominance and the discourse of gender differentiation which may expose them to a possible exclusion by other peers. The two other teachers of the English department were thirstily exploring issues of the students' use of speech and the assessment interplay by participating as research partners. Overall, this investigation seeks to answer the following research questions :

-How do students construct their gender identities through discourse ?

-Concerning females who explicitly adopt leadership positions over others, are they simultaneously subject to a discourse of gender differentiation ?

-What constitutes effective speech according to different participants (Students and their teachers)?

They seemed to turn a blind eye to the gender issues of the research; they paved heed to the issue of public speaking which is an undervalued segment within the Master curriculum. Whilst

my pivotal focus was to gain broader understanding of the gender issues pertaining to students' ways of speaking in public contexts, the principle concern of my research partners was, understandably, a curricular one. The study of the architecture community examines a mixed-sex group of two males (Ma_1 and Ma_2) and three females (Fa_1, Fa_2 and Fa_3) out of 39 students in their second year of Master. My research took place over four months by attending their weekly workshops of six hours which constitute the fundamental part of the structural educational program. By analogy to the EFL classroom, the audio and video recordings of the presentations and discussions where followed by an assessment meeting where the research partners would have the opportunity to watch video-recordings of the oral performances and comment on students' performances and their own role within the research process. This is to apply the multiple-voiced, multifaceted perspective on the case-study. Aside from transcripts of talk which were got from a range of different discourses, polyphony or 'multiple voices' offers me a space in the analysis for the co-existence and juxtaposition of a plurality of voices and accounts to investigate a richer, more complex set of possible understandings and readings of the data; those of the students in the class, the teachers and my own observations.

An additional source of data is heteroglossia which is useful to describe the complexity of the participants' practices, highlighting the ways in which positions of power are continuously negotiated, contested and subverted. In this sense, students' positions in my study are never permanently a fixed "structure", as there is the possibility that both male and female speakers are frequently marginalized in the whole class discussion.

This dissertation comprises four chapters, beginning with an overview of the literature of gender and education. To grapple with the full range of issue with respect to the essentialist theories of gender and language, the first chapter is designated to provide a synoptic overview of works done in the arena of masculinities and femininities in the classroom with a particular focus on power and hegemonic relations. This chapter addresses gender differentiation theories and inequality in schools by virtue of male dominance of space and time. An extensive volume of the empirical research done in language and gender since the 1970's and 1980, in educational settings, demonstrate that male students occupy asymmetric amounts of teacher time and attention. Then, feminist post-structuralist researchers inverted the traditional view of gender as

"given" and naturalized in the classroom, and reinvigorated a supple understanding of how male/female students exhibit shifting power positions depending on the discursive context.

The second chapter outlines and discusses the researcher perspectives and the methodological approaches exerted in this study, specifically how the feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis offers a rigorous approach to analyze and interpret the fluctuating positions of students within any discursive context. I adopt the communities of practice as another framework for describing how students' gender identities are transformed as they negotiate different forms of femininity masculinity and gender relations.

The third chapter is devoted to how tracking data points and observation in the field work is used to highlight the particular process by which I came to identify four competing discourses in the EFL classroom (gender differentiation, leadership talk, collaborative talk and discourse approval), and five in the architecture classroom (double bind, masculinity and public speaking, teacher / peer approval, scientific and architecture and double voicing). My awareness of the significance of the interaction of certain discourses in the two classroom settings, was almost subconsciously upon the re-readings of my field-notes, as they were actively constructing and mediating classroom practices. This part will sketch the process by which my decision to adopt FPDA was not a preconceived plan; it was emanated ethnographically along the collecting data track.

The fourth chapter applies FPDA on the transcript material of the two communities which is elicited from the corpus of data. This analysis aims to analyze how the students' gender identities are constructed through discourse by foregrounding the quest of whether females are considered to be less "effective" than males when speaking in public settings.

There are two types of analysis: a denotative analysis which is deployed to give a concrete description of the verbal and non-verbal interactions of the participants, to produce a grained elaboration of the ways in which specific linguistic styles are negotiated through a series of turns in mixed-sex conversations. And a connotative analysis which is used to explain how competing discourses position students in multiple ways, and display how they gain or lose power within different contexts. This analysis requires identifying social and institutional discourses which emerge through conducting ethnographic observation of a given community of practice.

General Introduction

Chapter I: An Overview of the Literature of Gender Identities and Education.

I.1 Introduction:

Gender, language and education is a moot and miscellaneous arena in the sphere of sociolinguistics which has proliferated so greatly and rapidly in recent years. The explosive growth of this field means that each successive decade gets harder to sum up. One of the pivotal queries in sociolinguistics involves how languages are shaped and influenced by parameters such as education and gender, and this greatly touches the gist of this examination. It is an insight worth attending to even now, gendered social relations and the different ideologies of gender fluctuate in and out of people's practices and beliefs in learning. One central interest is how learners negotiate or even resist unfavourable identities imposed on them. We beckon that students' gender identities are socially constructed, and go far beyond the folk expectations of society.

To challenge the notion that males and females need to adopt distinct styles and modes of learning experiences and practices. Notwithstanding, we think that this chapter should take the onus to reveal a succinct overview of the main theories of gender and language, which tend to shape stereotyped gender behaviours. Prior tackling the social construction of gender identities within the education system, it fares better to allow space for the bustling concourse of voices and perspectives in the area of the essentialist interpretations of males and females, gender roles and norms in a given society. To achieve some balance between depth and breadth, I incorporate the gender ideologies and stereotypes that students have learned outside the educational world.

I.2. Inequality theories of language and education:

To grapple with the full range of issues of how education is gendered and how may gender inequality contradict with students' gender identities, we strive to direct a limelight on essentialist theories of gender and language taking into consideration the potential transform of these gender ideologies in the education regime.

I.3.1. Female Deficit Theory:

As its name indicates, the deficit theory considers women's modes of speaking as an essentially "deficient" version of men's language (Sadiqi, 2003: p, 4). The essentialist view was the bedrock of this theory concerning the relationship between gender and language. Along this line of thought, a host of essentialist theories in language and gender studies have so far discerned gender as a possession of a set of behaviours which is imposed by the speech community upon women and men as adhering to two different categories. It must be noted that speech community, as defined by Bloomfield is "*a group of people who interact by means of speech*" (1933, p. 42) (Quoted in Abdelhay, 2008, p. 24). Overall, the speech community framework states for the assumption that a group of people, mainly women and men, are likely to be confined to certain ambits of their speech community norms. If one tries to transgress those limits, they would be, most of the times, judged as aberrant.

Abdelhay (2008) states that " *essentialism gives legitimacy to both gender differences and gender dominance by virtue of biology, culture stereotypes or all together*" (p.21). According to the bifurcated essentialist view of gender and language, it is possible to state that gender can be seen from three eminent clusters of characteristics: innateness, strict binarism, and bipolarization. Gender was described as innate in the sense that biological endowments were innate; it was bipolar, mainly, because human beings belong to one of the two bipolar categories: male or female. (Sadiqi, 2003)

In the same vein of thought, one of the most pervasive characteristics of the essentialist model was bipolarization. The categories "male" and "female" were tacitly assumed to be homogeneous, opposite, rigid, invariable and strict complementary distribution (ibid). In tune with the essentialist model, the deficit theory of language and gender portrays women as deficient and excluded. It states that language ignores, deprecates women and defines them as inferior to men.

I.2.1 Lakoff's Model:

This American linguist Robin Lakoff fell within the deficit theory through publishing her pioneering work "Language and Women's Place" in 1973 as an article and in 1975 as a book. As reported by the history of gender and language studies, her book launched a new era in the arena of research as having the prime importance of inspiring academic curiosity in the conundrum field of research.

Female's linguistic behaviours of handling communication are often evaluated as handicapped, maladaptive, and needing remediation (Henley and Kramarae, 1991). Lakoff (1973) was the first feminist linguist who delineated the features of women's use of language and conversational rules in terms of their lexical selections and the syntactical formation of their utterances. It is, accordingly, possible to state that Lakoff's endeavour to lead a close scrutiny about women's modes of speaking is a robust genesis of the modern study of language and gender. Beyond this level, she claims that the speech patterns attributed to women are weak, frivolous and hesitant in comparison with men's, through the elaboration of a number of features that she believed were characteristics of " women's language". Lakoff (1975) tends to underpin reasons why, in her view, manifest women's language as less powerful and even deficient than men's linguistic features.

I.2.1.1 Lakoff's Women's Speech Features (1973, 1975):

I.2.1.1.1 Heavy Use of Tag Questions:

Lakoff (1975) portrays women as having been taught to employ language in ways that relegate them to subservient status in society. According to her hypothesis, the use of tag questions such as: "isn't it?" "don't we? "is, in point of fact, considered as an insignia of women's trivialized and uncertain speech. By "tag question", we mean the restating-in form of a short question- the previous spoken utterance. It can signal politeness, emphasis or irony, and it may suggest confidence or lack of it. In this respect, Lakoff argues that "*Women's Language shows up in all levels of the grammar of English*." (1975, p. 8). The use of "tag" question is a linguistic tactic that combines an assertion with a yes- or-no questions such as, "*The movie does not start at seven-thirty, doesn't it?*" (Hendricks and Oliver, 1999, p. 4). Such questions indicate that the speaker is sure enough about the answer to eschew asking for information, yet uncertain enough to require confirmation from the respondent. Along this line of thought, Lakoff implies that this

move, although it symbolizes a reluctance to create a conflict within discourse, can also hint the impression of powerlessness.

I.2.1.1.2 Question Intonation on Statements:

Lakoff (1973) maintains that women tend to end statements with the rising intonation which is a characteristic of questions rather than with the falling intonation which indicates assertions. By analogy to the effect of tag questions, the answer "Oh around six o'clock."-to the question "when will dinner be ready?"-, can be interpreted as a signal of hesitance and lack of confidence by diminishing the force of the statement.

According to the normativeness of the speech community model, adjectives such as relentless, tough and aggressive must be male referential. Notwithstanding, women are obliged, in many times, to accentuate their positions of prominence like being a teacher, a headmaster, and a political leader. By this token, Abdelhay's (2008) work demonstrates that the presence of authority in females' voices does not necessarily reveal authority.

I.2.1.1.3 "Weak" Directives:

According to Lakoff (1957), women tend to use requests rather than direct commands. Formality and the frequent use of polite forms by women can be well illustrated in framing directives "shut the door" as requests "would you mind shutting the door?". Requests, Lakoff argues, carry an authoritative tone than directives which have the imperative form. It seems that one can readily re-interpret "weak" directives as "polite" directives which signify that those who use them are more attuned to the social and linguistic requirements of fellow conversationalists than those who adopt more direct directives. Weak directives may, indeed, be indicative of uncertainty in some situations; they may indicate politeness in other settings and even hostility or distance in others (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998). By way of explanation, a speaker may abruptly commence by using ultra-polite language forms along a conversation with an intimate friend to exhibit anger.

I.2.2 The difference theory:

As it was exposed, Lakoff (1973-1975) argues that woman's language is inferior and uncertain to its opposite man's language. Men adopt a language style that implies powerfulness,

since it portrays certainty and sway. Lakoff's claims were based on her proper intuition rather than empirical data collection (Wilson,1996). Notwithstanding, her work grabbed much attention and stimulated considerable interest. Many studies were, therefore, conducted to find systematic evidence for her claims.

Despite the lack of empirical evidence, the accepted conclusions of Lakoff (1975) led to an emphasis on training women to remediate this suggested negative styles. It must be noted that the term style refers to "*the choice of certain linguistic features in place of others, the set of features, which are accepted as fully appropriate in one situation, may seem comic or distasteful if it occurs in another*" (Chapman, 1973, p.10) (Quoted in Abdelhay, 2008, p. 88). That is, the goal of this assertiveness training is to boost women to stop using inferior "women's language" and commence to use the superior "men's language" as an alternative mode of speaking.

Differences of language usually spread-head the explanation of gender enquiry, whether there is adherence to the voices that deprecate women and picture them as secondary to men, or not. Tannen (1990) explains gender difference-which may cause the communicative breakdown by calling attention to the significant role the process of socialization plays from the very early years of childhood. We can elucidate this by stating that the idea that *"girls and boys grow up being socialized so differently, and with different conversational expectations; that communication between them is like communication between two different cultures"* (Tannen, 1999, p. 12). In support of this, Tannen (1990) endorses the idea that women and men belong to two different subcultures. When members of different cultures engage in communication, they attempt to maintain and show their own assumptions and rules of conversations to understand the interaction.

As Tannen (1990) states, boys are instructed to cooperate with teammates for the sake of winning, whilst girls learn to cooperate with friends in order to build and maintain relationships. A host of the other differences are actively cultivated and learned in childhood, as well. As a result, the different standards and rules which are variably displayed by women and men might be quite confusing. Transmission of the norms is held among the family and the peer groups. Speaking about the family_ the primary social group consisting of parents and their offspring, we can notice that children (girls and boys) acquire from their early childhood how to interact socially. Most of the time, the parents reveal attempt to teach their children what is socially acceptable from what is unacceptable. For a start, they must probably be in a state of readiness for learning the norms and social ambits that should not be transgressed, just aiming at a strict

respect of the two different cultures girls and boys should belong to. Lest future social deviation, parents try to transmit the norms to their children and offer them different instructions divulging them what is inimical to his masculinity or to her femininity. In an endeavour to initiate a spot-on process of socialization, parents constantly order their female infant with instructions such as "Don't be tough" "speak politely" "don't speak harshly" and "behave in a courteous manner". Similarly, expression such as "don't cry" is often directed to a boy since a man is not supposed to cry or even to convey his innermost emotions and feelings. In addition to that, the peer group plays a key role as an important medium of social norms transmission and the child often feels necessity to adjust his peers. Whereas boys, for instance, speak more about cars, violence and sports, girls communicate about fashion, cosmetics and colors.

Not to violate the moral code of society, children are grown up with special teaching of what to be in the future. Through the family's instructions, parents stipulate a set of ambits not to be transgressed by children as to painstakingly perform their future social roles. On the whole, according to the essentialist view, subversions of the norms are *per se* a deviance usually met with rejection and severe sanction. It seems rational to think that women and men are taught from an early age how to interact differently.

On the whole, the "Two cultures" theory resides in the notion that men and women belong to two different cultures as if they are coming from two different worlds (Tannen, 1990). But how do those early socialization processes tell boys and girls about the secret of being men or women?

Plethoric attention has been directed towards the nature of the traditional female sex role, but little has been written about what men are supposed to be and do. (Young, 1999). Perhaps this is because scientists and researchers are ardent to dissect things that are seen as cumbersome. The traditional male sex role was enormously ignored by researchers because it was not, in a nutshell, seen as problematic. In the same vein, David & Brannon's (1976) canvass the major dimensions of this role. The male sex role is characterized, according to these authors, by four major themes, viz. "No Sissy stuff", "The Big wheel, "The Sturdy Oak" and "Give Em hell" are learned by boys and are reinforced throughout the different stages of life. For a start, what does the theme "No Sissy Stuff" mean? This role taboos effeminate, weak or cowardly traits for a boy or a man. It stresses, in particular, that they must refrain from expressing strong and warm feelings in anyway, especially via crying.

By analogy to many other cultures, the Algerian culture corroborates the necessity to teach boys at an early age-to be reluctant to cry. "Don't cry like girls" is a pervasive expression sent by a host of parents to their sons. To put it briefly, boys are taught to eschew the tendency to shed tears, alleging this as being peculiar to women, whilst crying is seen as unexpected and inadmissible by a man. "The big wheel" of male sex role requires that the man should strive to be respected and well-thought- of for successful achievement. Moreover, the "Sturdy Oak" theme demands that a man should be intrepid and seeks risky-undertaking adventures even accepting violence if necessary. Finally, the "Give 'Em hell!" theme requires being bold in taking risks and being aggressive. It reads that they should occasionally become a hostile bulwark. In one word, this theme states that calling a man "aggressive" is usually revered as a compliment.

1.2.3 The social power theory:

Mahony (1985) sustains that theories of gender oppressors delineate women's *status-quo* as the direct power relationship between males and females. Radical feminists concentrate basically on tackling how patriarchy scatters its web in the lab of society (ibid). Mahony's research findings report that boys tend to dominate girls in classrooms and show a great tendency to control them, and this is of the power boys possess to decrease girls' chances of success.

Men deliberate use of "aggressiveness" against an interlocutor in organizing the conversational flow may be interpreted as a prerogative of power as well (Maltz & Borker, 1982). As for the term "aggressiveness", we think that it is too strong. To put it mildly, it seems that the word "arrogance" might be more reasonable to be used concerning language usage. In *loci* of inequality, the one of lesser power brave not exhibit aggressiveness to the other, specifically unilaterally. Moreover, men tend to ignore and transgress basic conversational rules by their tendency to male abrupt and brusque topic shifts. Likewise, this may be seen as a privilege of power which is to define and restrain a situation. In the same vein of thought, men's tendency to tackle the mention of a problem as an opportunity to act as experts and provide a gamut of advices rather than showing sympathy-especially with women-or narrating their own problems and innermost emotions is, again a prerogative of power. From a plurality of sight lines, Bohn and Stutman (1983) found that men were also more likely to interrupt each other than women are. Men not only interrupt but are also vulnerable to other men's interruptions. The conversational rule among men reads "*I will*

interrupt you when I want because I know that you will do the same". The rule among women, on the other side, seems to be "*I won't interrupt you, so please don't interrupt me*". (Young, 1999, p.158). Obviously, these rules seem to crash when women and men talk with each other. More importantly, there are two social power-based explanations that have been pointed for differences in women's and men's speech in cross-sex conversation as Henley & Kramarae (1991: 45) put it:

Social power (a): this explanation reads that men's conversational dominance is analogous to their social/political dominance; men use their power as a vehicle to underpin the effectiveness of their speech. Maltz and Borker (1982) state that men enjoy power in society and also in conversation. Maltz and Borker (1982) state that norms of appropriate behaviour for women and men are to offer power and interactional control to men while keeping it from women (p.164). So far, we have not tried to define the term "power". In that, the concept of power refers to *"a whole series of particular mechanisms, definable and defined, that seem capable of inducing behaviours or discourses"* (Jager and Maier, 2009, p. 35). (See Wodak and Meyer, 2001). It must be noted that according to the theory of social power, women are unsuited to wield power over men. To be socially acceptable as women, they cannot, in the words of Maltz and Borker, "*exert control and must actually support men in their control*" (1982, p. 164).

Social power (b): According to this explanation, gender inequality enters the conversational flow through the mechanism of gender role training, which serves to obscure the issue of power. When men display power, they are not necessarily flouting power in a conscious manner, but merely "*reaping the rewards given them by the social system*" (ibid). This may be interpreted in light of the idea that the use of power by men is an unconscious echo of gender role prescriptions and expectations.

I.3 Early theories of students' identity development:

For a start, theories of college students' development did not base their perspectives on gender differences, but rather on the development process positioned equally on males and females. Identity is defined as "*The set of behavioral or personal characteristics by which an individual is recognizable as a member of a group. The distinct personality of an individual regarded as persisting entity; individuality*" (Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, 2011, p. 245).

Erickson (1968) interprets the formation of identity as an ongoing construction of the self based on the encircling experiences and influences. According to him, this stage constitutes the bedrock where both men and women commence the construction of their identities. The generic objective of this stage is to establish commitment both to the self and to relationship, with the surrounding people. Following this stage, Erickson sustains that social actors would be ready to negotiate and develop the coming links and authentic intimacy. According to him, the transition from one stage to the subsequent one will take place after confronting what he labeled "the crisis", the moment when individuals face a moral internal development. Thus, resolving this problem will open the door to standing at a next development stage.

I.3.1 Chickering's theory of identity development:

Drawing on the work of Erikson (1968), Chickering proceeded to propose a theorem of college student development. He intends his theory of seven vectors of development to elucidate that the stages which students follow are directional and that each appears to have a significant influence on the students as they accomplish it.

As based on mathematics, a vector refers to a quantity that is comprised of both magnitude and direction, and this is particularly how Chickering (1969) employs the term. He further elaborated the idea by claiming that the direction may be conveyed "*more appropriately by a special or by steps than by a straight line*" (p. 8). In the first two vectors (developing competence and managing emotions), students are likely to attain intellectual, practical, and miscellaneous interpersonal skills. These skills form the base from which individuals can develop a significant capacity to enrich a deeper understanding of differences, to amalgamate confidence with their relationships, and engage in a vital tolerance and acceptance of these disparities. By this token, development occurs through the ongoing process of development tasks that belong to each vector. Widic (1978) briefly delineates Chickering's adoption of the vectors as a concept:

The vectors specify in psychological terms the nature and range of those tasks. It follows that the vectors also define what the central concerns of the student will be, the tasks which will confront and tend to be sources of worry and preoccupation. Finally, each vector delineates changes in self-awareness, attitudes, and to skills which are manifestations of successful completion of that task of vector (p. 21).

Furthermore, the interpersonal relationships (which might be romantic) which represent the fourth vector are believed to be pivotal in the formation of Chickering's fourth vector "Establishing identity". Chickering (1969) endorses the line of thought which acknowledges that individuals have multiple identities (e.g. female African American). He sustains that a student who has accomplished this vector will develop tasks related to comfort with self along a wide range of dimensions, such as gender, social and cultural contexts. Thus, this will display self-acceptance, and an inevitable incorporation of internal and external perceptions of the self. (Chickering and Reisser, 1993). To nuance the picture, self-assurance will be blatant at the level of this vector with a particular physical and emotional comfort.

In the final two vectors, "Developing Purpose and Developing Integrity", students are much more likely to employ the skills and confidence attained in constructing their identities to back them as they strive to reach their objectives and relationships. Along these stages, students become more capable to use the obtainable confidence for the sake of integrating external influences, such as the family with their proper aims and goals.

More interestingly, Chickering and Reisser (1993) reckon that women direct tremendous importance on the sense of interdependence, which refers to the reliance on mutual support of others, more than the sense of autonomous behaviour which represents the so-called "independence". By way of contrast, males opt for developing independence prior to interdependence.

I.4.2 Baxter Magolda's epistemological reflection model:

Baxter Magolda (1992) identifies gender related patterns in ways of knowing, yet draws an important distinction between specifically made a female development patterns. For both women and men, knowledge is constructed by the individual in societal and relational contexts. Familial beliefs and values put their tracks to make the development transactional and relative. Baxter Magolda (1992) supposes that students demonstrate a decline in 'Absolute Knowing' (a dualistic perspective of truth) during their college learning, and an attainment in 'Transitional and Independent Knowledge' (which considers the contextual nature of truth). Absolute knowers perceive a blatant distinction between the true and false. At the level of this phase, knowers concentrate on receiving knowledge from the authority figure (like the teacher) and mastering it. Whilst men opt to practice mastery behaviour which is resisting authority, women play the role of learners who listen and record information (Baxter Magolda, 1992).

Contrary to absolute knowers, transitional knowers reveal an enormous belief in the uncertainty of truth. These knowers go far beyond receiving and memorizing knowledge. They intend to negotiate the construction knowledge at this stage; students will display interpersonal knowing when they gain the opportunity to learn information from debate or challenge with others.

Albeit both men and women demonstrate a very active approach to attaining knowledge in these stages, Baxter Magolda (1992) claims that 'Interpersonal Knowing' is more peculiar to women than men. Overall, her findings report more similarities than differences among women and men. Thus, her theory posits a limelight on students as learners who seek for knowledge in general. This theory can be adopted to stress the importance and the value of the students' unearthing their own voices.

I.4 Gender differences and inequality in schools:

I.4.1 Male domination of space and time:

In their landmark research, Spender (1982) and Stanworth (1983) demonstrate that school boys gained far greater proportions of teachers' time and attention than did girls in the same classes. The work of Francis (2000), *inter alia,* champions these findings and reveals that girls are quieter, and their talk was less often heard than boys' talk. Male domination of classroom talks, such as frequently interrupting and talking over girls has an impact on teachers' perceptions of pupils. On this subject, Stanworth (1983) pinpoints that teachers could better recall the names and characters of their male pupils than those of females, and tend to perceive boys as having greater potential. Francis (1998) finds that femininity appraised by primary school girls, which stipulates being sensible and selfless, leads them to take a walk and leave behind power to the boys to achieve preferential access to school resources.

Dixon (1997) elucidates this line of reasoning by stating that the highlighted freedom of movement that males have in the outside world, is thrown back on their capability to dominate space in academic arenas where moving about is permitted and advocated, such as workshops and laboratories. Besides, boys attempt to adopt this assumed dominance to take the onus of scarce items of equipment. Randall (1987) asserts, in this respect, that in the craft, design and technology lessons he observes, boys are likely to monopolize the "action zone" around the teacher during initial practical demonstrations. This affords them with a good view of what they

are deemed to do, and a more potential eye contact with the teacher as well, something which is of paramount importance in gaining teacher's attention and space/time to speak in class (Swann and Graddol, 1995). Moreover, boys are particularly dominant in high-tech areas; for example, they have more or less taken over extra-curricular computer clubs by promoting a games-playing culture in which girls feel uncomfortable (Mac An Ghaill, 1994a, 1994 b).

I.4.2 Male domination of classroom talk:

An extensive volume of the empirical research on language and gender conducted since the 1970s and 1980s, in educational and other settings, has been interested to locate differences between female and male language users. Pertaining to education, many studies of classroom talk demonstrate that male students occupy asymmetric amounts of teacher time and attention. A spacious room is being allocated in the ring for gender differences in international style, and the major focus is on male students' attempt to dominate class discussion. In elaborating the difference in men and women's speech, Holmes (1994) argues:

> *Women appear cooperative, facilitative participants, demonstrating in a variety of ways their concern for their conversational patterns, while men tend to dominate the talking time, interrupt more often than women, and focus on the content of the interaction and the task in hand, at the expense of attention to their addressees … The strategies which typically characterize female interaction can be described as "talk-support" strategies, while at least some of those which characterize male talk function as "talk-inhibition" strategies. In the classroom these have obvious implications for learning opportunities. In the second language classroom they can either promote or restrict language learning opportunities.*

<p align="right">(Holmes, 1994, p. 156).</p>

Under such a scenario, Holmes (1994) is concerned with "improving the lot" of female students in ELT (English language teaching) classrooms. Her observations are, however, conforming with evidence of male dominance of talk, and (consequent) disadvantages for female speakers in many subject areas. In a similar vein, Holmes argues that women and girls are getting less than their fair share of opportunities to practice using English (1994, p. 157). At a more profound level, classroom talk has become increasingly cardinal to the teaching and learning process, of course with the growth in importance of student-centered learning.

Assuming that language is a form of social practice (Swann, 1992), the manners in which it is systematized and employed in school both reflect and prepare students for gender inequalities in language used in the lab of society. Along akin lines, Swann and Graddol (1994) highlight that male domination usually takes the lion's share in mixed six talk among adults, both in the senses that men talk more, and in the sense that men tend to hold sway over topics, interrupt women more than they are interrupted by other women. Apart from that, the manipulation of various aggressive tactics is adopted to get the floor. They agree that: *"The inequality of talk among adults is not an incidental feature of women's reluctance to talk. It rather results from a complex social process which seems to endow men with greater power than women in social interaction."* (Swann and Graddol, 1994, p. 153). Besides the extra attention swayed to boys and the more dynamic talk between teachers and boys, girls' relative silence appears to inhabit somewhere.

In her examination of silence patterns among female students reflected on "chatting female" stereotype, Spender (1980) reports that both males and females bring to the classroom an understanding that the boys should "have the floor" and females should be submissive and attentive listeners. Within educational institutions, Spender (1980) believes that girls are made aware that there is an uneven evaluation of their talk in comparison with boys. Notwithstanding, it is imperative to recognize this research emerges from a dominance perspective which tends to romanticize the view that females are being dominated by oppressive males.

Swann and Graddol (1994) argue that the teacher gazes, when talking to the class and particularly when formulating a question, at the boys than the girls, seem to invite them to speak. They assume that this is partly because experienced class teachers will look through the class all the time for the sake of checking for emerging discipline troubles; the more generally strident comportment of boys means that the teacher will tend to look in their direction more of the time: "*In several interchanges we found that teacher's gaze drawn towards the boys by muttering, which ensured that a boy was invited to respond."* (Swann and Graddol, 1994, p. 160).

Holmes (1994) recommends tackling the language behaviour of male students more directly, highlighting their "inadequacies" and teaching them to be "good conversationalists". This entails that she is interested in the fact that male students' behaviour makes up a problem, although one that adversely affects female students.

I.4.3 Linguistic space and silence in the classroom:

   Also of concern are issues of the connection with gender, speech and silence. This was first termed by Mahony (1985) as the distribution of "linguistic spaces" in the classroom. Mahony considers teachers' ignorance of girls normal as well as the adherence to boys' domination of classroom talk and actual physical space. Some would propose that the teacher demands such vital participation or engagement of the boys. This evidence of gendered language tendencies concerning the engagement of linguistic space in classrooms may be drawn from both the particular features of the language used (specific patterns and habits of belonging) as well as the amount or proportion of talk-time in teacher led lessons.

Lave and Wenger (1991) point out that individuals follow implicit rules in order to belong to their classroom community. Paechter (1998) regards teacher's tendencies to get boys to assert to their authority as one reason they permit boys more control over physical space, teacher attention and lesson content. Yet, with the conspicuous focus on the significance of student centered learning, classroom talk is increasingly viewed as central to the learning process. A plethora of international research has exposed that the skill to speak effectively in public awards social and / or professional prestige and that this usually offered to the males in any given society (Baxter, 2003; Holmes, 1998, Tannen, 1993).

   Speaking up in the classroom is not only restricted to the opportunity to engage with ideas or with language, it signifies important social power and legitimacy as well. Failing to speak aloud may result in lower confidence and having less recognition or involvement of girls when participating. In this respect, Swann (1992) puts forward that the student who quickly respond to the teacher, by raising a hand or making an eye contact with the teacher, are usually males.

   By being involved in such a form of privileged interaction, teachers may distance those who may by less competitive besides escalating the opportunities of those who already take precedence in claiming the floor (often the boys). Albeit the fact that Lakoff (1975) does not put her fingers on silence in female speech in her early work, it has become significant in her recent surveys. Silence is the absence of verbal articulation, and therefore, it is potentially intricate to identify in transcription work. It is still argued that silence is ambiguous and it cannot be caught by an interpretation of context. Lakoff (1975) admits that not all female silence is necessarily

explained by teacher power or more male power, but she recommends that teachers should reckon this possibility. There are particularly two of Lakoff's women's speech patterns that assign to silence; lack of interruption and lack of topic control. Lakoff (1975) sustains that if one is interrupted, then in a sense, one is silenced by being stopped. It seems that girls will stop speaking when disrupted in that to adjust with the gender role of silence, owing to the stereotype that they are more acceptable when being quiet. Some evidence reports that a sense of feeling silenced or unheard are hurting and frustrating experiences to many girls in schools. Whether intentionally or not, being ignored when speaking equates with being told that you know nothing or have nothing to say worth hearing.

Zimmerman and West (1975) report that the length of silence by both male and female participants when in mixed-sex settings is three times as long as in single- sex settings, but only after a considerable length of silence. This downtime of even minimal responses on the part of boys or men was thought to signify a lack of significance to a female speaker. Above all, it seems imperative to note that minimal responses are verbal and non-verbal indicators of the individuals' co-participation in the discourse. There are sometimes referred to as back-channel responses (Woods, 1988) such as "hummm", "uhhum". Fishman (1983) points out that if the silent listener is male, his silence is interpreted by researchers as his lack of interest; while if the silent listener is a female, it seems to indicate her lack of significance. Conversational control was and perhaps is still often settled by a non-response which is frequent in classrooms: "*when a female student raises her hand and is recognized, her comment often receives no response*" (Lakoff, 1975, p. 28). In her examination of silence and the societal perception of female "verbosity", Coates (1993) cites evidence that found men appear to take longer to delineate a picture (average 19 minutes) than women (average 03 minutes); and that males occupy four times the linguistic space in most conversations. Coates (1993) implies that the myth of females as talkative leads to certain expectations concerning who has the privilege to talk in classrooms, too. She is in line with Spender's (1980) hypothesis that female speech is seen as empty chatters, while what men utter is considered as crucial.

I.4 .4 Deficit models and the schooling of girls:

Teachers reinforce, in some case, the stereotypes about students' skills and opportunities. Common gendered teacher behaviours embrace what researchers have labelled the "hidden" curriculum: the unvoiced messages students receive from the daily practices, routines and

behaviours that take place in the classroom. Levine (2004) uploads that the hidden curriculum of the school's climate refers to things not deliberately taught or instituted, but which are the cumulative result of many unconscious or unexamined behaviours that add to a tangible style or atmosphere. A good example in this regard is in elementary schools when teachers assign girls the task of recording on the board during a demonstration lesson in science, whilst boys are required to assemble or inaugurate the accompanying materials. Unfortunately, this fine discrepancy can lead to gender differentiated discourses.

As a further case in point, when teachers focus a microscope, for example, for the female students who look for help but encourage male students to figure it out for themselves. At this level, we can suppose that the hidden curriculum is implemented (Koch, 1996). In brief, the hidden curriculum encloses the unstated lessons that students learn in schools. It is the running implications through which teachers advertise behavioural norms and individual status in the school culture and the socialization process that cues children into their place in the hierarchy of large society (Orenstein, 1995).

As a further case in point, when teachers focus a microscope, for example, for the female students who look for help but encourage male students to figure it out for themselves. At this level, we can suppose that the hidden curriculum is implemented (Koch, 1996). In brief, the hidden curriculum encloses the unstated lessons that students learn in schools. It is the running implications through which teachers advertise behavioural norms and individual status in the school culture and the socialization process that cues children into their place in the hierarchy of large society (Orenstein, 1995).

As long as the subject of education is male and because females are constructed as the other to the male, it is not accidental that females are seen as deficient in educational contexts. To nuance the picture, Peters (1965) refers to males and to "The educated man" throughout his paper when highlighting the potential of positioning girls and women as other in education. Walden and Walkerdine (1985) argue that girls are encouraged to be rule-following in dissecting primary mathematics, and that this assists them well at this level. Once they get to secondary school, their learned reluctance to "break set" or challenge procedures implies that they become called as lacking in "real understanding". They further set forth that their girls' lack of intelligence is asserted by their reluctance to challenge the teachers' ideas. On the other hand,

boys are ascribed to high intelligence on the basis of their level of activity, rather than on the evidence of their attainment.

While the deficit model dwells on girls' inabilities to perform as well as boys on various standardized tests throughout the pre-college experience, early research in gender equity tends to revile this deficit model because it proposed that there was something wrong with the girls that required to be fixed or rectified. These impelled researchers tend to delve into learning environment for girls and boys while they were participating in the same classroom with the same teacher. (Sadker and Sadker, 1994). They report that in predominantly white middle-class classrooms, the problems for the girls were not internal but set in the external learning environment. Early studies also demonstrate that classroom practices routinely lean towards the academic development of boys and interventions were fostered to offer more equitable learning environment for girls. (ibid). While these interventions served girls to achieve in areas in which they were putting off, this deficit model reasons that girls would be successful if they just acquire the same strength as boys. Drawing on this finely grained evidence, we can recognize that ceding the floor to invite each gender to adopt behaviours or practices seems to help cultivating strengths usually veiled by socialization practices and stereotyping. What is of particular interest here is that research reveals that when high school physics teachers provide appropriate attention to gender issues in their classrooms, achievement and engagement enhance all their students with a particular reference to female ones.

I.4.5. Girls' resistance to male domination:

There is no gainsay that boy's domination of school space and time does not receive resistance by girls. Girls employ certain strategies to assert their own power and challenge their deprecation. This is particularly palpable at infant and nursery level, where girls have been found to adopt fantasy play turning around domestic situations in an attempt to secure control over boys. On the ground that young children presume that mothers are very powerful in the domestic arena, girls are capable to get hands on power by acting the role of mothers in fantasy play (Peachter, 1998). On this point, the survey of Walkerdine (1990) paints a more vivid picture about how a group of nursery school children have been equipped for a game of doctors and nurses, where revealing how power differential evokes by asking the nurses to help the doctors. Striving to describe how gender / power relation is subverted by one of the girls, Walkerdine

(1990) elucidates how Jane turns this into a situation where she is to make cups of tea for the patients:

> *She goes into the Wendy House and has a domestic conversation with another girl, then the following sequence ensues: (One of the doctors arrives in the Wendy House and Jane says to him: Jane: You gotta go quickly. Derek: Why?*
>
> *Jane: 'Cos you're going to work. Derek: But I'm being a doctor. Jane: Well, you've got to go to work, doctor, 'cos you've got to get to hospital and so do I. You don't like cabbage, do you? [He shakes his head] ... Well you haven't got cabbage then. I'm goin' to hospital. If you tidy up this room make sure and tell me. Jane has managed to convert the play situation from one in which she is powerless and subservient nurse to the only one in which she has power over the doctor. By controlling his domestic life, by becoming the controlling women in the home.*   (pp. 10-11)

In this site, female resistance to male power and dominion is enacted through playing out of the traditional female roles. However, this may not be possible if social actors run away from childhood period. Quite generally, teachers' differential expectations of male/female behaviours can often imply that resistance is highly priced to girls in a number of ways. (Paechter, 1998). In tune with this, Robinson (1992) finds that teachers often see girls as submissive, passive and controllable. Paechter (1998) assumes that different expectations of comportment, and the teacher' focus on certain types of disruption, can have contradictory consequences for girls. In counterpoint to the expectation of quiet girls, they may be enabled to engage in a form of quiet resistance or rebellion. In other words, girls who are prepared to comply outwardly with the expected classroom roles of passivity can employ this as a cover for quiet resistance. Said differently, girls who may adopt the qualm to speak in the classroom, do not participate in class activities and discussions, and "shut down" without being disruptive. The passivity may be considered as a form of resistance. Mahony (1985) postulates that silence can be a possibility for resistance. Silence, then, should not be understood unidimensionally as the condition of submissiveness, or disempowerment by "being silenced". Rather, it carries the potential for strength and resistance.

Transgressing the expected behaviours for girls who display overt challenges, particularly to masculine authority, are, nevertheless, viewed by teachers as discipline problems. (Paechter, 1998). Scholars who have undertaken this thread of research (Robinson, 1992 and Kessler et al. 1985) consider competitiveness and boisterousness as deviant when practiced by girls, albeit the fact that they are ignored and sometimes praised when coming from boys. To elaborate more, assertive girls in the classroom may be seen as problematic. Their deviance is, furthermore, described in particular pejorative terms. Crozier and Anstiss (1995) report that whilst boys are usually described with regard to their behaviour and academic performance in meetings to tackle students' issues, girls are likely to be described in terms of their appearance and sexuality.

I.5 Gender stereotype development:

In order to be directly affected by the arousal of a gender stereotype, the individual needs to be in the know that a stereotype exists (Paechter, 1998). We reckon that female deficit theory has an indelible mark on the stereotypes as socially shared conceptions of women and men, and how these cultural conceptions give birth to gender-related expectations and ideas which, in turn, press and even coerce people into gendered roles and norms because: *"Gender stereotypes represent a form of cultural knowledge to which everyone has repeatedly been exposed, this should have been relatively easy. Even if you personally do not agree with a particular stereotype ... stereotypes tend to "stick" to your head."* (Rudman & Glick, 2008, p. 81)

Since we are dealing with the implications of the deficit theory, we are going to focus our attention, principally, on those which express dwell on the view that women are underprivileged and co-opted, and that men are the only ones that possess a *savoir-faire* and aplomb. As a matter of fact, popular stereotypes usually picture women as trivial and deprived; they overtly see that men are more serious and possess higher value than women. A stereotype is used, as a term, by linguists to refer to the different beliefs about language, for example as Abdelhay (2008, p. 46) states, the belief that women's gossip has, for a long time, been a favourable burning issue for linguists and non-linguists.

Gender stereotypes are intimately related with and corroborate "*gender ideologies to which women should accommodate their behaviour. They function to sustain hegemonic male dominance and female subordination*" (ibid). Moreover, Mill (2003) avers that stereotypes may represent negative affects to both women and men, since they are comprised of notions which

may totally differ from our own recognition and perception of ourselves. Femininity means, for the most part, being physically attractive, adore children, and care about them and home making. These features are claimed to be prototypically allotted to women as a biological part of being female, whilst "*one of the defining features of masculinity is seen to be aggression, which is often considered to a biological part of being male (caused by testosterone) ... Masculinity is often described in terms of battle and warfare"* (Mills, 2003, p. 188).

Overall, stereotypes begin to be formed at a very early age. The majority of children's first stereotypes are based on gender, as if this is one of the social categories that they persistently recognize. Moreover, gender stereotypes in Moroccan culture may be divided into two types: explicit and implicit. Explicit stereotypes bring emphasis to the ambivalent attitudes of society in general, and men in particular, towards women (ibid). Men manifest, for instance, positive attitudes towards mothers and "good" wives, but negative attitudes towards "a female leader" because the latter may jeopardize their *status-quo*. Explicit stereotypes underpin the intimate relationship between women and their homes and "fight", in the words of Sadiqi (2003), any participation of women in the public sphere such as the street.

As for implicit stereotypes, they constitute the number of internalized attitudes and beliefs about gender as a social category, which are the result of the unconscious socialization and the cumulativeness of daily behaviour, at home, at school, at work, etc. That is to say, Moroccan women are implicitly assumed to be weak public leaders, poor interlocutors in religious and serious matters, etc. (Sadiqi, 2003). Such implicit stereotypes "*operate in a way which often escapes conscious control and end up by constituting some kind of symbolic law for the member of the community*" (Sadiqi, 2003, p.124). Compared to explicit stereotypes, implicit ones are particularly rigid and pernicious.

On the subject of gender stereotypes about math and science, it is not completely clear-cut when or how children develop such specific stereotypes, yet there is an impetus to suspect that girls are *au courant* with some academic stereotype from early elementary school. (Shih et al., 1999). In some cases, gender stereotypes maintain boys' talents in mathematics and science, and offer girls an advantage in verbal domains. (Plante, Theoret, and Eizner Favreau, 2009). In most cases, gender stereotypes promote misconceptions with regard to females' abilities in science. Eagly (1987) sustains that role theory elucidates that gender stereotypes of women arise from socially constructed patterns of behaviour for women rather than from the intrinsic capacities of women.

Gender stereotypes of women in science, then, did not emanate from women's abilities in science compared to men's abilities in science. Alternately, the general gender stereotypes arose from socially constructed gender roles for women. Above all, we should point out that role theory serves as an explanation of the influence of gender expectations that may constrain behaviour and choices.

Role theory expounds that socially constructed patterns of behaviour are the echo of social norms and gendered expectations for women (Eagly, 1987). Besides, Wigfield and Eccles (2001) illustrate how the development of competence beliefs during early adolescence stands on "*The cultural milieu of gender role stereotypes, cultural stereotypes of subject matter and occupational characteristics*" (p. 93). They note that the beliefs of "the socializer" (p. 95) are linked, for girls, to gendered competence beliefs and to their achievement related experiences. Gender stereotypes of women in science are, thus, woven into the social context prior girls' development of their self-competence beliefs.

I.5.1. Stereotype threat theory:

Broadly speaking, stereotype threat theory, first described by Claude Steele in 1992, theorizes that societal stereotypes influence identity and performance of individual members of stigmatized groups. As reported by this theory, stereotype theory occurs when members of negatively stereotyped groups, such as women in math and science, encounter the plausibility of inadvertently reinforcing the stereotype about their group. Steele and Aronson (1995) claim that the potentiality of confirming a negative stereotype can be self-threatening and can evoke a disruptive concern that can interfere with performance in the stereotyped domain. Most importantly, this concern is most tending to be invoked among individuals who care about the domain and find it to be self-relevant. An often cited example, in this case, is the fact that it is women who are talented and identified with math and science are the most likely to exhibit stereotype threat effects. On the whole, Steele (1997) defines stereotype threat as:

> *The social-psychological threat that arises when a situation or doing something for which a negative stereotype applies. The predicament threatens one with being negatively stereotyped, with being judged or treated stereotypically, or with the prospect of conforming to the stereotype threat. Called stereotype threat, it is a situational threat – a threat in the air – that in general form, can affect members of any group about whom a negative stereotype exists (e.g. skateboarders, older*

> *adults, white men, gang members). Where bad stereotypes about these groups apply, members of those groups can fear being reduced to that stereotype. And for those who identify with the domain to which the stereotype is relevant, this predicament can be self-threatening.* (Steele, 1997, p. 614).

Another research surveying the influence of stereotype threat reports that female engineering students who interact with men, behaving in a sexist manner before talking an engineering test, perform more poorly than women displayed to a non sexist male prior to the test. This was, in fact, found for engineering tests but not for English tests, which is an area not expected to be influenced by stereotype threat. (Logel et al., 2009).

I .6 Theorizing gender:

I.6.1 Defining gender:

As the essentialist model strives to state, a wide range of stereotypes are blatantly androcentric. By androcentric, is meant to be the notion that man is the foremost part which dominates and exhibits sovereignty upon women. This concept is attested by the fact that a host of gender stereotypes portray the female sex in a negative manner. Males are, in general, the core power from which females derive their stamina to carry on their lives, as is defined by Dealey and Ward (2009, p.127): "*Andocentric is the view that male sex is primary and the female secondary in the organic scheme, that all things center, as it were, about necessary in carrying out the scheme, is only the means of continuing the life of the globe, but is otherwise and important accessory and incidental factor in*".

We have revealed the two term "sex" and "gender" throughout the preceding pages, yet without providing a clear-cut definition of the two concepts till now. Above all, the simplest explanation of gender is "*a social instruction organized around biological sex. Individuals are born male or female, but they acquire over time a gender identity that is what it means to be male or female*" (Gregson, 1997) (Quoted in Buckingham, 2000, p.53).

From this vantage point, we should note that by sex, is meant to be the biological traits of the human being, whether male or female. Meanwhile, "Gender" as a term differs from "sex" in being about the socially and psychologically expected characteristics rather than the biological organs provided by nature. Meanwhile, "Gender" as a term differs from "sex" in being about the socially and psychologically expected characteristics rather than the biological organs provided by nature. Assuming for the moment, that we are in front of a biological make up that is either

male or female; we should normally recognize them from their physiological and anatomical cues. It would be easier to identify the female from her pregnancy, for instance and the male from his moustache or beard (see Montgomery, 2008, p. 174). If we are, however, to identify their social roles and behaviours performed in their daily interactions, we must spring gender differences into considerations.

As it will be demonstrated in the subsequent chapter, gender has begun, in recent years, to be theorized in more productive ways. Researchers have shifted the way from a reliance on binary oppositions and generalization about the behaviour of all men and women, to a more detailed and modified statements about particular groups of women or men in certain circumstances, who reaffirm, negotiate identities in the face of the parameter of legitimate or socially sanctioned behaviours. (Coates and Cameron, 1989). Apart from this, hot criticism has been directed to the perspective which holds that gender language is intertwined in male dominance and female subordination.

There is no gain say, the concept of identity plays a pivotal role in reasoning the burning issue of language and gender. However, the explanations provided by the essentialists have been proved as ineffective and unsatisfactory (Abdelhay 2008 ; Bucholtz, 1999 ; Eckert and Mc Connell-Ginet, 1992). The notion of essential identities of women or men has long given serious critical remarks. Linguists have tried to promulgate the notion and the study of the multiplicity of gender identities beyond the dual fixed binary opposition of sexes. They reckon the idea of a wide range of different masculinities and femininities as : "*ongoing processes dependent upon systematic restatement, which is sometimes referred to as doing identity*" (Johnson, 1997 : 22) (Quoted in Abdelhay, 2008, p. 88). The terms "masculinity" and "femininity" are tremendously used in the scrutiny of male/female construction of gendered identities. Thus, it would be worthwhile to reveal the general interpretations of these terms.

In lieu of seeing gender as a possession or set of behaviours which is imposed upon the individual by society, as a host of essentialists theorists have previously done. (see Butler, 1990 for a critical overview), many feminists have now taken up the cudgels to view gender as something which is performed or enacted. Aligning with Butler's (1990) notion of performativity, gender is constructed through the repetition of gendered acts and swerves according to the context. Drawing on Butler's work, Eckert and McConnell – Ginet (2003) define gender in the following way:

> *Gender is not a part of one's essence, what one is, but an achievement, what one does. Gender is a set of practices through which people construct and claim identities, not simply a system of categorizing people. And gender practices are not only about establishing identities, but also about managing social relations.*

(Eckert and McConnell – Ginet, 2003, p. 305).

Rather than deeming gender as a variable which requires to be considered in isolation, we should see it as reciprocating influence with the wider society. Also, Wodak (1997) holds out for the notion of gender, arguing that we should regard the relation between gender and society as a dialectal one:

> *By only changing the organizational systems, no changes in gender roles will be achieved, and vice versa; by changing gender roles, no significant change of the structures would be achieved. The processes would have to be seen in a dialectal way: both would change each other and would have to be changed themselves (attitudes towards women and men, as well as organizational structures.*

(Wodak, 1997, p. 108).

This significant inquiry into the notion of gender does not mean that the category of gender is empty and that there is no room for gender differences. Freed (1996) argues that, despite the fact that the category "women" is not one which is homogenous, that does not obviate people classifying you as women and making judgments about you with regard to that classification.

I .6.2. Gender order:

The concept of "gender order", which was initially enunciated by the Australian social historian Matthews (1984), and further developed and elaborated by Connell (1987) and other social researchers. It refers to a historically constructed pattern of power relations between women and men. In her investigations of the historical construction of femininity, Matthews (1984) introduces the term "gender order" to refer to the systematic way in which societies turn scarcely differentiated babies into social men and women and order the patterns of relationships between and among them (3-39). Similarly, Matthews (1984) points that "*we can talk of an economic order as being the ordering of people's relationships to the means of production and consumption*" (p. 14). As this analogy postulates, there are other orderings which dichotomize the gender order and deflect and modify it.

In counterpoint to Matthew's concept which was exclusively concerned with women and femininity, Connell (1987) has explicitly linked the concept of gender order to other concepts, such as "gender regime", "gender practice" and the concept of "gender order" which is extremely adopted in the international literature on men and masculinities. Principally, it has been very influential in studies tackling the relationship between masculinities and sport. It was also used in studies that focus on masculinities and violence, masculinities and globalization and gender relations in the workplace. As it is revealed in contemporary literature, the concept of gender orders embodies an anti-essentialist, constructionist, and historic manner of thinking that distinguishes it from similar concepts such as "patriarchy" and "sex/gender system". Connell (1995) sustains that masculinities are not only differentiated; they rest against one another in relations of power. Thus, continued gender inequality is perpetuated by the internal relations of masculinities and femininities.

I.6.3 Gender regime:

Connell (1990) defines the term "gender regime" as "*the historically produced state of play in gender relations within an institution which can be analyzed by taking a structural inventory*" (p. 523). By this token, the gender regime is related to the gender order. At an institutional level, Taylor (2004) states that we can discern gendered patterns in everyday social practices in gender structured settings such as schools, families, and workplaces. To understand how gender influences education, one should recognize how gender is conceptualized. Connell (2002) provides a model that provides understanding of the gender regimes played out in schools. Gender stratification provides knowledge as to how men and women are assigned preconceived roles. Connell (1987, p. 120) highlights that a gender regime can be defined as gender-based institutionalized power relations which posit men and women to different social tasks and designate specific social institutions. As we can speak of gender regimes of the family, schools, and corporations, gender regimes are framed based upon the interplay between relations of power, production, emotional, and have symbolic dimensions. On the whole, the gender regimes of particular institutions tally with society's overall gender orders, but this is not always the case. As a matter of fact, "Crisis tendencies", which thwart gender regimes, can serve as catalysts that engender change in a society's gender order.

Connell (2000) points out that "crisis tendencies" can be identified in the dimensions of gender relations. Connell's (2002) model of gender regimes plays a key role in understanding the

restraints that are socially imposed on boys and girls in mixed sex groups. Connell (2002) employs four dimensions to detail gender in organizations. These dimensions enclose: 1) Power relations that pertain to authority and supervisors in schools; 2) the production relation that bears on the division of labour in a school. It is directly related to the curriculum particularly subject choice and the role of education in the labour market; 3) The feeling rules which are considered as the patterns of emotion; 4) Symbolic relations that concern culture in schools, essentially norms and beliefs about gender.

Gender relations in schools are produced by gender disparities but can also give birth to the construction of new gender regimes. (Kessler, Ashenden and Connell, 1985). These gender inequalities set girls and boys into hierarchies that influence unequal learning outcomes. Locating girls and boys into hierarchies to reinforce power differences in what makes feminists describe gender as a social construct rather that a biological process. (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Albeit the attempts to offer equity in co-educational schooling, boys and girls hardly receive identical education due to the gender regime that exists in mixed sex environments. (Connell, 1996). Apple (1993) demonstrates that females are internationally less portrayed in the field of mathematics and science.

Connell (2002) recaps that the gender regime is a regular set of arrangements about gender, that is manifested, for instance, in the education workforce from elementary school to higher education. Considering that gender regime is established in the everyday life of organization (Connell, 2002), the gender regime of an institution is prone to change. To elucidate, such change in determined by whether or not the gender regime of the institution can independently deviate from the broader setting of gender order that forms / influences it. Owning to the correlation of the gender regime and the gender order, we may argue that simple changes within the gender regime of an institution, such as a school or university, will be a starting point and may give birth to a wave of change in the gender order of the whole society.

I.6.4. Gender and power:

Connell (2002) puts forth that gender is "*The structure of social relations that centers on the reproductive arena, and the set of practices that bring reproductive distinctions between bodies into social processes*" (p. 10). He suggests that gender power is a systematic form of power that is both dynamic and historically (re) produced. This power could be institutional or discursive in

which femininities and masculinities are designated as hegemonic or subordinated. Despite of the tangible possibility of subordinated masculinities, the "most masculine" is always perceived as the most hegemonic, both in the sense of being the norm and more forceful itself (Connell, 2002). Connell (1987) highlights that "hegemonic masculinity" is the dominion of a certain form of masculinity that is "*embedded in religious doctrine and practice, mass media content, wage structures, the design of housing, welfare / taxation policies, and so forth*" (p. 184). Connell's notion of hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation both to subordinated masculinities and to women. It is the predominant form of masculinity to which other kinds of masculinity are subordinated, not phased out and it offers the primary basis for relationships among men. Force and its threat may be employed to help maintain hegemonic masculinity, the idealized form of masculinity in any culture, which is celebrated, glorified and honoured. This exaltation "*stabilizes a structure of dominance and oppression in the gender order as a whole*" (Connell, 1990, p. 94).

Despite of the potential of individuals' move between different identities instead of being stuck with one, feminine power has been usually considered as non-existent. This may stereotypically imply that women in power and sway must be masculine, and men lacking ascendancy must be feminine. It seems imperative to note that power should be examined in the form of a claim, as something which circulates (Foucault, 1980). Furthermore, he states that:

> *Power is employed and exercised through a net like*
> *organization and not only do individuals circulate through its*
> *threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously*
> *undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its*
> *inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of*
> *its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of*
> *power, not its point of application.*

(Foucault, 1980, p. 98).

Thus, all social practices are shaped by power, embracing, at least according a wave of thinking, the reproduction of traditional gender arrangements.

I.6.4.1 Patriarchy

In an attempt to sketch the structure of gender relation in society, it is significant to recognize what creates the differences in power between a group of people who suppress and who are being oppressed. Specifically, I will lightly refer to feminist critical theory on the grounds that each theory enormously concentrates on power relations (Lazar, 2005a), and how this is useful to elaborate how such gendered power relations are systematically produced and reproduced to uphold gendered social practice. Critical feminist theory directs a limelight on the relations of power that systematically induce a privileged social group (men) and underprivileged, excluded and disempowered group (women). (ibid).

Generally speaking, societies deem masculinity as superior to femininity for the sake of maintaining unequal gender relations which suppress women. (Connell, 1995). Men are, thereupon, the premier and principle heirs of the "patriarchal dividend" where they build up material health and social power (Connell, 2009, p. 142). The bulk of the gendered power structure is generally the connection of authority with masculinity (Connell, 1987). The term "patriarchy", which is also referred to as "gender order" at the structural level (Connell, 1987, p. 91), is employed to determine such male dominant power that acts over dependent female and male members in a family. That concept of "patriarchy" has found its way, through several feminist interventions, into the sociology of education. Radical feminists pitch into issues that sociologists have traditionally moved away from, such as the analysis of symbolic forms of male power in school curriculum, texts and school subjects (Spender, 1980), and sexual dominance of boys in classrooms (Mahony, 1985). Meanwhile, radical feminism boosts women to address the notion of liberation through the collective critique of male domination in education. (Thompson, 1983). Not to leave this statement obscure, we should reveal that radical feminism mainly reiterates that women, as a social group, are oppressed by men, and that patriarchy is the system of male power and such patriarchal power normally operates through "*The routine functions of the institutions*" (Connell, 2002, p. 145) where male dominance is embedded.

Wearing (1996) postulates that the term "patriarchy is" *an umbrella to signify male dominance at all levels of society* "(p. 23). Although male dominance may take a common form, as it is listed to gender as practice, power is never absolute but fluid and multidirectional. In this sense, individuals shift between experiencing various forms of powerfulness and powerlessness (Weedon, 1996).

I.6.4.2 Hegemony in gender relations:

In a patriarchal social order, the gendered relationship of dominance by men over women is systematized and maintained, because such a gender ideology is extolled by community consensus. (Lazar, 2005b). Moreover, Fairclough (2001b) asserts that hegemonic struggle penetrates all domains of social life, including cultural, economic power which is, hence, a natural process in the struggle for dominance.

Such conflicts over power which is determined by assertion rather than coercion are known as hegemony, as labeled by Fairclough (2000b). Hegemony, as Connell (1987) highlights, is "*a social ascendancy achieved in a play of social forces that extends beyond contexts of brute force into the organization of private life and cultural processes*". (p. 184). Power relations operate as a social structure, as a pattern of restraint on social practice because social practice is stratified by a gender order, which is regulated by the so-called "power". (ibid). Extending Gramscis' notion, Connell (1987) expounds in the definition of hegemony as follows:

> *Ascendancy achieved within a balance of forces, that is, a state of play, other patterns and groups are subordinated rather than eliminated. If we do not recognize this it would be impossible to account for the everyday contestation that actually occurs in social life, let alone for historical changes in definition of gender patterns on the grand scale.*
>
> (Connell, 1987, p. 184)

Such hegemonic discourse is greatly accepted in society more generally. A key question that can be raised in this context is how do men negotiate masculinity in a patriarchal culture? Connell (1995) devises the construct of hegemonic masculinity to decipher the relationship between patriarchy and privilege, and how men make sense of masculinity in distinct social contexts. Expounding the notion of multiple masculinities and femininity to fathom the relations between and among masculinities and femininities in patriarchal societies, Connell (1987) defines hegemonic masculinity as the idealized pattern of masculinity in patriarchal societies. In Connell's definition, hegemonic masculinity is "*The pattern of practice (i.e., things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allow men's dominance over women to continue*" (Connell and Masserschmidt, 2005, p. 832). The subordination of women, and the celebration of competitiveness and toughness are decisive features of hegemonic masculinity. (Connell, 2000).

Notwithstanding, hegemony does not, by its very nature, mean violence. It is the ascendancy accomplished through culture, institutions and persuasion. (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). In counterpoint to this, emphasized femininity endorses sociability and acceptance of marriage and child care. (Connell, 1987). Additionally, Foucault (1978) sustains that *"Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations."* (Foucault, 1978, p. 94). Rather than considering power as something that is wielded only by the dominant social group, it fares better to assume that it is something that can be utilized by everyone.

By analogy to the wider society, power relations are often gendered in schools, but distinct forms of power can be gendered in different ways. Among teachers, for instance, men are more likely than women to occupy positions of structural power, as heads of department or head teachers. On the other hand, women may potentially hold the ability to resist this by employing interpersonal alliances to assemble networks of group power which can overburden it for those in powerful roles to take the entire advantage of their position (Paechter and Head, 1995). Likewise, boys' domination of classroom space is prone to challenge, and it does not remain beyond question. It has to be constantly fought for, with stereotypical standards of masculinity and femininity invoked in line of this appropriation of resources. These standards are *per se* open to be resisted and contested by both genders (Paechter, 1998).

I.6.5. Gender as habitus:

Above all, Bourdieu (1984) tends to privilege male and masculine experience. Silva (2005) corroborates this claim by reporting how Bourdieu (1991) perceives "The social origin" of his respondents in his distinction study, by inquiring about the educational qualifying and occupation of the fathers and grandfathers in preference of the women in families. In masculine domination, Bourdieu (2001) attempts to rectify these shortcomings and has a hand in a considerable reassessment of the pertinence of his concepts for the analysis of gender. Within this work, Bourdieu (2001) duplicates the primitive argument he made in distinction but explicitly approaches gender as a principle organizational feature in social space.

"Masculinity Domination" is congruent with Bourdieu's other works on the symbolic symmetry and social practice; in that the habitus plays a pivotal role. Bourdieu (2001) asserts that the gendered habitus is constructed "relationally"; in that it is "*socially differentiated from*

the opposite gender" (p. 24 – 4). By way of explanation, the female habitus is constructed in cultural contraposition to the female habitus. Bourdieu (2001) ascertains that is a relative consistency in what is regarded masculine and what is considered feminine. The gendered dispositions often appear to be relatively fixed on the grounds that the habitus assures consistency in practice over time. Overall, the concept of habitus helps us understand the gender constructions which are regulated by men's and women's social practices in each society.

Principally, habitus designates gender norms and folk expectations. Bourdieu (2001) claims that gender habitus has traditionally regulated the lives of men and women to secure cohesion and compliance to gender expectations and norms. Originally speaking, Bourdieu conceived habitus in terms of social class, but later extended his concept to gender. Habitus is ascribed to the way social actors, belonging to the same segment of society, perceive the world, think and act. As a matter of fact, habitus does not predetermine individual behaviours; it regulates and controls it.

I.7 The binary nature of gender identity: An essentialist perspective:

Gender was traditionally assumed to be based on a bipolar, mandatory system that ascribes social characteristics to sexed anatomy (Hausman, 2001). In agreement with essentialism, those born males are supposed to act masculine and be attracted to women, while those born female are required to act feminine and be attracted to men. Connell (2002) asserts that society takes the onus to employ various methods such as legal, religious, and cultural practices to corroborate adherence to these gender roles.

Building on this line of thinking, gender is perceived as being only two categories, male and female, that are biologically determined from birth. In other words, gender is represented as difference; gender categories are usually being treated as binary, fixed and static. In fact, feminist theorists used the term "gender" in the 1960s and 1970s to refer to the construction of the categories "masculine" and "feminine" in society (Sadiqi, 2003).

This preoccupation with difference reinforces stereotypes and shores up essentialism in gender perception, and this may effectively undermine the emancipatory crux of feminism. Overall, essentialism presupposes that gender identities are unchangeable. Gender identities are, therefore, perceived as the echo of fixed underlying factors. As a result, biology becomes the key element for explaining differences in male and female behaviours, attitudes and speaking styles.

Chapter I: An Overview of the Literature of Gender Identities and Education

Garfinkal (1967) postulates that since the two categories of 'male and female' are exclusively considered as being determined from birth, this gendered binary socialization is viewed as being "natural". It is thus not questioned and no "choice" is required. Besides confining the role of males and females to procreation (Connell, 2002), essentialism also underpins the traditional gender role schema. Women will, therefore, take care of the children and men will be the "breadwinners". Albeit the fact that it may display the way of looking at gender roles, Connell (2002) maps out the historical roots of gender roles and they can change to cater to the needs of the culture and, in some contexts, could be conceptualized as being "situational".

Moodie (1994) elucidates this type of situational gender role when talking about the "men in the mines". Men would do housework, while off in the mines, and the women would practice masculine functions needed to maintain the household whilst men were away. Central to the essentialist line of reasoning is the assumption that there are only two genders, and that individuals possess either a masculine or a feminine gender identity. Davies (1989) elaborates that *"Far from 'sex' naturally giving rise to gendered practices, it would seem that the possession of a particular set of genitals obliges the possessor to achieve the ways of being what appear to be implicated in the particular set of genitals they happen to have".* (p. 237).

By and large, gender identities and differences between women and men are seen as the result of fixed underlying factors. Biology, therefore, represents the crucial source for explaining differences in male and female behaviour, attitudes, and manners of reasoning. It is worth noting that fixed binary conception of gender identity has been argued to be inadequate and ineffective (Abdelhay, 2008; Butcholtz, 1999).

Linguists commence to celebrate the study of the multiplicity of gender identities beyond the static binary opposition of sexes. Against gender binarism, it is argued that there is no necessary relation between gender and biological sex. In this case, women may espouse elements of masculinity to meet the needs of the context without being judged as aberrant. Rather than considering masculine authority and feminine subservience, critical attention has shifted to emphasis from gender as a given stable entity, to gendering as a practice. (Butler, 1990).

I.8. Language and social cognition: Representations of gender in language and interaction

A crucial assumption made by psychologists taking a socio-cognitive approach to gender identity is that language is both an avenue for expressing gender identity and a reflection of it. The idea that language holds a representation of social identity drove much early social cognitive research or gender (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 2008). The fundamental question was about whether speech is reflected on gender identity, then to what extent can a speaker's gender identity be exactly determined by listeners? An interviewed interest has been with how much gender differences in speech and beliefs about gender differences mould evaluations of speakers. Since the 1970s, definitive answers, in research, to these inquiries have not been reported owing to the fact that the eminence of gender identity in speech and communication fluctuates depending on the conversational context. (ibid). Social identity theory and communication accommodation theory provide two salient frameworks for elucidating the subtleties of context for the expression of gender identity in language and speech.

Adopting an experimental approach, Smith (1985) investigates whether speech based attributions of masculinity and femininity is the very picture of speakers' self-assessed masculinity and femininity. Speakers' gender identities were assessed via their endorsement on times asking about sex stereotypes.

A speaker of each sex was selected with a relatively masculine identity, a relatively feminine identity, an androgynous identity (i.e. they advocated both masculine and feminine characteristics as being like them) and an undifferentiated identity. (i.e. they had no truck with both masculine and feminine characteristics as being like them). The results report a high level of correspondence between listeners' perceptions of the speakers' gender identities and speakers' self-ratings of masculinity and femininity. As a further experimental twist, Smith (1985) investigates whether listeners' gender identities would affect their ratings. The findings indicate that the stronger the gender identity of the listener judges the findings, the more likely are to polarize the differences between women and men speakers and overemphasize the similarities among some gender speakers.

In corroborating the view that gender identity is an essential (internal) aspect of an individual's psychology, Cutler and Scott (1990) explore the influence of speaker's gender on listener's judgments of speakers' verbosity. In this research, the social categories of "men" and "women" were being employed as a proxy for gender identity. This study exhibits that people

reproduce cultural beliefs about gender and speech in experimental situations when asked to provide plain, fixed judgments.

Given that speakers' gender identity and gender stereotype about speech affect how other speakers are perceived and assessed, a persistent question is how much we evaluate women's and men's speech based on actual differences in linguistic styles, as opposed to stereotypes with regard to the way women and men talk. In an endeavour to resolve the relative significance of stereotypes about speech and actual sex differences, Laurence, Stucky, and Hopper (1990) spread out to test what they labelled the sex stereotype hypothesis and the sex dialect hypothesis. The sex stereotype hypothesis argues that speaker's gender alone sets off differential evaluative responses in listeners. In contrast, the sex dialect hypothesis puts forward that distinct evaluation of men and women are the result of the differences in their speech patterns. The results do not endorse either hypothesis. Rather, the findings demonstrate that the listener-judges are influenced by both original and attributed speaker gender. Besides, the variation of these influences depends on the particular conversational segment. The impact of gender differences in speech styles and gender stereotypes may be fluctuating and transitory. (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 2008). There is, therefore, a need for descriptive research on how speakers produce and align to social identities such as age, gender and social class in interactions.

I.8.1 Gender and Social identity theory:

Social identity theory highlights that the ways people think and behave depend partly on the social groups they belong to. Social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel, 1981) is one of the most influential contemporary theories that emphasize the importance of social identities and their impact on language use and interaction. At the heart of social identity theory is the view that individuals can perceive their social world in terms of two groups: in-group and out-group. An "in-group" refers to the group that the individual feels he/she belongs to, and an "out-group" are groups that the individual does not belong to. (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). By social identity, Tajfel and Turner (1979) refer to those aspects of our self-concept that are evolved from our knowledge and feeling of group memberships that we share with some and not with others.

A crucial aspect of this theory is that it recognizes that different social groups vary in terms of the power and status that they have in society, a recognition that is paramount to a comprehensive understanding of women and men as social groups. The underlying assumption

of SIT is that people go all out to view themselves in a favourable way. They do this by making social comparisons in order to evaluate the attitudes and capacities of people who share, or don't share the social group membership. If a group to which an individual belongs has a low social status they may attempt to overcome any sense of inferiority emanating from that group membership through a number of identity maintenance mechanisms. (Weatherall, 2002). A potential strategy, in this case, is to leave the group that has low social status, and this is an individual strategy. If social mobility is not possible and group membership is fixed, other strategies may be adopted to obtain more positive self-esteem. These incorporate:

> *Social creativity, or finding new dimension of comparison*
> *where one's own group comes out better (e.g. using nurturance*
> *or people – centeredness as a key dimension, rather than*
> *leadership-, and social competition, or entering into social or*
> *political conflict to gain more status for the group (e.g. joining*
> *the feminist movement).*

(Holmes and Meyerhoff, 2008, p. 491).

Furthermore, social identity theory has been influential in sociolinguistic accounts of language variation. As a case in point and in terms of gender and language, Coates (1989) postulates that an assimilation strategy is a pervasive identity maintenance tactic being employed by women to reinforce their social identity. The work of Williams and Gill's (1978) initiates a considerable criticism about the legitimacy of dealing with women as a single, coherent social group. The heterogeneous nature of what it means to be a woman or a man is also a burden for research based on essentialist perspectives about gender identity and its relationship to language. Albeit of the limitations of SIT for understanding women's identities, it continues to be adopted, particularly in sociolinguistics, as a framework for exploring the relationship between language and identity. (Weatherall, 2002).

I.9 Critics of essentialist perspectives of males' / females' identities:

The last three decades have provided a bustling concourse of voices and perspectives striving to offer a thorough explanation of the distinct linguistic practices between women and men. The most salient studies of that period of investigation highlight the differences perceived in the speech of women and men, for the most part, in the spheres of linguistic politeness, women hesitance versus men directness, the picture of women as "chatterboxes" versus the

delineation of men as robust "silent creatures" and, of course, all those linguistic aspects which portray women as linguistically deficient and men as more efficient. (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 85). This view preserves the idea that yields legitimacy to male dominance and female subordination. Following the essentialist character of the speech community, one may easily acknowledge that the speech community is split into fixed binary oppositions, viz. Groups of social actors which are blatantly underprivileged or deprived and the other group would be, of course, the powerful one.

Despite of the miscellaneous utterances and linguistics styles that can be performed by women and men, alignment towards the essentialist perspectives would shrink the multiple and fluid gendered identities that display masculinity or femininity. Above all, thinking about gender identity is far more than a simple female or male. Gender identity casts "*a net far wider than the biological features, including activities and interests, personal and social attributes, social relationship, communication styles, and values*" (Deaux, 2001, p. 1065).

In this respect, a girl's gender identity might embrace playing with dolls, being encouraged to adore children and take care of them, and looking pretty. Whereas, a boy's gender identity might encompass special accentuation on self-reliance, reluctance to cry, and displaying autonomous and strength, particularly in competitive realms. It would be, then, possible to state that one of the most eminent problems with the speech community model is the reduction of gender identity to a position in the social structure. (Weatherall, 2002, p. 134). So, being a "woman" or being a "man" is treated as a social address. A great number of gender researchers have been striving to explore the research avenue of how women and men come to construct their gendered identities.

Their keen of interest has also touched the flaws of the speech community model in providing a spot-on explanation of how speakers use language to shape masculinities and femininities to construct what has been called "gendered identities". Hymes (1972, p. 273) criticizes those linguists as adopting a "Garden of Eden" view of language which serves to present an ideal speaker-a passive and unmotivated cognitive mechanism, not a person in the large social world. The concept of identity plays a significant role in reasoning the burning issue of language and gender. However, the explanations provided by the essentialists have been proved as ineffective and unsatisfactory (Abdelhay 2008; Bucholtz, 1999; Eckert and Me Connell-Ginet, 1992). The notion of essential identities of women or men has long given serious

critical remarks. Linguists have tried to promulgate the notion and the study of the multiplicity of gender identities beyond the dual fixed binary opposition of sexes. They postulate the idea of a wide range of different masculinities and femininities as: "*ongoing processes dependent upon systematic restatement, which is sometimes referred to as doing identity*" (Johnson, 1997, p. 22) (Quoted in Abdelhay, 2008, p. 88). The terms "masculinity" and "femininity" are tremendously used in the scrutiny of male/female construction of gendered identities. Thus, it would be worthwhile to reveal the general interpretations of these terms.

To be masculine is to be strong, ambitious, successful, rational, and emotionally controlled (Wood, 2000). In general, the "real man" who can successfully show his masculinity must follow and exercise the four themes provided by David and Robert Brannon (1976). Femininity means, principally, being physically attractive, sleek, emotionally expressive, having low and smooth voice, and concerned with people and relationships (Wood, 2000). By this token, a "real woman" still looks good, adores children, and cares about them and home making. Speakers would cull cornucopia of suitable linguistic behaviours that are apt, of course, to be displayed in certain communities of practices. This is why the speech community perspective is seen as a barrier to the possible subtle and flexible variations of language.

I.10 Feminist Post-structuralism: An alternative approach to female student identity development in education.

The decades devoted to tackle female students' identity development investigate the deep effect the social relationships drawn on framing and forming identity. Gilligan (1982), for instance, reports that women define themselves on the basis of their relationships with others and within the context of intimate relationships. She is more concerned with the line of reasoning which reads that men usually represent the basic background of the normative behaviour and development, pulling women away to appear underrepresented, immature and co-opted in some cases. In a similar view, Belenky et al. (1986) propose five epistemological perspectives viz., silence, received knowledge, subjective knowledge, procedural knowledge, and constructed knowledge, which have an intimate relation with patterns of family interactions during the years of childhood. By way of explanation, the first perspective of silence denotes an automatic and unthinking submissiveness which indicate powerlessness and of being the recipient of the external dominion and authority. Females experiencing this perspective are often underprivileged

in different ways, either socially, educationally, or economically. In the next perspective, women are learning about truth by listening from others while they are still silent and callow. Meanwhile, it is believed that truth is handled by an external sway which cannot belong to the women deeming her as unsuited to wield power in order to be able to create knowledge.

Women who have the perspective of "Subjective Knowledge" recognize that they possess some power to create truth. This perspective tends to develop when a woman encounters the fiasco of an authority figure. She starts to believe that truth may be inconsistent for some people and in differential contexts, and that this is generally created by society. In the subsequent perspective, "Procedural Knowledge", two different types of knowing "separate and connected" go in tension. For more details, separate knowers attempt to reach an objective pursuit for truth by *par excellence* adopting critical thinking skills and objective reasoning. Connected knowers do not actually encounter arduousness to objectify their proper perspectives and they are more likely to expect what they are learning from other individuals as transmitted via a subjective lens of those speakers.

The final perspective of this theory "Constructed Knowledge", which is mainly the most convoluted stage, is characterized by the ability to fuse both the objective and subjective into personal truth. From Belenky's lens, women who sense up this perspective are capable to thoroughly listen to others without being deprived from their self-confidence and own sense of self. Moreover, Josselson (1987) adopts the model of Erickson (1968) to suggest that the pivotal site for identity construction and development among women arise in relationships with family and the miscellaneous contacts with others. This finding enormously contrasts with what has been reported for men; who have been revealed to develop individual identity as based on autonomy, independence and separation.

By this token, counting the relationships as the focal point for the development of female student identity assumes a fixed and universal build-up for all women. Thus, the flexible constructions of identity and the multiplicity of experience and intersections of class and race have been greatly overlooked. In an attempt to yield an alternative perspective of female identity development, we tend to render a feminist post-structural framework to identity which maintains that identity as flexible and contextually akin.

The mid to late 1980s represented a watershed and a transformative period in the study of gender and education. Feminist post-structuralism settles on the assumption that gender is socially constructed in a society that systematically and historically plot women in oppressive positions. Not only women, men are restricted by the system the privileges strict patriarchy and stereotypical notion of masculinity. By and large, modernist feminist perspectives in education could be regarded as rationalistic explanation which elucidated the crucial premises of the construction of gender identity in modernity besides determining the genesis of gender disparity. (Dillabough and Arnot, 2002). The multiplicity of women's identities can be associated with race, socioeconomic class, and religion that affect their identity development. In time with the contest against essentialism in "education feminism", a more elicit thread of research interest has been directed to consider the multiple forms of gender identities in the education context. Butler's (1990) analysis of "sexed identity" in school performance may display one of the different forms of gender constructions.

Moreover, in the arena of sociolinguistics, a growing interest has been proliferated to emphasize on taking into account the fluid, locally situated and socially constructed aspects that construct identity. Obviously, focusing on the social and cultural considerations is crucial for thinking about the multiplicity of manners that can be adopted to construct the gendered identity. In support of this, gender can be elaborated in terms of drawing a link between identity and cultural expectations deeming behaviour as "a performance". Butler (1990) extends De Beauvoir's renowned line of thinking that "*one is not born, but rather becomes, a women*" (1949, p. 281) to propose that "a woman" is something we "do" rather than something we "are". This insight dovetails with Butler's (1990) notion that gendered identity is performative not a performance, since the latter pre-exists the performer, and her claims tend to eschew presupposing the presence of a subject or an actor who is doing that performance. For Butler (1990), gender comes into being through performance. Accordingly, one's identity is an ensemble of a variety of body habits, clothes, gendered attributes a so on, when the individual can fluctuate between male and female identities. The word 'performance' was used to challenge the notion of a fixed identity and to demonstrate the oppressive assumptions upon which such notions were based.

Butler (1990) maintains that there is no essential masculinity or femininity. Instead, we tend to "perform" our subjectivities employing stylized and repeated acts of speech and gesture that form the delusion of a fixed gendered self. Butler's (1990) notion of gender performativity

creates essential ramifications for the prevailing conceptions of performance in the period of early feminism. Put differently, the supple monitoring of roles and the enactment of self-transformation in performance is likely to pave the way to the potential challenge of the imposed and stabilizing gender roles.

Drawing on Foucault's (1981) framework, Butler (1990) argues that education can play a potent role in the transformations of patriarchal and heterosexual power, to create novel forms of agency putting no sex outside of the circle of culture. We can consider gender as a " *'corporeal style', an 'act', as it was, which is both intentional and 'performative' suggesting a dramatic and contingent construction of meaning*" (Butler, 1990, p. 139). She takes apart the earliest feminist notions that the construction of a gendered identity is directly related to an already sexed body. In Butler's view, the self represents a "discursive effect", and it does not necessarily rely on our sexed bodies. In support of this, Butler (1990) elucidates that "*The gendered body is performative which suggests that there is no ontological status apart from the various acts that constitute its reality*". (p. 136). Gender, therefore, hangs its natural form through repetitive performances, which she labels "performativity". Within the emergent tradition of feminist post structuralism, a thread of identity research has been proliferating in recent years to be devoted to scrutinize the issues in which educational discourses lead to myriad forms of masculinity and femininity in schools.

This research will highlight how "education feminism" intends to address the fluctuation in social/cultural theory rooted from post structural thinking, particularly with regard to shifting gender identities. This shift could symbolize the turning point from the sociology of women's education with political and pedagogical concerns to the construction of gender identities and new gender theories of education. One of the most crucial theories drawn upon to argue the uniform lens of perceiving gender has been feminist post structuralism. The latter deviates from the other modernist feminisms by its emphasis on the view that gender identity is not a coherent or abiding narrative to be recognized in any ultimate poststructuralists who opt for adopting terms such as "discourse", "deconstruction", "subjectivity" and "regimes of truth" to tackle the gendered nature of educational language. The gist behind this is to exhibit the cultural elements of educational life such as teacher's talk, peer culture and school text as discourses. This will champion the insight that the discourses are embedded in language, not in the rigid social expectations, shaping masculinity and femininity. In support of this, Davies (1989) claims that "*In learning the discursive practices of their society, children learn that they must be socially*

identifiable as (either male or female). Positioning oneself as male or female is done through discursive practices and through the subject positioning which are available within those (linguistic) practices. " (P.1-2).

Feminist post-structuralism elaborates that women construct their identities inasmuch as the social norms of gender are conveyed in language (Weedon, 1997). Overall, language can be assessed as contextually bound. In some cases, identity development is touched by particular contexts which in turn change gender messages. As a case in point, male students seem to be twice as likely as female students to take part and participate in the classroom community. (Sadker and Sadker, 1994), and teachers are often more likely to interrupt female students (Hall and Sandler, 1982). By this token, females' identities as college students are constructed by silencing them in the classroom. Davies' investigation in Australian primary schools was one of the first to report how young children construct their gender identities through discourse and discursive practices. This approach enabled her to dismantle the simplistic sex/gender binary of "male/masculinity" and "female/femininity" and elaborate how children negotiate a wide range of multiple masculinities and femininities. Ultimately, the rigorous male/female dualism is simultaneously produced and reproduced.

Feminist post-structuralism dwells in the line of thought that identity is not singular. A female college student, for instance, can have a bundle of multiple identities, relating to her gender, race and class. Interestingly, identities such as socioeconomic class and race intersect rather than demonstrating a separation. As a case in point, a female student may simultaneously exhibit her ethnicity and sexuality to foreground her membership as bisexual and transgender students of colour. In a similar vein, female college students negotiate multiple identities while in college that are sometimes related to their involvement in campus activities and students' organizations such as sororities, social clubs, sports and other academic organizations. Where conflicts appear and these identities are threatened, female students are found to encounter particular psychological problems that are accompanied by physical symptoms (Rozin, Bauer and Catanese, 2003). For example, women whose identity is intimately correlated to a specific sport which stresses the bodies, they may suffer from eating disorders (ibid) in believing that there is a close relationship between body shape and athletics. As a result, female students may exhibit identity conflicts and negative effects as they are succumbing to the ideals of femininity of groups such as some sororities.

Moreover, engineering is traditionally a masculinity domain where traditional notions of gender identities persist. Female students are, therefore caught up in conflicting demands which require their response. (Talbot, 2010) Accordingly, if female students in engineering continue to engage in heterosexual social relationships and succeed in their studies, they need to behave in a stereotypically "feminine" manners, and to assert themselves via competitive behaviours which are believed to be "masculine". In her study of female engineering students' patterns of speech, Bergvall (1996) maintains that melding masculine and feminine behaviours can be interpreted in terms of gender as performative, while she stipulates that the performance framework is not based on dichotomous differences expected under polarized, categorical roles of feminine and masculine, but on the fluid enactment of gender roles in specific social situations. (Bergvall, 1996). Conspicuously, female engineering students create particular gender identities by responding to the conflicting pressures. This will align with the pivotal tenets of feminist post structuralism which calls for the shifting of identities with distinct social structures.

I.11 The social constructionist model: an alternative approach to male student identity development

The early research conducted in men and masculinity directed much focus on investigating male "sex roles" and strived to draw an empirical link between what they believed to be crucial traits of masculinity to men's biological and cognitive compositions (Connell, 1995). The sex role paradigm stipulates that men's violence, sexual harassment, competitiveness is culturally associated with masculinity by virtue of natural, biological and physical traits. This paradigm discards the "Complex social meanings" that are linked to masculinity and relating social processes by which these meanings are negotiated, produced and reinforced. As a result, this approach confronts a hot criticism by feminist researchers (Gilligan, 1982), and this was corroborated afterwards by scholars of men and masculinity studies. (Connell, 1987; Ferguson, 2001). Their studies constitute the foundation of the social constructionist model which endorses the notion that masculinity is influenced by different factors and are developed and learned in social institutions while interacting with other social agents. Along this line of reasoning, Kimmel and Messner (2007) report that "*In contemporary united states, masculinity is constructed differently by class culture, by race and ethnicity and age*" (p. xxii). What we can glean from this assumption is that masculinity is not single and universal, but rather a bundle of norms and principles that govern gendered practices for males in particular contexts. For this

very reason, the word of "masculinities" is usually employed by men's studies scholars instead of the singular form "masculinity".

Research that acknowledges the social construction of masculinity stresses the ways in which gender identities proliferate by manners of socializing practices. By socializing practices, Connel (1987) and Kimmel and Messner (2007) intend to refer to the primary means by which boys develop and learn during the early stages of gender identity. Socializing practices come onto play within normative social structures such as school environments, sports and popular cultures and more importantly, the family. Dwelling in these structures, boys tend to learn at the early years that they are required to be physically potent, tough, aggressive and homophobic (Whitson, 1990). Kimmel (1994) does not refer the definition of "homophobic" to the traditional sense which reads that it is the fear or hatred of homosexuals. Instead, he writes: "*we are afraid of other men … Homophobic is the fear that other men will unmask us, that we are not real men*" (p. 131).

To scrutinize the nuances of the gendered identity, some researchers (eg. Butler, 1990; Cameron, 1997) opt to consider the manners in which gender identity is constructed in interconnection with the "individuals" other identities. Scholars, championing this line of thought, argue that relying solely on sex as fixed and prior category, often times, pulls to a superficial recognition of the sociolinguistic phenomena.

Research done in the area of men's identity development adopts social psychological approach blended with other relevant disciplines to challenge the previous lens of education to men and masculinity. By this token, Davis (2002) sustains that by analogy to femininity, masculinity is a construct of our culture and society despite of the uneven ways of communicating practices of resistance and the construction of identity.

From Davis's (2002) analysis, the significance of self-expression, codes of communication caveats, fear of femininity in identity expression, focusing about being deprived from masculinity and sense of challenge are deemed to be five themes which may encompass common threads to challenge men's sense of self. One particularly crucial finding across this thread of research is the obstacles that men encounter in balancing their internal world with the external notions of identity and the expectations about the identity which is ascribed to them by others (O'Neil, 1981; Davis, 2002).

In an endeavour to explore and understand the process of which male students perceive themselves as men, Edwards (2007) proposes a grounded theory of men's gender identity development. In his qualitative study of ten college men at an East Coast research university, Edwards (2007) reports that males are constantly negotiating their gender identity in relation to society's expectations. To make the picture more vivid, men engage in the process of taking the onus to wear a ready-made mask that displayed being a man as society stipulates and expects, and they are likely to refrain from any flaw which may fracture the expectation principles and they do not meet masculinity boundaries. The Harper et al. (2005) model rests on the basis that the men's socialization prior to college that rewards tough behaviours, tends to be reinforced by the gender norms of the college. In this sense, O'Neil (1981) postulates that the students' masculine identities may be challenged as a result of gender role conflict. Thus, the fear of femininity seems to be reduplicated following the failures that male students may encounter in the classroom.

I.11.1 Masculinities and laddish behaviour in classrooms:

A range of empirical studies throughout the school system from pre-school to upper-secondary level demonstrate the fundamental influence of the male peer group and its echo on boy's educational behaviours and achievement (Ashley and Lee, 2003). Connell (2003) claims that adolescent boys extremely regulate each other's masculinity in terms of dominance-driven heterosexual male norms. In the sense, the so-called "laddish behaviour" can be considered as one of displayed practices of dominance-led behaviour which is adopted in an attempt to either eschew the deriving reactions on those who attend the academic work within particular male peer group, or to hide real academic challenges (Connell, 2005).

An insight worth attending to even now, the term "laddish" was traditionally associated with young men and boys, and has gradually taken on a particular connotation about being "one of the lads" (Francis, 1999). "Laddish" behaviours in the classroom trashing talk and performing unsuitable behaviours are disruptive as they obstruct the formal learning. On this point, male students aim at thwarting diligence and learning values needed for academic achievement in school. In this view, boys engage in "laddish" behaviours such as "having a laugh", non-compliance with authority, and boisterous behaviours as a result of their negative schooling

experiences and frequent disenchantment (Jackson, 2002). By way of elucidation, boys take up the "laddish" behaviours as an alternative means of negotiating meanings and constructing their self-esteem. Along a slight difference, there are some researchers who argue that such boys endorse the rule which reads that "if they can't win then no one will", or they find out other competitions to outperform such as being most rebellious and maintain the traditional masculine hegemony (ibid). Moreover, being the best at sports can protect them from failure and rejects its effect. Not less interestingly, a further body of work elaborates that there is a specific influence of masculine identity and male peer pressure on learning literacy. Owen's (2000) qualitative study demonstrates that students face an educational failure:

I suppose the slagging in the pub stops people from coming to education, some people take it personal which puts them off. I'd say that's the main thing that puts people off, the slagging. They say to themselves well I got this far without it. So, there's a lot of pull there. You're exposed when you step out of your expected role as a man. Men don't go to college from a working-class background. You get stick from your mates. This gives you a huge fear of fear of failure. It's a huge risk. You lose friends when you step out of your role and class.

(Owens, 2000, pp. 25, 26).

By this token, boys tend to dissent some values of academic learning by focusing on hyper-masculine interest. In an attempt to resist being ostracized, boys employ "slagging" which refers to teasing or verbal deprecation to further insulate themselves from the failure and feminization taking into consideration that some boys see academic application as feminine. (ibid). Besides, the increased peer status that laddish identities entail may conceal the loss of power over girls. Potential higher accomplishment, in other words, substituting the parameters of success may call for the necessity to associate hegemonic masculinity and winning or achievements, and opting out from situations in which success may be effortful.

The interchangeable use of the terms "male" and "man" throughout the research requires pointing out that by "male", we intend to refer to the biological concept, meanwhile "man" touches in definition the social meanings that are both culturally and socially perceived as masculine and they encompass traditionally sex male roles.

I.11.2 Social constructions of Gender and Masculinity:

Overall, there are multiple constructions of gender and masculinity in society. Traditional gender ideologies can play a critical role in these social constructions. Some constructions are also based on either sexuality or power relationships and dominance. Connell (2000) maintains that manhood is a socially constructed process and has culturally reinforced characteristics of gender despite the fact that it is also a biological and psychological process.

I have been using the term "masculinity" quite a lot up to now and I have not actually revealed a definition of this concept. The traditional belief of masculinity is based on biological, physical, psychological and socio-cultural traits of males. Meanwhile, the meaning of masculinity we intend to adopt in this research is based on the attitudes and behaviours about the meaning of maleness that is historically, socially, and culturally constructed. (Connell, 2000). Besides, the social construction of masculinity can either accept or deny the traditional gender ideologies. To tap the distinction between masculinity and traditional masculinity, we should note that the latter is the long established ideology about what is stipulated historically and conservatively, of being a man. Despite the wide range of inconsistent and contradictory masculinities over different societies, cultures and history, traditional masculinity is defined as a socially constructed of the expectations of stereotypical masculinity such as being aggressive, dominant, strong, authoritative leader, risk-taking, exhibiting agency and independence, etc.

Negotiation of gender perspectives can be generated, yet this would consist of a more complexity and contradictions with the traditional gender ideologies. Grant (1993) acknowledges that the negotiation of gender perspectives is disciplined by social sway without one's own consciences. The following statement will underpin that this argument:

In truth, ideology has very little to do with consciousness, even supposing this term to have an unambiguous meaning. It is profoundly unconscious. Ideology is indeed a system of representations, but in the majority of case usually images and occasionally concepts, but it is about all as structures that they impose on the vast majority of men, not via their consciousness.

(Grant, 1993, p. 161).

This line of thinking elucidates the subconscious manners in which males and females are marked with structured gender ideologies. It is not hidden that the traditional gender ideologies about men calls for a necessary resistance to social change, inasmuch as they strictly linked to be a socially dominant ideology. Aligning with gender ideologies, men have been delineated to be more violator as if they are "normal" whilst women have been bound up with sexual body images as if they are "others". In support of this, Casper and Moore (1995) argue that the socially structured paradigm's influence on gender ideologies reflect masculinity as normal and femininity as not normal. As a result, the dichotomous gendered social imagination that tends to equate masculinity with superiority and femininity with inferiority was transpired.

I.12 Communication Accommodation Theory:

The psychological concept of social identity in general, and gender identity in particular, appears in a slightly distinct guise in another influential theory called communication accommodation theory (CAT; Giles and Coupland, 1991). CAT is extremely influenced by social identity theory and is based upon the assumption that speech is likely to be a fundamental base for social categorization that speech is likely to be a fundamental basis for social categorization and consequential marker of social identities. CAT or speech accommodation theory (SAT) has been adopted as a framework for understanding the relationship between social identity and language variation during interactions. It has also been used as an explanation for gender differences in language use. (Weatherall, 2002).

Overall, a crucial strand of the research on social identity and language is that a speaker's speech style may tag them as belonging to a particular social group of groups. Over and above, when hearing a speech style correlated with a certain group of people, identity maintenance processes may be triggered that will have a part in a listener's perceptual evaluation and linguistic response to a speaker using that style. A high-pitched voice may, for example, be a linguistic identity marker of what it means to be a woman. High pitched speech may trigger evaluations consistent with feminine stereotypes such as dependence and submissiveness.

The first primary theoretical framework proposed to decipher the individual and social psychological processes influencing language use in any interaction was speech accommodation theory or SAT (Giles and Smith, 1979). Speech accommodation theory applied four social psychological theories to language use. First, adhering to similarity-attraction theory, SAT

postulated that speech convergence is employed to imply that we like or want to be admired by the interlocutor or to identify with the interlocutor's group. By speech convergence, it is meant to be adjusting the manner we speak to be more like the person we are speaking to. For example, a young man aspiring to signal his liking of a young woman may lead him to converge to what he believes is her polite speech, by eschewing the use of swearing and taboo language.

Similarity-attraction theory highlights the benefits of speech convergence: an increase in attraction or approval. However, such convergence has costs; for example, the young man using polite speech patterns, while he displays his identification with his love, his masculinity may be at stake by losing its language markers. There is a prediction by social exchange theory which reads that convergent speech acts occur only when the advantages of the exchange make up for the disadvantages. The potential dilemma for women with regard to costs and benefits of using a particular language style is pointed up a study by Carli (1990) on gender, language and influence. The findings demonstrate that women who use a more tentative speech style are more compelling when talking to a man than talking to a woman. However, a speaker with a more tentative speech style was estimated by both women and men as less competent. Weatherall (2000) notes that this can be interpreted as demonstrating that the cost of using assertive speech styles of women is not being persuasive, particularly to their male counterparts, but the benefit for women of using such language is that they are rated as more competent.

Third, causal attribution theory postulates that the way speech shifts are assessed depends on the intentions and the rationale that are attributed to them. For instance, if the young man in the above example reduces his swearing only when the young woman's mother is around, the young woman may be less likely to accredit that change to the young man's attraction to her (regardless of his intention which may actually be to beckon his attraction).

Finally, social identity theory has its theoretical influence on SAT in which Giles and Smith (1979) argue that in situation where group membership is conspicuous, speech divergence (switching language style to make it more dissimilar to the interlocutor's) reflects a group identity maintenance process, and this strategy is to identify oneself as distinct from another social group. As a case in point, a woman who intends to stress her femininity may exaggerate the characteristics associated with women's language in a mixed-sex interaction.

Particularly speaking, social psychological research has widely avoided trying to identify and to evaluate the aspects of a group's speech style that might be associated with the social identity

of group members. In the case of gender identity, research adopting communication accommodation theory has attempted to build upon stereotyped notions of gender differences in speech. Hannah and Murachver (1999) define a feminine facilitative speech style as the intensive use of minimal responses, fewer interruptions, and not looking away during an interaction. They then search for divergence from or convergence to the facilitative or non-facilitative style across two conversations between either same-sex or mixed-sex dyads. They find no compelling patterns of change driven by gender identity. Some sociolinguistic research, outlined later, has been more impressive at identifying particular linguistic features that are mobilized to designate a gender group identity (Eckert and McConnell – Ginet, 1995). All in all, social identity theory and speech accommodation theory have been influencing social psychological approaches for investigating language behaviours. (Weatherall, 2002). For example, SAT has been adopted to explain the whys behind women's use lower pitch in politics, feminist challenges to sexist language, and the advocacy of a co-operative communication style in business. Moreover, CAT provides a framework for elaborating why speech styles might shift during the course of the interactions, standing on the relative importance of interpersonal or inter-group dimensions in that interaction.

Phonological variation has been strongly linked to social identity variables, such as gender, social class and ethnicity, but which has tended to dwell outside the realm of social psychology, and has largely fallen within the realm of sociolinguistics. Scholars those who embark upon identity and phonological variation are also prominent players in the gender and language arena of research. (Coates, 1989; Eckert, 2000; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992).

I.13 Discursive psychology and identities:

A discursive psychological (DP) perspective is to identity discounts of the essentialist assumptions of social cognition when gender identity is expressed through language. In counterpoint to social psychological research on gender identity and language, discursive psychology reiterates that identities are produced and negotiated in constant manner among social interaction. (Weatherall, 2002). In consonance with this, identity is not viewed in essentialist terms as something that people are, and has predefined essentialist characteristics. Rather, identities emerge from the practices of local conversations. Thus, identities are constructed in a dynamic way through the discursive practices that individuals engage in. Along

similar lines, talk is the most essential site for studying identity, not cognition (Edwards, 1997). One style of discursive psychology puts a spotlight on how identities as social categories are invoked, made, run and managed in order to do things in interactions.

This kind of discursive work tends to be in keeping with ethno-methodological and conversation analytic approach to the analysis of interaction. Another form of discursive psychology considers the broader meaning systems that form the background upon which individuals can settle themselves. Within a medical discourse, for example, various identities as having particular ailments are available. This kind of discourse analysis tends to align itself along post structural or Foucauldian lines where the basic concern is to consider the relationships between discourses, power and subjectification. By subjectification, Foucault (1980) refers to the process whereby one achieves the constitution of a subject. According to this perspective, identities are ascribed through positions in discourses. Individuals are seen to be located in and feel disposed for a variety of different positions depending on the social, historical, political and economic aspects of their situations. Thus, subjects are positioned within discursive practices.

The notion of positioning was elucidated by Davies and Harré (1990) as "*an individual emerges through the processes of social interaction, not as a relatively fixed and product but as one who is constituted and reconstituted through the various discursive practices in which they participated.* " (Davies and Harré, 1990, p.46). Elements of post structuralism and positioning theory have been coupled to be employed in a discursive approach to the study of identity. Wetherell and Edley's (1998) discursive approach to gender identity as social practices bears ideas about identity taken from post structuralism and positioning theory together with those from ethno-methodology and conversation analysis. In other words, individuals can be perceived as "positioned" as masculine or feminine within gender discourses.

A second notion of practice that Wetherell and Edley (1998) embrace in their discursive approach to gender identity is that adopted in ethno-methodology and the more conversation analytic standards of discursive psychology. They argue that this view of practice is significant to a social psychology of gender because it offers a context for the more theoretical ideas about discursive positions. Through the concepts of norms and liability; it begins to clarify how the constraints of the social environment operate. An example of how the distinct senses of practices were integrated in a single discursive study is Edley and Wetherell (1997) scrutiny of how a subordinated group of school boys negotiate their masculine identity within the school social hierarchy, where rugby players dominate.

During discussions, the non-rugby boys invoke identities such as the "new man" to subvert the dominance of the more conventional masculine identities of the sporty group of lads. Notwithstanding, in the constructions of the "new man", traditional features of masculinity such as power and strength are reproduced. The marginalized boys, in their discussion, challenge the dominant position of the rugby boys. Meanwhile, they attempt to call into play and reproduce conventional cultural notions of masculinity.

I.14 Conclusion:

This chapter has outlined the most renowned theories which have been postulated to explain the essentialist view of gender and language studies. Within the essentialist view, gender is based on a biological sex and is, therefore, considered as essentially dichotomous. Essentialism is one of the means by which gender bias may occur in language. Both males and females are displayed as having inherent qualities. Using terms such as "feminine" and "masculine" to describe social behaviours is another way that language can essentialize gender. Moreover, this chapter presents theories of college students' identity development, with a particular reference to feminist poststructuralist approach to male/female student identity development in education. Research reports that in contrast with male students, identity construction and development among women is determined by their relationships with the family and other contacts. Thus, the fluidity and multiplicity of identities that can be negotiated and constructed are left out.

Feminist post-structuralism celebrates identity multiplicity in which a female college may, for instance, exhibit various identities pertaining to gender, race and class. Instead of deeming gender as an essential characteristic of an individual's psyche, it is thought as a social construct, one that is produced by language and discourse. I opt for revealing the impact of what has been labeled the discursive turn on the field of gender and language research. Feminist research in discursive psychology has blatantly demonstrated how the theoretical shifts associated with social constructivism have resulted in a change in methodological approach. One feature of discourse analysis is that the object of study is *per se* language use.

The subsequent chapter will sketch out and discuss the feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis and the community of practice as the main methodological frameworks I intend to adopt in characterizing the construction of gender identities in education.

II.1 Introduction:

This chapter elaborates the analytical framework that I opt for adopting in this investigation. It will be argued that both feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis and the community of practice framework are pivotal in the study of students' construction of gender identities through discourse in the architecture and EFL classrooms. I commence with a theoretical section elaborating the dialectal-relational approach, revealing my view of feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis and the community of practice frameworks in tackling the manner in which students negotiate and construct their identities as males and females, taking into consideration the way language contributes to social reproduction and social change. Above all, I intend to invite inquiry into the importance of adopting feminist critical discourse analysis instead of critical discourse analysis and the community of practice instead the speech community framework. The main objective of this chapter is to demonstrate how FPDA and the community of practice frameworks tend to challenge the taken-for granted gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations. That is to say, this methodological framework argue that gendered identities are discursively produced, re-produced, sustained, negotiated and resisted in different communities. Starting from the premise that the analysis of students' discourse is pivotal in grappling with the issues of how gender practices put feet on the learning process, the selection of the above frameworks has been made.

II.2 Discourse analysis:

II.2.1 Discourse:

The prime concern of discourse analysis is the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is employed. In the 1960s and early 1970s, it grew out of study in different disciplines such linguistics, psychology, semiotics, anthropology and sociology. Discourse analysts study language in use including written texts and spoken data from all forms of talk. Whilst linguistics was concerned with the analysis of single sentences, Harris (1952) reveals a newfangled line of thinking which reads that the distribution of linguistic elements in extended texts is of paramount importance, and that the overall unit of language is discourse, not a sentence. More interestingly, the basic premise in this definition is that discourse reflects extra-grammatical linguistic units, variably described as speech acts, utterances, speech events, conversations or combinations of these, and may be, other language forms. The extra sentential status of this definition is *per se* the significant distinction which can be ascribed to it.

In linguistics, Van Dijk (2001) states that analysts often define discourse either as a structure or as process. Structural definitions are much more concerned with what constitutes a unit of discourse, and their task is to canvass the units of language that construct the link that occurs in predictable patterns, and are governed by rules which interpret the occurrence of these elements. Moreover, discourse can be defined in other branches of linguistics, as the process of employing language of the sake of accomplishing an aim or action. They concentrate on the manners language functions to achieve goals or activities in people's lives. By this token, Schiffrin (1987) assumes that one of the potent properties of discourse is to form structures, and convey meanings to accomplish actions. She further points out that analysts should be aware of the properties' interdependence when analyzing discourse. From this perspective, the structures of language are interlinked to each other and cannot be disrobed from the way people use language to convey meaning.

For linguists who concentrate on pragmatics or discourse analysis, the term discourse can refer to language use in particular social situations as action or interaction. Meanwhile, linguists who do phonology and morphology tend to use the term differently to refer to stretches of language longer than a sentence. On this point, It should be noted that I will adopt in this research the first sense which defines discourse as social interaction in specific communities. A great proportion of discourse analysis concentrates on spoken interactions, but texts can be written as well as spoken (Widdowson, 2004), and should be analyzed in linguistic terms of their intended meaning. Along

this line, Widdowson states that text is the product of discourse which is "*the pragmatic process of meaning negotiation*" (2004, p. 8). Besides, Foucault has played a pivotal role in the proliferation of discourse analysis through work and empirical research. Traditionally, discourse is defined by Foucault as follows:

> *We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation [discourse] is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form [...] it is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history posing its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality (Foucault, 1972, p. 117).*

Discourse for Foucault is a structure of possibility and constraint. For instance, medical discourse tends to define health and illness, which is *inter alia* a body of knowledge, practices and social identities. We go further by noticing that if we take hysteria, as an object, which is defined by medical discourse, this kind of discourse comprises of the overall points said or written about it. Yet, discourse about hysteria is a constituted social construction in the body and distribution of knowledge, which has changed from one century to the subsequent. Medical discourse still, quoting Foucault (1972), determines who holds the power to define knowledge. Thus, discourses are constitutions of possibility for the social; underlying what is the truth, reaching that truth, who may determine it, all rely on relations of power in institutions. In this sense, he argues that dominant members of institutions tend to sustain control and sway over others, through discourse by creating order and drawing the boundaries and categories.

A striking fact about Foucauldian (1980) notion of power is that it does not belong to particular social agents such as individuals, the state of groups. Instead, power is spread across various social practices. Power should not be interpreted as negative, and what makes it accepted is the fact that:

> *It does not only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that is traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repressive"*
>
> (Foucault, 1980, p. 119).

To illuminate, power should not be judged as exclusively oppressive but as productive. It constitutes discourse, knowledge, bodies and subjectivities.

II.2.2 Gender identities discourse as a social practice:

A central tenet in Foucault's understanding of the concept of discourse is that power and knowledge are welded together in discourse. For him, discourses are mechanisms and practices that can shape what can be said and thought. In support of this, Foucault (1972) demonstrates that "*discourses are practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak*". (p. 54). Moreover, Foucault stresses the productive characteristic of discourse which is able to "*transmit and produce power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders if fragile and makes it possible to thwart it*" (1981, 9, p. 101). What we can glean from this understanding is the fact that power equates with resistance.

Critical discourse analysts employ the term "discourse" in both the linguistic explanation of social interaction in particular contexts and in Foucault sense. In his characterization of discourse as a social practice, Kress (1985) draws on Foucault in this explication of the delimiting quality of discourse:

> *Discourses are systematically organized sets of statements which give expressions to the meaning and values of an institution. Beyond that, they define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say (and by extension what it is possible to do or not to do) with respect to the area of concern of that institution, whether marginally or centrally. A discourse provides a set of possible statements about a given area, topic, object, process that is to be talked about. In that it provides description, rules, permissions a prohibitions of social and individual actions* (1985, p. 6, 7).

Historically speaking, discourses are constituted bodies of knowledge and practice that frame or shape people, providing positions of power to some but not to others. Thus discourse is both action and convention taking into consideration the fact that discourse can only exist in social interaction in particular contexts.

In discourses, people tend to engage in different subject positions. This may shift experiences in the individuals' lifetime, if not with a couple of hours. Naturally enough, an individual's subjectivity is constantly shifting to be diversified and potentially contradictory we all encounter shifts during our lifetime, holding different gender identities in different communities inasmuch as we perhaps experience transition from school to college, or may be from bringing up a family and becoming a full-time student at university. This engenders contradictory values and

conflicting assumptions which shape us. Many women seem to experience contradictory beliefs and ideas when they strive to balance between their domestic social subjects as wives, mothers and daughters, and their engagement in a traditionally males' centered environment. These contradictions are part of our gendered identities, and they are not solely formed in the minds of these women. The contradiction is omnipresent as a repercussion of real relations within both the family and the economic world. By and large, women may be unaware of this contradiction between the two subject positions imposed on them. Notwithstanding, we should discern that people are not passively shaped. Instead, they are actively involved in the construction of their gender identities. They perform their gender identities. In claiming gender identities as performative accomplishment, Butler (1999) explains:

> *The view that gender is performative sought to show that what we take to be an internal essence of gender is manufactured through a sustained set of acts, posited through the gendered stylization of the body, in this way, it showed that what we take to be an "internal" feature of ourselves is one that we anticipate and produce through certain bodily acts.* (1999, p.15).

A study of discourse in education, conducted by Bergvall (1996), resides explicitly on the performative view of gender. In an endeavour to scrutinize the construction of gender identities through discourse among engineering students, she intends to examine verbal interaction among them in classes and small group discussions. Engineering is traditionally a masculine domain, and albeit the fact the women study to become a member of the engineering community, andocentric stereotypes still fluctuate, both in the educational institution and elsewhere.

According to Bergvall (1996), the traditional notions of gender identities leave room to conflicts of achieving professional identity and serious problems for women engineering students. Assuming that the culture of engineering is masculine, it is naturally enough to claim engineering as incompatible with femininity. That is to say, female engineers find themselves within something of a *cul-de-sac*, struggling between catering to the social need to behave in a feminine manner and asserting their reasoning in order to succeed in their studies. In a sober fact, female engineers

contrive to adopt the competitive behaviour which is perceived as masculine and cooperativeness deeming it the apt for the traditional social ideology of women.

II.3 Critical discourse analysis:

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) directs a limelight on socio-political sway, focusing on issues of social change, power abuse and social injustice by critically examining language as a social practice. The focus of CDA was set on approaches that tend to understand and criticize social inequality, based on gender, ethnicity, class, origin, religion, language, sexual orientation and other criteria that define differences between people (Van Dijk, 2001). That is to say, researchers adopting CDA strive to challenge inequality, images of injustice and lack of democracy in society by primarily analyzing social practices and socio-political change, through a critical analysis of discourses and social actions. Along this line of thought, Fairclough (1989) sustains that CDA seeks to explore the relationship between discourse and social actors, and he further views language as a form of social practice. On this point, the practical endeavour of CDA is to boost critical awareness of language, particularly on how relations of power and power struggle give birth to discourse conventions. Overall, critical discourse analysis tends to rebuff the predominant view of language as an essentially referential system and theorizes language as a practice (the pragmatic dimensions) and its representation (the semantic dimension).

Critical discourse analysts opt for introducing the defining role of the discourse as a controlling pivot in society, and they seek to provide an in depth understanding of the manner language is employed to persuade and police both social actors (individuals) and social groups. For its ordinary sense, the world "critical" is supposed to hind that the scrutiny of CDA would direct hot criticism and negative judgments. In fact, the term means, in a specific way, not just "being critical" in the ordinary meaning (Talbot, 2010), but investigating the hidden connections and assumptions on how discourse re (produces) social domination and power misuse of one group over another. This term, therefore, implies an analytical approach that is explicitly ideological. In this sense, Van Dijk (2001) considers ideology as the bedrock for the representation of social groups and he finds out a significant relationship between social structures and discourse structures.

II.3.1 Considering "discourse" and analysis" in CDA:

As a matter of fact, people usually aim to make and negotiate meaning with every aspect of who they are and what they are doing i.e. how they use and respond to their bodies, integrate

objects and technology, employ gestures, time and space; alter and adjust their voice quality when they speak; select the opt words; and interact in particular ways and eschew others. Consequently, meanings are constructed via representational systems, and language is one of the sign systems social actors use to negotiate and create meanings. Above all, meanings are usually motivated and embedded within a complicated network within social, historical, political, and ideological contexts. Calling on representational systems, such as gestures or words is not randomly decided; people then strive to accomplish particular aims such as building knowledge and relationships; and construct identities.

Linguistically speaking, systemic functional linguistics is the representational system (Halliday, 1989), which is mainly the most embedded in critical discourse studies. Deeming systemic functional linguistics as a theory of language rests entirely in the casting of agents' decision making about the social function of their language use. This social semiotic theory operates, by default, on perceiving meanings as being invented or constructed not inherited. Thus, meanings are actively performed by social agents who have choices which are among the representational systems from which to produce meanings. From a plurality of sight lines, the function of discourses dovetails both the constriction and the representation of the social world. This harks back to the assumptions that discourse is not merely an aircraft; it is a bundle of consumptive, productive, distributive, and reproductive process which is omnipresent in the social world. If we oscillate between the linguistic and the social, discourse has been assigned a host of meanings.

This scenario tends to fuel with the line of reasoning which defines discourse as a social practice, a process and a product. Standing on the broadness of discourse components, we can glean a lot of miscellaneous definitions of discourse commencing from language use, to theoretical devices used for meaning making, to social identities, relationships, practices, and categories. The analysis of discourse stipulates the analysis of language in use. In this respect, Brown and Yule (1983) maintain that "*it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes of functions that these forms are designed to serve in human affairs*" (p.1).

In most critical studies, the framework towards discourse draws from the traditions of critical linguistics, cultural and media studies, ethnographic approaches to language study and social

semiotics. Furthermore, Foucault's conceptualization of discourse as a social category rather than a linguistic one has had a critical role in critical discourse studies. As it would be clear by now, the paradigm of critical discourse analysis is not homogenous. Albeit the variation in CDA methods and procedures, the different approaches of critical analysis studies concede the coherent connection of the social world theory and the theory of language. Three of the most renowned and influential critical approaches of discourse analysis employed in the educational research arena (Gee (1986, 2004, 2011), Fairclough (1989b, 1989a, 2003), and Kress (1993; 2003). These researchers all encompass the concept of methodological hybridity; yet they freely apply a set of theoretical frames to tally with the research topic being used. Fairclough (2006) recognizes that discourse is socially shaping while it s socially shaped, and other social changes are often instigated by new discourses. He points out that Romanian Higher education adopted a new discourse that initiated a change in the syllabus and brought new practices in Romanian Higher education.

II.3.1.1. Gee's approach to discourse analysis:

Gee's tradition of discourse analysis, referred to as "building tasks" analysis, draws on three traditions: American anthropological linguistics and narratives (Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1974); social discourse theories (Foucault, 1972); and cognitive psychology (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). He was influenced by Chomskyan (1965) linguistics in as much as he was a theoretical linguist who worked on syntactic theory and the philosophy of language. From a plurality of professional commitments, his line of reasoning extended to literary stylistics, Hallidayian grammar, and neo-Marxist theory, and this represents his developing approach to the social and cultural study of language. In 1990, Gee introduced the distinction between "discourse" – language bits and "discourse" – the sociopolitical uses of language. The theory of language, endorsing Gee's framework to discourse analysis implies that people purposefully employ language, dwelled within social, historical, and political contexts. The presence of this theory in life is demonstrated through five related frames and a set of building tasks that illuminate the intimate link between language and the social world. By theoretical frames, it is meant to be the social and cultural frameworks for understanding how individuals use language to sew up social goals.

By way of elucidation, Gee (2011) goes further to claim that:

> *Situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, and discourses*
> *move us from the ground of specific uses of language in specific contexts*
> *(situated meanings) up to the world of identities and institutions in time*

and space (Discourses) through varieties of language (social languages) and people's taken for granted social theories of the world (figured worlds). This progression is, in my view, the point of discourse (or, better d/Discourse) analysis (Gee, 2011, p. 43).

On this point, Gee's (2001) distinction tends to conjure up that the so-called situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, and discourses may be considered as "tools of inquiry". As it is revealed above, "situated meanings" evokes notion of genres and dialogues (1986) and points out how people make words meaningful, and this encloses the historical, inter-textual and social representations of sign systems. It seems keen to point that "intertextuality" denotes how texts are drawn upon and re-articulated within or across social practices. Furthermore, "social languages" refer to grammar and the function of language as a social practice as it leaves space to convey socially situated identities and relationships (p. 161). This tends to highlight that grammar is not something that people inherit. Instead, individuals outline to construct the social identities and build relationships.

"Figured worlds" refers to mental models and images that shape up how people perceive the world and make sense of it (p. 171). And "discourse models" are used to refer to the storylines, narratives, and explanatory frameworks that are exposed in a society. Aligning with Gee's framework, people are building social relations, identities, activities and knowledge at anytime we are interacting and communicating. Discourse analysts seek to provide answer to: What sign systems are being adopted to accomplish these social goals?

The "seven building tasks", as a second part of the framework, plays a crucial role in helping people in the interpretation of meanings. The "seven building tasks" are composed of seven entry points that tend to avail analysts in constructing meaning from a network of discourse patterns. The tasks touch significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections, sign systems, and knowledge.

A set of associated questions are raised for each dimension for the sake of alleviating the analyst's burden. For instance, Gee poses the questions "What sign systems are relevant (and irrelevant) in

the situation? " within sign systems. Moreover, he strives to answer the question: "What are the situated meanings of some of the words and phrases that seem important in the situation?

II.3.1.2 Fairclough's approach to critical discourse analysis:

Norman Fairclough's approach was derived from sociolinguists (Labov, 1972), systematic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978) and social theories of discourse (Foucault, 1972). Fairclough has, *prima facie*, worked on the query of the reconciliation between the textual and social world. To nuance the picture, how does one oscillate from the textual to the social world?

Along this, he directs a limelight on the analysis of social problems through textual analysis that draws on systematic functional linguistics (Fairclough, 2000). In this sense, he has constructed a useful framework for the analysis of discourse as a social practice. In exploring this research avenue, Fairclough (2000) brings into open the different sorts of semiotic resources people stand on as they scheme and interpret social practices through genres (ways of interacting), discourse (ways of representing), and style (ways of being). To elaborate, "ways of interacting" refers to the types of texts that individuals construct. "Ways of representing" appertain to the clusters of meanings that breed macro-narratives or cultural models. "Ways of being" pertain to the kinds of identity work that people enact as they are employing language.

Adopting the tradition of critical discourse analysis (CDA), Fairclough (1989, 1992) holds out that "text", "discursive practice" and "social practice" are the backbone of this three-dimensional discursive event model. Textual analysis embraces crucial headings "vocabulary" (individual words), "grammar" (words combined in sentences), "cohesion" (how sentences are abutted) and "text structure" (the large scale organizational properties of texts). Fairclough, in working within critical discourse analysis, strives to go beyond these categories which are, hitherto, the fulcrum of a host of non-critical approaches to discourse analysis. Basically, Fairclough (1995) postulates in spelling out CDA as:

> *Discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque*
> *relationships and determination between (a) discursive practices,*
> *events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures,*
> *relations and processes; to investigate how such practice, events and*
> *texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power*
> *and struggles over power; and explore how that opacity of these*
> *relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor in seeing*
> *power and hegemony.* (Fairclough, 1995, p133).

In an attempt to theorize discourse production distribution and consumption, Fairclough (1992, 1995) tends to labor the point of "discursive practice". This dimension is not at play in non-

critical discourse analysis body within discursive practices. Institutions are believed to possess particular routines for processing texts, associated with achieving hegemony and power, through discriminating ideology. Bringing to bear this notion of the state, Fairclough sustains that:

> *Government departments produce texts in ways which anticipate their distribution, transformation, and consumption, and have multiple audiences built into them. They may anticipate not only "addressees" (those directly addressed), but also "hearers" (those not addressed directly, but assumed to be part of the audience), and "over hearers" (those who do not constitute part of the "official" audience but are known to be de facto consumers).*

(Fairclough, 1992, p. 80).

According to Fairclough, discourse practices are socially constrained and their nature depends on "*the nature of the social practices they are part of*" (1992, p 80). Through social practices, Fairclough delves into notions of ideology and hegemony. By ideology, it is meant to be located both in the structures and in the reproduction and the transformation of the structures. In addition to that, Fairclough tackles social practices through Gramsci's notion of hegemony (intellectual, moral and cultural persuasion). He further argues that hegemony is a bid for closure of social practices and networks of practice.

Gramsci (1971) used the notion of "hegemony" to set forth the exertion of power through tacit means rather than military force. This may be carried out through the implementation of rules, laws and habits. (Van Dijk, 2008). In consonance with Fairclough (2003), hegemony is "*leadership as much as domination across the economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of society*" (p. 92). Hegemonic struggle can be related to discourse making allowance for the social structures and the discursive structures which are in a mutually defining relationship. To make the picture more vivid, the social structure is displayed in its discursive practices which are institutions. (Fairclough, 2004). That is to say, societal changes are taken often in changes in discursive practices vice versa.

Fairclough (2003) tends to spin out the concept of "hegemony" in aggregating hegemony and discourse together, and this is what he labeled "discursive hegemony". To expound, Fairclough

(2003, p. 218) defines the term as "*the dominance of naturalization of particular representations*"; how particular discourses come out on top in given sociopolitical contexts, as the result of a struggle between the relevant political actors. Apart from that, Fairclough, among many others,

inquisites the ways in which discourse reproduce social domination. As a case in point, he investigates "power behind discourse". "Power in discourse" refers to the state of employing power by powerful participants for the sake of controlling and constraining non-powerful participants from coming through. The use of technical terms by the medieval staff to squeeze patients may be an illustrative example. "Power behind discourse" refers to the overall social order of discourse, which in tandem symbolizes the veiled effect of power. At this point, the medical institution or the system itself tends to impose upon all of those involved, both the medical staff and the patients.

A point worth revealing demonstrated by Fairclough (1989) is that power has a shifting nature at all levels; a particular social situation or whole society. That is to say, power is won, exercised, maintained, and lost along the social struggle. The assumption that power is not fixed calls for the necessity to hypothesize that power can, on the one hand, retained and exercised and, on the other, can be resisted and challenged. Bourdieu (1991) investigates how power is exerted and kept through symbolic power, an "invisible" power that is "misrecognized" as such and thereby "recognized" as legitimate. He claims that power is seldom put into practice, in per diem life, as explicit physical force. On second thought, it is transmuted into a symbolic form, and therefore endowed with a particular kind of legitimacy. Symbolic power, ergo, presupposes a kind of active complicity "on the part of those subjected to it. In fact, dominated individuals are not uninvolved bodies to which symbolic power is executed. Instead, they are of the opinion in the legitimacy of power and the legitimacy of those who handle it. As for the ways of the resistance and challenge to power, achieving access to knowledge can be considered as an effective mode. In his study of the doctor-patient relationship, for example, Fairclough (1989) marks that the patient requires to gain access to professional knowledge of medicine prior to challenging the doctor who wield power over him or her.

In keeping with critical discourse analysis, discourse can be seen as a social as well as linguistic practice that serves to maintain social conditions which bring up into open power relation aligned with race, class, and gender ideologies. Fairclough (2001) and Van Dijk (1998b) reiterate that these relations are susceptible to resistance, contestation and subversions. Over and above, Fairclough

(2003) notes that in being critical, "*we choose to ask certain questions about social events and texts, and other possible questions*". The questions may be raised to unravel issues of unequal power relations such as gender. Overall, critical has also been considered by Fairclough as essentially

making conspicuous the interconnectedness of language and other things. CDA is critical first, in the sense that it strives to canvass connections between language and other elements in the social life and disentangle which are often obfuscated. This may heavily rest on: how language figures within social relations of power and sway; how language works ideologically; the negotiations of social identities. Then, critical discourse analysis is critical because it is committed to continuous social change (Fairclough, 2001).

As brought to light earlier, CDA investigates – in linking ideology to power the relationship between language and social practice, and in particular, between language and power (Fairclough, 2001, Wodak and Meyer, 2009). Bringing power to bear in modern society is settled through ideology and more so thought the ideological workings of language. Power "*does not derive from language but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term* "(Weiss and Wodak, 2003, p. 15). Language does not attain power by its own but it is powerful by the use people make of it. Fairclough (2001, 2003) figures out different kinds of power: coercion of distinct sorts including physical violence, and the manufacture of consent or acquiescence (which Gramsci (1971) labels hegemony). The fundamental matter of CDA resides in the second kind. Typically, CDA researchers are keen to explore the ways in which discourse (re) produce social domination, and they analyze language use of those in power, who are responsible for engendering inequalities.

2.3.1.3 Kresser's Approach to Discourse Analysis:

Kress is one of the people credited with the proliferation of the branch of critical linguistics. Albeit first Kress's training (early 1960) was in English literature, he became dissatisfied with what he considered as a theoretical approach to English literary criticism (interview). He was exposed to a watershed by moving to incorporate Chomskyan linguistics into his work with the idea that a penetrating analysis of syntactic structure could improve figuring out how literature worked. Critical discourse analysis serves a richer theoretical and methodological framework for discerning

linguistic categories than does the sociology of media. When it comes to the analysis of classification in a culture on subculture, Kress and Hodge (1979) claims, for instance, that language

is the suitable object of study on the grounds that it "*provides the major access for individuals into the classification system of their society*" (Kress and Hodge, 1979, p. 63).

Contrary to media sociologist, CDA analysts concentrates on the ways that linguistic classification confine and inflect writers' and speakers' reports about the world. Aligning with Whorf and Sapir hypotheses, Kress and Hodge tackle categories in the language to reveal the culture and worldview of the speakers and the writers of that language. A class of classification system, they report, contains "*Thought, giving a basic unity to everything expressed within it, whatever its content, and making alternative systems of classification seem incommensurable*" (Kress and Hodge, 1979, p. 74). Following Halliday's (1978) approach to language which is based on the connection between form (structure) and function (social practices), Kress discerns a speaker as a socially located individual who utilizes semiotic systems to attain particular functions. A host of salient assumptions of CDA in the early stages of the theory development dwells in Kress's work. Drawing up Kress's work (1985), language is considered as a social phenomenon in which institutions and social groups have specific meanings and values that are conveyed in systematic ways. So, this does not pertain solely to individuals. Besides, readers / hearers are not passive recipients in their relationships to texts.

II.4 Feminist discourse analysis:

As it has been demonstrated earlier, "discourse analysis" is an umbrella term adopted across disciplines, which incorporates many various and overlapping approaches to discourse, from linguistic, sociological, social theory and feminist perspectives. Sunderland (2004) directs a limelight on the angle which considers discourses to be "gendered". She opts for the use "gendered" as a term, as she reveals that it is far stronger than the more descriptive term "gender-related". She elaborates this point by further sustaining that "gendered" explicitly denotes that gender is already a part of the "thing" which gender describes (2004, p. 20-1). Sunderland draws attention on the "discourse of gender difference", which she identifies as an overarching discourse of "gender difference", which she identifies as an overarching discourse which governs societal expectations for gender normative behaviours.

In this respect, Sunderland (2004) maintains that "*it is a significant 'lens' for the way people view reality, being for most people what gender is all about. Once its 'common sense' status has been contested, 'gender differences' can be seen as such*" (p. 52). This discourse is maintained by the deeply embedded ideology that the biological differences of men and women make them inherently different. A wide range of discourses which function within the overarching gender differences discourse are often recognizable narratives for males and females. In western contexts, Sunderland (2004) refers to "the incompetent father discourse" and "father as line manager discourse" and so on. Albeit the fact that some of these discourses are intricate to be compared and they are of distinct sorts, it is quite useful to mark familiar and reduplicated narrative scenarios which seem to be gendered in particular ways. Assessing that these discourses can be prejudicial, Sunderland holds out that whether this position is damaging or not, this will be settled by the hearer. In keeping with this line of thinking, she argues that "*whereas some individuals may be damaged by sexist discourse, others will recognize it for what it is, resist it, laugh at it and / or become empowered in the process*" (Sunderland, 2004: 194).

In this sense, discourse permits speakers to speak and act in specific ways, yet speakers are capable as social agents to negotiate their status-quo and lay out resistance within these discourses. Gender differentiation is a bundle of dominant cultural practices that women, most of the time and often some men, do in restricted and underprivileged manners. Notwithstanding, speakers can renegotiate, review and challenge their subject positions and employ alternative ways of "doing gender". Accordingly, Sunderland (2004) offers a range of different strategies with regard to gendered discourses: first, there is meta-discoursal critique, followed by non-use of the damaging discourses and then a stage of rediscursivization, where the elements of discourses are rebuilt to be less damaging.

Besides, Backer (2008) labors the point of gendered discourse, particularly in relation to discourses concerned with sexuality. As people are sometimes influenced by discourses or ideologies, he argues that "*they also have the ability to challenge and change discourses, imagining new configurations or refusing to go along with the way things are*" (Backer, 2008, p. 257). For example, he delves into the ways that Action Man and Barbie dolls are depicted. In this analysis of

children's toys, Backer states that these toys are described in advertising in terms of a discourse of "gender differences". Boy's toys are imaged in terms of adventure and taking risks action (he leaps

into the unknown) and the toy for girls being described in terms of passivity and submissiveness (She wears a soft blush-sating groom). These discourses may be prone to challenge or interruption of the lack of choices and opportunities girls have. (ibid)

Backer (2008) describes the action of the Barbie Liberation Organization, which stole in 1989 and changed the circuit boards of some talking dolls, such as Barbie Teen Talk and then replaced them in the stores. The swapped Barbie dolls' talk consisted of utterances which were stereotypically masculine such as "Vengeance is mine" and the modified Joe dolls uttered stereotypically feminine phrase like "I love shopping". These actions by this organization fix attention to the way that toys for boys and girls have adopted a new portrait by being gender-differentiated. These actions pointed, ergo, out the stereotypical mature utterances of those talking dolls. Therefore, feminist discourse analysis tackles the manner that discourses can be gendered, leading to particular sorts of utterances in particular contexts. But because these are discourses, they are open to resisted potential.

II.5 Feminist critical discourse analysis:

Talbot (2010) underpins that the reason behind the need to analyze texts from a position informed by CDA is "*the beliefs that are put forth in the texts of greatest interest to critical discourse analysts are those that encourage the acceptance of unequal arrangements of power as natural and inevitable, perhaps even as right and good.* " (Bucholtz, 2004: 57).

Lazar (2005) argues that feminist discourse analysis is a critical perspective on unequal social arrangements sustained through language use with the goal of social transformation and emancipation. She designates that the need of feminist CDA can be interpreted by critical discourse analysts' lack of interest in the analysis of gender. Moreover, the requirement to abut those studies already conducted in the field of critical discourse analysis with feminist linguistics is crucial in the arena of language and gender studies.

The 1980s and 1990s saw the coming forth of a novel approach to language and gender studies, namely the "post-modernist approach" (Gibbon, 1999: 11) or the discoursal approach, responding

to the influence of post-structuralism. Whilst the dominance and the difference approaches postulate that gender pre-exists social behaviours and plays part in the way that interactions develop, the post-modernist approach defines gender as socially and discursively constructed and the way participants

perform in conversations being to pass their gender identities (Mills, 2008). The new approach foregrounds the role of discourse which is generally seen as a social practice, and this reflects and determines how we see the world with all its assumptions about gender and gender inequalities.

In consonance with this perspective, Litosseliti (2006) assigns that language use has a potential to help establish and harbour social and power relations, values and identities. Thus, language does not merely reflect social reality but it is also integral of such reality.

The veering in the theorization of gender and language evokes a shift in research methodology. Critical discourse analysis aims at revealing blurry ways in which language is incorporated in social relations of power and domination, whilst feminist linguistic strives to leave no stone unturned about unequal gender relations prevalent but veiled in discourse. In support of this, Wodak (1997) states that the basic assumptions of feminist linguistics and their proposals relate to and overlap with principles of critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. By considering this point, it seems that the marriage between CDA and feminism is reasonable and inevitable.

Above all, what mainly differentiates between those two approaches is that feminist CDA has led to the proliferation of a more sophisticated theory of gender. Feminist CDA adopts an explicit stance of working towards emancipation and is blatantly committed to the attainment of social order through a critique of discourse (Lazar, 2005). Generally speaking, Cameron (1992) states that the target behind writing more extensively about feminism and linguistic theory was to "*question the whole scholarly objective bias of linguistics and to show assumptions and practices of linguistics that are implicated in patriarchal ideology and oppression*" (1992: 16).

Obviously, the feminist CDA perspective is interdisciplinary in nature. It contributes, on the one hand, to critical language and discourse studies. On the other hand, it proposes the usefulness of language and discourse studies to canvass feminist issues in gender and women's studies. CDA theorists often emphasize, in their scrutiny of texts and conversations, on linguistic elements such as transitivity (who does what to whom), nominalization (where verbs are turned into nouns and lose their agentedness) and passivization (where events are described adopting passive voice, and again, losing agentedness). To nuance the picture, if the text consistently portrays women using a particular transitivity choice as a receiver rather than an actor as in "He gazed at her" "I admired her", then this commences to enhance the generic image of inaction and passivity. Using the passive voice to display women as "acted upon" will have an analogous effect, as in "she was left behind".

Fairclough (1989) indicates that the principle of CDA can be used to tackle any level of the linguistic ranks scale, but it is at this grammatical level where the detailed close reading practices to critical discourse analysis' theorists have been highly used by feminist CDA theorists. (Wodak and Meyer, 2001). CDA has arguably been adopted most broadly by feminist linguists to offer minute examinations of gender representations through media discourse.

Listosseliti (2006) examines, for instance, western media immediately post 9/11. Similarly, Lazar (2006) conducts an extensive feminist critical discourse analysis of advertising discourses in Singapore. Lazar (2005) perceives gender, from a CDA perspective, as "*a category which intersects with and is shot through by other categories of social identity, such as sexuality, ethnicity, social position and geography. Patriarchy is also an ideological system that interacts in complex ways with, say corporatist and consumerist ideologists*". (p. 1). Feminist CDA posits gender ideologies at the forefront of analysis. According to its theorists, there is an avid sense of the workings of ideology, which they define as "*representations of practices formed from particular perspectives in the interests of maintaining unequal power relations and dominance*" (Lazar, 2005, p. 7).

Meanwhile, one of the central and practical aims of CDA is to help increase consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, because consciousness is the first step towards emancipation (Fairclough, 2001). Aligning with Lazar (2005), a central tenet for feminist critical discourse analysts is with "*critiquing discourses which sustain a patriarchal social order: and this will engender an impetus to work towards "a feminist humanist vision of a just society*". (Lazar, 2005: 6)

More importantly, feminist CDA attempts to sketch the difference between ideological knowledge and what people, *de facto*, do or are able of. Concerning gender ideology, it is crucial, Lazar (2005) expounds, to be aware of "*the dialectal tension between structural permanence of the practical activity of people engaged in social practices*" (p. 8).

II.5.1 Principles of feminist critical discourse analysis:
II.5.1.1 Feminist analytical activism:

Since the overlapping of power and ideology in discourse is sometimes unsettled to participants involved in some social practices, discursive critique the perspective of critical feminist theorization and analyzing their coalition is pivotal. As it has been revealed earlier, feminist CDA is a radical discursive critique of discourses which buttresses and sustains a patriarchal social order – a system of power relations which privilege men as a social group and obviate women as a social group. In doing CDA, there is an understanding of social practices as reflected in as well as embedded in discourse (Fairclough, 1992), whilst a feminist standpoint calls for the fact that a host of social practices, far from being neutral, are gendered in someway (Lazar, 2007). In line of feminist perspective, the crux of the critique is to take issue of the social status-quo regarding radical emancipation and change, and this leaves space to possibilities for both women and men as social agents and as human being rather than having gender predetermined and confined on sense of who we are or might become.

By extension, the gender nature of social practices can be elucidated by two ways. First, gender functions as a discursive category that permits individuals in a community to make sense of and construct their particular social practices. Second, gender is a social relation that partially constitutes all other social relations and activities (Connell, 1987).

Analysis of discourse which exhibits the working of power that maintain oppressive social structures / relations engenders on-going conflicts of contestation and change through what may be labeled "analytical activism". This entails catalyzing theory for the sake of creating critical awareness and develops feminist strategies for resistance and change (Lazar, 2007). As a radical emancipatory discourse politics, feminist CDA is a form of analytical activism.

Interestingly, to speak with the voice of a "women" does not equate with speaking from the political lens of a feminist. Knowing as a "woman" means to know from the structure of gender, whereas a feminist perspective entails owing a critical distance on gender and on oneself (Grant, 1993).

Besides, critical praxis research dissolves the dichotomization between theory and practice among feminists, whereby academic feminists get associated with "theory" and major feminist activist with "practice". Correspondingly, Lazar (2007) suggests that the work undertaken by critical academic feminists can be considered as academic activism-raising critical awareness through research and teaching – of which feminist CDA incorporates a form of analytical activism.

2.5.1.2. Gender as an ideological structure:

Gender is, in patriarchal societies, an ideological structure that divides people into two classes, men and women, based on a hierarchical relation of domination and subordination. Based upon sexual difference, the gender structure appoints of social dichotomy of labour and human traits of women and men, and the quality of which varies according to time and place. From a critical view, ideologies are representations of practices shaped from particular perspectives in order to sustain unequal power relations and dominance. Albeit such a perspective was developed in Marxist accounts especially in terms of class relations, the notion is now rampant and incorporates other relations of domination, including gender (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). Whilst the ideological structure of gender systematically privileges men as a social group allowing them what Connell (1995) terms "a patriarchal dividend", it disempowers, ostracizes and blacklists women as a social group.

Gender ideology is hegemonic in the sense that it often appears as enormously commonsensical and acceptable to most in a community, yet it does not appear as domination at all (Lazar, 2007). Gramsci (1971) sustains that the winning of consent and the perpetuation of the tenuous relation of dominance are extremely performed through discursive practices, particularly in the ways ideological assumptions are constantly re-enacted and circulated through discourse as natural and reasonable. Lazar (2007) maintains that the taking for granted and the normalcy of such knowledge is what obscure the power differential and disparity at work.

Weedon (1987) states that asymmetrical gender relations cannot merely be interpreted by individuals' intentions, even though it is often individuals who act as agents of oppression (Lazar, 2005). Connell (2005) stresses that institutions are substantively structured in terms of gender ideology so that although gender may not represent the significant aspect in a particular instance, it is in most cases. This entails the persuasiveness of tacit andocentric perspectives in a lot of institutional cultures and discourse, where not only men but also women who are complicit through their habitual and differential participation in their particular communities of practice. (Lazar, 2007).

The institutionalization of gender inequality, which is discursively enacted, have been minutely examined in a wired range of institutions such as the media (Lazar 2004; Talbot 1998), education (Swann, 1993), government (Lazar, 1993, 2000) and many professional and organizational settings (Wodak, 2005).

What is of particular interest is that although the prevailing gender ideology is hegemonic and routinely put into practice, it is also moot. Whilst focusing on transgression and creativity is rudimentary, this has to be painstakingly considered in relations to the constraints and possibilities yielded by particular social structures and practices.

Also worth mentioning, Lazar (2007) postulates that going against gendered expectations in some settings could bring about reinforcement, instead of eradication, of the existing gender structure. For example, Holmes (2005) reports that in negotiating an apt style of "doing" power in the workplace, women managers sometimes steer clear of "feminine" speech styles and opt for more authoritative speech style which is stereotypically endemic for men. The masculinization of talk by women in power and the feminization of forms of masculinity in the home, on one level may seem to reformulate conventional gender norms for women and men in particular communities. On the other level, these gender crossings index (and perpetuate) the underlying dualism of the gender structure – the behaviour of the masculine woman and the feminine man" *gets read against the expected behavioural norm of the other"*. (Lazar, 2007: 148).

These studies also presuppose that departing from gender – appropriate norms are policed and contained in the presence of a prevalent discourse of heteronormativity. The term "heteronormativity" is used to refer to the insistence that "*humanity and heterosexuality are synonymous*" (Warners, 1993: xxii). To such a degree, "heteronormative discourses" are linguistic and/or cultural practices which construct and disseminate representations, practices and identities as the natural or normal expression of humanity.

II.1.1.3 Complexity of gender and power relations:

The aim of feminist critical discourse analysis is to contextually examine and analyze gender and sexism in contemporary societies in their complex and multiple forms. Complexity refers to the fact that feminists opt for considering that gender structure does not function in isolation, but inter meets with other structures of power such as those based on sexuality, ethnicity, age, social class and geography. Whilst there are varied forms of gender assumed by gender and sexism in different cultures and across time, the structure of gender has been remarkably persisted over time and place (Lazar, 2007). As follows, the essential objective of feminist CDA is to undertake contingent analyses of the oppression of women (ibid). From a feminist perspective, Lazar (2007) stresses the point that despite of the fact that power may be omnipresent (as theorized by Foucault), gendered subjects are affected by it in different ways. Similarly, it is useful, from the

perspective of CDA, to correlate the concept of modern power with the view of power relations as dominance, particularly in Gramsci's term of hegemony (See Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999).

The concern of feminist critical discourse analysis is to study how power and dominance are discursively resisted and / or (counter) resisted in various ways through textual representations of gendered social practices, and through the inter actional strategy as well. Moreover, what is of particular interest is the access to forms of discourse, such as particular communicative events and culturally valued genres (Van Dijk, 1993) that can be empowering for women's joining in public spheres. Although the effectiveness of modern power is based on an internalization of gendered norms and acted out routinely and naturally in everyday texts and talk, discursive resistance will be negotiated to secure and challenge the interests at stake in a dynamic contest.

II.6. Feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis:

Feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis in a form of developed by Judith Baxter (2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2006, 2008a, 2008b) which is used to supplement (rather than substitution) other approaches to language and gender research. Feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis (FPDA henceforth) concentrates on the way that identities are in a continuous shift, particularly in spoken interactions (such as the workplace and classroom contexts). In this respect, Baxter (2003, p. 9) assumes that "*individuals are rarely consistently positioned as powerful across all discourses at work within a given context. They are often located simultaneously as both powerful and powerless*".

Similarly, to CDA, FPDA draw it roots from discourse analysis approaches, but more exclusively from poststructuralist theory (Bakhtin, 1981, Derrida, 1987, Foucault, 1972). Rather than taking a critical perspective, it has embraced a "feminist poststructuralist" perspective. Baxter (2008b) holds that FPDA can be defined as:

> *an approach to analyzing intertextualised discourses in spoken interaction and other types of text. It draws upon the poststructuralist principles of complexity, plurality, ambiguity, connection, recognition, diversity, textual playfulness, functionality and transformation.*
> *The feminist perspective on poststructuralist discourse analysis considered gender differentiation to be a dominant discourse among competing discourses when analyzing all types of texts.*
> (Baxter, 2008b, p. 245).

Baxter (2008b) highlights that poststructuralist discourse analysis (PDA) follows Foucault's thesis (1980). It is worth noting that fixed binary conception of gender identity has been argued to be inadequate and ineffective (Abdelhay, 2008; Butcholtz, 1999). Linguists commence to celebrate the study of the multiplicity of gender identities beyond the static binary opposition of sexes. Against gender binarism, it is argued that there is no necessary relation between gender and biological sex. In this case, women may espouse elements of masculinity to meet the needs of the context without being judged as aberrant. In lieu of considering masculine authority and feminine subservience, critical attention has shifted to emphasis from gender as a given stable entity, to gendering as a practice. Accordingly, Foucault (1980) expounds that the motor for this is power which is:

> *never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as commodity or a piece of weather. Power is exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. There are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation.*
>
> (Foucault, 1980,

p. 98).

In keeping with this, poststructuralists have argued that individuals - for example, boys, girls teachers and researchers – are not unitary "subjects" uniquely positioned, but are produced as "*a nexus of contradictory subjectivities*" (Walkerdine, 1990, p. 3). And this will be enacted in relations of power which are constantly shifting and exhibiting them at times powerful and powerless, at other times.

Overall, PDA has a keen interest in the free play of multiple voices within a discursive context, which calls into play that the voices of silenced or minority groups need to be heard. Aligning with Foucault's line of thinking, Baxter (2002a) suggests that poststructuralist discourse analysis needs to deconstruct discursive context whenever "*dominant discourse is the means by which spaces can be allowed for alternative voices, and varied standpoints*" (ibid). In line with this, PDA plays a role in determining, observing, recording and analyzing discursive contexts where marginalized and silenced voices may be contesting to be heard.

Similarly to other form of post-structuralism, FPDA does not subscribe to a "grand narrative" such as the belief that all women are harassed or opposed by all men. On second thought, it aims to reveal the intricacy of power relations, pointing out that even powerless people may experience "moments" of power.

II.6.1 FPDA as a theoretical approach

Feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis employs exactly similar methods to PDA, but with a focus on a feminist perspective where gender differentiations are crucial. Baxter (2003) defines FPDA as "*a feminist approach to analyzing the ways in which speakers negotiated their identities, relationships and positions in their world according to the ways in which they are located by competing and yet interwoven discourses*". (p. 1). For this very reason, I opt to follow, with regard to analysis, feminist poststructuralist discourse analytical perspective. Complementary with other gender and language theoretical approaches within post-modern feminism, FPDA helps the understanding of identities by negotiating, challenging and resisting already existing subject positions in competing discourses.

Since discourses of gender are competing, the construction of power in a certain community can be based on status, ethnicity, etc. For example, the construction of power by speakers may not solely be based on gender identity, but also on educational background, political expertise etc. Again, Baxter (2003) stresses that although "*there may be dominant discourses constructing stereotypical assumptions about masculinity, femininity and binary gender differences ... there may also be resistant or oppositional discourses advocating, for example, gender diversity, inclusion or separatism*" (p. 8). Albeit the fact that some current researchers in critical discourse analysis have looked at resistant and oppositional discourses (Homes, 2000), this point was not emphasized by CDA as it was by FPDA. To nuance the picture, the fluidity of power in both dominant and competing or resistant discourses provokes me to find FPDA a very useful approach for my analysis.

Baxter (2008b) points out that feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis has no interest in competing with other discourses for perspective punters. Because one of the pivotal values of FPDA is that it offers itself as "supplementary" approach, simultaneously complementing other methods. I faintly draw on feminist CDA approaches (Lazar, 2005) to disclose and critique the

subtle biases and ideological workings in the texts. This is an aspect of text analysis that FPDA does not accentuate. On this point, a multi-perspective approach allows for a tremendous breadth of coverage of the requisite explanation, in the sense that it amalgamates different methodological tools in a functional way that befits the undertaken task. Whilst CDA and FPDA share commonalities in theory and methodology, the two approaches arguably have contrasting perspectives on the world and pursue divergent outcomes (Baxter, 2008b).

Feminist CDA embraces the critique of "*discourses which sustain a patriarchal social order: that is, relations of power that systematically privilege men as a social group and disadvantage, exclude and disempower women as a social group*". (Lazar, 2005, p. 5).

As it has been heretofore mentioned, feminist CDA is concerned with sketching how language use harbors unequal relations, with its main goals being emancipation and transformation. Whilst feminist CDA addresses issues of how taken – for – granted assumptions around gender can be negotiated and contested as well as (re) produced, Baxter offers an approach which is more thoroughly focused on negotiation. Approving feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis, Baxter (2003) suggests that females always adopt multiple subject positions, and that it is far too reductive to constitute women in general, or indeed any individual women, simply as victims of male oppression.

Particularly important here is the point that FPDA is very similar to feminist CDA in that it endorses an openly critical language – orientated perspective on the analysis of texts and conversations. However, Baxter's point of departure from many feminist CDA theorists is built on the premise that women can carve out a niche and new positions for themselves within the competing discourses. In her work on the female students who may be disempowered in terms of public speaking, Baxter (2006) details FPDA in the following terms:

> *FPDA takes issue with the traditional feminist view that for example, female students are universally disempowered it prefers instead to promote an understanding of the complex and often ambiguous ways in which girls / women are simultaneously positioned as relatively powerless within certain discourses, but as relatively powerful with alternative and competing discourses ... the key point is girls / women are not permanently trapped into silence, disadvantage or victim hood by dominant discursive practices; rather there are moments within competing discourses when females can potentially covert acts of resistance into "new" if inter-textualized forms of expression.* (Baxter, 2006, p. 162).

Moreover, Feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis does not have a critical / emancipatory agenda, but an "epistemological transformative" agenda, in which it is less interested in displaying unequal relationships and injustices. FPDA has a keen interest in understanding the complex and shifting relationships and identities within and across given communities. Whilst CDA often canvasses crossing power relationships, FPDA leaves room for a range of different perspectives. Baxter (2003) sustains that FPDA cannot corroborate any ideological agenda which is committed to focusing on social problems. It cannot support a political or, in fact, a theoretical mission which might one day becomes its own "grand narrative". On the other hand, FPDA can support, aligning with poststructuralist principles, small scale, bottom up, localized social transformations that are pivotal in its larger inquiry to challenge dominant discourses (like gender differentiation) that inevitably become grand narratives (Baxter, 2003). In keeping with Bakhtin's (1984) concept of heteroglossia, FPDA means allowing space to marginalized or silenced voices, such as certain girls who mumble or convey little in classroom settings. Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia, or multivoicedness, is basically pursued in novelistic discourse. To quote from Bakhtin:

> *Heteroglossia, once incorporated into that novel (…), is another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Such speech constitutes a special type of double voiced discourse. It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions, the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such discourses there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions.*

(Bakhtin, 1981, p. 324).

So as a methodological approach, FPDA is thus best appropriate to small scale ethnographic case studies in which subjects have some agency to change their conditions (Baxter, 2003). FPDA, on the other hand, objects lines of thinking which tend to structure thoughts in oppositional pairs, positing one term over another. FPDA is concerned not to polarize males as villains and females as victims in any oppositional sense, nor even to postulate that females as a category are necessarily powerless, disadvantaged or oppressed by the other. On second thought, it argues that female subject positions are complex, shifting and multiply located. (Baxter, 2003). In a similar vein, it puts forward that the continual interaction of competing discourses denotes that speakers will constantly oscillate between subject positions as being powerful or powerless in different ways at the same moment in time. As for classroom settings, this approach also helps elucidate the complex pattern of discoursal relations that produce such abrupt and dramatic shifts in power. By the same token, FPDA differs from CDA in that it is anti-materialist in its view that speakers are seen as only

existing inside of discourses, where one discourse is always negotiated, challenged, evolved and adjusted through the lens of other discourses. (Baxter, 2003). What the anti-materialist means for FPDA, at least, is that research practices are always highly discoursal and textualized (ibid).

II. 6.3 Principles of FPDA

We can identify a host of principles constituting the practice of the discourse analyst, which blatantly define the FPDA approach but overlap with certain aspects of methodologies associated with CDA (Baxter, 2003).

II.6.3.1. Self-reflexivity

First of all, Baxter (2003) stresses that FPDA practitioners should tend to self-reflexive when revealing their theoretical positions, and make explicit the epistemological that are to be put into practice to any act of discourse analysis. This is based on the challenge of both poststructuralist theory and more recent feminist theory (eg. Butler, 1990) to the positivist view that there is a definite world that can be decisively known and explained (Foucault, 1980). By way of contrast, both feminist and poststructuralist theories agree that any interpretation of data must explicitly recognize that it is constructed, contingent, perspectival and context-driven. Feminist poststructuralist feminism must therefore:

> *Accept its own status as context-specific, the product of particular sets of discursive relations. It has no more claim to speak the truth than any other discourse but must own up its own points of view, specifications, desires, and political positions within power relations ... Poststructuralist theory argues that researchers should only temporarily associate themselves with a particular stance for fear that a "will to truth" will convert into "a will of power.* (Baxter, 2003, p. 59).

In an attempt to develop a wide and rife interplay and viewpoints in the discursive arena, FPDA practitioners should eschew engaging more than temporarily with any single agenda. However, this does not mean that FPDA practitioners cannot identify with a feminist perspective or take on a particular cause aligning with poststructuralist theory (e.g. Elliot, 1996). FPDA does not have a transformative inquiry, to represent the complexities and ambiguities of female experience; and to

afford, accordingly, space to female voices that are being silenced or marginalized by dominant discourses (Baxter, 2008a). Similar to CDA, FPDA challenge the assumption that there is an independent knowable world unassociated with human perception and social practices. In short, both of them share the conceptual awareness that they are self reflexive with regard to their development as "knowledge" (Baxter, 2003, p. 50). These approaches acknowledge that social realities are socially if not discursively produced.

II.6.3.2 A deconstructionist approach:

Deconstructionism has a rudimentary room in FPDA in that it allows a new way of interpreting texts by postulating "*a method of questioning the hierarchical oppositions that underpin gender, race and class oppression*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 24). To deconstruct a fixed representation or term is to examine, challenge and "problematize" it. A central tenet to both feminist and poststructuralist analysis is to catechize things, to deconstruct the constructions and structures around us, not in "*the nihilistic or relativist sense sometimes stereotypically associated with deconstructionism*" *(eg. Linstead, 1993; Norris, 1990), but in order to release the possibility of fresh juxtaposition and interplay among established and new ideas*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 61). This can then bring to light new insights and small-scale transformative actions.

A deconstructionist approach to discourse analysis might reiterate the existence of a constant "textual interplay" or "double movement" between concepts so that opposites blend in a continually undecidable exchange of attributes. The principle of "textual interplay" derives from Derrida's deconstructive principle difference, in which meaning is produced through the bifold concepts of difference and deferral, that theorists have developed an understanding of language in an incessant state of flux.

According to structuralists (eg. Saussure, 1974), signs are divided into "signifiers" (words, sounds, visual images) and "signified" (concepts), neither of which possess an intrinsic meaning.

Whilst their identity emerges in their difference from other words, sounds or images, Derrida (1978) argues that this identity is "*in turn subject to endless deferral*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 24). This is to mean that the meaning of any representation can solely be fixed impermanently as it is built upon its discursive context. Overall, signifiers are always dwelling within a discursive context, so that the

temporarily fixing of meaning which is the outcome of the reading of an image, word or text will depend upon that particular context. To nuance the picture, texts are continuously on the line of rereading and reinterpretation, both within the particular context and when / if there will be a shift of other contexts. Put simply, the meaning of texts is, in the words of Baxter (2003), always a "site" for contestation and redefinition by different readings within different contexts, rather than being fixed as knowable and immutable. In a broader context, the poststructuralist project attempts to challenge and break up all forms of queries that seek to fix meanings permanently as knowledge or, eventually as "truth narratives".

The major crux of a deconstructionist analysis is to question the modernist assumption that language is orchestrated in terms of oppositions, each term depending on and being endorsed by the other in order to signify. Terms of opposition such as male / female: public / private; subjective / objective exist or are often approached by modernist analysts as though they exist in a hierarchy, a polarity, a relationship of power, with one term at any time dominating over the other. However, Cooper (1989) argues that one term in any pair of oppositions always resides and interpenetrates the other term, creating a supplementary of both / and or a kind of *'double movement between the two'* (Baxter, 2003, p. 62). Whereas post structuralism challenges the closure of terms and actively probe the interconnection or "supplementary" of the one with the other, modernism underpins the opposition of terms placing one over or against the other.

Cooper (1989) comes up with two interrelated deconstructive "movements" or (in Baxter's terms) strategies that might be usefully employed by FPDA practitioners. The first is that of "overturning", which focuses on the dual oppositions of terms and challenges the place of the suppressed term. This, Baxter (2003) advocates, is the approach used in CDA, according to its stated mission that terms associated with the "oppressed" must be analyzed and determined as superior to terms associated with the "oppressor". Centering the marginal and marginalizing the central still assumes of role of being oppositional (strategy and itself instigates another hierarchy which in turn requires overturning the metaphorisation in the second strategy which, by its very nature, constitutes the hallmark of deconstruction. It makes a run at going beyond hierarchies of oppositions and maintains the perpetual double movement within the opposition metaphorisation which identifies that the definition of the positively valued term is built only by the contrast with the negatively valued term,

and that each reside, co-exist and co-evolve with the other. (Baxter, 2003). A deconstructionist approach:

> *Would advocate the need to juggle with sets of oppositions and supplementarities, always keeping one's options open in order to keep a richer, more nuanced range of ideas in play, it is this subtle process of textual interplay with apparently opposing on perhaps, competing terms and sets of ideas which has distinguished the deconstructionist approach from modernist versions of discourse analysis.*
>
> (Baxter, 2003, p. 63)

In an attempt to conduct a feminist poststructuralist approach to discourse analysis and step aside the criticism against deconstructive approaches, Baxter (2003) expands that there are numerous strategies by which FPDA practitioners can develop an established and focused approach to their work whilst simultaneously acknowledging the constant textual interplay of data arising from their quest, without "*being swallowed up by deconstructionist relativism*" (p. 64). The first is by obviously not developing a cardinal authorial argument at the expense of alternative points of view. Those alternative standpoints might be rendered by the voices of other theorists in the field. The participants in the research study, and / or by different members of a research group in conducting the business of analyzing texts. The bottom line is that the FPDA's motive is to preempt the imperialism of the author's voice and bring a richer, potentially more imaginative set of ideas and viewpoints into play. (Baxter, 2003). At a more profound level, the analysts should not privilege their own readings, and they must allow the change to their own voice to be supplemented by voices from a variety of data sources.

Secondly, discourse analysts, aiming for textual interplay, should resist the temptation to go for narrative closure, and opening room for an open ended verdict, or for alternative voices to illustrate the data. Following a deconstructive perspective, this encompasses the possibility of ossification and degradation into hierarchical structure, and brings up the recognition of the subtle, continuous

shifts between terms, ideas and perspectives. Baxter (2003) outlines that the business of FPDA analyst is effectively like that of a juggler who tends to hold all the batons in the air simultaneously. It is worth revealing that this analogy implies the multiple accounts, (the batons) and the author (juggler). FPDA framework should strive, according to Baxter (2003), to offer opportunities for

multiple, open-ended readings of a piece of analysis, but self reflexivity considers our own supplementary accounts alongside those of other participants.

II.6.3.3 Finding a feminist focus

Baxter (2003) explores how "third wave" or post-structuralist feminism seeks to smooth over and dissolve the opposition and tensions which indict the emancipatory agenda of modernist feminism. Above all, feminist modernism's hallmark was to pull together women against patriarchal oppression by displaying its arguments and calls for change with a common voice. The modernist or 'second-wave' feminism in the 1960s can be coupled with political resistance against sex discrimination and with the support of equal opportunities and women's emancipation as well. Modernist feminism has generally been identified by versions of enlightenment dream. This dream is, in feminist terms, constituted as the requirement to challenge and thwart the structures of male power. Along similar lines, the proliferation of gender and language research during the 'second wave' has aimed attention at discrimination and sexist vs. inclusive language, and has focused on aspects of difference and dominance in interaction.

Baxter (2003) argues that "*the current versions of feminism are in many ways compatible with, and supplement poststructuralist theory*" (p. 65). For example, poststructuralist principles of 'second wave' feminism challenges constructs of gender dichotomy and celebrates constructs of diversity and complexity as a supplement. Equivalently, 'third-wave' feminism, with its more critical, constructivist, and poststructuralist theoretical paradigms have a hand in with a host of current thinking within feminist linguistics. According to Mills (2002) and also summarized in Baxter (2003, p. 66), 'third-wave' feminism is concerned with the multiplicity, diversity, performativity and co-construction of gender identities with specific contexts and communities of practice. Feminist linguistics upholds that speakers produce their identities in social interactions in oscillating moves from sometimes underpinning and other times challenging ideologies of gender. In this sense, Bucholtz (1999) asserts that as new social resources become available; language users enact and

produce new identities that assign new meanings to gender. Generally speaking, third wave feminists fulminate against 'second wave' analysis in view of its 'essentialist' focus on comparing male and female speech.

It fares better to consider second and third wave feminist linguistics as being approaches which may be appropriate depending on the socio-cultural context, rather than seeing the two waves as chronological. In the case of sexism, for instance, for certain types of sexism, where a stereotypical view of men and women is being referred to, a second wave feminist approach may be far more relevant. In other cases, where the sexism is peculiar to specific context and can solely be inferred, a third wave approach can be applicable (Mills, 2008).

Overall, the end of second wave feminism and the starting point of 'third wave' was not sudden, nor was modernist feminism displaced by postmodernist feminism. Thus, the second and the third wave approaches or the modern and postmodern approaches are "*better seen as representing tendencies in feminist thought which have historically overlapped and coexisted*" (Cameron, 2005, p. 483). Within a poststructuralist paradigm, feminist research is concerned with feminist questions and issues that might be brought out in the study of specific communities of speakers, and is therefore perfectly suited to small scale, localized, short-term, critically planned projects which attempt to transform some aspects of social practices for girls/women. (Baxter, 2003). So, selecting a feminist focus to poststructuralist discourse analysis must inevitably have to move away from the old issues of women's subordination and oppression, or the effects of gender on speech patterns of particular social groups. It incorporates emphasizing key discourses on gender as they are negotiated and performed in the lab of specific, localized contexts.

Furthermore, it involves highlighting and elucidating the ways in which these discourses position female speakers (in particular) as relatively powerful, powerless or an association of both. It acknowledges the differences and complexities in the social practices of particular female speakers, as well as stressing the possibilities for resistance that redefines these social practices. It elaborates and illuminates moments of strength in women's interaction with others, whilst self reflexively "*pointing up the danger of becoming complacent about privileging certain (female) voices over those of others*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 66).

II.7 The pragmatic benefits of FPDA perspective to the study:

Feminist post-structuralism has sought to subvert the modernist myth that females' notion of "*essential identities has come the study of the multiplicity of gender identities and the realization that these are different femininities and masculinities which are often culturally and historically specific* "(Baxter, 2003, p. 182). Such a perspective is able to cite an interpretation of some of the theoretical complexities that have challenged feminism such as the multiplicity of ways in which power is constituted from both men and women, and between individual females themselves. On this basis, Baxter (2003) states that FPDA approach is not designated to make exaggerated generalizations about what is to be "male" or "female", as this tendency blatantly corroborates the dichotomization of the experiences of men and women and celebrate differences between them. Politically speaking, Baxter (2003) asks analysts to be constantly self-reflexive about making its attempt to privilege the category of "female" and discourses of gender for the practical aim of the study, a discursive choice.

In this respect, FPDA opts not to perceive females as the victims of the patriarchal order, nor to consider males as the villains of the piece (Baxter, 2003), but to view both biological sex categories from their plurality or diversity. Plurality also entails that both males and females are multiply set according to competing discourses, as powerful at times and as powerless at often times. Interestingly, this issue is often not one of difference but of gender polarization or, in Baxter's (2003) terms, the historically and culturally accreted discourse of "gender differentiation" (p. 183). FPDA helps describe the complexities of the experiences of numerous women/girls, and it equips feminist researchers with the thinking to unravel the issues, ambiguities and confusion of particular discursive contexts where women/girls are simultaneously positioned as powerful and powerless. In my study, I intend to explore how female students negotiate to benefit from the potential "proper platform" offered to them by FPDA.

The bottom line is that FPDA approach leaves space to multiple and competing voices by aiming to recognize and reveal "sites of struggle" in stretches of spoken or textual interactions. Because the meaning of identity, which is set up through competing discourses, poststructuralists consider language as a major site of struggle (Weedon, 1997). A site of struggle is usually adopted to refer to a discursive location (such as the family, motherhood, education, religion and so on) in

which authorial discourses compete for domination in their continuous endeavour to fix meaning (Simpson, 1997; quoted in Baxter, 2003, p. 187). Alternatively, it may also symbolize, on a micro analytical level, significant moments in spoken discourse where meanings are re (negotiated) and contested, revealed by differences of viewpoint, disputes of opinion or conflicting readings.

In sum, the rationale for adopting Baxter's proposal of feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis is to account for the complex ways in which classroom participants are both positioned by, and effectively construct their gender through discourse. In 2008, Castanẽda-Pẽna scrutinizes the social construction of gender identities through a case study of Colombian pre-schoolers learning English as a foreign language. He finds that FPDA is useful on the grounds that it offers a very specific, focused micro-analytical tool to determine the ways in which a number of gendered discourses function intertextually to position the pre-schoolers' voices within classroom discourses. He suggests that FPDA allocates a room for a new self-reflexive theoretical framework to the study of interface of gender, EFL learning and early childhood education. Drawing on this finely grained evidence, I opt for employing FPDA to investigate whether male/female students in the departments of English and architecture are uniformly powerful or powerless, or not. We attempt to delve into the ways in which students constantly shift between different subject positions in relation with the different discourses.

II.8 Communities of practice:

Wishing to move towards a dynamic, not just a static analysis, and to make the argument relevant to practice, linguists strive to move away from a reliance on the binary categorization and the generic fixed statements about all men and all women to a more malleable and clear-cut accounts about specific groups of women and men. Within this framework, women and men construct a variety of gender identities responding to particular circumstances that come about in different loci. In this vein, Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) have introduced the concept of community of practice (CofP) in which they develop the notion to corroborate the view that intermingles gender and language with the social practices of specific local communities.

To grapple with the full range of issues about gendered identities, we should first painstakingly recognize that the CofP is "*an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour*" (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992, p. 464). The concept of the community of practice permits a rich, vital and supple tool for the close examination of the interaction of language and society and; therefore, "*for studies of female's and male's gender variations*" (ibid).

The community of practice perspective directs the utmost importance to the activities, the practices in which components of the community engage and through which they linguistically endeavour to define themselves as members of the group. In an attempt to disentangle and clarify the opaque concepts adopted in gender studies, the construct of communities of practice has been aroused for the sake of enriching the inquiry of gender identity through postulating a clear- cut and penetrating analysis to the intimate relation that exists between language, identity and practice.

Aiming for looking over how students learn when constructing their gender identities, we opt for using the CofP as a theoretical framework in tackling this query because "*The essentialist view based on the determinism of the speech community has proved inadequate in dealing with issues of gender identity as agency and fluidity in identity construction are discarded*" (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 244). Considering the CofP model as being of utmost importance of the wide range of frameworks that have contributed to examine the sphere of gender and language, it would be momentous to elucidate how it has been brought to light and how it has evolved. The term community of practice was coined for the first time by Lave and Wenger in 1991 in their seminal book "Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation" where they attempted to spearhead the definition of the CofP. They saw that communities of practice as groups of people who have a keen interest and endeavour to perform something, and they have already learnt how to accurately reach it through their regular interactions. (Abdelhay, 2008). That is to say, the basic point of the concept of "community of practice" is a number of concourses of people who choose to interact together during their customary engagements in particular practices. In other words, those groups of people are no way compelled to take part; they themselves choose to engage in common practices. Then they are classified in relation to a set of characteristics and attributes mainly as in the view of the speech community frame work.

So, as we aim to canvass how EFL and architecture students learn and construct their identities in the process of "doing gender" based on community of practice model because *"Identities are rooted in what we do rather in the social categories, the Community of practice model can better capture the multiplicity of identities at work in specific situations, more fully, than is possible within the speech community frameworks" (*Abdelhay, 2008, p. 129). The community of practice plays a pivotal role in cogitating about the pliable nature of an individual's gender identity, in the fact that individuals are social actors who are constantly striving to anchor themselves in a wide range of different communities with different norms and values, and they will have; therefore, miscellaneous identity positions within these groups, both dominant and marginal. By way of explanation, women and men are not passive components who slip into claims of the social grid. If they misquote what the strict norms and standards of the speech community, they should be criticized for their deviation from the conventional rules. We think that this line of thought carries certain fallacy, not in entailing a set of attributes and gender roles, but in the fixed and passive picture of the construction of gender identity.

The basic premise of the community of practice framework is that individuals develop the manners of doing things together in the enterprise they engage in; being a family, teaching, learning, or playing music…etc. They develop the activities through refreshing common knowledge and beliefs. Of course, the communities of practice do not invent their way of speaking out of the whole cloth (Talbot, 2010), but orient to the different practices of larger speech communities, refining the practices of those speech communities to which individuals aspire.

At the level of the community of practice, ways of speaking seem to be most closely coordinated. It is through the participation in a range of communities of practice that people reify their personalities, their mental and social needs. Drawing on the community of practice perspective, our limelight should be directed to the term of "practice" which is the core sense of the whole framework. Lave and Wenger (1991) reckon that practice refers to the activity of "doing", but not doing for its proper purpose. That is to say, Lave and Wenger strive to point out that practice is doing in a social context (Abdelhay, 2008), which offers meaning accentuation to what individuals do.

Overall, the community of practice approach calls for a priority to the local and practical on the assumption that these hand over certain variability of gender practices. Along this line of thought, Eckert (2000) claims that practice is not simply a by-product of those groups of individuals; the communities of practice are created and developed in practice. (Abdelhay, 2008). The notion of practice was a potent concept of the CofP framework in the sphere of sociolinguistics concerning the area of language and gender. Theories of social practice pinpoint the necessity to find out ways to produce and reproduce manners for the sake of contributing in the various activities covering the world. These theories are "*concerned with every activity and real life settings, but with an emphasis on the social systems of shared resources by which groups organize and coordinate their activities, mutual relationships and interpretations of the world*" (Wenger, 1998, p. 13).

As it has been stated earlier, the gist which can be taken from the connotation of the concept of "practice" refers to the activity of doing, but this activity should prevail a social context, which gives certain value and specific meaning of what we do. To put it briefly, practice is, to the greatest extent, the medium via which our real and daily experiences reveal special meaning and become meaningful. The enterprises we engage in our life would be "valueless" (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 111), if it is likely to be bereft of meaning. So, we cannot reckon any activity we do as a practice-in a community of practice-unless it is destined for a certain purpose. That is, the practice, we intend to mean as having a critical role in the definition of CofP framework cannot be futile or empty of meaning. As Abdelhay (2008) claims, the meaning we aim to produce as an everyday experience, can be neither found in dictionaries nor in philosophical queries; where does the ball start rolling then?

The answer to this question would not be intricate by bringing into open the proposition rendered by Wenger (1998) to highlight the negotiation of meaning as a social practice. He stresses the concomitance of participation and reification as extremely interwoven into the human experience of the negotiation of meaning.

II.8.1 The negotiation of meaning:

Above all, the negotiation of meaning refers to the vital, active and productive process, a process which affords individuals the opportunity to make sense of their living in the world. Negotiation of meaning refers mainly to a continuous process of interaction to negotiate stands to

obtain an agreement between people; and this kind of negotiation is not, Abdelhay (2008) argues, different from negotiating a transaction and price. As a term, "negotiation" is used to convey the unceasing trials to succeed in passing rounds of daily interaction. By the concept of "negotiation", it is meant to be, according to Wenger (1998), the general need to reach meaningfulness while practicing daily activities in our world. Whether we are talking, acting, thinking, solving problems, or daydreaming, we are asked to achieve meanings.

Negotiation of meaning doesn't only dwell in a spate of words; it denotes far more than producing and making meaning through language. Since the construction of meaningfulness arises from the variety of activities we engage in everyday, it "*may involve language, but is not limited to it*" (Wenger, 1998, p.53). We cannot deny that language is one of the best mediums of human communication; yet it is not the only social practice individuals adopt to express themselves, swap news and convey essential commands. Spoken communication or direct contact is not the unique arena that allows the negotiation of meaning; clothes and body postures may be among the various factors of social relations.

Drawing on Wenger's practice theory, the conventional notion of femininity and masculinity, which has been for a long time claimed as sharing bipolar meanings, have been in fact, altered. It means that femininity does not necessarily equate with femaleness in the same way as masculinity no more equates with maleness (Abdelhay, 2008). This makes us keenly aware that the community of practice framework allows for a tremendous breadth of coverage of the salient aspects of how women and men come to readjust the meaning of femininity and masculinity, to shape and construct their gender identities; not as a bundle of fixed binary rules but as a tractable practice to negotiate the meaning in order to convey the *status quo* of the social actors those are interested in playing part of the social negotiation of meaning. Along Wengers' broad understanding and development of the concept of "meaning", he provides analytical tools that minutely investigate this process as it is constructed by people in different communities. He reckons that the negotiation of meaning constitutes of two convergent and interlinked processes which he labels "participation" and "reification". The negotiation of meaning is brought to light by virtue of the convergence of these two processes.

II.8.2 participation:

Participation can be classified as a significant concept in the community of practice perspective. For a start, the overwhelming majority of dictionaries would offer the definition of participation as taking apart and becoming actively involved in some activity, enterprise, etc. It would be conspicuous, then, that participation is the social practice which refers to the continuous activity of partaking and also to the relations shared with others that reflect this process.

For Wenger (1998), participation denotes both action and connection. People engaging in communities of practices exhibit various aspects of participation that give incentive to individuals to join and take part in a community. The bottom line is that participation is far more patulous than merely a restrictive engagement. Abdelhay (2008) states that the adjective of "academic" is not likely to be evanescent once the academic leaves the academe. Of course, we cannot deny that the teaching task is the most intense moment of participation for teachers, yet participation is not something that a teacher merely gets rid of it once s/he leaves the university. This is because it symbolizes who she/he is and it is omnipresent with her/him. It would be worth reminding, accordingly, that "*our participation as teachers has surfaced in short encounters on board a plane during trip, in public gardens or even in social gatherings and family dinners or celebrations*" (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 114).

From this point, we can agree with (Wenger, 1998; Abdelhay, 2008) that our engagement and participation within our communities is social and designates conviviality even in the absence of the direct contact with others. When an Imam, the leader of congregational prayer in a mosque-is preparing the *résumé* of the Friday Sermon, for instance, under the rubric "Be Righteous and Dutiful to our parents", he feels the presence of the prayers looking at him and listening to his religious exhortations, and they would react of course, silently. That is, he feels how the prayers will be influenced by his religious instructions and verses from Quran sent to them from his pulpit. For this reason, Wenger (1998) directs a spotlight on the fact that the notion of participation spreads to refer deeply to the social character of our experience of life.

II.8.3 Reification:

The term reification means "*making into a thing*". (Wenger, 1998, p. 58); its usage in English may carry an important twist; however, it is used to refer to the idea that has been made as real and concrete. Wenger used the concept of "reification" to mean the process of reincarnating our experiences by the innovation of objects that congeal the meaning of these experiences into "thingness". By so doing, we beget points of interest in which the negotiation of meaning becomes organized. In other words, Wenger (1998) attempts to explain the term "reification" as the process participants trace in a community to tackle an abstraction as substantially existing or as concrete material things. He figures out reification as the act of transmuting an experience or an idea to a tangible form.

Most significantly, the process of reification is a core stage to every practice. In any community of practice, there exist a number of abstractions, tools, symbols, stories, terms and concepts that reify something of that practice in a congealed shape or form (ibid). We think that reification as demonstrated by Wenger (1998) would be beneficial in the scrutiny of how women and men construct their identities. Whilst a fashion designer contrives garments and accessories aiming at incarnating his /her aesthetical ideas, language can symbolize the process of reification in the case of constructing gender.

Wenger (1998) puts forth that participation in a community of practice depends on reification in which they are constitutive of each other. Reification entails not only the negotiation of shared understandings but also raises the curtains to enable particular forms of social relation to be shaped in the process of participation. In elucidating the range of application of the term "reification", Wenger (1998) states that it can:

> *Cover a wide range of processes that include making, designing,*
> *representing, naming, encoding and describing as well as*
> *perceiving, interpreting, using, reusing and recasting ... from*
> *entries in a journal to historical records, from poems to*
> *encyclopedias, from names to classification systems, from dolmens*
> *to space probes, from the constitution to a signature on a credit*
> *card clip, from gourmet recipes to medical procedure, from flashy*
> *advertisements to census data, from single concepts to entire*
> *theories ... In all these cases aspects of human experience and*
> *practice congealed into fixed forms and given the status of object.*
> (Wenger, 1998, p. 60).

Wenger's examples of reification involve quite different kinds of representations, and the way he speaks about reification here makes it analogous to semiosis itself, that is, the sense-making and representation of meaning which are a fundamental part of all discourses and social practices. In particular, Wenger's notion of "reification" is useful to search out as long as it offers a specific analytical connection across communities of practice, literacy studies and broacher social theory.

II.9 Dimension of the community of practice:

As it has been revealed earlier, the community of practice framework, unlike the aforementioned theories, drew its roots from sociology, psychology, anthropology and women studies. The limelight of this theory was directed to five aspects of analysis, viz. No presupposition of gender differences as a starting point, it stresses the significance of the constructive practices of a group, especially mutual active engagement of attaining a jointly negotiated practice of gender. It shows an emphasis on learning and mutability in gendered linguistic styles displayed across groups. The community of practice perspective evinces that the intra-group variation should be interpreted as natural, and the crux of this theory is that the social construction of gender is local and cross culturally variable. In other words, argumentation and evidence of this theory was usually offered by canvassing activities and interactions, not differences. Of course, the communities of practice are not produced out of a thin air; Lave and Wenger (1991) define the CofP as one of the central insights which calls for a shared expertise. The emergence of communities of practice arouses from the shared expertise, specific ardency and position, which form the bedrock of the participation of the group of individuals in the world and catalyze those members to negotiate meaning via shared practice.

According to Lave and Wenger (1991), we are members of communities of practice. Needless to say, communities of practice are omnipresent. The substantial overlap of teachers in the department of Biological and Agricultural studies, for instance, takes place because the teachers partake the same interests. In an attempt to duly preserve and maintain the interests of the department and strive to engross in a variety of practices that tend to bring their academic roles to fruition, they should, according to Wenger (1998), sustain mutual relationships; either harmonious or conflictual. It is not necessarily to manifest a permanent concurrence. Put differently, albeit they may face disagreement, the practice of those teachers is to be personally involved or implicated into how they

would create a set of strategies to deal with the potential obstacles that may plague the prominent task of those teachers.

Similarly, radio journalists can symbolize one kind of the communities of practice. The members of this community tend to weld their formal academic backgrounds with their talents and viewpoints aiming at putting it into practice. By so doing, they attempt to keep themselves in tune with their audiences and improve the services and programmers. It is true that the entire world is saturated with different sorts of communities of practice. Yet, it is not usually, according to Wenger (1998), possible to call everything a community of practice. We and the cohort of our neighbors may constitute what is known as a "community", but it is not always a community of practice. (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 117). For this reason, the community of practice was defined by three elements.

- Mutual engagement
- A joint enterprise
- A shared repertoire

II.9.1. Mutual Engagement:

There is mutual engagement among the individuals of the community of practice. Its construction is not from scratch, the members of each community of practice are not randomly motivated to engage in practices whose meanings are negotiated with each other. The history which ties the teachers and even the Master students of architecture and English studies commenced long before they came to participate at the university along a continuum of teaching and learning. If we take Master students as a community of practice, their history would be seen as a preamble which offers relations of mutual engagement by which they can do whatever they want. The members of this community: "*develop practices, routines, stories proper to their department but which may overlap to practices of other teaching communities*" (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 117). According to Wenger (1998, 94), mutual engagement is the pivotal component that play a key role in any practice. It enables action, typically via "regular interaction".

Unlike the speech community which sets a bundle of instructions that should be taken into consideration by the members as a potent benchmark in order to be considered as belonging to

certain social category. The community of practice leaves room for the participants to join the community and take the onus to grapple with the variety of practices to engage in the process of the negotiation of meaning. By this token, we are inclined to tackle the differences of male/female modes of speaking from a community of practice perspective, because women and men engage in an interlocking networks of interpersonal relations from which practice is likely to spearhead the engagement with different practices. Overall, engagement in a community calls for the involvement in what matters inside it. This is, not only for the assurance that we belong to a particular community; but requirement would boost the preservation of the community's coherence as well.

It is true that mutual engagement plays a crucial role in making what we call a community of practice; it does not read for homogeneity. The heterogeneous manner of engagement adds a productive impetus to the process of practice. That is to say, the interactions and relations that make the nexus between the members of the community are not based on the homogenizing social expectations attributed to them. They can be rather epitomized as that they strive their relevance from the complexity of doing things together with an open variability; no rules regulate the form that it may take. (Wenger, 1998).

II.9.2. Joint Enterprise:

The community of practice is further defined by a joint enterprise, negotiated by the members of the community. The joint enterprise denotes the practices by which participants strive to meet their mutual engagement. Wenger (1998) directs attention that the joint enterprise refers to the joint for the joint action. In the case of the architecture teaching community, the joint enterprise was to ensure that the students come to capture the subtle ideas of architecture. Said differently, joint enterprise is the community's interpretation and the response to its shared situation. This enterprise is negotiated among community members and league persons together.

II.9.3. Shared Repertoire:

Finally, the community of practice is defined by a shared repertoire for sustaining the joint enterprise. The shared repertoire refers to the daily habits such as the three meals of the day, rituals

for special occasions, ways of speaking, modes of walking, lores and so forth. These routines and daily actions become part of the community's practice. In support of this, Wenger (1998) suggests that the repertoire includes *"routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures symbols, genres, actions or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence which has become part of its practice"*. (Wenger, 1998, p.83)

That is to say, thanks to their shared repertoire, members of community of practice contrive meaningful expressions about their ambient world and their identity, and "*their creation of styles-including linguistic style-by which they express their forms of membership and their identities as members*" (Abdelhay, 2008, p. 120). As a community is based on shared practices, the repertoire is a key component in recognizing and defining them. It seems interesting to note that the repertoire is not static, but it creeps over time as a response of either internal or external factors. From this vantage point, it would be clear why recent studies of gender and language adhere to the community of practice analysis; this framework allows for the diversity and fluidity men and women who generate and fine-tune their enterprise to display a number of social meanings.

II.10 Identity and Communities of Practice:

For a start, let us point that identity merely means how individuals come to construct themselves, of course with respect to those surrounding cohorts. Gender researchers have recognized, across the social sciences, that gender cannot be assessed as fixed or stable category because this would be generalizing the myriad experiences of women and men. In this line of thought, individuals contribute in various communities of practice and those communities are nested in a host of ways with other communities. Inasmuch as these processes of participation and interaction are continuously changing, members of the community of practice constantly reshape any sort of individual's identity, including gender identity. Wardaugh (2009) claims that individual's identity is created in and through several interactions with others, and the change may be tremendous. By this token, Ivanič (1998, p.10) notes that "identity" is a useful term, since "*it is the everyday word for people's sense of who they are*".

Gender is constructed through the social practices that people display in the miscellaneous communities in which they are members. Gender is, furthermore, what individuals do, not what they have (Wardaugh, 2009). It is a set of social practices and behaviours emanated from certain

ideas about what a particular culture at a particular moment in time reads as "masculine" or "feminine". Thanks to the concept of "community of practice", we gain the opportunity to canvass the individual's co-construction of the identity from the calibration of day to-day social membership and activity of individuals. Along this line of thought, Wenger (1998) defines identity as spatio-temporal, which means that identity is constantly constructing in a social context and through time.

Ivanič (1998) demonstrates that an individual's multiple identities are unlikely to be equally essential at any particular moment in time; one or more may spear-head at several and different times. Above all, Ivanič (1998) suggests that it would be beneficial to use the plural form of the word "identity" rather than its singular form. The plural form of identity, accordingly, allows for a tremendous breadth of coverage of the plurality and multiplicity of identities. She stretches the idea by asserting that:

> *The plural word 'identities' is sometimes preferable because it captures the idea of people identifying simultaneously with a variety of social groups. On or more of these identities may be foregrounded at different times; they are sometimes contradictory, sometimes interrelated: people's diverse identities constitute the richness of their sense of self. Identity is a result of affiliation to particular beliefs and possibilities, which are available to them in their social context.*
> (Ivanič, 1998, pp. 11-12).

By this token, individual identity is not built in a vacuum; it is co-constructed with a group of identities. In tune with recent gender studies, the emphasis shifted from the fixed and ready-made gender identity. Instead of looking at how selections of identities change in a number of different circumstances, linguists began to concentrate on figuring out the fluidity of gender identities. Gender identity is no longer tackled as fixed or unidimensional, but rather as a vital process, incarnated and reincarnated as the situation changes, time mutates, and the relationships are negotiated in the social practices of the community of practice.

People can have multi-membership when they take part at different communities of practice at the same time. Thus, learning also involves an identity negotiation process. However, conflicts may emanate among different identities, for example when females infiltrate the traditional male-dominated profession like architecture, their gender identity is stereotypically confronted by the culturally defined identity of the community, whish is associated with masculinity.

When Wenger (1998) postulates that the experience of identity is the practice of being in the world, there is an indication of an extensive connection between identity, experience, practice and social context. As Wenger (1998) argues that the issue of identity becomes more individual because individuals become a unique intersection of forms of participation, have multi-membership of different communities, and are situated in diverse social contexts where the identities are defined and constructed. Learning is, along these lines, a process of identity management, whereby individuals relate identities among diverse communities.

In consonance with Lave and Wenger (1991), learning involves traveling along a trajectory from a periphery to the center and becoming a full member of the community. For this very reason, I opt for adopting the CofP perspective to look into how architect female students might have different experiences. By extension, men and women may encounter different ways of access to participation into the community of architecture, in which the culture of architecture educational institutions are masculine and female's participation has been historically obstructed and marginalized by virtue of the historical male hegemony. In an attempt to investigate the process of professional identity construction, I aim to catechize how female students travel from the position of newcomer to the center, taking into account the prevailing norms which are based on men's interests.

Moreover, we hypothesize that there are also implicit expectations as to how femininity and masculinity should be performed in local scale of community (The English and architecture communities in our study), which requires different experiences in the identity work and the development process. Whilst learning involves participation in a community of practice, I intend to inquire about participation to local events of engagement in particular activities within certain students, but I kept account on a more encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities in relation to those communities (Wenger, 1998) as well as an experience of meaningfulness.

It seems imperative to assume that active participation, full membership and meaningful experiences are shaped and confined by gender norms of the big scale of community and the prevailing gender relations in the local community of practice. In engineering and architecture domains for instance, women are either ostracized or have to forsake their femininity in order to

cater to the needs of the masculine culture when participating into the communities of practice, by cause of the reproduction of values and behavioural patterns which transforms them to be more masculine (Salminen-Karlsson, 1999).

Besides, Kvande (1999) discusses how female identity in an engineering community of practice is also a process of getting a handle on the conflict of professional identity and gender identity. This is consistent with my research on how female architects negotiate their identity and position themselves in a male world, trying to illuminate the students' dilemma in facing of the challenges of identity. The key thrust of this study is a reanalysis of gender from the CofP perspective to outline how female architects learn to adjust to the masculine norms at the price of changing identity, or to openly resist it to keep femininity in the normal social value.

II.11 The Relevance of Communities of Practice in Gender Studies and Linguistic Variation:

It is worth reminding that the CofP is seen by lave and Wenger (1991) as
"an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour, ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations- in short, practices-in the course of this mutual endeavour" (Wenger,1991, p. 464).

The definition highlights the critical role that practices play in constructing group membership and belonging without glossing over social and linguistic differences. The community of practices framework places language in the column of the different practices performed by individuals. A host of traditional researchers of gender and language studies (Lakoff, 1975, for instance) postulate that this arena of research should imperatively direct the limelight on women and how they deviate, or how they are perceived as turning aside from what is called "the norm". Eckert and Mc-Connell Ginet (1992), however, argue that researchers must also examine the norm for the sake of uncovering how it becomes the norm, and to challenge its status as a norm. In a community of practice, language is seen as crucial in reliance with other practices. In accordance with this conceptualization, individuals can participate in multiple communities of practice and individual identity is the eventual repercussion of the multiplicity of this participation. Gender construction and development, to *précis* the view again, does not stop in childhood or adolescence. Rather, gender is constantly reshaping as we learn to act like journalists, students in the laboratory, teachers in seminars, and as we move in the market place. As another community which leagues persons

together, the family via which individuals are taught how to cope with the constant status changes of the family. We learn how to be wives and husbands, mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, sisters and brothers, grandmothers and grand fathers. (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1995).

The community of practice perspective permits linguists to look over how males and females learn how to look and act in particular ways and to heed the way they participate in specific communities and relationships. So, the gist of the CofP perspective is to cast light on the activities and practices, in which members of the community perform practices striving to define themselves linguistically as members of the squad they belong to. Eckert and Mc Connell-Ginet (1992) present the community of practice perspective as a theoretical framework to illuminate how women and men construct new and variable identities through breaking down the monotonous expectations of what women and men should be. They consider the CofP as a heuristic model which better helps capture the way femininity and masculinity are delineated. In a word, the community of practice perspective can be considered as feasible in analyzing the fluidity and the malleable perception of gender within the community.

Interestingly, Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) introduce the concept of communities of practice attempting to rectify some gaps left by the speech community perspective. They tried to use the CofP, *in lieu of*, speech communities to analyze social identity as fixed and gender as homogeneous category. By this token, the community of practice is explained as a combination of people who come together around a specific mutual engagement or enterprise. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) describe the CofP framework as a constructionist approach to the interlocking network between language and identity. Many arenas of gender research have considered the community of practice framework as an analytical tool which serves for a penetrating analysis of variation. Those researchers aim at moving towards a dynamic not static analysis and to explore the avenue of how gender is constructed through language. The construction of meaning by means of linguistic variation is part of the individual's participation in the different networks and communities of practice. Variation can be considered as part of the speaker's active participation and his/her construction of the social world and himself or herself in that world.

In her study of a nerd identity, Bucholtz (1999) elucidates the construction of a nerd identity in the students that she dissected. In her scrutiny, she finds that the students' identification as nerds has to infiltrate a process of negotiating their identity via a complex and dynamic set of activities and

practices. In an attempt to negotiate the nerd identity, those students attempt to innovate their practices so as to be the *ne plus ultra* of the other students. They try to distinguish themselves from other students by creating specific practices as a *sui-generis* of their identity adopting formal language and inserting complex and sophisticated vocabulary and expressions. It was blatant, therefore, that the identification as a nerd was shaped within and in response to other identity practices. (Weatherall, 2002). In this vein, Bucholtz (1999) intends to sustain the assumption that identity is constructed prior to language.

Again, the CofP notion of identities is not predetermined by what the expectations of the speech community call for; it is neither fixed nor unified. People may rather choose to engage in the construction of identities through practices performed across times and places. Along this line of thought, Eckert's (1989) examination of the study of identity practices of students in an American high school would be an illustrative example of the research conducted on linguistic variation and identity drawing on a community of practice framework. Eckert (1989) suggests that the social life of the students those who she investigated was defined by two salient social identity categories, viz. "Jocks" and "burnouts". "jocks" were effectively an adolescent version of the corporate middle class, where students' visibility was obtained through their commitment and success in school-related activities.

The term "Jock" originated in sports, which are core elements to the high school culture; this term is a classic North American stereotype of male athlete. By way of contrast, "burnouts" were likely to involve norms more associated with working-class ideals (Eckert, 2000). "Burnouts" and "jocks" as communities of practice were defined by engagement and participation in certain activities, such as drug use for burnouts and the contribution in school sports for jocks. They do so through the use of a specific unprecedented Detroit accent for burnouts and a more standard Midwestern accent for jocks. As they label themselves "jocks" and "burnouts", gender and (class-based) burnout/jock identities interacted in order to leave room for burnout girls to display novel pronunciations from Detroit that discriminated them from burnout boys and from jocks girls as well. Albeit burnout girls identified with burnout boys more than with jock girls, burnout girls engage separately in practices from burnout boys. Say differently, these students seem as innovating multiple identities simultaneously, as burnout or jock, girl or boy.

As a host of sociolinguists that have taken up the concept of the community of practice, Eckert (2000) mainly bases her explanation of communities of practice through her rife ethnography of jocks and burnouts as adolescent style-groups at Belten High school in the Detroit suburbs. She painstakingly explains how meaning is built through the interlocking network of relations. She elaborates as follows:

> *Meaning is made as people jointly construct relations through the development of a mutual view of, and in relation to the communities and people around them. This meaning-making takes place in myriad contacts and associations both with and beyond dense networks. To capture the process of meaning-making, we need to focus on the level of social organization at which individual and group identities are being constructed, and which we can observe the emergence of symbolic processes that tie individuals to groups, and groups to the social context in which they gain meaning.*

(Eckert, 2000, pp. 34-35).

A propos, Eckert (2000) dissects the way jocks and burnouts generate and live-out specific styles-styles of dress, activity and speech-so as to define themselves as separate from other groups. Aligning with this idea, individuals are capable to beget novel symbolic features into their proper interpretations of group-style. In support of this, Eckert (2000, p. 43) maintains that "*both individual and group identities are in continual construction, continual change, continual refinement*". Concerning the scrutiny of language variation, the "practice" perspective pulls us away from what might be called, the strict pre-formed sociolinguistic structure. It, however, sustains the idea of structure as a potential attainment of language and discourse. The limelight of practice perspective has been on social meaning, which is veritably obscured by classical variationist researchers such as Labov (1972) and Trudgill (1974).

Put simply, it focuses on the construction of social meaning in a given context:

> *Variation does not simply reflect a ready-made social meaning; it is part of the means by which that meaning emerges. A study of social meaning in variation, then, cannot view speakers as incidental users of a linguistic system but must view them as agents in the continual construction and reproduction of that system. Social meaning in variation is not a static set of associations between internal linguistic variables and external social variables; it is continually created through the joint*

114

> *linguistic and social engagement of speakers as they navigate their way through life.*

(Eckert, 2000, p. 43).

Again, Eckert (2000) suggests, accordingly, that the phonological variation of language can serve in the distinctiveness of the jock and burnout social groups besides their variant engagement and commitment to school activities. Eckert (2000) directs a spotlight on how certain discursive moments are extremely salient loci for highly styled socio-phonetic features. She finds out frequent communicative routines such as dude, cool, right, excellent and damn. (Eckert, 2000). By this token, she elucidates how socio-phonetically tremendous variants infiltrate the utterances they reveal by adding social meaning to those linguistic articulations. By way of illustration, the word "right" said with a very high nucleus of [ai], excellent with backed [ɛ], damn with raised [æ] may symbolize certain social meaning which differentiates them from the rest of the groups. The identities of those students were conveyed by the creative use of those phonological variants in their accents. Eckert (1996) interprets this fact of variation (the girl's use of [ai]) as a stigma of their pride of displaying particular styles that put them aside from the other jocks, albeit she is a jock. (Abdelhay, 2008).

As a theoretical framework, the community of practice embraces the idea that language can be considered as one of the various practices individuals put forth to take part in their communities of practice as means of constructing gender as something we do, create, manufacture, perform and thrive. More interestingly, it should be noted that the community of practice subtle ideas about how women and men engage in a constant creation of novel and, sometimes, unprecedented linguistic styles, are crucial in the study of gender and language. Put in another way, this new perspective provides the opportunity for a host of gender researchers to discern the vast array of linguistic choices men and women tend to perform as they contrive to construct miscellaneous gender identities drawing on a number of factors such as age, race, religion, history, etc. That is, the CofP model pulls us away from looking at gender differences as a fixed and binary opposition. This framework does not abort the existence of some linguistic differences between women and men, but it has been trying to dig out facts proving how gender differences are significant in understanding the relation between gender language and society, not as a stable and permanent roles that makes what is known as gender, but as a flexible and temporal social practices from moment to moment. Along this line of thought, gender implements the social practices is order to make them apt for the

sudden and continuous situations that they spring each day and in every locus. We do think that the CofP perspective allows for looking at how social actors update their social identities corresponding to a great number of social and psychological factors.

II.12 Communities of practice and learning:

Wenger (1998) demonstrates that CofP presents a theory of learning that lays foundation with the assumption that engagement in social practice is the rudimentary process by which we learn and so become who we are. In addressing issues of learning explicitly, institutions are extremely built on the assumption that learning is an individual process, that it is confined by a beginning and an end. In line with Wenger (1998), we tend to adopt a different perspective to interpose learning within the list of our lived experiences of participation in the world such as eating or sleeping.

According to Wenger (1998), knowledge is a matter of competence with regard to valued enterprises (such as exploring scientific facts, writing poetry and growing up as a girl or a boy, and so forth), whilst knowing refers to participating in the pursuit of such enterprises, that is, of active engagement in the world. As mattering much, learning is to produce meaning which is our capacity to experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful. In this sense, participation here goes far beyond referring to local events of engagement in certain activities with certain people; it refers to a more embracing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities with regard to these communities.

For many of us, the concept of learning immediately evokes images of classrooms, teachers, homework, textbooks and exercises. However, Lave and Wenger (1991) are postulating in their model of communities of practice, that learning is social in nature and is generated from our practices in daily life. Communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) are usually unofficial communities in which learning by doing is constitutive. The bottom line is that learning is not abstract in individual minds, it is constructed through participation in social practices. Thus, learning takes place through participation and engagement in different activities and through interactions with others, and learning can reproduce and change the social structure, or community through this constant interaction. By this token, Wenger (1998) argues that *"learning is an integral part of our everyday lives. It is part of our participation in our communities and organizations. The problem in*

not that we do not know this, bur rather we do not have systematic ways of talking about this familiar experience." (Wenger, 1998, p. 8).

The concept of the community of practice is, for Lave and Wenger (1991) an ideal learning context in which new members of the community can engage in "legitimate peripheral participation" and embark on belonging to the community and their cultural practices as well. "Legitimate peripheral participation" refers to the process of becoming a fully participant and accepted member of a community through participating in this community. Therefore, learning is defined as the process of "understanding" in practice "*that is embedded in taking part in daily activities*" (Wenger, 1998, p. 46). As individuals participate in communities of practice, they glide from the position of "newcomers" to "old timers" as they become knowledgeable in the practice. It is the subtle opportunities that afforded to leaning by the "peripheral participation" within the "lived in" world that are critical. It includes:

> *An increasing understanding of how, when, and about what old timers collaborate, collude and collide, and what they enjoy, dislike and respect and admire. In particular, it offers exemplars … including masters, finished products and more advanced apprentices in the process of becoming full practitioners.*
>
> (Lave and Wenger 2002, p. 114).

These lines of thought signify a shift away from the development theory of Piaget (1973) in that learners acquire structures to understand their world. Lave and Wenger (1991) assert that Piaget's work apparently miss the recognition of the role of social influences, which model the way knowledge is understood, framed, represented and applied. Thus, they probe the kinds of social engagements that offer the appropriate context for learning to take place, rather than examining the cognitive process and conceptual structures which are involved in learning.

II.12.1 Situated learning:

As its name may indicate, situated learning is learning that takes place in the same context in which it is applied. Lave and Wenger (1991) situate learning in communities of practice where "*learning is described as an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice*" (p. 53) which is captured in their descriptions of "legitimate peripheral participation". Lave and Wenger (1991)

argue that situated learning is more encompassing in intent than conventional notions of "learning in situ" or "learning by doing" for which it was used as a rough equivalent (p. 31). Also worth considering, Wenger (1998) characterizes "situated learning" as the duality of participation and reification in social practice. This relation reckons up two aspects to the prior work of Lave and Wenger (1991). Firstly, the development of action based concepts and meaningful practices; and secondly, the notion of learning as a continuing process, which develops through ongoing negotiation of practices and concepts among practitioners. The latter aspect also implies the limitations of the earlier concept of "legitimate peripheral participation". While "legitimate peripheral participation" is meaningful in the initial phases of learning in the community context; the duality of practice and reification bears out the ongoing learning process of long standing members and "experts" as part of the social practice of a community (Wenger, 1998, p. 55).

Situation learning or "learning in practice" coverts accordingly three fundamental aspects: understanding, participation in the continuing social activities, and context. This would raise the question "what are the integral relationships between persons and the contexts in which they act? This relation of the three aspects is commonly used in the field of ubiquitous learning, by determining ways of offering learning events according to the (physical) context of a learner (Wenger, 1998). Lave (1996) recognizes that the problem of context in learning has to aim attention at the relationships between local practices that contextualize the ways people act together, both in and across contexts. Drawing on this perspective, context is bifold on the grounds that it defines possible activities and is defined, as well, through the activities of people. That is to say, learning cannot be reduced to a set of contextual learning events, but it needs tight blend to the social practices in which learning is situated. To nuance the picture, knowledge is not a bundle of descriptions, therefore, learning is not only the acquisition of certain forms of knowledge, but it rather arises and develops in all human activities in daily life. To espouse social practices, learning and context is linking to Wenger's (1998) concepts of "identity" and "meaning". Lave (1996) states that both concepts are actively constructed by the learners.

II.12.2 Learning, practice and identity:

In the discussion of the relationship between identity and learning, Wenger (1998) views learning as "*a process of … becoming a certain person*" (p. 125), of transforming knowledge into an identity that has context. Wenger (1998) stresses the temporal nature of identity and suggests that

identity, a crucial concept in social constructivist views of learning, is being constantly renegotiated in our learning process. In this sense, Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that learning and identity construction are fundamentally social practices than a set of individual cognitive or psychological function. All the while, meaning is central to Wenger's line of reasoning of how learning an identity relate.

Inevitably, there is no learning and, as a consequence, no identity construction without personal meaning. On this point, meaning is not given; it is rather achieved through learning. There has been traditionally far too much limelight directed, for educators – especially in the arena of work – based learning – on relevance of learning rather than meaningfulness. As a matter of fact, Lave and Wenger (1991) asserts that relevance is already guaranteed where learning is "situated" or based in authentic work contexts. In lieu of defining learning as an accumulation of knowledge, skills and values, they harbor that learning is meaningful social act of participation. Giving insight into the fact that learning and the construction of identities are inseparable when individuals participate in the CofP, Wenger (1998) claims that:

> *As an aspect of social practice, learning involves the whole person [and] implies becoming able to be involved in new activities, to perform new tasks and to master new understanding. [They] are part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning ... Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations.*
> (p. 53).

As people participate in a range of social practices and contribute to relationships, they are in proper sequence defined by those relationships. They are, therefore, involved in a process of identity construction that is evolving, dynamic and an ever continuing process of becoming. Whilst people move along the trajectories through CofPs, they construct their personal professional identities, as well as identities of participation.

By way of defining, Wenger (1998) spells out that practice is the participation in social activities, and this is the way in which individuals learn. He describes practice as "doing" in social and meaningful ways, and it involves explicit elements such as tasks, language and artifacts (documents, images and so on), as well as implicit elements such as perceptions and relationships.

Wenger's conceptualization of social practice reckons that learning occurs in every aspect of people's interactions with the social world.

Starting from the premise that there are powerful interrelationships between practice, learning and meaning negotiation in CofPs, Wenger (1998) acknowledges that they ultimately lead to the construction of personal and professional identities, learning within social contexts is therefore a cardinal part of identity construction in any learning satiation, including formal learning organizations such as universities. Although Wenger's (1998) work was not specified to education, he considers educational expertise as CofPs, and argues that the central task of such communities is the "opening identities" (p. 263), and the exploration of fresh ways of being that did not exist before. Education is, in essence "*an investment of a community in its own future, not as a reproduction of the past through cultural transmission, but as the formation of new identities that can take its history of learning forward*" (Wenger, 1998, p. 264). He reasons that schools and universities should be learning organizations rather than teaching organization, and that educational institutions can endorse transformational learning in several ways. He maintains that harmony is required between newcomers' assimilation of existing knowledge and the incorporation of other knowledge that they import into the institution.

Learning would, from then on, enable newcomers to contribute their proper ideas and beliefs to the shared knowledge of the community, and to negotiate new meanings about its practices. Wenger (1998) believes that educators should offer resources that allow learning to emerge from individuals' participation, and from the collective negotiation of meaning. That is to say, students will be provided with the opportunity to draw connections between their current context and other communities of practice.

Identity construction, which is a natural consequence of apprenticeship, involves three vital factors. First, the presence of an authentic CofP with attainable expertise to encourage the learning activities of apprentices; second, meaningful peripheral participation for apprentices that confers a sense of belonging to the target CofP, and third, meaningful engagement with practice turning towards fuller and deeper participation in the CofP. This formation of learning is also a formation of identity, conferring not only meaning in learning, but "*more significantly, an increasing sense of identity as a master practitioner*" (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 111).

The major thrust of this study is to tackle both how students perform a task to develop their identities, and how they learn to do in gender appropriate way in CofPs. We strive to test, in the case of identity struggle how students confront dilemma situation in the process of negotiating different and contradictory identities.

II.13 Conclusion:

We champion the coupling of feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis and communities of practice in unraveling issues of gender identities in learning English as a foreign language and architecture as distinct communities with different stereotypes and norms. I FPDA to scrutinize the multiple performances of masculinity and femininity in the EFL and architecture classrooms.

Besides, we opt for adopting the Cofp perspective to well demonstrate the shift away from threads of research which shoehorn all males and females into discrete categories. I expect that this combination of approaches will allow us to benefit from each method, in its own way, in uncovering gender issues in educational communities of practice where speakers are often positioned in different ways.

III.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I intend to move from the theoretical background of feminist post-structuralism of the principles of FPDA, to recognize how we can apply such approaches to analyse discourse within two different contexts. I aim to take the EFL and the architecture classes as case studies to delve into the fluctuating power relations through competing discourses. This part seeks to consider the relationship between gender and students' use of 'effective speech' and authoritative talk in the classroom. By so doing, I highlight the process by which I identify different classroom discourses in an attempt to analyse them adopting FPDA.

III.2 Purpose of the Study

In line with the concordance of the social constructionist view and feminist post-structuralism, I seek to survey how gender identities are continuously performed (Butler, 1990) and in conformity with cultural norms to define masculinity and femininity (Cameron, 1997b). This approach permits us to mirror the fact that individuals are not uniquely positioned, but are produced in relations of power that are constantly changing, displaying them at times powerful and at the other times powerless (Baxter, 2003).

In order to pursue the question of this thesis about gender construction in the EFL and acrhitecture classrooms, it is essential to begin by looking at the perspectives from which the original query of the study arose. From a feminist perspective, I had an interest in exploring how language constructs subject identities, how speech is produced, negotiated and contested within particular social contexts. I strive to describe, analyse and interpret an aspect of spoken interaction perhaps overlooked by CDA (Baxter, 2003, p.44) - the fluctuating ways in which speakers, within any discursive context, are positioned powerful or powerless by competing social and institutional discourses. Adhering to the performative rather than the essentialist or possessive nature of gender (Butler, 1990,1991), I aim at tackling the multiplicity and diversity of women's and men's identities. Indeed, the terms 'power' and 'powerfully' are continuously used in this research to refer to the way in which students are often better positioned than others to

benefit from experiences and interests of a prticular context, and more importantly perhaps by virtue of their more privileged positioning (Baxter, 2003) within a complex network of dominant discourses. In this vein, Holmes (1992) reveals that a male speaker in a business meeting may be more pwerfully positioned than a female speaker for the sake of displaying an extended contribution to the meeting. She further illuminates this case by the fact that a dominant discourse of gender differentiation tends to construct men as more willing than women to contribute in public or formal contexts.

By way of contrast, FPDA perspective view that individuals are seldom consistently positioned as powerful across all discourses within a given community of practice (Baxter, 2003). In this case, they are positioned simultaneously as both powerful and powerless. Within competing discourses, it is possible for speakers to be positioned as relatively powerful within one discourse but as relatively powerless within another.

A feminist post-structuralist perspective on discourse suggests that females always adopt multiple subject positions, and that it is far too constricting to designate women in general, or indeed any single woman, simply as victims of male oppression (Jones, 1993). In most cases, females-according to Baxter (2003) may be simultaneously perhaps powerful withing certain subject positions. Besides, I intend to exhibit the complexities and the ambiguities of female experience, giving space to female voices being silenced or marginlized by dominant disocurses in both communities of practice, which is the *raison d'être* of FPDA.

Overall, we try to see through the ambiguities and confusions of certain discursive contexts where females are sustained as simultaneously powerful and powerless. In other words, this research explores the uneveness and ambiguities of power relations between male/female students. Authoritatitve speaking skill in public context –with its power to influence personal opinions as well as to bring change to social and professional practices, is of paramount importance for success and, utimately leadership, in most professions. As revealed in the first chapter, recent studies (Maltz and Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1995) argue that men steer away from asking questions, employing the statement of the fact in their own conversation patterns, whereas women are supposed to create and maintain relationships of closeness and equality, and to criticize each other in an acceptable way.

My premilinary observation of the classrooms holds out that female students are not permanently trapped into silence, disdvantaged or victimhood by dominant discursive practices, a fact which tends to butress by linguists such as (Butler, 1990 ; Weedon, 1997 ; Baxter, 2003). In dissenting the traditional feminist view that, for instance, female students are uniformally disempowered. Taking issue with gender binary opposition and female discrimination, my first observation may carry a factual tone about the students' ability to adopt speaker positions which are continuously intervened by his /her subject positions within a number of competing discourses in both communities.

Most concern of this study falls broadly into attempt to unveil the complex network of power relations and the role of gender stereotypes in the EFL and architecture classrooms. Albeit the fact that there is some evidence- in terms of classroom behaviour and management- that in mixed groups, male learners tend to dominate verbally the conversations, there is a growing consensus about the popular belief that girls are 'better' L2 (second language) learners than men and boys. For this very reason, girls achieve higher language related exam results in British schools and elsewhere in the world (Sunderland, 2004).

Basically, what we want to investigate is the paradoxical positioning to negotiate identities and meanings, which are embedded in gender stereotypes and the discursive practices enacted by students in their cofPs. Eventhough they have not remained uncontested, the belief that language learning is a 'feminine domain' and that *"females are better at language learning than boys"* is rife (Soars & Soars, 1989, p. 6). To nuance the picture, I srive to survey how both females and particularly males negotiate to be power-positioned via authoritative talk in the EFL as a feminine domain.

On the other side, Bergvall (1996) holds that engineering is a traditionally masculine domain, and despite the fact that women now study to be enginners too, it is still an extremely androcentric area, both in education and elsewhere. Bergvall reports that female engineering students face big problems as a result of such traditional notions. This line of thinking invites one the significant

inquiries in this study which is the emphasis upon notions of fluidity of gender constructions and female resistance and reinterpretation of stereotyped subject positions.

My decision to select this community next to the EFL classroom engendered quite naturally from the ethnographic process of observing classes of Master one and Master two architecture students at the university of Hassiba Benbouali university (Chlef, Algeria). In consonance with Bergvall's (1998) examination of femle engineering students' discourse, my interest to explore the complexities of female architecture students in a traditionally masculine domain calls into play. She reports that women in this community of practice (an engineering department in US, mid western university) must shift between competing subject positions (Bergvall, 1996). She reiterates that women in this community of practice are unable to tally with the rigid notions of dichotomous gender. They struggle continuously between multiple gender positions, some relatively empowering and others less, in order to attain recognition and acceptance from their male colleagues. Yet, she argues that this complex struggles over gender identity are unlikely to empower women in a long run, which may impede their success in pursuing an education and a career. I agree with Baxter (2003) in the fact that Bergvall (1996) prefigures FPDA approach in conducting an analysis which takes the form of a detailed recognition of the ways in which female speakers co-construct varying identities for themselves according to the context. Along this line, Bergvall (1996) highlights the need to a theory of language and gender that is neither binary nor polarizing, but situated and flexible to delve into the complexities of constructing and enacting multiple gender positions through discourse.

Baxter (2003) holds out an FPDA approach which is concerned with the free play of multiple voices within a discursive context, which means that the voices of silenced, minority or oppressed groups need to be heard. In light of these complexities, I will adopt Baxter's (2003) FPDA approach to sketch how some Algerian students may acknowledge their agency to resist, challenge and potentially overturn discursive practices conventionally position them as powerless victims. Moreover, an educational perspective also tends to generate the original objective of this study.

In line with the growth in emphasis on the significance of student-centered learning, classroom talk is increasingly seen of paramount importance to the learning process. A range of international research has persuasively evidenced that the skill to speak effectively in public awards social and/or professional prestige which is usually addressed to males in any given society (Baxter, 2003 ; Coates, 1993 ; Holmes, 1998 ; Jones 1997 ; Tannen, 1995). Here, I wish to direct a spotlight on exploring how speaking up in the classroom negotiates and creates important social power and legitimacy.

The ability to speak effectively in large groups, formal or public contexts is potentionally empowering for young people actually, academically and professionally. This thinking reconciles with Baxter's (2003) view of effective speech as the capability to make a convincing case to a group of peers, to persuade people's point of view and to resist the false arguments of others to make an impact on public opinion. Again, I underline the importance of effective speech techniques used by the participants of this study who will be future English teachers. Professional communication about how an architect informs, persuades and instructs his/her clients is also one of the concerns of this profession. That is to say, learning public speaking and debating with other classmates are of the chief importance to the future architects for more effective job performance.

Another quest to be surveyed is what constitutes effective speech in classroom public contexts for EFL and architecture students in Algeria. Unfortunately, criteria of speaking in public contexts and its evaluation has been an undervalued part within the curriculum. In light of this, I strive to uncover how male/female students in both communities are evaluated by their teachers, raising questions to find out what constitutes the ways in which students speak in public contexts. Besides, I aim to delve into the perceptions of what is to be an 'effective' speaker in public contexts according to the students themselves, their teachers and the researcher. And central to this study is to chalk out the role gender plays for evaluating effective speakers following Baxter's (2003) feminist post-structuralist analysis of British high school students' classroom talk. She sketches the extent to which institutional assessment of effective talk is based on criteria associated with stereotypically masculine speech.

Taking into account the complex and probably more troubling insights into the possibilities for transforming social practices, I select FPDA, rather than CDA which was my preliminary approach alignment, to understand how language constructs subject identities in learning contexts and how is speech produced, negotiated and contested within particular social contexts. It seems imperative to note here that the decision to apply FPDA was very much a contextualized response to the scope and nature of this particular corpus of date. I decided to take up FPDA as a discourse analysis tool only during the ethnographic process of collecting the data as I begin to notice that speakers are able to adopt or resist relatively powerful or powerless subject positions at their disposal within competing discourses at any given moment.

III.3 The Research setting
III.3.1 The EFL Classroom

The research study took place at the university of Hassiba Benbouali in Chlef (located in the north of Algeria), particularly in the department of the English language. The study examined a mixed-sex class of Master two (entitled English literature and civilization). I have observed their oral presentations over a period of four months during their 'feminist tradition in the English novel' module in their Master 1 class. I continued my observation with the same students in their Master 2 course of 'oral presentation' in which they display their MA dissertation proposals and discuss them with their teacher and their peers. Master 2 class comprised 34 students as it comprised unequal numbers of boys and girls (25 females and 9 males). I was aware of particular commonalities between the students' ethnic background, age, class and competence. Yet, I forgrounded gender for specific observation and detailed examination because the crux of this research is to draw a comparative analysis between males and females talk in their oral presentations. As I was inspired by Baxter (2003), I intend to check whether female EFL students are multiply located in discourse and not constituted as victims, and how they can resist particular classroom practices.

As part of his examination, students are required to speak persuasively and influentially in public settings as a preparation for their viva-voces to get their MA degree. The central concern of my research is more emperical than curricular ; I aim to observe and get an in-depth understanding of the gender issues arising from the ways in which speakers and listeners in

public contexts and negotiate different, and sometimes contradictory positions to construct their gender identities in their communities of practice. In explaining my interest in the relationship between gender and talk in public contexts, two teachers in the English department conveyed an interest to take part as research patterns in this study ; I was the third teacher participant as first group 'oral presentation' teacher next to another teacher who teaches this module as for other classes, and the teacher of 'feminist tradition in the English novel'.

III.3.2 The Architecture classroom

The second case study took place in the department of architecture at the university of Hassiba Benbouali (Chlef). Again, the second community of practice is based on extracts from a reflexive ethnographic study of male/female architecture students' speech in public contexts. The study examines mixed-sex groups of 39 (33 females and 6 males) students in their second year Master. I selected group one out of five groups in their first year of Master for observation. I kept my investigation with the same group on their final year of Master. On this occasion, I state that my selection of only one group was not haphazardly. It was agreed by the great majority of the tutors that group one is comprised of a number of effective speakers from both genders, and others who say little. My research took place over the second semester of Master one and the first semester of Master two. Eight 'Master one' and ten 'Master two' workshops have been investigated on their oral presentations of their final projects. In fact, the weekly workshops of six hours, which contain the main part of the strutural educational program, provide a broad insight in architectural design skills with a focus on tectonic qualities. Students work in groups of four or six, to some extent independently from tutors, and their final results are displayed to a jury of two or three teachers.

The students of each group present their works in the form of drawing and models, after which their work is discussed and criticized by students and tutors. Their teachers provide them with a feedback that incorporates a graded mark based on their progress to date. The major thrust of this part of research is to analyse gender negotiation in public contexs by architecture students. I can deem the classroom setting or the architectural workshops as a 'public' context (Baxter, 2003) because it is an oral activity involving groups of eight students or more. The tutors of the

workshops had the opportunity to watch the video recordings of the students' presentations, evaluate their works, comment on their students' design, consult and give feedback on their oral presentations. Within this in mind, I try to respect Baxter's (2003) multiple voiced and multifaceted perspectives of FPDA. Importatntly, The extracts of the architecture students are translated to English because their presentations are in French and Arabic as they code switch to it.

III.4 Methodology

As detailed in the previous chapter, FPDA combines the principles and practices of post-structuralism with a feminist focus in order to address specific contextualized gender issues. In keeping with Baxter (2003), the methodology for this research is designed to analyse the ways in which speakers shift between subject positions of 'powerfulness' and 'powerlessness' during influential interactions. I have chosen an ethnographic approach to conduct the classroom study because it is highly conductive to a feminist post-structuralist analysis of the data (Baxter, 2003). By this token, ethnographic research methods are apt in this study because of its epistimological parallels and connections with feminist post-structuralist theory. The epistimological basis of ethnography can be defined in its refusal of the positivist research for universal law in favour of detailed descriptions of the specified experience of life within a particular culture and the social rules or patterns that constitute it (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995) (see Baxter, 2003 p. 85).

Besides, an ethnographic description is particularly useful in reiterating speakers' competence, local understanding of cultural practices, and cross-cultural variation. It therefore contributes in the feminist aim to highlight women's abilities and agency, whilst there are some lines that see gendered language use as not always identical (Bucholtz, 2004). The nature of the ethnographic study allows for a detailed examination of the complexity, subtlety and diversity of discursive practices over a period of time. Considering the efforts of gender upon the speeech patterns of the social group, it facilitates to search students' ability to adopt authoritative speaker positions which are continuously mediated by his/her subject positions within a number of competing discourses in the classroom.

My analysis tends to weave togeher the diverse and multi-faceted perspectives of the different participants in the study : those of the students of the research class, the class teachers and myself. I hope that this line of reasoning will lead me to a more understanding of what constituted principles of effective speech in the classroom public context in relation to gender. As I stand on feminist post -structuralist perspective, I opt for deploying plural research methods as part of an 'explicative mosaic' in the words of Wodak (1996, p. 23)

Getting practical, I choose multiple methods in this survey to apprehend the contrasting voices and complex interactions of my research participants in both contexts. In an attempt to gain a general diachronic impression, observation and field-notes were first employed over one semester of Master one and another semester in Master two of verbal and non-verbal interactions of both classes in a variety of speaking and listening activities. By leaving room to comprehend diachronic impressions of the data, I recorded the ways in which speakers engaged in continuously shifting subject positions within different contexts. Secondly, video recordings were used to unravel elements of synchronic insights into the verbal, and particularly non-verbal interactions of the classrooms during the presentations and their debate. Thirdly, audio-recordings were deployed to capture teacher and students' interviews, and the meeting of teachers, so that to benefit from a possible range of a varying and competing views for transcription purposes.

Finally, I should note that I actively engaged in this study as a researcher-participant, except for the EFL oral presentation sessions, where I adopted a dual position as a teacher and as a participant-observer. Also worth considering, self-reflexivity, within my ethnographic methodology, becomes the central issue in drawing attention to the authorial power of the researcher over the research. This is particularly with regard to decisions about the construction of the research process and the representation of research accounts (Baxter, 2003). Moreover, ethnographic researchers will have an observable effect upon their research context and subsequently on the data gathered. Contrary to the traditional posivist research which regards this effect as a form of 'contamination' (ibid), FPDA allows the researcher/analyst to know the

context in which they are gathering data, and to enable them to be self-reflexive about its influence.

In keeping with contemporary ethnography, self-reflexivity is used to demonstrate the copmlexities and contradictoriness of participants voices-through interrogating research involvment, choices and decisions, rather than aiming to unify research findings into a single authorial narrative. Thus, FPDA flags up the monologic voice of the author which ultimately prevails and enterferes the research. In this vein, the principle of self-reflexivity calls in my survey for a level of honesty, openness and continuous self-criticism between me and my research participants. It was a collective investigation where no choice or conclusion is assumed or taken for granted. My observation protocole encountered reflective comments and questions that arouse as I conducted the field observations. Questions such as 'why do students use such a linguistic strategy here, not that ?' 'Why do teachers assess the effectiveness of the students following these criteria, not others ?'- interfered my data collection sessions. This imposed at times a time consuming constraint upon the progress of data collection. I also provided each teacher with a copy of my field observation notes and ask for their feedback and reflection. Otherwise, another ethnography's emphasis, which can be also linked with feminist post-structuralism, is the inseparability of the 'participant-observer' from their research context (Baxter, 2003). In a similar vein, Gold's (1985) widely known typology indicates that the ethnographers are in intrinsic part of the world they study via four roles the researchers might adopt as a complete participant, partcipant-as-observer, observer-as-participant and complete observer.

In my EFL classroom study, the role I initially chose to adopt most matches Gold's (1958) second category of participant-as-observer where, as a teacher at the department of English, I was fully involved in the site which helped me to get holistic insight into all aspects of the site. More to this pont, my role was made explicit and observation was conducted overtly. In the study of the architectural context, I took on the role of observer-as-participant because I was not part of the architecture world. According to Gold's (1958) typology, I was aware that I was likely to be more of an observer than a participant, as I participated briefly with architecture students but spent most of the time observing and recording.

Also worth considering, I will analyse the two classrooms as communities of practice drawing on Olitsky's (2007) view that students' *"impetus for acquiring new knowledge and skills are not only engendered by intrinsic interest in the topic, or exmination-oriented learning systems. It is also from the desire to contribute as valued members of the community"* (P.33).

As elaborated in the previous chapter, Lave and Wenger (1991) assume that learning is situated in the interaction among members in a community of practice. The teacher and students, with a shared interest in the English language and a common endeavour of developing spoken English skills, form a classroom community of practice. Language is not only the outcome of practice in the cofp but also serves as an interactive device during members' participation in joint activities such as research projects. In keeping with the parallel principles, I consider the architecture classroom as a community of practice in that students learn to become architects through negotiation of reification (technical knowledge, for instance) and participation into the practices in the local context.

As Lave and Wenger (1991) point out that learning involves travelling along a trajectory from the periphery to the centre and becoming a full member of the community, my question will be raising about whether male/female students have different access to participation into the community of architecture if the social image of an architect and the culture of architectural educational institutions are masculine.

III.4.1 Sources of Data : Polyphony and Heteroglossia

Also worth considering, FPDA has developed an approach to data that is blatantly different from mainstream approaches to discourse analysis. In agreement with Bakhtin's (1981) principle of polyphony, FPDA opts for providing multiple voices and accounts rather than adopting the unitary perspective of the data by single authors. As a term, polyphony originally derived from music and it is *inter alia* a unique characteristic of prose. Polyphony was described and illuminated by Bakhtin (1981), whereby several contesting voices revealing a variety of ideological positions can engage equally in a dialogue, free from a variety of ideological

positions can engage equally in a dialogue. To such a degree, FPDA maps out space in a discourse analysis for the coexistence of distinctively different voices and accounts (Baxter, 2003), such as those of the research participants, other researchers on the project and even people who review and comment on the research can possibly have space in this scenario.

The polyphonic approach to data tallies with a second methodological feature: Competing voices and accounts drawing on Bakhtin's (1981) principle of "heteroglossia". This strives to create spaces to let on the voices of marginalized groups such as women or the disabled. Literally speaking, this might be the representations of people who are silenced and never speak. In her classroom study, Baxter (2003) highlights that voices of certain 15 years old girls who seldom speak in the class were considered "good listeners". Again, Baxter (2003) foregrounds, in her management study, the voice of a female personal assistance whose institutional position, determined that she should never speak at meetings. Baxter's objective was to enable her to convey her views alongside those of her six male and one female bosses, because she was conspicuously an integral presence within the management team. In the same view, "heterogossia" is thus a poststructuralist principle for both data collection and presentation that produced a particular range of richness and plurality of meanings. (Baxter, 2003).

Getting into practice, how can the FPDA practitioner achieve a polyphonic approach to the data? Baxter (2003) postulates three possibilities. First, an analysis can endeavour to produce multiple perspectives upon a single, centralized event, text or textual extract. Baxter puts forth that, in her classroom study, she selected just one speech event for the purpose of the analysis – a whole class discussion – from many similar events, she observed and recorded as part of longer term, ethnographic approach to the data. She points that the selection and the foregrounding of their particular discussion was random; it was to be employed by the school's English department as a focus for formal course work assessment, followed by a staff moderation meeting. This offers her:

> *The potential for a plurality of voices and perspectives, those of the students in the class, the class teacher, the staff moderating the activity and my own observation. I added the researcher's dimension of a video-recorder in order to capture the non verbal as well as the verbal interaction of the discussion. Having video recorded and transcribed the discussion, I showed the video tape to different groups of*

133

> *participants and afterward, tape-recorded their reactions and*
> *responses.*   (Baxter, 2003, p. 68).

In the final analysis of the class discussion, she tends to juxtapose the plural and often competing accounts of these different groups of participants alongside her own. The other suggestions of integrating polyphony within discourse analysis are more speculative and are proposed as possibilities for future development of the FPDA approach (Baxter, 2008). Therefore, her second suggestion is where one author might produce multiple and perhaps competing versions of the same act of discourse analysis, so in sense that there would be no "original" or authorized version. Their approach is devised to make feasible an initial draft of a given work of discourse analysis available to the subject within a research study for their feedback, response and critique. The final draft would be multi-authored inasmuch as it attempts to connect or juxtapose the researcher's analysis alongside these supplementary accounts. In the case of team discourse analysts who tend to investigate a particular phenomenon such as gendered discourse in the classroom, an alternative version might be needed (ibid).

Albeit the fact that these approaches are inevitably time intensive and space consuming, they befit the task in hand in producing a multi-faceted discourse analysis of considerable complexity; insight and depth. Furthermore, a polyphonic approach, Baxter (2003) claims, "*helps to reveal the gaps ambiguities and contradictions within and between different accounts that are often ignored, masked or glossed over by the single-authored, monologic analysis*" (p. 69).

To come again to the concept of "heteroglossia", Baxter (2008) harbours that this is a further source of data for feminist post-structuralist discourse analysts. Bakhtin's concept of "heteroglossia" is valuable to FPDA because it differentiates the deeply relational view of post-structuralist theory from its parodic stereotype as a ceaseless free play of signifiers without reference points. In his concept of heteroglossia, Bakhtin spots ideological struggle at the center of all discourse, where in the form of political rhetoric, artistic practice or everyday interaction. He postulates that every unified linguistic or social community is characterized by heteroglossia, whereby language becomes the space of confrontation between differently oriented voices, as diverse social groups fight it out on the terrain of language. In line of this theory, while the dominant discourse seeks to make a given sign, such as "women", uni-accentual and endowed

with an abiding, reified character, resistant discourses rise up to get out of live and disrupt conventional understandings providing multi-accentual readings.

In post-structuralist terms, heterolgossia displays the struggle for the control of signifiers such as "women", and the process by which discourses compete to fix meaning on behalf of hegemonic interests. Bakhtinian perspective on heteroglossia buttresses the ideological agenda which allows space for the voices and issues of the "oppressed" meanwhile; a feminist post_structuralist viewpoint seeks two related reference points. The first one is the focus upon (especially) female voices and accounts of participants in research study who may be relatively silent if compared with their "*more vociferous male or possibly female counterparts*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 70). Besides, it can make space for voices which render evidence of having been regularly silenced by others.

In light of these complexities, it is worth pointing out that FPDA would consider at least two distinct levels of interpreting the "silencing" of women, according to feminist linguistics. On a literal level, it is the interpersonal attempts or tendency of men to "silence" women by tactics of even sudden interruptions, talking over, taking their floor and so on (Fishman, 1980; Zimmerman and West, 1975). On a theoretical level may pertain to the "dominance" perspective (Spender, 1980) of an ostracizing "man-made" language which has positioned females as the "othered" or "silenced" sex. By and large, a FPDA approach aims to determine where competing discourses in a particular context seem to temporarily create more fixed patterns of dominant and subordinated subject positions.

FPDA's second reference point is its delving to challenge any simple dualism between dominant discourses exhibiting oppressors' voices, and oppositional discourses representing the voices of the oppressed. Its crux is to unveil the complexities of participants' interactions, highlighting the ways in which positions of power are continuously negotiated, contested and subverted, never permanently setting as "structure" (Baxter, 2003). For instance, FPDA practitioner must regard the possibility that both male and female speakers are frequently marginalized in such contexts as board meeting or whole class discussions. And this is due to the relative powerfulness of competing institutional discourses other than gender differentiations

135

functioning in those settings. As a case in point, a male business manager may seem to be employing a quite dominant subject position as a speaker at a board meeting but, is being simultaneously challenged by his colleagues. Similarly, a female manager in the same context may be conspicuously positioned in a different way from her male counterparts by a discourse of gender differentiation, even though she comes across as a dominant and influential speaker.

In an attempt to promote a heteroglossia analysis of the data, Baxter (2008) expounds that the most obvious strategy is literally to offer a voice to those research participants who are likely to be either silent or silenced. In her analysis, she sets the sights on giving space to the competing voices of the participants – juxtaposing the heterogenous and often conflicting perspectives of students, the class teacher and the examiners but to allow special eminence to those female speakers whose standpoints might easily have been left out or marginalized.

However, Baxter (2003) provokes me into thinking about the possibility that silence or silencing should not necessarily equate with marginalization or submission. It can also embrace a potent means of resistance; in that being silent can sometimes be "*self-affirming rather than undermining*" (p. 72). Baxter (2008) calls for the need to caution for the researcher who attempts to adopt a "heterglossic" approach to the analysis. An analysis must execute a considerable degree of penetrating examination of the scenario about what constitutes a silent or silenced research subject within a particular setting; who decides the identity of the silent or the silenced; and upon that basis of what evidence. Therefore, FPDA practitioners must strive to make quite explicit the possible gaps, obscurities and contradictions in their data on the basis of which they may select to constitute and display particular subjects as silent or silenced, and others as doing the silenceing.

III.4.2 Textual analysis :

A crucial aspect of FPDA, like CDA, is the identification and meaning of significant discourses within spoken and written texts (Baxter, 2003). This would not be executed in the traditional sociolinguistic sense in order to record patterns or variations in speech and behaviour according to a variable such as gender. The FPDA approach, to some extent, would be to observe

and cross examine the ways in which certain speakers may be more consistently positioned as powerful or powerless, whereas others are subject to more shifting power relations (Baxter, 2003). Such an analysis explores the ways in which girls / women negotiate their positions within competing discourses, and thus captures the speakers' instances of resistance and empowerment of those who might be deemed as being victims. In short, unfolding the moments of change in the form of challenges, contestations and power switches would be possible.

More interestingly, the FPDA approach to micro analysis works in tandem with two levels: denotative and connotative. The former attempts to offer a description of verbal and non-verbal interactions of the participants. In her work within the context of the classroom, Baxter (2003) holds that she adopts non-verbal language of participants, verbal language and meta-language as sources of evidence, this is the connotative level of analysis which aims to boost the inquiry with more searching and interpretative commentary of extracts of spoken discourse, drawing slightly from the synchronic, denotative evidence, and partly from ethnographic or diachronic sources of data. By way of elaboration, Baxter (2003) provides one succinct example of how she applied this approach to the classroom study.

> *I identified a discourse of gender differentiation at work first of all by carefully noting patterns of non verbal interaction for instance, I recorded how girls conformed to classroom by putting their hands up in the classroom more often than boys, yet boys were granted for more turns to speak. Secondly, in terms of keywords and phrases, I noted how girls regularly agreed with points that boys had made in a discussion by saying, "I agree with Joe that ..." ... Thirdly, in terms of metalanguage, I noted how both boys and girls spontaneously referred to gender difference as a means of generalizing about speech and behaviour in the classroom (eg. "Girls tend to put their hands up more.*

<div align="right">(Baxter, 2003, p. 77).</div>

From these three sources, she was capable of collecting ample evidence to suggest that gender differentiation was one of a number of powerful discourses constructing students' talk in the classroom. Overall, a connotative analysis is devoted to reveal how speakers are in a constant process of being positioned and re-positioned by a range of competing discourses related to a particular social / institutional context. It demonstrates how speakers constantly negotiate for positions of power or resist positions of powerlessness.

<div align="center">137</div>

III.5 The English as a Foreign Language Classroom : From theory to Practice

With almost any ethnographic study, the talk of putting research principles into practice encounters a certain degree of adaptation and compromise (Baxter, 2003). As a teacher at the department of English, I did not experience any restricted access to the research setting which enabled me to make close and detailed observations. In this case study, there was a consistent level of confusion over the exact nature of my role. There was an ambiguity about where my position as a participant ended and where my position as an observer began. As a participant-observer, I actually takes on a much more active role with the EFL context. For example, I had the oppotunity to fully interact with Master one students in the course of 'oral presentation'as I was a teacher of the module. At the same time, I continuously took notes on what was observed and I started observing the students from their Master one to ensure an in-depth knowledge about the participants and their practices. Glesne (2006) sets that there is an interesting paradox that can occur when in this role. The more you act as a participant in the context of research, the more you risk losing your eye of objectivity. However, at the same time, the more you participate, the greater your chance to learn first hand what goes on the setting. According to Baxter (2003), feminist post-structuralist perspective does not consider the ever-shifting position of the researcher along a participant-observer axis as an issue. This can be the case as long as it is recognized and analysed rather than glossed over or excused.

On grounds of space, I focus on 4 students in the research study whom I have labelled M1....M2 for males and F1....F2 for females. They have been selected as a hetereogenous group which was comprised of some speakers who are considered by the teachers (including the researcher as a teacher) to be potentially 'able' speakers, and others as less effective. I was able to employ a multi-method approach to collecting data in the way I hoped. Through the course of classroom observations, I conducted audio recordings of 10 sessions of oral presentations of Master 2. Besides, 8 audio-recordings of the semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the students themselves. Recordings range in length from 30 to 52 minutes. As for semi-structured interviews, I adopted a common format : a set of generalized, open-ended questions were employed as a starting point for a discussion leaving room for the participants to speak

extensively with no intensive interruption from the interviewer. My particular interest was in analysing the discussions among students and their teachers after each presentation.

Following Gumperz's (1982) micro-linguistic evidence in transcripts, I intend to analyse the language of students identifying significant moments in linguistic interactions where a speaker shifts between different positions of power. Drawing upon practices of semiotic analysis (eg. Barthes, 1973) and Baxter's (2003) FPDA principles, I carried out my analysis on two levels. First, a denotative micro-analysis of selected extracts from classroom talks by closely referring to verbal and non-verbal interactions of the speakers obtained from 4 video-recordings. At this level of analysis, I examine linguistic data in terms of turn-taking, sentence structure, verb tense and lexical choice. Second, I deal with connotative (macro) level analysis to identify how speakers shift between competing discourses within a single or a series of social interactions. In an attempt to represent the multiple, contrasting and polyphonic perspectives of the case study, I try to weave together the supplementary accounts of the participants (Baxter, 2003) -those of interviews with the students and the class teachers.

III.6 The Architecture classroom : From theory to practice

Albeit the fact that the architecture classroom was almost literally for me an outsider setting, I gradually assume the characteristics of the participants the longer I remain part of the community of practice. At the start of the investigation, I quickly realized that ethnographic research, if imposed from outside rather than being promoted from within, may be understood by insiders as a form of surveillance. For this very reason, I started my observation by taking field-notes over a month keeping the role of an observer to infiltrate daily working practices, so that my presence will be gradually accorded both by teachers and students. Thus, I spent the first period of time in the role of an observer, so that the class became used to my taking notes at the back of the workshop.

Similar to the EFL classroom, I was able to draw upon a multi-method approach to collecting data via field-notes, audio-recordings and video-recordings. The semi-structured interviews with the participants lasted about 30 minutes each. In this context, I was also able to display the diverse voices of all the research paticipants : the students and the tutors.

With regard to the inseparability of the researcher from the research, my role was an observer gradually altered into that of a participant, as I become increasingly involving in teachers' assessment of their students oral performances. Again, I focus on 5 students whom I have labelled Ma1...Ma2 and Fa1...Fa3 to be differentiated from EFL participants. I have undertaken audio-recordings of 10 workshops and video-recordings of 4 workshops. Prior to embarking upon denotative and connotative analysis, I translated the extracts from French and Algerian Arabic (the colloquial dialect) to English. Architecture students study and present their works in the French language and they often adopt some Arabic- French code switching. By this token, Poplack (1980) defines the linguistic phenomenon'code switching' as the alteration of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent.

III.7 Identifying disourses

III.7.1 Observing discourses in the EFL classroom :

Prior to understanding the different disocurses detected from my extended observation in the EFL classroom, I shall sketch the process by which my decision to adopt feminist post-structuralist analysis engendered ethnographically as a response to the collected data. My inital plan was to adopt Lazar's (2005b) feminist critical discourse analysis to explore the construction of gender identities through discourse. For feminist CDA theorists, there is an interest in the representations formed by discourses which sustain a patriarchal order (Lazar, 2005b, p.5). Besides, I had the intention to imply CDA (Wodak, 2002) as it was fundamentally concerned with investigating social inequalities as constituted and legitimized by language or in discourse. I was supposing that this concern with analysing the relationship between dominance, discrimination and power as manifested in language, is vulnerable for studying female architects negotiation of gender. However, through the course of my classroom observation, I have noticed that students can continually fluctuate between subject positions on a matrix of powerfulness and powerlessness. FPDA concentrates more on individual agency and how identities are flexible and can be multiple. So, this complex interplay of discourses and discursive practices in my classroom study could not merely analyzed by CDA. We cannot deny that CDA and FPDA share the same focus on how identities emerge through discourse, rather considering them as pre-

discursive. Yet, FPDA seems to be useful in my analysis on the grounds that it accentuates the emphasis on how identities are flexible and can be multiple, and not necessarily attached to ideological power structures in any given context.

At the beginning of my research journey, I realized that Baxter's (2003) FPDA should be adopted to display the alternative and competing discourses that simultaneously position both male and female students as relatively powerless within certain discourses, but as relatively powerful within particular discourses. I could pay attention that female students are not permanently restricted by silence and disadvantage, they could rather negotiate for themselves moments within competing discourses when they can potentially manage acts of resistance to negotiate different meanings in the same context. Within this in mind, I will argue that both speakers (male and female students) encounter different subject positions that can occur within a single speech event.

Through my observation in the EFL classroom, I gradually became aware that students' negotiation to adopt authoritative speaker positions is continuously mediated by their subject positions, as it was the case with Baxter's (2003) examination of effective speech in her secondary English classrooms. Whilst recognizing of FPDA methodology *prima facie* in this study, I will juxtapose it with feminist CDA from time to time for the sake of surveying how power and dominance are discursively produced and/or resisted in a number of ways through my EFL students' talks. In particular, I integrate feminist CDA in my connotation analysis of some extracts to offer further insights into how discourses are hierarchized and how they may shape, or sometimes resist hegemonic discourses and ideologies of gender which are produced in the EFL classroom. In that sense, CDA generally focuses more on the social structures which tend to restrain the construction of identities.

Besides my intention to hightlight students' agency through FPDA, I found that these approaches, with their distinct focuses, may be convenient for an in-depth and comprehensive account for the processes at work in the data. I was, *de facto*, unaware of the plural and competing disocurses constituing power relations within my EFL classroom during the course of my study. It was only upon my prolonged re-readings of my field-notes after the fullfilment of my field examination that I realized four discourses which were being interconnected and were

always intertextually linked. At this level, I was aware that we cannot reckon that there is simply one discourse to determine gender negotiation. By way of explanation, there may exist dominant discourses regulating presumptions about masculinity, femininity and binary gender roles, yet there may be also resistant or oppositional discourses as competing with others.

These discourses do not function in isolation, Baxter (2003) sustains that they are in a continuous process to allow individuals to negotiate particular meanings according to the way they position themselves. Thus, it was not difficult to recognize that shifting power relations in the classroom are constantly negotiated through the medium of competing discourses *"constantly negotiated through the medium of competing discourses"* (Baxter, 2003, p. 829).

Along the attempt to survey how both male and female students negotiate for positions of power, I explored that four interwoven strategies (or as Baxter terms discourses), were repeatedly demonstrated in their conversation and even behaviours. These discourses are 'gender differentiation', 'leadership talk', 'collaborative talk' and ' discourse of approval'. In this study, I adopt the word 'discourse' following Foucauldian definitions (1972) and Baxter's (2002, 2003) use in her study of public talk in the classroom. By considering these lines of thought, I take discourse as different sets of language/test patterns that seem to designate students' subject positions. In addressing the gist of my study about gender construction through discourse, I choose to foreground 'gender differentiation' discourse. This discourse will paint a more subtle picture on the different ways that differentiate speakers' identities primarily according to their sex and gender. In her research in a secondary mixed-sex UK classroom, Baxter (2002) represents that girls are, according to a discourse of gender differentiation, stereotypically exepected to be good listeners, which consequently minifies a positive assessment of their participation in the classroom.

In an endeavour to explore how students negotiate chairing or leadership positions (Baxter, 2003) through their talks, I came across another discourse which I label 'leadership talk' discourse. My growing awareness of the students fluctuating status positions arose from two sources. First, I noted how some female speakers displayed talks which are more associated with competitive styles such s challenging disagreements, assertive comments and interruptions.

Secondly, the comments made by the students and assessor (x) among those who attended the moderating meeting to discuss students' evaluation, indicated their own awareness of the presence of authoritative speech when 'doing power' (Baxter, 2003).

Assessor (x) : F2 is almost the dominant speaker in the classroom. She negotiates the chairing status via controlling topics, finger-pointing and interruptions.

F1 : Well, as you noticed, I try to avoid confrontation as I smile and make head noddings, but it is important to take over from time to time and control the discussion. Otherwise, you won't be heard in the presence of M1 and M2.

M4 : F3 always fights to gain a dominant position to attract attention. But she succeeds to be powerful. Sometimes, she is 'bossy'.

Particularly, this final comment tends to echo with Cameron's (2006) thinking that assserting authority is generally far less of an issue for males that is for females. In this sense, Baxter (2010) reckons that a male leader is far less to be charaterized as 'bossy' for delivering an order than a female leader is. As for the discourse of 'collaborative talk', I mean both teachers and students expectations around abilities in active listening to each other, taking turns and co-operating with each other (Baxter, 2003). In my study, this discourse emerges even when the teacher does not articulate these rules of collaborative talk. After each presentation, the teacher allows students time for open discussion without explicitly indicating specific rules that should structure their talks. Then, the fouth discourse which is 'approval discourse' refers to the signs of approbation of participants by affirmations among peers, for instance, or praise markers directed by teachers to some of their students.

Taking my lead from Baxter (2002, 2003), I try to find out how EFL students play an active role in being able to resist their positioning in particular ways, and negotiate new meanings from these competing discourses. As Fairclough and Wodak (1997) illustrate, these discourses are contextually situated as they are inextricably intertwined. This chapter is designed to clarify what I understand by each discourse in further details.

III.7.1.2 Discourse of gender differentiation

The first discourse I noted is 'gender differentiation' (Francis, 1998 ; Baxter, 2003) which is primarily based on teachers and students' perceptions about the teachers' treatments of females and males, and the different types of behaviours displayed by students. In her study, Baxter (2003) sets down the extent to which both students and teachers constructed and naturalized their classroom activities and experiences according to forms of gender differentiation. That is to say, the perception of gender categories in binary terms has been naturalized.

Although I was the teacher of 'feminism' for the students of my investigation, I tended to point out that my interest was in students' strategies to achieve effective speech in public discussions and their negotiation for authoritative positions, rather than highlighting my 'gender' issues interest. I was more inclined from the start of my research to allow spaces for the participants' unprompted perceptions and thinkings. After having enough spontaneous examples about 'gender differentiation' discourse, I have explicitly elucidated my interest in exploring how their gender identities are continuously constructed through discourse via different positioning in the classroom. The following examples from both teachers and students will suffice to illustrate this point.

F3: I think that this clear that there are differences in males' and females' ways of speaking… I usually don't criticize others even though I disagree in my mind. Yet M1 and M2 are always dominant, they are always sure that they are right and they don't except opinions of others.

F6 : Any way all men are like that. As you see… M2 kept teasing me when I was talking about women's right to be independent and have a job. For me, I cannot tease someone especially in a formal context.

F5 : We do not think like them (men). I mean the bosses in our society, not only in the English classroom... Females are sometimes unable to explicitly explain what they think. Whereas, boys assert themselves and they go direct to the point.

Assessor (x) : May be things are changing, I have noticed that female students interrupted more than their male counterparts. But male students are dominant speakers here. I think that M4 and M6 are being hesitant about their presentations and even when being asked the questions.

Assessor (y): I sometimes find differences between males and females… Females are in some contexts more serious than males. I don't know… may be in other cases, roles will be reversed. It depends on the context and on the student him/her self, but I feel that there is a degree of a gender devide here.

As I stated before, these comments were lightly solicited by me lest they say what they thought I wanted to hear. I opt for checking whether there existed students' talks differentiation based on gender. This common-sense thinking about gender differences in classroom talk is perhaps unintentionally corroborated by the difference theory of language and gender (eg. Coates, 1993 ; Holmes, 1992; Tannen, 1992).

Along this line, Baxter (2003) adds that gender differentiation discourse is not only emerged to afford common-sense thinking and day-to-day conversation but was also deeply entrenched within the structures of classroom discursive practices. Along a similar vein, rather than promoting gender strategies for one gender, Francis (1998) argues that a critical pedagogy would teach the discourse of gender to students, fostering them to engage critically in the allocation of traits to one gender and its outcomes. It is imperative to note that, at the first glance, I had the impression that I should classify these comments as 'male dominance' discourse before having such illustrating comments obtained from my interviews with the participaing assessors and students.

Me: From your previous comments, do you mean that there is currently male dominance in classroom interactions?

Assessor (x): No, it is not a matter of dominance. F1 is, for example, a dominant speaker. But, I mean that there is a certain gender divide in their speaking styles. Even if females are dominant, they share a soft dominance rather than their male counterparts.

F4: Both male and female students are unaware about the necessary moments when they should control the topic. But, I think that it is a matter of difference rather than male dominance.

Building on these comments, I opt to direct a limelight on how female students are positioned by competing classroom discourses as both powerful and powerless : discourse of 'collaborative talk', 'authoritative talk' and 'gender differentiation' construct females in contradictory ways as supportive listeners, powerful speakers and at the same time powerless.

145

On the one hand, girls are positioned as powerful according to the discourse of 'collaborative talk' because this considers good listening and building on each others' ideas (Baxter, 2002a). On the other hand, according to the discourse of 'gender differentiation', girls may occupy less powerful subject positions, which effectively avail the interests of male students (ibid). This is mainly what makes 'gender differentiation' intricately embedded in classroom discursive practices in how male/female students speak, listen and interact.

Besides, competitive strategies of female students such as blocking statements and challenging utterances may position female students, by a traditional discourse of 'gender differentiation', as falsely and incorrectly (Baxter, 2016). She further notes that "*Even if there is a conventionalized, if resentful, acceptance of female competitiveness with each other for the attention of males, there is possibly far less acceptance of inter-female competitiveness for positions of power, in a world where male leadership is still regarded as a cultural norm.* " (Baxter 2016, p. 169)

Within this theoretical frame, I will investigate whether female students who openly adopt dominating positions are subject to a discourse of gender differentiation (Baxter, 2016). In her study, she maintains that the process, in which gender categories are perceived and constructed in binary terms, was naturalized.

III.7.1.3 'Leadership talk' discourse

As we will expound in this study, students' ability to adopt authoritative speaker positions is continuously interposed by his/her subject positions within a number of competing discourses. Albeit the fact that the word 'authoritative' is revealed in the participants' comments, I opt for labeling the second discourse as 'leadership' rather than 'authoritative' or authority. Authority and leadership are conceptually different (Gastil, 1994). In fact, authority refers to a position either formal or informal with the power to make decisions. Whilst, leadership is defined by Parker (2005) as'"*a negotiated process of mutual influence*" (P. 27). In this context, I recognize the need to borrow and quote Baxter's (2003, 2006a, 2006b) term 'leadership' because, according to Heifetz (1994), authority should be treated as something someone has, that can be acquired and maintained, and leadership is considered to be an activity and something someone does.

The classroom study encompasses how students, particulary voluble ones, negotiate to play a leading part fluctuating from different subject positions within four intextualized yet competing discourses. By way of explanation, I am interested in unveiling the dynamics on how students adopt power to play the role of leadership, rather than having the authority position with the power to make decisions. As teachers and academics, we are not concerned about which authority positions will be occupied by the students, we seek how they actively develop and practice leadership in their educational and future professional contexts.

My awareness of the power of this discourse of 'leadership talk' and its intextual links with the other discourses emerged from two sources. First, as I mentioned earlier, I have noticed that some members of the classroom (both male and female students) appear to perform a chairing role in either presenting their own works, or when discussing their peers' research projects. These voluble students exhibit some strategies which serve to dominate the conversation by challenging comments, interruptions and reinforcing their assertions. Second, teachers' and students' comments about how some students tend to be powerfully positioned as dominant and effective speakers as these examples illustrate :

M3: I think that you noticed that F2 always challenges others' views and kept asserting her opposed argument.

Me: Do you think that this is good since she was presenting her work and defending her lines of reasoning?

M3: We got her points, but without such violent explanation. She has the right to convey what she thinks… but she has to respect the others' opinions.

Assessor (x): Well, the theme of F1 is not so strong and fascinating like some others, but I appreciate her confident presentation and dominant discussion. This is the significant point… They have to be prepared about how they will defend their projects. I liked her way of defending her theme and the rationale quite forcefully.

F4: F2 is single-minded and very courageous. She is my close friend. I know her… she kept being hard-nosed even in the classroom in front of our peers and teachers. I think that it will be better if she will be more flexible especially the day of the viva voce.

M1: M2 persuades us when presenting his research questions and objectives. He succeeds to get a laugh even while minimizing the serious questions and comments made by F3. His presentation was nice, I would like to listen to presentations or works from this type.

F4: He (M2) explained well his objectives and theme. M2 knows how to chair any discussion. He convinced me … but it depends on the others. His presentation may be weak for others. Even if he inserts some jokes when discussing his work, he can assert himself at any moment because he is a man. And no one will say a word.

Assessor (x): M2 in all his presentations wants to be the leader when presenting and even in his way of responding to the questions. He is popular with his leading contribution to any discussion in the classroom. He has an intelligent manner in making himself noticed. I feel that he can easily dominate the discussion in supple ways unlike F2… you feel that the process of dominating the discussion is exhausting in comparison with her male-peer M2.

….

Research focusing on 'dominance' in educational settings, during the 1980s and later, revealed that girls were located in a disadvantaged position compared to boys in educational contexts (Swann, 1992 ; Swann and Graddol, 1988). More specifically, Swann (1992) summarized this by setting forth that boys outspoke than girls in the classroom, interrupt more in conversations, and they had the tendency to hold over the floor longer once they took their turns in the conversation.

By analogy to Baxter's (2002, 2003) work, the comments listed above and the extracts that will be analysed later on, are not looked into particular speaking styles, but can resist dominant classroom practices which privilege and preserve male power. Similarly, Holmes (2005a) discusses how language is a part of the construction of leadership roles. Without giving a direct critique to the studies which address how dominant constructions of masculinity lead to the silencing of women (Sadker and Sadker, 1994 ; Swann, 2003), my preminilary observation mainly stands on Baxter's (2002) line of thinking which holds that females are not restricted within particular ways of speaking typically associated with boys.

In this sense, some female students tend to take care not to show gender bias, but rather to call attention to their contributions in classroom discussions and even to their own presentations. Some examples will suffice to demonstrate how some female students may challenge the norms of collaborative talk such as taking too many turns, interrupting and controlling others. The term 'leadership' will keep cropping up in this work, so that it is imperative to clarify what I mean by this concept. Within many traditional models of leadership, the required conditions, to be an effective leader, have long been assumed (Still, 2006) (See Baxter, 2009, p. 24). This assumption is deeply embedded in western thinking that language of leadership often corresponds to the language of masculinity which reflects qualities such as assertiveness, competitiveness and aggressiveness (ibid).

By this token, Schein (1975) states that the standard measures of what makes an effective speaker (or leader), seem to be entrenched in an authoritarian and masculine perspective on the way it is accomplished. Tannen (1994) claims that the very notion of authority is associated with maleness, and consequently normatively masculine speech styles are regarded as qualities for authority and leadership. Therefore, females are less likely to be perceived as potential leaders, and those who aspire to play authoritative roles face what Lakoff (1990, p. 206) labels 'the double bind' regarding professionalism and femininity. A vivid illustration of this is her quoted explanation "*When a woman is placed in a position in which being assertive and forceful is necessary, she is faced with a paradox, she can be a good woman but a bad executive or professional, or vice versa. To do both is impossible* ". (Lakoff, 1990, p. 26)

In this context, Jones (2000) adds that if the woman talks like a manager to control the situation involved in, she will be transgressing the boundries of femininity. And if she talks like a woman, she no longer represents her current status as a manager. In an attempt to survey this complex scenario in the EFL classroom, I will examine how both male and female students adjust their leadership styles to reflect the norms of the classroom context. At the same time, I shall unravel how certain females do- leadership regardless of their gender, by opposing a norm that women are not self-confident speakers. In the subsequent chapter, I will investigate how girls, who deploy strategies for enacting power and adopt leadership positions, are simultaneously

subject to a discourse of gender differentiation. A vivid illumination of this will be reported via F₁ and F₂ talks in the classrrom presentations and discussions.

Whilst F₂ tried to resist the essential claim that gender immediately follows in the footmarks of biological sex, gender differentiation discourse sustains the assumption that biological sex prevented her from commanding a similar level of authority that a powerful male speaker polices. Unequal power relations were thus reflected within the classroom. For instance, assessor (x) comments that there was a difference between F₂ and M₂ in the construction of leadership positions. She asserts that F₂ seems to have difficulty in adopting authoritative or leadership positions. This issue of agency may be explained by the tendency to ensure her own sex for 'standing out' (Baxter, 2006, p. 176). Notwithstanding, Baxter considers that, from a post-structuralist perspective, this is not being regarded as a deficiency in the female character, or even as the effect of male/female socialization into different worlds. Social-cultural and educational discourses rather combine to position females in such a way that they are less likely to employ authotitative roles a speakers than males (ibid).

Moreover, M3 delineates F2 performance of leadership as violent disempowering her strategies for assertiveness and competitiveness for positions of power. Social cultural discourses routinely position girls as non- competitive friends, and educational discourses position girls as responsible for taking the collaborative role in conversations (Swann and Graddol, 1995).

III.7.1.4 'Collaborative talk' discourse

My observations and interviews demonstrate that the discourse of 'collaborative talk' plays a role in the discourse practices emerged in the classroom. Similar to Baxter (2003), comments made by both male and female students in the interview I made reveal that they are aware of the significance of the rules of collaborative talk in designing and controlling their participation in the classroom discursive practices, as these extracts display:

Me: What makes a good speaker in the classroom discussions?

F₁: To be direct to the point and clear… leave space also for others to understand what you mean.

M₃: They have to carefully listen to others and agreeing with others or disagree in polite ways. It will be better for some to smile … this is important in any discussion.

150

F4: They should be polite and patient… The presenter is chairing the session…so, we have to respect them and avoid being all bossy.

M3: They… they (not males) have to avoid interruptions, speak politely… they have to listen to others and be co-operative. They must be tentative and leave the flow if necessary.

F1: I am sorry, but I am against what you say… You M3… you are about to repeat Lakoff's model of women's language weakness. If there is a rule to forbid controlling the conversation… so, it is applied on males and females. We are all participants here in this class. The teacher will assess everybody… not you… not only you (males).

   ….

These comments seem to refer to what Baxter (2003) labels 'collaborative talk' discourse which values supportive speech and good language skills. Besides the students' awareness of the rules of 'collaborative talk', there is again an emergence of 'gender differentiation' discourse. M3 explicitly reports that cooperating speech styles should be associated with female students. The idea that women's speech is co-operative and men's competitiveness is an extension of gender differentiation seems to be fueled with gender language stereotypes in the classroom context. What is of particular interest here is F1 realisation of M3 denotation about the gender divide in speech/ listening codes, and her argument by contesting the equation of powerless speech and femininity. F1 explicitly relates what she understood from M3 with Lakoff's (1975) view of women's language as tentative, mitigated and hesitant.

Indeed, F1 sustains that female students are also social agents in the EFL classroom, and they should not be ostracized from valuable contributions to the discussions, and therefore to their assessment. In this respect, discourses of 'collaborative talk' and 'gender differentiation' set females in conflicting positions, as good, supportive listeners who comply with classroom rules, and at the same time as powerless. Baxter (2002) argues that girls are powerfully located according to the discourse of 'collaborative talk' because this appraises cooperative speech and good listening skills.

By way of contrast, girls appear to be powerless according to the discourse of 'gender differentiation' in which they are stereotypically expected to be good listeners. The subsequent chapter will explain how F1 challenged the norms of collaborative talk. The interview extracts will illustrate how she is perceived to be inconsistent with cooperative speech strategies, by interrupting, controlling others and taking over.

With regard to the function of 'collaborative talk', Swann and Graddol (1995) note that his talk *"while apparently democratic, may turn out to be exploitative"* (P.48). Furthermore, Cameron (2000) points out that co-operation and consensus building are strategies that function well in a context of basically egalitarian social relations. However, where relations are unequal, the norm of collaboration may, in practice, serve the more powerful group-in other words-, 'reproduce the status-quo' (2000, p. 173).

Unlike the teachers in Baxter's (2003) study who repeatedly point to allegiance to the model of collaborative talk for their students speaking and listening, the class teachers' agenda for classroom management –in this study- was set only at the beginning of the semester. This may be explained by the fact that my participants are adults at tertiary education, in which one time is sufficient to determine rules of collaborative talk.

Class Teacher (me) : After these four sessions of principles of effective oral communication, it is your turn to present your dissertation proposals. In every paired candidate, you will have to listen to the presenters who are going to chair the discussion. 15 minutes will be allocated for each project presentation and 25 minutes for discussion and asking/ answering questions. I will appreciate your careful listening and respect. Then, raise your hands if you would like to intervene. The presenters will be in charge of distributing turns.

….

It is clear, then, that the class teacher considers the importance of deploying the standards of 'collaborative talk'-that the ability to listen, take turns and co-operate with others are to be followed by everyone. An outstanding trend in British educational discourse-the promotion of a model of collaborative talk-might seem to object the contentions of previous research that girls are marginalized or silenced in the classrooms (Baxter, 2002b). This model is associated with the

UK National Oracy Project (NCC/NOP, p. 1991), has privileged small groups, informal talks at the expense of formal or public talk, and has been particularily effective upon curriculum development and teaching in the subject of English (eg. Howe, 1992). The collaborative model, I agree with Baxter (2000b), has much in common with the difference theory (Holmes, 1995; Maltz and Borker, 1992; Tannen, 1982) as discussed earlier. To nuance the picture, Baxter (2000b) maintains that this discourse *"Valorize the more informal, co-operative speech styles stereotypically associated with female talk, coding as good the skills of careful listening, not interrupting. In contrast, the more public, competitive speech style associated with males, with its emphasis upon gaining and controlling the 'floor', is coded as bad. "* (Baxter, 2000b, p. 82).

From an educational perspective, I asked the teachers about the criteria for the evaluation of their students in their oral presentation examination. The following extract will clarify their answers :

Assessor (x): Actually, I don't have clear criteria to stand on when evaluating my students. In the LMD Master Canva of Mr. Haddouch, there are no specific standards for the assessment. Yet, I take into consideration the following points :

- Topis should be introduced clearly

- I emphasize on the language ; the vocabulary should be appropriate. Grammatical mistakes weaken the evaluation.

- More important, the way of answering questions in the debate and their arguments to defend their research projects.

Assessor (y) : Not all who present their works and do not commit errors they succeed in my oral performance assessment. I stress on the confidence and the speech tactics to convince others. If you do not persuade me, you are not going to be considered as successful in your presentation. The presenter who is chairing the discussion must be able to monitor speaking turns and able to make decisions. He must know where to stop and listen and when to intervene. But listening is also important in public speaking. Also I extremely support the intermixing of seriousness and a sense of humour as some of my bright students do. I find that their charisma is fostered this way. These students will good be teachers God willing.

….

153

From the teachers' clarification, I can assume that each teacher can decide the criteria for their students' oral examination and avaluation. There are no fixed criteria for assessing oral performances of the students. In light of this, I display an extract from Master canva of 'English Literature and civilization', which has been adopted at the department of English (Hassiba Benbouali university), about the module of 'oral presentation'.

….

Oral presentation:

Teaching objectives: Oral presentations allow students to improve their oral communicative capacities, which can be used in defending their arguments in the viva voce.

Course content: Students choose a topic in literature or civilization, a topic that can be suggested or selected from the other courses, and perform oral presentations after submitting the written form one week before.

Evaluation mode: Continuous evaluation.

(Source: Master of English Literature and Civilization, Fethi Haddouche: Hassiba

Benbouali University: 2012, 2013)

….

I have touched this point because I aimed to have a clear idea about the principles of being an effective speaker in oral assessment. This will serve me in scrutinizing how students meet these criteria for better evaluation directing a limelight on gender. Although both teachers and students admit and share a consensus upon the importance of 'collaborative talk' model in classroom interactions, F_2 reports that she is capable of debating anyone in case that does not agree as the extract illustrates :

F_2: I am in this classroom to defend what I think. If I am not convinced, I will argue with anyone if necessary.

M_5: I am not only against you… if you don't believe in something, I would loudly say no.. sorry!

….

These examples echo Baxter's (2003) view that there was evidence of apparent counteracts of resistance among students against the authorized discourse.

III.7.1.5 Discourse of approval :

My growing awareness of the effectiveness of this discourse upon the spoken interactions of students in the classroom setting arose from two sources. First, a particular motif began to engender in my field-notes, which recorded a direct and clear relationship between the extent to which a student is accepted and approved by his/her peers, and their vigorous positioning and confidence. I set down, for instance, that two 'popular' male and one female students seize the whole floor where seldom interrupted by their peers. Conversely to less popular students, M_1, M2 and F_1 were actively receiving a backing and support for what they said by minimal responses and prompting utterances. In terms of the students, peer approval refers to the ways in which students' relations with each other are established and conveyed in terms of notions of "*coolness, popularity, personal confidence, physical attractiveness, friendship patterns and so on*". (Quoted in Baxter, 2003, p. 92).

In my study, peer approval is lightly interwoven with a discourse of teacher approval : that is "*the extent to which a teacher appaeared to favour or privilege one student as a speaker over another*" (Baxter, 2003, p. 92). Contrary to Baxter (2003), teacher approval had not a great effect in my context, in which students led discussions where positions of power were much more openly negotiable than for a context such as a teacher-directed. In this sense, each presenter is supposed to chair the discussion starting from his/her project presentation to the group discussion. Yet, we cannot deny that like peer approval tends to empower some students and disempower others, teachers favouritism for some students might *"well be construed negatively by students, particularily those consumed to be positioned by their peers as 'cool' or 'unboffy'"* (Baxter, 2003, p. 93). The following extracts from class teacher will clarify this theme :

Class teacher : Yes, F_1… you can clarify more what you have said before

You are right M2.. You can explain

Yes, M2.. go ahead.

….

In fact, the teacher elected those students to speak rather than others transgressing her own principle of presenters' chairing. Students comment on this as follows :

F4: M2, M1 and F1 are favoured by you Miss. I don't know if you can understand me… When I was presenting, I gave them the floor, but you intervened by nominating them again to speak.

….

Secondly, I became aware of the power of 'approval discourse' from the various interviews I conducted, both with the group of students and with the teachers. Some of the interviews pointed out spontaneously to the theme of 'popularity' and its influence on the creation of speech privilege for certain students to have the floor. Their comments report that likable and popular students gain self-confidence as they are less interrupted when they speak publicly. In this recognition, students' aplomb will be grown and reinforced by the discourse of approval.

….

Assessor (y): F1 and M1 are very popular speakers who gain respect and support from all their classmates… they are persuasive and their peers trust what they say. Even me, I find them very effective speakers. They know how to control the conversation whilst securing consent and reinforcement from us.

M4: I am sure that students like M1, M2 and F2 are believing in themselves and they will be accepted as speakers because they are confident… I liked their presentations despite the difference in their speaking styles to give their arguments.

F4: M1 is popular for all teachers… the floor is always permitted for him more than others… he is the first of the promotion so he takes the first chair in the public discussion.

….

As the last comment indicates, teacher approval may be interpreted by some students as an immediate reward to diligent students and this will endorse their potentials to take control of the conversation in several occasions more than others. Moreover, I have noticed that discourse of 'peer approval' is particularly powerful in potentially defining and limiting the possibilities for students to use authoritative speech in public contexts (Baxter, 2006b).

In this study, I highlight a difference between F_1 and F_2 linguistic interactions. F_1 privileged access to the floor seems to be corroborated by a powerfully positioning within the discourse of peer approval as she is popular enough to be guaranteed by such support from almost other members of the classroom even the teacher. My findings on this issue may be paralleled with the case of 'Sophie' in the study of Baxter (2003, 2006b), who gained dominance and preferential access to the floor by her popularity and peer/teacher approval. On the contrary, F_2 seems as someone who is less popular to be endorsed by the backing of peer approval. As this limits her possibilities to do leadership, she fights to take control of the conversation. And she succeeds most of the times in keeping for her extended turns, the case which seems to draw an analogy with Baxter's (2003) student 'Gina' in her examination of girls' negotiation of leadership in public contexts.

III.8.2 Observing discourse in the Architecture classroom

Within the context of architecture, there is a great similarity in the approach employed to identify discourses in the EFL classroom from the gathered data. As a teacher in the English department, I started earlier my observation in the EFL context. I explicitly strive to reapply the FPDA approach used in the English classroom. Along my trip of observation in this context, I realized that FPDA central interest is the complex relationship between power, gender and discourse (Baxter, 2002a) which makes it an accurate and flexible framework for analyzing verbal and non-verbal interactions in the architectural domain. I will explore how male/female architecture students negotiate their identities focusing on their experiences of the complexities and ambiguities of power. This will uphold the scope for a more complex, nuanced understanding of spoken interactions by giving space to multiple and competing voices, as well as the voices which have been silenced in the architecture classroom as a male-dominated context.

Baxter (2008) states that male-dominated corporation continues to stick around today, expecially in banking, finance, insurance, building and engineering sectors. Along this line, Faulkner (2006) argues that professional engineering continues to be perceived and experienced as somehow masculine. I shall point out that I purposefully selected architecture context to be

analysed with the EFL classroom to check whether the upholding gendered stereotypes about women's suitability for the so-called masculine domain brings a difference in females' negotiation of identities in a distinct context.

My choice fells on architecture students rather than engineering context which has been tackled by tremendous threads of research (Dryburgh, 1999 ; Faulkner, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2009a, 2009b ; Jorgenson, 2002). Coversely to engineering students who are extensively involved with complex mathematical analysis which cannot often be challenged, architects are trained to be more independent and are trained to challenge their critics. In this study, I focus on speakers identities and how women and men adopt their linguistic awareness to demonstrate their abilities and power to negotiate and construct leadership. In this sense, I believe that students in architecture should be on guard about their leadership language to discuss their architectural conceptions and convince others.

By analogy to the process of collecting data in the EFL classroom, I decided to adopt both FPDA and feminist CDA after having noted several examples of how students' speech in the architecture classroom appears to be covered by a number of discourses that vie with each other. I have noticed that female students are not permanently disadvantaged and enclosed in silence. Rather, students experience a continuous shifting chain between different subject positions when females can potentially transform acts of resistance into new (Baxter, 2006a).

On the practical part, I take ethnographic research principles for data gathering on account of their epistemological relevance and parallels with feminist poststruturalist theory (Baxter, 2003). The study of the architecture classroom recurs the same methodology employed in the EFL classroom, and therefore considers the theoretical commentaries of the nexus between ethnography and feminist structural inquiry.

On the level of identifying discourses, as revealed earlier, I draw upon a classic ethnographic approach (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995) to gather my data. I endorse Baxter's (2002b, 2003) view that this 'close-up and personal' approach allows the researcher to survey a single case from a range of multiple perspectives. I shall apply FPDA to samples of spoken data collected from the architecture classroom leaving space for varying voices : students, teachers and me. Once again, I

Choose to use feminist CDA and FPDA because they share a central concern of the discursive construction of subjectivity. I intend to probe the working out of binary power relations in the (de) construction of identities, and the resistance of such binaries, which is the *raison d'être* of such approaches (Butler, 1990).

In the phase of identifying discourses, I faced a fear of only detecting what I wanted to see. For this very reason, I took into account the significance to feedback my observation and interpretations to the participants themselves and impart their response. Because it was not evident at the very beginning, a lengthy spelling-out of my field notes and repeatedly replaying of the audio-transcripts were required to identify the dominant discourses. Meanwhile, I tried to pay attention, when identifying the discourses, to the students' reflection and their self/peer assessment. My research is concerned with the themes, links and competing viewpoints which have a direct relation with the construction of identities in the classroom, not foreign stories which may give irrelevant answers to my inquiry.

The research process gives rise to my awareness that there are five considerable discourses in the architecture classroom : 'Double bind', 'masculinity and public speaking', 'teacher/ peer approval', 'scientific and architecture' and 'double voicing' discourses which jostle with each other in a constant process. Here, I will consider the sources of each discourse and its realisation.

III.8.2.1 'double bind' discourse

Ma4: My female classmates are good… but as we are in 2016 … you will find it normal but in our group of architecture, you have 30 girls and only 4 boys… mm… but in reality, my female peers have by nature a conflicting situation in which they are confronted with being a woman and an architect. I think it is not easy for them.

Fa5: During my studies, I generally don't have a problem in succeeding in my studies, but I think that I will face a problem in my future work as an architect because I am a woman.

Fa3: I hate something in architecture… The builder who is ignorant does not accept an advice from a female architect just because he is a man and even though I studied five years of architecture, I must have a good knowledge in cooking and dish washing, not architecture and give instructions to male builders.

….

My awareness about the significance of this discourse initiates from some students' views that I gleaned from the interviews with Fa5, Fa3 and Ma4. These comments tend to harbor Bergvall's (1996) claims on engineering students that when women are assertive and bold, they will face some types of resistance. This theme tends to resonate with the classic 'double bind' (Lakoff, 1975) which sets that women seem to be transgressing the boudries of femininity if they talk, for instance, in ways which are associated with authority and leadership. Along this line, women who strive to display and enact power can be seen as facing a 'double bind' (Holmes, 2006a, p. 34), because power is associated with masculinity which is by definition a paradox of femininity. Fa3 and Fa5 exemplify the classic 'double bind' fear that females encounter in leadership positions. In bearing the stereotype that the double bind is particularly intense in masculine domains, I sensed that the notion of authority and effective speech in leadership positions is associated with maleness. But, I dropped this sense lest I raise delusive conclusions until my interviews (with the students) awakened females' presumed dilemma to be an architect and a woman.

Leadership, which should be contrived by architects who change minds while challenging traditional notions of space, time and materials (Gardner, 2004), requires being strong and articulate. However, some of female architects report that they face an impass when they start to adopt the linguistic strategies required by the field of architecture, which don't jibe with the cultural and social expectations. Bergvall (1996) demonstrates that when female engineering students are 'assertive', they are resisted by their peers ; when they are facilitative, their work may be taken for granted and not acknowledged (P. 192).

Keeping in this regard, Fowler and Wilson (2004) write : *"the privilege to tear open the soil and create monuments has every where been denied women, even in the United States"* (P. 107). As declared by Ma4 and despite the increase number of females in the department of architecture (and in group 1), females are still somehow underrepresented as encountering difficulties in light

of gender codification of professions. Overall, the concept of 'double bind' is used to refer to the dual constraint that women face when they interact in public arena (Lakoff, 1990; Coates, 1996; and Brewis, 2001).

Linguistically speaking, if women employ a more assertive speech style typically associated with masculine speech, then they will have the risk to forfeit their femininity as they will be perceived as being 'aggressive' by their peers. Yet, if they adopt speech styles typically associated with femininity, then they risk being negatively evaluated as incompetent and weak. Fa3 exemplifies the classic 'double bind' that women face in leadership positions. When discussing her project with the teacher and the other peers, she displays traits associated with a masculine speech style such as expressing intensity, directly expressing her opinion, overlapping with others and displaying decisive points of view. Although there was no blatant spat between Fa3 and their peers along the discussion, some of them expressed during the interviews a particular objection with Fa3's tough explanation to prompt them to accept her thoughts and judgments. This case draws an analogy with Baxter's (2006c) student in her study 'Sophie' who was marginalized by her peers. I reckon, as Baxter, that Sophie's marginalization by the other students is the result of her masculine leadership style. Both cases endorse Brown's (2003) finding about the fact that overconfident females can receive derogatory labels.

To illustrate Fa3's leadership in presenting her research proposal, the following extract from the interview with Fa5 and Fa4 may well portray her resentments towards Fa3.

….

Fa5: I think that Fa3 style of speaking and discussing her project is inappropriate. She seems to be too offensive… She spoke out without any results. I am not convinced… may be... if she was more flexible, it would bring good results.

Me: Are you dissatisfied with her overconfidence?

Fa4: The problem is not in her confidence… normally she does not forget that she is a woman.

….

At first glance, I thought that Fa4 and Fa5 are merely opposing Fa3's personality and I started considering the possibility of the existence of certain tension between them which will be beside the point of my research until Fa4 sets forth that Fa3 subverts her femininity by reifying masculine qualities such as aggression. So, the classroom is an arena where dominant, hegemonic, subordinate and oppositional masculinities and femininities are constructed and sustained. Matching how accomplishment in the public context of work is associated with masculine characteristics such as competitiveness and aggressiveness, the route access in the classroom also demands displays of verbal bravado to compete others (Charlebois, 2010) to construct an oppositional form of femininity.

The study of Baxter (2003) offers an insight into the 'double bind' that ambitious girls face when they step outside the limits of dominant femininity. Similar to my discussion of 'gender differentiation' discourse in the EFL classroom, this scenario is problematic because it not only assigns gendered practices to biological sex and thus celebrates gendered stereotypes, but also because it conflates effective leadership with masculinity. Specifically, one of the teachers of the workshop demonstrates how effective speech according to her reflects the masculine traits of confident self expression.

Teacher1: Although the core curriculum in architecture does not require taking into account the verbal behaviour of the students, but I think that the future architect should be bold and articulate in defending his/her efforts. In their presentations, we estimate the correctness of their language… which is French, but being effective is also important.

….

Despite of the significance of effective speech which may be given by some teachers of architecture, Fa3 can be seen as embedding a subordinate oppositional femininity within the classroom because she was infringing the confines of dominant femininity. I hold with Baxter (2006c) that the fear of gender violation and social exclusion is one potential commentary to account for why female leaders face hardness assuring their authority later in life.

III.8.2.2 'Masculinity and public speaking in Architecture' discourse

In this study, I agree with Baxter (2003) that it is better to move away from the monolithic model of what women do in language to a more 'local' way of analysing gender. However, the theme of 'masculinity and public speaking' in architecture seems to awaken the sweeping generalizations about women's speech styles. The following extracts from interviews with Fa2, Fa3 and Ma1 demonstrate the notion of effective speech and leadership as linked with masculine modes of speaking. This discourse intersects with the 'double bind' discourse and provokes female students a particular paradox in doing gender and studying architecture as a 'the masculine domain'.

….

Fa2: When we are supposed to present our project proposals we show display our confidence and verbal capacity… but the problem is in authority styles of speaking… so… if a female architect uses a low pitch will be considered as masculine. Personally, I don't have a problem in being assertive when I believe in what I say, but this cannot stop that it would be better if I use more supple and feminine styles.

Fa3: I don't understand why it is unnatural…influential and decisive for female architects when exhibiting their projects. If you speak in a loud voice, you are not good.

Ma1: I find sometimes…sometimes that my female peers are a bit anxious when presenting their designs.. this is perhaps seen in their physical and linguistic behaviour. May be… may…I think this lack of confidence is due to their participation in a hard domain for them. They are… emotional.

Me: Why do you think is it a hard subject for them?

Ma1: Generally… I am not specifying… generally, architecture is a difficult branch but females are not sure what they can give to architecture.

Me: There are also some males who are sometimes not confident about their presentations. Why are you specifying female peers?

Ma1: LAUGH… this is not to underestimate their capacities, but I said this because some female classmates told me that they are not suitable for their hard working speciality… I say that they usually face anxiety when speaking in front of a large group of audience and this may become worse in the domain of architecture. They think that this arena is suitable only for us (males).

….

163

There is not effectively a masculine reality about public speaking, but it seems to be indirectly gender-indexed (Mills, 2010), that is the linguistic styles prevalent within the public contexts are indirectly related with speech styles associated with masculinity. According to the comments listed above, the hypothesized stereotypes of gender play a role in one way or another. In this sense, assertiveness, communication skills, self-confidence and authority are all values which seem to index both effective public speaking and stereotypical masculinity (Johnson and Meinhof, 1997). Kiesling (2001) states that there is an arbitrary social acting norm that connects authority with pitch, pointing that a low-pitched voice is indicative of masculinity.

It is a positive point that some students are aware of the importance of using language that strengthens the message conveyed. But, it is imperative to underlie the present stereotypes about masculinity and public speaking. Bringing back women's choices about whether they adopt the masculine speech styles or employing feminine traits, they may face performance anxiety. In Mill's (2006) study of performance anxiety, she reveals that female academics tend to adopt tentative and indirect speech styles, because public speaking seems for many as a 'masculine domain'.

In the case of Fa_1, the gendering of public speaking plays a significant role more than the masculine nature by architecture. Despite of the superiority of Fa_1 in her group either in writing exams and even in the base of their projects' designs, she suffers from performance anxiety. She has got an articulate language, but she seems to be more effectively oriented using conciliatory expressions. Unlike Fa_3 which seems to represent a subordinate oppositional femininity which was faced with discontent, Fa_1 appears to encounter a particular congruence with her female and male peers.

According to Holmes (2006), women have to transgress their gender order to be assertive since the workplace assertiveness and effective leadership are often associated with masculinity. So even if some women are competent, the gendering of the context plays a key role in the manner of social agents' speech styles as they view themselves in relation to their community of practice.

Baxter (2006b) reports that female tendency to censure their own sex for 'standing out' is an important explanation of women's difficulty in adopting authoritative or leadership positions lateron. Accordingly, Fa₁ cannot be considered as deficient, it is rather the fact that socio-cultural and educational discourses which integrate to position females in such a way. By this token, Baxter (2006b) insists that females must be *"taught how to deconstruct the gendered power relationships assured within many social and educational discourses"* (P.176).

The fulcrum of the previous studies, demonstrated to explain this point, holds that adopting language styles prevalent in the masculine environments is an indicator of both masculinity and professionalism. Coversely, we should interpret women's adoption of masculine dominant styles as strategic. Their positions of institutional status may engender the use of speech styles which pertain to a different approach of 'doing power' (Diamond, 1996).

Drawing on Foucauldian's framework, researchers such as Baxter (2003) and Mills (2003) employ the metaphor of describing 'power' as a 'net' or 'web', rather than a possession that speakers may have. In keeping with this, power is something fluid which needs to be enacted and contested within interactions. Cameron (1998) argues that the most useful approach to the analysis of power and gender is to focus on the resources available to speakers in particular contexts to draw upon strategically. Now, there is a move away from analysing women's subordination or lack of effectiveness towards considering how strong women speakers resist masculine speech forms such as interruption and aggressiveness (Mills, 1999).

Commenting on Ma₁'s interview responses, he reports that his female classmates are more likely to experience performance anxiety when speaking to the audience. He relates this lack of confidence to the marginal position in the architecture sphere which is hard-working and inconvenient for females. I have noticed that Fa₁ exhibits some kind of gaze eschewal which is theoretically associated with submissive behaviour. In interviewing the students and asking them some questions about whether they experience performance anxiety and why, I have selected these main extracts :

Fa₁: I like what I am doing and I enjoy presenting my findings and display my proposals…but I find it difficult when there are large audiences such as lecture theatre and now in the workshop. I am thinking about the day of the viva … I am sure about my scientific knowledge, but I am afraid… afraid of making

mistakes in French. I don't have a problem in spending sleepless nights preparing my project… I am just worried about teachers' assessment of my work and and presentation.

Ma2: I have never liked public speaking. I prefer if we explain our design to the teachers informally using some colloquial language… it would be better because I find it difficult to prepare a formal presentation and engage in a public speaking.

Fa2: I don't have any problem in speaking in front of the public.. I am just worried about what teachers think about our work… otherwise, speaking in front of our teachers and students brings a sense of self-confidence and enjoyment of what have been done.

….

What is significant here is that both Fa1 and Fa2 demonstrate that they don't have any fear which comes from hard working in architecture as a masculine domain. In that Fa1 shows that she is competent and has no doubt about his scientific abilities which may engender her performance anxiety. Rather, she adds that his nervousness is sometimes due to her fear of committing language mistakes. So, she worries about the judgment of their teachers and classmates. Fa2 has, however, a fear from teachers' evaluation of their work without manifesting a conspicuous kind of anxiety.

Meanwhile, the male respondent Ma2 describes his anxiety in terms of the formality of the discussion. Although it seemed important for male students to represent themselves as convinced and confident, Ma2 spells that he has a particular reluctance to public speaking preferring smaller groups in order to be at ease while discussing his project. I was able to find out that students' confidence in public speaking, regardless of its correlation with masculinity, tends to be triggered by teacher/peer approval. I became aware about the dominance of this discourse from my interviews which unravel how confidence in public speaking is experienced, in some cases, when students benefit from positive evaluation of the audience's assessment.

III.8.2.3 'Teacher/peer approval' discourse

I characterized in my observation of teacher/peer approval discourses as interwoven to either afford students with interactional power or confine the possibilities for doing authority. As in the EFL classroom, my initial heed about the prominence of this discourse began to engender in my field notes which set down moments where certain students enjoy confidence and popularity from peer support and teacher approval. Whilst these students gain opportunities to construct themselves and potential leaders of their peers, others' chances to be dominant speakers are limited by some interruptions by their peers and sometimes the teachers. The students seem to be less popular when they speak publically.

Baxter (2003) holds that students' confidence in her study seemed to be developed in a curiously circular process whereby those who were considered popular students approved by others. Thanks to this approval, they assumed that they were popular and more confident than others. This may be well indicated in the following extracts :

Fa5: In any formal presentation which will be assessed by the teacher, it is important to have a support from our classmates and the teacher in particular.

Teacher (1): It is sometimes notable for me that my positive evaluation to my students is helpful for them as if they are just waiting for appraisal.

….

Furthermore, Baxter (2003) retains that those who are not popular, they are also not confident. The case of Ma1 and Fa1 seems to refute this assumption ; the two students are eminent in their studies and they are popular among their friends and even teachers, but they sometimes suffer from conspicuous lack of confidence when presenting their projects via using oblique commands. Yet, this does not deny their popularity in the classroom contexts and having a positive assessment reinforce the dominant position that students negotiate for. Fa2's leadership position appears to me as being corroborated and maintained by the approval of the members of the community.

Teacher 1 : I think that Fa2 who is appearing confident and persuasive receive peer approval. This is significant… sometimes even when the scientific and technical skills are banal, students who receive a boost from their peers empower them as speakers or presenters.

….

According to Baxter (2003), dominant speakers in the classroom are those who are able to gain, from their popularity, a disappropriate share of the speaking time, and to command regard of what they say. Less popular students like Fa3, have to struggle harder to gain the floor, and what she says and in what manner are often challenged. However, being broadly focused, I have noticed that dominant speakers such as Fa3's and Ma2's leadership roles are distinctly expounded by their classmates. In this, Baxter (2002b) states that popular females tend to attract dissatisfaction from their peers when they try to enact authority and play leadership roles, whereas this is not true for males. This will be illustrated from the following extracts collected from the interviews :

Fa1: Fa3 is so serious… I find that she has to adopt more supple ways to convince others… I think it is better if she leaves a bit the floor for others to speak.

Fa2: Ma2 is very confident in his presentation and powerful when discussing others. This is a good criterion for a successful architect.

Ma3: I like Ma1's style in presenting… he is very calm, but he creates a certain dominance in his speech… may be certain strategies to control topics. I like these skills… even if he is silent, he can convince others without using aggressive and inappropriate styles.

….

These arguments tend to uphold Baxter's (2003) view about the fact that dominant behaviours are less acceptable for females than for males. As the interviews demonstrate, both female and male peers did not educe any objection about Ma1's behaviour. By contrast, Fa3's leadership play is deprecated by her peers as being transgressing the norms of femininity not only because the idea of the 'best friend' is central for females (Maltz and Borker, 1982), but also because of the double bind women face in architecture as a masculine domain (Adams and Tancred, 2000). As it will be revealed in the subsequent chapter, female students are no less competitive than boys, but the ideological opposition between femininity and power appears to shackle their possibilities to

manoeuvre their status-quo. Female leadership is still a contestable construct within a patriarchal society (Baxter, 2002b), and this echos that male leadership is still considered as a cultural norm.

Besides, I have noticed that teacher approval plays a prominent role in Fa1's negotiation of leadership position for herself. Regardless of the lack of confidence experienced in some moments, Fa1 demonstrates that she actively constructs a powerful position by the support she receives from her teachers. When there is a backing from the teacher, Fa1 gains a number of extended turns which seem to create an instant control over the group by her.

Fa1: I confess that most of the time I face anxiety during my presentation… Usually, I suffer from this at the beginning of my exposition. If I feel that my teachers approve my work, I can be more assertive.

In fact, this scenario sets that female students can actively adopt flexible speaking styles via swinging from co-opeartive to competitive strategies, according to the subject positions available to them. So, according to my field-notes and the interviews, I became aware that attention and favouritism of teachers towards some of their students' manoeuvre to establish leadership positions.

III.8.2.4 'Scientific discourse of architecture'

Akin to the professions within the construction industry, architecture is regarded as a male-dominated career. Fouad (2009) claims that architecture has always been a male-dominated profession ; the most prestigious projects, commissions and the highest awards seldom go on women. In general, science is a way of reasoning based on reason, induction, deduction, logic, analysis and synthesis (ibid).

My awareness of the power of the scientific discourse of architecture evolved from my close observation of the significant moments where some female architects utilize the scientific discourse of architecture for scholarly authority and to make effectiveness of what they say. This reflects the way female architects use technical language to report the integration in the architectural domain. For example, Fa1 enjoys her mystifying language to describe issues related to the technical core of her project, emphasizing her scientific knowledge to position her self on the scientific realm. The following example illustrates how Fa1 uses a technical jargon :

- Shape-memory polymers (SMP) were used here which can reach a soft and flexible state when exposed to heat of around 60 to 70°C… at which point they can undergo geometrical deformations.

- In the previous versions of AUTOCAD… surface models can be created by drawing a polyline and assigning thickness 0 to the polyline.

- SKETCHUP 7 was used to produce a simple 3D model of the outer shell of the house.

….

Some females can negotiate for empowerment within peer/teacher approval and the scientific discourses. Although masculinity discourse –which is based on a clear perspective of gender differentiation-, limits the potential access to the leadership position, Fa1 opens free space for her through the scientific discourse. She experiences a shifting subject positions as a speaker along a variety of competing discourses. Overall, feminist critiques of science have demonstrated that the scientific thinking is highly masculine, effectively distancing women from full participation in its community (Haraway, 1991).

In general, the scientific discourse denotes the strategies harnessed by female architects to negotiate leadership and recompense the moments of powerlessness that may encounter along other discourses such as the double bind and masculinity dominance. Fa1 comment points out that the fine-grained knowledge about technical architecture is a source of empowerment to control the floor and proves the eligibility to be a member in the architecture community of practice.

Fa1: It is true that our teachers' positive assessment fosters my level of confidence… but the basic knowledge of architecture is also very important… yes, it is hard architecture. It is not easy for a woman to spend eight sleepless nights preparing a project. But to be a scientist and to be able to explain her thoughts in an accurate scientific language is a powerful guarantee for your place in the architecture domain.

….

By way of a parallel example, Ma2 sustains that some female students are skillful in addressing the scientific knowledge of architecture.

….

Ma2: Fa1 and Fa2 are skillful in presenting their projects and designs in a scientific way. I find it a good point because it is not always easy for us to interpret scientifically what we think about a particular phenomenon or what we manage to do in the future.

….

I find that the scientific discourse of architecture serves a redeeming power for some female architects to deconstruct their negative representation and leave room for the silenced voices along the discourses. This would rectify females' exclusion in the 'masculinity and public speaking discourse'. In fact, the masculinity discourse is mainly similar to the EFL classroom 'gender differentiation discourse' in which gender difference imputes polarized qualities to males and females, so that males are considered as more competitive, rational and independent (Baxter, 2010). Whereas, females are viewed as passive, irrational and dependent. This holds the view that women use language supportively to bind and build rapport.

In light of the dominant discourse of masculinity with the view of male as norm-entrenched, women's perception as irrational is at odds with the scientific discourse of architecture. Fa2 reports that there is a jostle between gender norms which term women as undue in the masculine/scientific domains and their 'power' of the 'scientist'.

….

Fa2: This is reality…we…women are emotional and sensitive, but when it comes to our study, we can assert that we are logical thinkers. I feel that I am powerful and deserves my place as a female architect when I discuss issues such as 3D printing, laser cutting for example… yes and techniques of SKETCHUP… Even if I am a woman… but… I think by the brain not my heart.

….

This extract shows how certain women are continuously adopting multiple subject positions. Within the discourse of masculinity, females may be powerless whereas in other subject positions such as the 'scientific discourse' they can be distinctly powerless (Baxter, 2003). I have encountered the theme of female's emotionality, but I did not find it powerful discourse unless it is fastened with the dominant discourse of masculinity. Females' representation as irrational and intuitive (Litosseliti, 2006) is deep-seated in the discourse of masculinity which sustains that males are logical thinkers and rational. Brewis (2001) suggests that the discourse of 'gender difference' should be seen in a connection with a discourse of 'scientific modernism', which connect to reinforce understandings and representations of women as being inapt to organizational life. In notable contrast, the 'scientifc discourse' appears to be, in my study, a platform where some females seem to be powerfully located which permits for potential possibilities to negotiate leadership positions and enacting authority.

III.8.2.5 Double voicing discourse

My primary source which allows me to detect the dominance of this discourse is the use of double-voices strategies within spoken interactions in the classroom. According to their subject positioning, speakers may or may not be able to adopt double-voicing as a resource for linguistic expertise. This discourse involves setting others' voices into one's own voice, either through direct or indirect quotation, or more subtly through mimicry or tone (Bakhtin, 1981).

Baxter (2011) employs the term 'double-voiced discourse' to examine the ways in which females use language consciously and strategically to compensate for their marginalized status in male-dominated environments. Through the readability of my field-notes, I have learnt that some female students like Fa_1 and Fa_2 use moderating strategies such as inviting responses, self-deprecating comments, proposing a compromise, attempting to hand about the feeling of others and other aspects in order to achieve more effective role in discussing the project with their peers and teachers. The following snatches of conversation can be expository to this linguistic strategy.

- **Fa_1:** It is a huge project, but I know that it is not easy to admit the extermination of your prefabricated houses.
- I don't want you to feel sorry for that

172

- Look! We are in guard of all your worries

- I will be happy if you enrich our project with your propositions

….

This 'mitigating' double voicing allows speakers to reduce the social disctance between themselves and the interlocutors. Baxter (2010) sets forth that effective speakers use a variety of sociopragmatic strategies to enact power in the workplace interaction. In the study of UK senior management meetings, Baxter (2011) finds that women managers engaged in a more 'double-bind' discourse, whereby they manipulate and regulate their speech styles in order to evade any possible elimination. She adds that managers who are anxious about how they are perceived are more likely to be self reflexive in their language use, as it is the case for Fa1.

Fa1 tends to demonstrate a particular awareness and responsiveness to the interests and thinking of peers. This can be clearly reflected in her language use to serve her perspective and those of her classmates. This mitigating double voicing strategy is used in doing 'politeness' (Holmes and Stubble, 2003). Politeness is considered as a substantial strategy in which people engage in social and professional relationships (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Borrowing the term from Baxter (2010), Fa1 is doing 'warm' politeness by exhibiting a veritable concern in the others and providing space for the participation.

Baxter (2011) infers that the double-voiced discourse is not simply a survival strategy but an avenue to practice different types of leadership at different moments. Accordingly, women in leadership adopt eloquent ways of being less harsh and sharp. From Bakhtin's (1984) perspective, Fa1 uses double voicing either to enact power or to resist it. Put simply, male/female speakers may employ double voicing not just to 'save face', but in order to negotiate complex power relations in their social and professional lives.

The following extract from Fa2's conversation reveals that the use of authoritative double voicing is to deepen the influence on the others and exhibit personal power. This double-voicing can be difficult to identify linguistically, and often depends on tone. But it is often marked by linguistic expressions of authority such as meta-pragmatic or qualifying clauses, followed by a directive (Foucault, 1995). Fa2 also employs even stronger directives to enact authority.

- **Fa2:** I realize that is a big change which might not be easy… but even if you disagree now to apply this project, you have to think deeply about what will happen to you and to your health if you maintain your prefabricated houses.

….

This extract mixes between mitigating and authoritative double voicing which expresses the presumed quibble other peers or teachers will make, and follows this by 'but even if you disagree' to strengthen her dominant position and secure her leadership from any potential threat, objection or criticism. She is reinforcing her authority by inviting others to deeply consider the issue of 'adjusting the current project of prefabricated houses'-by employing stronger directives. The functions of double voicing are evident here in which Fa2 mitigates the effect of her authority.

Previous research has indicated that double voicing does not always echo linguistic expertise. This strategy can, however, indicate a speaker's sense of linguistic 'insecurity'-language enclosing an apparent lack of confidence, or a sense of disempowerment (Fishman, 1980). The poststructuralist perspective of linguistic insecurity is to re-consider it as behavioural and material 'effect' of discursive positioning (Butler, 1990), and to re-conceptualize in security as a semiotic sign of consistent positioning of a speaker's subject as disempowered (Baxter, 2003). Indeed, even within the same interactional context, a speaker may shift in their use of double voicing to express their linguistic expertise or mitigate their linguistic insecurity.

III.9 Conclusion

The feminist research requires playing social and discursive construction of gender at the centre of its investigation. In this chapter, I have identified four significant discourses in the EFL classroom and five key discourses in the architecture classroom. My survey is based on FPDA which provides space for female voices, which have been marginalized or silenced by discursive practices which split the speaking context into two categories in which male speakers are more powerful than female speakers. As revealed earlier, this is not derived from an emancipatory

agenda; it is rather a part of post-structuralist consideration to bring a deeper and richer understanding of ideas, viewpoints and voices. FPDA focuses on the complexity of female subject positions and recognizes the existence of competing discourses which multiply locate speakers. This offers ways to challenge expected norms through the exploration of language and its role in creating, sustaining and reinforcing discourses. From my observation of the presentations and discussions in the two classrooms, I became aware of a complex and often ambiguous ways in which speakers (particularily females) are simultaneously positioned as relatively powerless within certain discourses and as relatively powerful in others. In the next chapter, I will deal with denotative and connotative analysis of the moments of exclusion, resistance and (dis) empowerment.

Chapter 04: Data Analysis: Denotative and connotative analysis

IV. 1. Introduction:

Following on from chapter three, I shall now analyze the stretches of spoken discourse in the natural setting of the two classrooms. To recap briefly, the crux of this study is to learn about how male and female students perform their gender identities and negotiating leadership as they are constantly negotiating for positions of power, defined by the range of discourses to which they find themselves positioned. It will be demonstrated how students' ability to adopt dominant speaker positions is continuously mediated by his/her subject positioning within a number of competing discourses operating in the EFL and architecture classrooms as exposed in the foregoing chapter.

Both case studies were conducted in almost commensurate ways involving semi-ethnographic approaches to data collection. The central methodology used in this research is FPDA which helps us to unveil the ways in which speakers are positioned by gendered and other discourses and they shift from positions of "powerfulness" to positions of "powerlessness" during influential interactions (Baxter, 2003). Interestingly, I will refer to a light combination of FPDA and feminist CDA which focuses on how gendered relations of power are re(produced), negotiated and contested (Lazer, 2005a).

I will deal with denotative analysis which supports the synchronic dimensions by undertaking detailed, micro linguistic analysis of the significant moments with their interactions to describe "what is going on within this context" (Baxter & Al A'ali, 2016). And on the basis of the micro linguistic evidence, I employ connotative analysis to provide my investigation more with interpretative commentary of extracts of spoken discourse drawing from the synchronic and diachronic sources of data.

IV.2. Case study design

In an endeavour to gain "thick descriptions" (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995, p. 10), I adopt a semi-ethnographic perspective by using methods of data collection which tally with participant observation such as being there, participating "overtly or covertly" in their lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions and

collecting the available data of the search focus. What I have been seeking to do through incorporating the semi-ethnographic approach with the case study design is to characterize the contextual factors which construct gender identities and forms of effectiveness among male/female students.

Principally, researchers opt for using qualitative case studies when they are exploring the "what" and "how" of participants' lives. I choose the case study approach for descriptive reasons in order to illustrate and explain key features of "the students" negotiations and constructions of varying identities according to the context. Mabry (2008) states that qualitative case studies are often used to capture and light the complexity, detail and multi-faceted nature of the participants' diversity in a given context.

Within this theoretical frame, I design this quest to pinpoint and describe the moments when students negotiate their shifting subject positions. Again, Mabry (2008) argues that qualitative case studies cannot be generalized to an entire population; they are often employed to foreground the deep understanding of the diversity of any given context. Yet, case studies are often heuristic by extending the recording of "what" and "how" to the "why" of the context, allowing free room for assessment and critique. Thus, the function of case studies as both descriptive and heuristic shape the design of our research methodology. Yin (2003) records that "case study" can be single or multiple, but the evidence from multiple cases is often valued more compelling and robust. In multiple case studies, a researcher tends to collect data from a number of sub-cases independently and then conducts analysis across the cases, which is the case in my study.

In investigating the EFL and architecture classrooms, the multiple case study I adopt is defined as comparative case study in which the data, from the two, classes, will be compared with each other. I will specifically consider if the nature of the context brings drastic change to the theoretical assumptions about students' negotiations of gender identities and the performance of "changing positions" and "effective speech". Through the examination of spoken discourse, I strive to demonstrate whether the same complexities and ambiguities of female architects in a traditionally masculine domain will be replicated in the EFL classroom.

IV.3. Methods in use:

Compatible with the ethnographic research, I foreground the "participant-observation" method of investigation Duranti (1997, p. 99) distinguishes between types of observations stretching from "passive participation" to "complete observation". He points out that taking a complete participant's role is not handy to achieve owning to the number of challenges facing during the collection of confidential data. Moreover, He recommends that researchers should take the role of a "professional over - hearer": attending but not actively participating (p. 101).

As for the group of EFL Master students, I reached a "complete participation" stage, as I was the teacher of the "Oral presentation" module, and this offered me the opportunity to directly experience the very processes I was trying to document as Duranti (1997, p. 100) reports. Taking into consideration Duranti's (1997) warns to researchers about the risk of losing sight of one's task as a researcher and becoming distracted, I tried to play the role of a "professional over hearer" from time to time.

As for the architecture context, I adopted the position of an "accepted by stander" and "passive observer": attending but not actively participating. For this, I needed to find out an unobtrusive site which was a place at the back of the workshop. I was generally expected to introduce myself at the beginning of the attendance, defining the sake of the research (even through this had been stated as part of the ethical consent), and explaining my role as a researcher. In order not to leave the ethical issues unexplained, it is imperative to note that I got an informed consent from the research institution (both departments) which was approved by the faculty where the investigation was based. Prior to the onset of this study, participants were informed about the research purposes and the methods would be adopted. Permission was also asked if the video recordings could be used, which showed the students presenting and discussing their final projects. Thus, participants were assured that they were free to choose whether or not to take part in the research and could retreat at any time.

To recap briefly with some exposition, I used field notes to capture and store some contextual and paralinguistic features such as body language and seating arrangements when I was conducting audio-recordings. As revealed in the previous chapter, I used four video recordings in the architecture sites as a supplement to audio recordings. My decision to include video recordings in this context was derived from the fact that I was not familiar with the architecture community of practice, and this technique facilitated the reading of data as it vividly captures the plan drawings and the design works. In both contexts, I followed up my observation of the presentation with interviews with the students and the teachers. This was for the sake of eliciting participants' perception of how they interact in public contexts and how they strive to be placed in a chairing position and adopting effective speech.

Within the poststructuralist paradigm, interviews are considered as discursive events where talk is co-constructed and cooperatively realized between the interviewer and the interviewee (Talmy, 2011). In this sense, Hammersley and Atkinson (1995, p. 156) argues that the research should consider the interview data as revelatory of *"the perspectives and discursive practices of those who produced them"*. Thus, interview data offers me considerable insights into participants' assessments of themselves and the other interlocutors, arguments about the working discourses in the context, as well as the norms of the Cofps in the two classrooms.

Reflexively, there was a requirement to assess my own role in constructing the realities, identities and discourses produced within the interview context. So, I decided to employ semi-structured and open-ended interviews to get an in-depth data for this part of the study. The choice of these types of interviews was taken to boost the participants to "take the floor" and convey their own impressions and understanding of their experiences and practices. To avoid prompting their answers and urging particular ideas, I used a combination of close questions to detect initial factual information, and open questions to trigger broader views and thinking. For instance, I tried to avoid what Baxter and Al A'ali (2016) labels "Putting words into the months" for interviewees, and I did not direct their minds towards "gender", unless participants brought it up. This was the case at the very beginning of the survey, I was careful about the need to explain to the participants that the gist of the study is to examine how students develop their speaking skills and how they speak "effectively" in public settings. And even in reality, I consider the issue from

an educational perspective by exploring how students reach leadership positions wondering whether female students are less inclined to occupy chairing positions.

Again, as for the research methodology, the predominant one is audio-recording which was defined by Flachs (2013) as a communicative practice of listening carefully to what the locals speak among themselves and to how they perform speech acts, how they attribute meaning, how they shape, comment on, and explain events and phenomena in the world. In both classrooms, I used Philips Digital voice recorder to audio record all the students' presentations and the interviews with the respondents. I additionally utilized a field notebook to write down obscure words and utterances of the participants, especially for architecture students. Note taking allows me to record the central facts and issues, and facilitates the analysis of the transcripts by highlighting the significant moments of the interactions. During audio-recordings, I used to take notes in order to learn the meaning of some unclear technical terms, for instance in the architecture site. At the end of the session, I got an elucidation from the teacher and the students of some scientific concepts that I totally ignored.

IV.4. The EFL classroom study:

For the EFL classroom, I observed the classes of "oral presentations" module for the group of Master students, when exhibiting their Master research projects. As elaborated in the preceding chapter, the transcript material is read out from a corpus of data composing a study of classroom spoken interaction. In outspread review of the literature had referenced that gender differentiation is a pertinent discourse in discourse analysis in classroom contexts, and furthermore, while female students are often seen to be more articulate than their male counterparts, they may nonetheless be at a prejudice in assessment terms (Swann and Graddol, 1995).

My ethnographic approach to the research design incorporates spending time at the research site, extensive observations, taking field notes and conducting interviews with students and teachers. In the extracts below, students were being assessed by the teachers when presenting their final projects. In Baxter's (2003) work, the students were evaluated by their teachers according to new British examination criteria for effective speech in public context (EDEXCEL,

1998) which provided evidence of a meaningful exchange in the criteria from a model of informal, exploratory, collaborative talk in small groups to that of more public, performance-based talk. (Baxter, 2003). However, teachers in my study are not standing on unified standards about their students' assessment; there were no fixed criteria that define their evaluation of the students' oral performances. I used FPDA in order to analyze the ways in which students adopt leadership positions and construct "effective" speech as mediated by the interplay of the interwoven discourses found to be at function within that EFL classroom, namely 'gender differentiation', 'leadership talk', 'collaborative talk' and 'approval'.

In an attempt to make a close and itemized FPDA commentary, I will focus on just 4 of the 34 students (four males and four students) whom I have labelled M_1, M_2, F_1, F_1 and F_2, although there are references to other students (such as M_3, M_4, M_5, F_3, F_4, F_5 and F_6). In the analysis as follows, my role as a research participant is juxtaposed and intermingled with the accounts of the participants in the study: that is, the four students and me as a teacher next to my status as a researcher.

In this study, I adopt feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis to unveil the continuous shape-shifting that students experience between subject positions within a single speech event (class discussion). Building on this line of analysis, my survey will demonstrate how students, as social actors, negotiate for positions of power which are defined by the range of discourses to which they have access to (Baxter, 2003), or within which they find themselves positioned. As will be outlined in this chapter, a student's ability to adopt a leadership position is constantly interposed by his/her subject positioning within a number of competing discourses (Baxter, 2006b).

One of the key features of FPDA is that it can supplement other approaches to discourse analysis such as feminist critical discourse analysis which is concerned with the inequality and the manner that discursive means are employed to sustain the status-quo. My FPDA commentary will almost cover some lines of analysis based on Feminist CDA (Lazar, 2005a) in order to provide a rich understanding of the complex workings of power and ideology in discourse as it interacts with patriarchy as an ideological system. Despite of the similarities between FPDA and feminist CDA, Baxter (2003, 2006b) who has developed feminist CDA, focuses on the way that women can carve out new positions for themselves within the competing discourses.

This chapter is organized in two parts: "M_1 and M_2" and "F_1 and F_2", within each part, the format is the same: two extracts have been singled out from the transcript of the whole class discussion. I specifically consider the "significant moments", as Baxter (2003) recognizes them, which are opposite to the ways in which they light and exemplify the positioning of the selected students in relation to the interwoven discourses disclosed in the former chapter. My analysis will be based on two discrete but interrelated levels: "Denotative analysis for each extract followed by a connotative analysis, or the FPDA commentary in other words (Baxter, 2003).

IV.4.1: The case of "M_1 and M_2"

Extract one:

The following extract launches after about seventeen minutes of the presentation of M_1's and M_1's Master project which revolves around the American Muslim Community's status during Obama's administration. After according an entire chairing role by the teacher to the presenters from the beginning of the session, M_1 has just designate the controversial issue in the discussion: whether president Obama's foreign policy brings a shift in the traditional U.S (United States) foreign policy towards Muslims.

01   **M_1:** we thank you for your kind listening and interest.
02   your suggestions and welcome (He is walking and waving his hand to grab the attention).
03   **Class teacher**: Thank you very m::uch M_1 and M_2 for your
04.   bright presentation.
05   **M_1:** You are welcome (.) now (looking at the black board
06   and pointing to the title of their presentation) what do you think.
07   about Obama's promise to Muslims?
08   **M_3:** Thank you very much for your (.) the significant topic of research (.)
09   I see that president Obama actually set a new beginning in
10   U.S Muslim relations
11   **M_4:** Yes M_3, but I think that Obama did not really succeed in
12   eliminating all threats Muslim American have faced.
13   **M_1:** Obama believes in freedom of religion(.) =
14   **F_1:** = Aheee yes = but some Muslims really suffer from racism
15   And violence.
16   **M_1:** Indeed, and in general the president Obama tried to promote
17   (.) and (.) I say the idea that Islam is not the enemy of America and that
18   U.S is not the enemy of Muslims. He ↑ called for
19   Breaking up the relationship ordered by misunderstanding
20   and any kind of [violence

21   **F₁:**   [↑ yes, ↓ yes the president Obama a:: lso stated
22   that islam has been always a part of America
23   M₁: Exactly ↑ (head modding) F₁ (.) You are right (.) Obama's Cairo speech
24   Created a paradigm ↑ shift in U.S foreign poli[cy
25   M₃: [Yea :: The president n :: eeds to (…)
26   That America has tuned the corner to be a leader rather
27   Than a loner
28   **Class teacher**: ↑ Yes (.) M₁ I think you want to elucidate
29   More your point (F₂ and F₃ are raising their hands to take turns).
30   **M₁:** ↑ Yea (.) thank you ↑ well (.) in so far as domestic
31   Policies and the Muslims are concerned, president Barak Obama
32   tried hardly to incarnate his promises during Cairo's speech.
33   Overall, [the F.B.I
34   **M₂**:   [The Federal Bureau of Investigation
35   **M₁**: :: yea, it continued to intimidate Muslims and Islamic institutions.
36   (…) Right, what you have gleaned from our brief?
37   we are very interested in your comments and remarks to
38   finish this investigation.
39   (pointing at F₂)
40   **F₂:** some people say that O::bama's policy was prudent and others [
41   **M₅:**   [tries to change (…)
42   **M₁:** (1.1) (Pointing to F₂ and coming towards her table) ↑ yes F₂
43   Can you please continue your ↑ opinion?
44   **F₂:** haha (.) I was saying that other views criticize his foreign
45   policy.
46   **M₁:** so, what's more significant in Obama's policy?
47   (M₃ is starting to raise his hand to take the floor)
48   **M₁:** ↑ yes M₃ go ahead (F₁ is also trying to get the floor
49   by raising her hand).
50   **M₁:** (1.6) we will be happy to hear the other worries not
51   only M₃ and F₁ (.) F₁ you can take your turn just after M₃.

IV 4.4.1 Denotative Analysis

In this sequence, M₁ experiences two lengthy turns, if compared with the other peers in this discussion. No other participant in this class discussion has the opportunity to get this unique access to the floor. In this extract, M₁ also adopts the chairing role such as nominating and authorizing his peers to take part in the discussion. (lines 42, 48, 51), dissecting opinions (lines 6, 7, 36, 46) decision markers (lines 1, 6, 42, 48, 51), and supporting other participants to extend their points of view (lines 23, 42, 43, 48). From this extract, I can reckon that M₁ tends to develop a public voice (Baxter, 2006a). After having the chance to speak in public setting and present with his peer M₂ their Master project, he negotiates for himself a certain kind of linguistic

visibility, which is a crucial means of being recognized and noticed. Cameron (2006) labels the principle strategy to reach this as "speaking out".

At the very beginning of the presentation, M_1 appears to be aware about the importance of occupying the most central and visible standing position. He succeeds in catching the equidistant line between the teacher and the classmates. M_2 stands beside him when presenting, but M_1 moves towards his peers who take part in the discussion. Besides his audible delivery, M_1 embosoms his confidence and dependability. As the extract displays, M_1 adopts assertive body language searching for attention. If compared with M_2, M_1 uses the assertive body language to rivet the attention of both the teacher and the classmates. Albeit the fact that M_1 has extended turns if compared with others in the discussion, he is interrupted by F_1 in line 21, by M_3 in line 25, and by M_1 in line 34.

After M_1's interruption by F_1 in line 21 "Yeah", he endorses her opinion by head nodding and a minimal response "Yeah" (line 23). Although M_1 appears to be the most voluble speaker who plays the leading part in this discussion, he does not resist F_1's interruption as he corroborates her view without persisting with his speaking turn. He listens carefully to what F_1 says and agrees on what she presents. M_1 is unworried by the gaze or interferences of the audience. As appears in this extract, M_1 is able to use a wide range of types of speech such as controlling turns (regardless of the interruptions directed to his turn), refocusing the discussion and inviting his peers to participate. For this very reason, I can rate M_1 as an "effective speaker", borrowing this from Baxter (2000a, 2003), in view of his use of the strategy of parallel processing which is of paramount importance.

In constructing an "effective speaker" from a "dominant speaker" (Baxter, 2000a). M_1 is able to make a vocal impact on his audience which may *"maximize the chance of dynamic interplay with other voices"* (Baxter, 2000a, p. 29). More to the point, Baxter (2000b) references that this linguistic tactic serves to be a distinction between a "dominant" speaker and an "effective" speaker in public contexts. While retaining his dominance and holding the floor, M_1 seems to be aware of the moments which should encounter his silence (in lines 13 and 16 as interrupted by F_1, in line 24 as intervened by M_3). He does not allow his dominance to resist such interruptions; he leaves the floor for them with certain confidence permitting them to plainly develop their opinions. Then, he responds to his peers' viewpoints through stretched

contributions. He often listens carefully to the participants' reasoning and he is able to "parallel process" (Baxter, 2000a) by controlling turns between F$_2$ and M$_5$, mediating and inviting F$_2$ in line (42) to speak after having been interrupted by M$_5$ in line (41).

Among the chairing strategies M$_1$ deploys, he nominates F$_2$ to speak which follows his attentive listening to M$_3$'s butting in. Further, his skillfulness in chaining and dominating sounds in nominating F$_1$ (line 51) to debate after raising her hand (line 48) at the same time when M$_1$ accords the floor to M$_3$. In this significant moment, M$_1$ evinces his ability to speak with audible delivery, without any kind of perplexity when controlling the discussion and doling out turns.

According to Baxter (2010), M$_1$'s ability to ensure that every participant gets his / her turn to speak is a way of "doing politeness" (p. 151). This linguistic strategy, to enable everyone's voice to be heard, helps to raise the support of others. Next to the chairing strategies used by M$_1$, he is able to "parallel process" as he contributes his views to the essence of the discussion (lines from 16-20 and from 30-33).

Despite of the non-destructive interruptions by some peers during M$_1$'s turns, it appears that he gains a "clearing space" (see Baxter 2003, p. 105) when overriding F$_2$ and F$_3$ when starting to raise their hands to be nominated by either M$_1$ or M$_2$. Teacher (1) reinforces his chairing role and reminds him (line 28) about his need to expound the point he was intending to illustrate (line 23) as he was intervened by M$_3$ (line 24). The teacher further legitimates M$_1$'s access to the floor and to monitor the discussion through the extended turns.

Extract two:

52   **M$_2$:** In America, today (.) Muslims are the most ascribed
53   Racial categories (he stands up and walks from the desk
54   to the board facing the audience)
55   **Class teacher:** Yes M$_2$, absolutely (…) so, in your view, M$_2$, how can
56   you see the relationship between Isla::mophobia and ↑ racism?
57   **M$_2$:** ↑ yea (.) Islamophobia has long been a part of the problem
58   of racism in America and it becomes worse in light of the
59   shocking terror attacks (1.0) Our research investigates the issues
60   of racialization of Islam in the U.S and how this is influenced by
61   the historic and geographic trends that surrounded American
62   Muslims in America. Till now yes, islamophobia appears in
63   Inverted commas to indicate that they did not yet find an
64   accurate definition for it (M$_1$ is nodding his head three times
65   to say "yes"). We find in some reports that "islamophobia" is

66   defined as the close-minded fear and hatred of Islam and

67   Muslims. (Teacher is supporting this with "Yeah. Yeah")

68   **M$_3$:** Islam is seen as inferior to other cultures (1.1) yeah

69   **Class teacher:** Yes M$_2$ (.) do you want to elaborate more?

70   **M$_2$:** another important point ↑ yea is in the U.S, racial and

71   religious minorities, I mean communities are seen and exploited

72   As "colored" men and women through racial classifications (M$_3$

73   and F$_1$ make overlapping supportive comments during this).

74   As it is shown in the table (He points to the board), the recent

75   compilation of Islamophobic ↑ hate crimes (he looks at M1 at

76   this moment) data by the council on American-Islamic relations

77   reports that between 2014 and 2016, anti-bias incidents increased

78   by 65% (F5 puts her hand up).

79   **M$_1$:** Can anyone explain a hate crime? yes £ politicians £

80   No American intelligence [(laughs and smiles from some students).

81   **M$_3$:**   [Err (.) an anti-Muslim hate crime (...)

82   yea yea, of religious hate crime =

83   **M$_2$:**= OK (.) yes :: a hate :: crime is explained as a criminal

84   offence motivated by the actual or actual or perceived status

85   of another such as race, ethnicity and religion (.) err [

86   **F$_1$:**   [and ↑ gender =

87   **M$_1$:** = haha (.) yes Miss feminism £ (laughter from F$_3$, F$_1$,

88   F$_5$, M$_3$, M$_2$, M$_6$ and other peers) … You are ↑ right (.) American women

89   are more stressed than men about hate crimes and violence.

90   **Class teacher:** F$_5$ I think you wanted to say some::thing (pointing at her) (.)

91   right =

92   **M$_1$:** = F$_5$ ↑ yes ↓ (.) I am sorry I did not give you the floor.

93   Yes, go ahead (.) I noticed your request to intervene (…)

94   **F$_5$:** ↑ Thank you (.) No problem (…)

IV.4.1.2: Denotative analysis

In contrast to the first extract, M$_2$ has two lengthy turns without any interruption. No other student in the whole class discussion has this unequaled access to the floor, and therefore I find it imperative to look closely how M$_2$ succeeds in holding his two lengthy turns. Unlike M$_1$, M$_2$' s lengthy turns are not interrupted by the other peers, and he appears to be actively supported. M$_3$ and F$_3$ who tend to interfere M$_1$'s turns, in the previous extract, show no intention to interrupt, and they wait patiently for their allocated space to take part in the debate.

Besides, M$_2$ has the right to chair the discussion after presenting his MA project with his peer M$_1$; his right to have a wider space to expand his points is conspicuously protected by the teacher$_1$. Yet, there were no attempts to challenge or interrupt him except in line (73), where M$_3$ and F$_1$

make supportive comments to boost and consent upon his point and not to transgress his right to elaborate more. The sequence begins shortly after the close of extract one, where M_2 has his turn after M_1 to answer his peers' queries and starts to take an active role in the discussion. Again, M_3 starts his overlapping sentence (line 80) during M_1's turn. Then, M_1 uses latching to recover his right to take the floor with supportive minimal responses (Ok, yes).

Whilst M_2 is able to sustain his speaking turn in order to develop his point of view, he is not very aware of what is happening with the audience. In line (78), F_5 strives to take part at the discussion and raises her hand to be nominated by the teacher or one of the presenters (M_1, M_2). Yet, M_2 does not remember that F_3 was putting her hand up. The class teacher invites her to speak (line 90). Then, M_1 adopts controlling turns and making decisions via nominating F_5 to convey his opinion which was requested during M_2's lengthy elaboration. Without any interjection, M_1 employs his leadership tactics by checking understanding and questioning assumptions (can anyone explain a hate crime?). With a smiley voice, M_1 uses humor (yes politicians) as a linguistic strategy to foster good relationships and a soft atmosphere for debate and discussion, thus provoking a laugh from the audience especially F_1, F_3, F_5, M_2, M_3 and M_6.

IV 4.1.3: Connotative analysis:

From both extracts, there is evidence that M_1 occupies an authoritative position as a speaker of the group. He holds his chairing position via deploying a significant repertoire of skills from light touch to strong monitoring. He seems to be an astute communicator with a sophisticated awareness of the effects of the linguistic styles he employs. Among the wide range of case-making skills he adopts, M_1 plays a key role in encouraging participation of subordinate or less voluble speakers as these extracts demonstrate.

Assessor (y): M_1 is among the best students in this group. He is very confident and clever in echoing his linguistic styles to monitor the whole discussion. He likes adopting the role of a leader, this is why he succeeds in persuading others to respond and take part in the discussion. For example, F_6 and M_6 are less active in public speaking context. They usually have good marks in written exams, but they cannot express themselves. I can say that they lack a bit of confidence even when presenting their own works which are really interesting. But M_1 knows how to evoke their interest to participate in the discussion. Yes, he is very dominant … and always, but he makes silent students active to engage with him.

F₆: M_1 uses humor and lesson the stress of the discussion … I don't like speaking in front of the teacher and my classmates but I participate and I like having my word when M_1 presents his works. He knows how to invite us to express ourselves and speak without fear. He is a good presenter and I think that he will have a good future with teaching.

….

From these extracts, we can glean that M_1 is an effective speaker in which he uses "transformational" styles of leadership (eg. Vimmicombe and Singh, 2002) (see Baxter, 2010, p. 12). In this sense, M_1 is capable to boost the participation of subordinate and passive students, as he transforms his own self-interest into the interest of the group through concern for a broader intent. Extract 1 and extract 2 evidence how M_1 stimulates his peers' abilities to be effective and creative by questioning assumptions and inviting all students to share out the discussion. M_1's chairing skills and his linguistic construction of leadership is explicit in the former extracts; his popularity plainly appears in the following extracts :

M₂: M_1 is very active, I like working with him, especially when presenting, I usually focus on informing and explaining, but not creating active argumentations like my friend M_1.
M₃: I highly appreciate the presentation of M_2 and M_1 … they are brilliant and popular and their topic is a recent topic and new research. Both M_1 and M_2 are very lovable persons and M_1 is famous with his charisma.
M₅: M_1 is a very famous boss in our class. He is brave and he knows how to take control of any discussion. He is cool also.
F₅: A good manager in the classroom is M_1. He is the teacher. He explains well and he controls the calm of the class. M_1 and M_2 are very popular students.
M₆: M_1 is famous with his dominance and his humour. He will be an excellent teacher with his personality.

….

Indeed, it seems that there is a great intertextuality of the discourses of the "leadership" and the discourse of "peer approval" in the classroom. As stated before, peer approval refers to the ways in which students' relations with each other are set and expressed in terms of notions of popularity, friendship patterns, physical attractiveness and personal confidence. His positions as a "cool and popular" member of the group makes it easier for others to accept his leadership positions. When I raised the question of M_1 and M_2's roles when presenting their project in my follow-up interviews, I gleaned that there was no challenge from the other members about M_1's

assumption of authority. It is clear that there is no issue among the students about his authoritative position as a speaker and leader of the group discussion. M_1's confidence to assume the leadership position is not challenged by his peers; and there is little evidence of negotiation for this positioning. So, next to M_1's ability to use a range of linguistic strategies to enact dominance, the discourse of "approval" from the teacher and the peers –tends to powerfully position M_1 as flexibly performing his leadership. Another evidence of the interconnection between "approval" and enacting authority is the written self-evaluation of M_1.

….

M_1:   I tried to do my best in the presentation. I believe that it very significant to listen to everyone. This is why I tried to offer everyone his space to give his point of view as I am always aware about the fair when having the chair role. As the praise from you (the teacher) and my friends reinforces my skills to control everything, this also reinforces my confidence. I am sure of what I say and I know where I place and put each word, but when you are accepted by the audience, this facilitates the task for us.

….

More to the point, the previous extracts evidence that the discourse of "approval" is tremendously powerful in appointing who should hold over the floor and how long in the whole class discussion. It seems that there is a considerable coincidence about the nexus between the issue of "popularity" and developing confidence among speakers as these extracts display:

Teacher (meeting with other assessors):   I know M_2 and M_1 … they are very confident speakers. They know what they say and they know how to police their talks but I suggest that their renowned popularity is bolstered by their peer's approval and support. As you see, they were able to play a dominant role, in the discussion which follows their presentation, by speaking extensively in this public setting.
F_3:   I am sure that M_1 and M_2 usually have good marks in "Oral presentation" and are praised by most of the teachers because they know how to convince others. Because they are sure about what they say and they try and they obliged us to listen to them and we become convinced …
Interviewer (the class teacher):   What makes an effective speaker?
M_1:   Someone who is confident and who is autonomous and seeks agreement from others at the same time.
M_2:   It is the one who believes in himself and who speak clearly.
F_1:   We have to be serious and brave … gaze at the audience without any fear. If you are sure, don't stop.
M_3:   Confident and dominant people succeed in their in their life … being supported is also important.

F₂: How to persuade other is the first thing … and doing it with confidence.

F₃: Make your voice loud … this needs courage. This is necessary if you want to be accepted.

…

These comments recap the most significant points about some students' views about how should an influential speaker be. The students characterize that effective speech should be in a loud voice and with certain qualities such as autonomy self-belief, backing by the audience and retaining extended contributions. It may be argued that humor is more of a personality quality than a learnt skill. According to Baxter (2010), only effective speakers who are aware of the importance to employ humor to entertain and relax, not to "hog the floor", or to "put down" other speakers. With regard to his use of humor, M_1 sets forth in his written self-evaluation:

M₁: I like humor in my presentation. Being an influential chair does not necessarily mean the use of strong commands and invading others' rights for expression. Jesting from time to time does not lessen my qualities as a chairman. Contrast, it facilitates the task and find it very enjoyable.

….

In her study (2003), Baxter reports that popular people use humor and the case in following two extracts of M_1 and M_2 denotes that this is not adopted by all popular students. M_2 is very popular and very recognized in all the English department with his outperformance and high scores, but he never uses humor in his public speaking. In disparity with this case, M_1 tends to use humor to allow for some space for breaks from the serious discussion, to release tension and to underline solidarity with the audience. In line (80), M_1 tends to spontaneously use humor to attract and keep an audiences' attention and as a strategy to minimize "face – threatening acts" such as commands and demands for explanation.

In my study, the discourse of "leadership" appears to shape a link between the student who is deemed to enact authority (example M_1) and the one who uses humor in his public speech. M_1 uses humor to connect with his peers and garner their support. Humor is, therefore, deemed a beneficial resource of leadership and enacting authority. According to the comment of M_1, humor creates a subtle and complex interaction between doing authority and doing politeness, two sources to achieve an effective language of leadership according to Baxter (2010).

In terms of M_1's popularity, he benefits from humor to "steal the show", in the words of Baxter (2003), which may beguile the audience and veer the attention away from the more serious points being made by less entertaining students like M_2. Although M_1 M_2 are very famous and popular, M_1 creates for himself an incandescent space in the public context. In line (87), M_2 uses latching to interrupt F_1 when she points to the issue of gender (line 86) and uses a kind of humor with a laugh (yes Miss feminism). I reckon that this type of humor falls in the category of "cold" humor (Morreal, 1991) which is not overtly fully, and can hurt. The following interview brings to light the connotation of this humor.

….

M_e :　M_1 what did you mean you call F_1 "Miss feminism"?
M_1 :　Yeah … (haha) just to have fun, I wanted to remember her that she is fond of gender studies … (err) and she is very interested to think about any issue in the lens of gender. She is a woman and she have the right to think about the status of women in U.S.
F_1 :　I got what he means. It did not tease me. I know that he was concentrated on certain political issues, but it came to my mind "gender" when he speaks about violence and crimes. Gender is an important scope, but they think only men can examine it.
…

Building on those comments, there is a particular interconnection between the use of humor and the discourse of 'gender differentiation' which serves to foster and legitimize differences between men and women. The matter is often far more than one of a difference but of gender "polarization" (Bing and Bergvall, 1998). In this trend, Bem (1993) points out that it is not merely an issue of the difference between women and men, but it is the male / female difference which is superimposed on so many aspects of the social world. This incorporates disparities between the two sexes in every other aspect of human experience and social roles. M_1 creates the discourse of 'gender differentiation' which reinforces unequal power relationships which have traditionally and stereotypically position women less powerfully than men. This makes it easier, for example, to exclude F_1 from debate which revolves around politics and limits her opportunities to make her voice heard.

F_1 signals that what she gleans from M_1's humour is that he wants to call for gender differences which traditionally consider women as weak, uncertain, focuses on the unserious and emphasizes personal emotional response (Lakoff, 1975). In fact, this discourse positions F_1 in a powerless spot by contrast to the discourse of collaborative talk as the following comment shows:

Assessor (x): F_1 seems to be hasty in certain moments when she interrupts others and throw long overlapping comments. Yet, she listens carefully in some cases which enables her then to succeed in developing a supportive speech for her peers.

….

F_1, then, appears to be powerfully located according to the discourse of 'collaborative talk' which estimates conciliatory, supportive speech and good listening skills. The assessor (x) criticizes her for going beyond the relatively feminine norms of speaking when she interrupts. According to the previous extract, F_1 enters to the larger discussion with the intention to challenge or confront M_1 through some interruptions, yet there are also other occasions where she listens to the speakers and avoid verbal hindering. Then, the intertextuality of the discourses of "collaborative talk" and "gender differentiation" can be conspicuously recognized in the assessor's comment. She states that F_1's cooperative strategies to listen and use of supportive statements posit her in a good and a powerful position, but her attempts to dominate and competitively overlap the conversations are unsuitable in the public speaking context.

In compiling all the comments of my interviews about M_1 and M_2's presentation and public speaking discussion, no one contends for M_3's obstructing comments, but the assessor mentions F_1's interruption in two occasions. This may serve to stress the fact that the female's attempt to confront or handicap male verbal dominance would put her into a double kind in the classroom setting as Baxter (2003) indicates. As evidenced above, FPDA permits me to demonstrate the ways in which students continuously shift between intertextualized and competing discourses, with particular focus on M_1 and M_2. The following comments reveal how assessors judge the ways that M_1 and M_2 speak and interact.

Assessor (x): Both M_1 and M_2 are among the best students I have ever met. I highly appreciate their work. They were clear and clarity is very important. They seem to be confident as they give an effective opening to their presentation. Both of them (…) they have mainly the same level. They have very good language. They seemed to concentrate on avoiding language mistakes. They are very clever in presenting; they were able to succeed in pausing in the right places. Both of them are collaborative and friendly with others, they did not interrupt and they distribute fairly the floors. In spite of this, they make lengthy contributions to answer all the questions of the peers. Their dominance did not hinder them to create a good relationship with their peers. I see that they deserve the same good mark.

Assessor (y): Yes, M_1 and M_2 are good students, their topic is new and they perfectly present it. Well, I see that they have a deep grasp of their research as this was obvious in their lengthy answers and explanations. May be M_1 spoke more than M_2 and even with a general calm from the peers; I mean no interruptions and no sudden questions which intervene his floor, but M_1 is more effective. I think he deserves a bit more. M_1's dominant chairing does not hinder him to show a great respect to his peers when he listens carefully to their comments, he also, I see, accepts the interruption from some students like F_3. He controls well the speaking turns and he know how to build upon the points of the contributors. As for M_2, his understanding of the topic is excellent. It was clear, but after he finishes his presentation, all his turns were prolonged, I think that he should give more space to the audience to discuss. They had twenty minutes for presenting their work. So, I think it is very important in any influential presentation. May be … I don't know, I think that M_1 should have a higher score than M_2 because he well employed case-making skills to be more persuasive and uses his voice, his body language and his linguistic tactics to captivate the attention of others.

…

Albeit the distinct viewpoints which touch M_1 and M_2's presentation by the assessors, they jibe with the interesting presentation of the students, they show inconsistent assessment about their effectiveness. M_2 was not interrupted by the audience and he did not, by the way, violate the norms of collaborative talk as opposing others or interrupting them, he is criticized for his lengthy turns in which assessor (y) considers it as invading others' space to talk. In contrast, assessor (x) seems to estimate their extended turns as a good sign to interpret their thorough understanding of their research. Assessor (y) appears to echo Holmes' (1992) view that collaborative talk should encourage more equal participation in the classroom and in other contexts. M_2's most prominent participation was in his lengthy turns in which he profoundly illustrates his research. So, his long contributions are mainly the substantial moment where he was powerfully positioned, but this positioning was reviewed by assessor (y).

A complex and interlocking factors tend to monitor the speakers' positioning as relatively powerful or powerless within a web of competing discourses. M_1 was, in particular, considered to be effective and influential both during his presentation and when chairing the public discussion, as he speaks out using a wide range of case-making skills. M_2 is also a voluble speaker who succeeds in connecting a series of points in order to build a convincing argument and providing an in-depth informing and explaining. As the teacher who decides the score for this group of students, I gave them the same score. We have all agreed that both of them are influential, but I cannot estimate him according to his friend's performance. For instance, M_1's tactics such as questioning assumptions, creating scenarios, inviting others to speak, controlling the turns,

monitoring and using humour are not, *de facto*, references in an official curriculum to be implemented in the English department for the oral examination.

IV.4.2 The case of F_1 and F_2

Extract one:

This extract launches mainly after three minutes of the end of F_1 and F_2's presentation which outlines gender roles and stereotypes in the British feminist writer Virginia Woolf's works. As this extract features F_1 and F_2, it draws a particular reference to other peers such as M_1, M_3, F_3 and F_4.

95   **F_1:** In all the essays of Virginia, she tried to challenge the role.
96   of Victorian [
97   **M_3:**   [and her essays as well
98   **F_1:** Yea … Mrs Dalloway # (looking at the teacher who is
99   standing on the left) is a good work of Woolf that
100   examines Butler theory (.) the theory of gender performance (err)
101   performativity, sorry and the formation of subjectivity through [
102   **M_3:**   [To the light house
103   also tackles their roles and their identities =
104   **F_1:** = Yea ↑ absolutely (…) check the handouts and tell #
105   Me what do you think of Clarissa ? (sounding uncooperative)
106   **F_4:** Clarissa have a quality of independence (with a faint voice).
107   **F_1:** Yeah (.) another one (.) another answer(.) Be active £.
108   **M_3:** (He tries to raise his hand at the time of speaking) May
109   I say my point ?=
110   **F_1:** = yeah please, of course (F4 tries to raise her hand)
111   **M_3:** The novel shares the insight of social constructionism in which
112   Clarissa's identity is constructed over time through discursive
113   practices [
114.   **F_1:**   [this is the fluidity of the character =
115   **M_1:** = this criticizes western society's limitations of traditional
116   marriage and conservative politics (F₁ roughly rolls her paper)
117   **F_1:** (…) from our analysis I underline that (.) if you have
118   another point I will be happy to have it.
119   **F_2:** It is very important to talk about Butler's theory. Butler's
120   theory says that the woman is not fixed and the gender difference
121   is not fixed [
122   **M_1:**   [↑ But this theory f becomes problematic because it (.)
123   it denies, I mean (.) the fluidity of gender denies the way in
124   which one can criticize some representations of gender.

194

125   **F$_1$:** Yeah (haha) it is problematic because it is against
126   patriarchy and men's dominance = (she mimes looking under the table)
127   **F$_2$:** =This theory challenges the essentialist view of women's subordi::nate and males'
       dominance.
128.   **F$_1$:** M$_1$ (.) do you support deprecating women and silencing them?
129   (general hustle as F$_1$ speaks; M$_1$ attempts to chip in, F$_2$ makes
130   supportive comments to F$_1$ and general laughter at the same time)
131   M$_1$: No (…) this was not what I meant (.) you did not
132   understand =
13   F$_1$:= I understand very well (.) I know that we are in a masculine
134   World =
135   **F$_2$:** = male's dominance £ (general laughter from the class).
136   **Teacher** : please (.) again to the discussion (1.0) (M$_1$ raises
137   his hand).
138   **F$_1$:** Yes, M$_1$ give you opinion quickly, we haven't time.
139   **M$_1$:** I read many books on this and I am convinced that (…) =
140   **F$_1$:** = Yeah (.) but if you are supposed to judge the theory,
141   will you still say this?
142   **M$_1$:** ↑ Sure (.) sure (…) I am sure £=
143   **F$_1$:** = Absolutely, if you meet Butler, and you still say this?
144   (general laughter at this)
145.   **F$_2$:** I support my friend F$_1$'s argument, but M$_1$ is also not
146.   wrong (nods and supportive minimal responses
147.   From some peers) (.) M$_1$ if you can explain more (.) that
148.   will be good.
149.   **M$_1$:** I was convinced to say (…) =
150.   **F$_1$:** = and then again we come to the same point (demonstrates
151.   with hands and leans towards the center of the classroom)
152.   **F$_2$:** Right (.) [any one can give us more examples
153.   **M$_1$:**   [if we go to this city center now we will see how
154.   Many women are imprisoned and violated (looking at F$_1$) (A general
155.   laugh from the class peers including F$_1$ and F$_2$; some heckling from others)
156.   **F$_1$:** M$_5$ yes go ahead (.) do you want to say something?
157.   **F$_2$:** Yeah (…) that could be right, but can we implement this?

158.   I think it is difficult [
159.   **M$_3$:**   [it depends, we cannot take every::thing
160.   for granted =
161.   **M$_1$:** = we need a national thinking (looking at F$_1$) =
162.   **F$_1$:** = That's what's we are trying to do (head nodding from F$_2$) (.)
163.   Are you all with me? (…) Ok (.) Yes F$_4$, yes. We need new
164.   voices and new things, yes please, the floor is yours (waving her
165.   hands to encourage other speakers).

IV.4.2.1 Denotative analysis:

Throughout this extract, it is demonstrated that both F_1 and F_2 struggle to carry on their ideas as their turns are heckled by most peers, males, in particular such as M_1 and M_3. By lines 97 and 102, F_1 is in the middle of the reasoning of her argument with regard to the works of Virginia Woolf (line 96) and Butler's theory of performance (line 101). When reaching to touch the core of her idea, M_3 immediately interrupts her.

By line 104, F_1 seems to use the strategy of case-making (Baxter, 2000a) by employing supportive minimal responses (yeah) followed by casting M_3 with a question as instructing him to re-read the handouts they (F_1 and F_2) gave it to their peers before the start of the presentation. Through doing this, F_1 appears to construct a platform of leadership for herself. Her overlapping statement (line 104) appears to position F_1 as the chairing student who is in charge of ruling the discussion. Through her irritated tone of voice, F_1 resists M_3 interruption for her (line 102) and asks him to check again the given information.

By line 106, F_3 who seems to be reticent and calm. I have noted that she took notes from mainly all the presentations, which is a sign for a good listening. By line 107, F_1 affirms what F_4 is saying by the minimal response "Yeah", and then, she invites other peers to take part in the discussion. At this moment, M_3 appears to respect F_1's chairing role and raises his hand to be authorized by her to take the floor. This is done by using polite forms of asking the question: "May I say my point?". Again, F_1 offers M_3 the floor by using the polite marker "please" to develop rapport and maintain collegiality. From line 113 to 115, there is an interlocking of overlapping and latches between M_3, F_1 and M_1. When F_1 interrupts M_3 and tries to elucidate more the point, M_1 immediately steals her speaking space (line 115). F_1's annoyance is blatant from the harsh manner she rolls her paper.

Then, F_1 tends to reinforce and assert her opinion (line 117). Possibly aware that she appears too vexed, she uses the strategy of double voicing as she stresses her view (I underline that (.) if you have another point, I will be happy to have it). Perhaps, she uses this linguistic tactic to smooth the potential difficult situation that she may experience with M_1 and the other peers. Put simply, F_1 seems to be aware of the necessity to achieve peers' acceptance. By line 122, M_1 interrupts F_2 and attempts to criticize what she was explaining. F_1 ironically uses a supportive response "Yeah" (line 125) accompanied with a laugh attempting to put down what M_1 is

claiming. By line 125, F_1 seems to attack M_1's views by asking him a direct question and creating scenarios. At this moment, a general hubbub is raised in the classroom when F_1 is speaking, and M_1 is attempting to overlap and when F_2 sustains her backing and support to the reasoning of F_1. Then, F_2 builds a backing for her friend F_1 and persistently challenging M_3's view about Butler's theory of gender (line 127).

By line 128, F_1 seems to attack M_1's views by asking him a direct question and creating scenarios. At this moment, a general noise arose in the classroom when F_1 is speaking; M_1 attempts to overlap when F_2 sustains her backing and support to the reasoning of F_1. M_1 responds to F_1's question with an indirect assertion of his opinion revealing that his viewpoint is dismissive to her opinion (line 131).

The misunderstanding between M_1 and F_1 is clear in lines (131, 133). F_1 and F_2 complain about M_1's presumed adherence to the patriarchal assumptions about women's deprecation, and M_1 refutes this assessment. F_2 again uses her reasoning defense, in a mold of sarcasm, to attack M_1. By line 136, there is a general laughter from the peers and a kind of clutter. At this moment, the class teacher interposes to secure the tranquility of the discussion. Then, M_1 raises his hand indicating his acceptance of F_1's chairing role as he tries to talk over the issue in a collaborative order. F_1 enjoys her authoritative position and nominates M_1 to take the floor and exhibits her dominance when enacting her role to control the turns and take decisions (deciding the remaining and the allocated time for discussion) (line 138).

By line 140, F_1 plays the role of "agent provocateur" as Baxter labels it (2000a) when she initiates and sticks around an opponent argument. F_1 tries to convince M_1 and the other peers with her argument using her dominance as a weapon to face any peer pressure. M_1 sustains his decisive understanding of this issue. He did not lower his dominance as he retains standing on his opinion. He reiterates the word "sure" three times in a smiley voice. By line 143, F_1 keeps her "agent provocateur" position with the resistant point of view. In the same line, F_1 engenders class laugh when using a kind of humour when threatening (as it seems) M_1 if he meets Judith Butler, is he going to maintain what he is saying now.

By line 145, F_2 sustains her support to F_1, but she employs double voicing: (… but M_1 is also not wrong). This is perhaps to build accord and create a harmony between the peers. She then invites M_1 to clarify more if there is a possibility, she appears to seek for the group's approval. By line

150, there is a simultaneous and a kind of latching between M_1 and F_1 when the latter shows her annoyance, again, about M_1's insistence on his argument. She overlaps dismissively and enacts her authority by showing denial to what M_1 is going to say.

Then, F_2 tries to moderate any tension which might arise during this discussion about gender issues and the question of women's rights. By line 154, M_1 brings a huge laugh from all the group (including M_1 and M_2) when he adopts his style of humour when asking the audience (including F_1 and F_2) to check, at that moment, the city center indicating that they should find a lot of women outside, and this is to throw down F_1's presupposed fact of women's segregation in Algeria. Here, M_1 uses sarcasm to convey objection and an indirect criticism which is perhaps more brusque because it is known for everyone that a great number of women are present in the city center each day. To oppose the claim of women's segregation, M_1 says the opposite of what he means. Sarcasm is often classified as a form of irony while some researchers employ the term interchangeably (Attardo et al., 2013). According to Barbe (1995), sarcasm comment shapes a face threatening act for the speaker.

After nominating and giving the floor to M_5, F_1 (line 157) uses double voicing (that could be right, but can we implement this, I think it is difficult) to mitigate her confrontational behaviour in some moments. Then, an overlapping speech is created by M_3, M_1 and F_1. Again (line 162), F_1 uses an authoritative double voicing when saying (that's what's we are trying to do) and nominates F_4 to say her word, and she fervently calls and encourages other unheard voices to see light.

Extract 2:

166   **Teacher:** Yes F_1 (…) I think it is very important (…) yeah, yeah.
167   **F_1:** it is true that boys and girls were not born the same, one
168   should not take things for granted and believe everything as
169   the negative theories about women and the language, some
170   researchers say that females are excluded from the participation
171   in society and they weak in everything,
172   politics, sciences, etc. The woman is excluded from her role
173   in society. Lakoff said that women's speech is maladaptive and
174   handicapped. And others also support this view such as [
175   **M_3:**   [spender =
176   **F_1:** = Yea, Spender agreed that female are not certain about

177   themselves and what they say. But the dominance and difference
178   theories are resisted and criticized by poststructuralist feminism yea so (.).
179   **F₂:** Exactly (…) Masculinity and femininity are not fixed that cannot
180   be changed these notions are continuously negotiated in all our
181   behaviours, not only only in speech. According to Butler, she says that
182   gender is not something fixed (Teacher's head nodding; gives
183   supportive minimal responses), but women and men negotiate
184   and perform their gender identities. The gender identity is performed
185   according to the social norms [(supportive comments from M₁, F₃ and F₄)
186   **F₁:**   [sometimes the construction of the identity
187   needs some practices to resist some negative social norms about
188   women =
189   **M₃:** = But resistance is not so easy in a Muslim society (F4 raises
190   her hand, M₁, F₂ and F₃)
191   **F₁:** yes F₃, the floor is yours [
192   **F₂:**   [yes, yes go ahead.
193   **F₃:** thank you (…) I agree with you F₁ (…)
194   **F₂:** notions of "performativity" and gender negotiation in the
195   communities of practice are very important in understanding
196   how the gender is not fixed that cannot change gender is
197   something that we hope to build, we negotiate for this
198   according to our position and place in society (.) women can fight the
199   social norms that do not fit them [
200   **M₃:**   [women's emancipation (F₁,
201   F₄ and M₄ attempt to interfere)=
202   **F₁ :** = yes, please I cannot hear you all at the same time.
203   raise your hands in order to enable the others and all
204   students to participate [
205   **M₁:**   [Excuse me, I want to say that
206   things cannot be taken for granted (…) you need to
207   be critical = (he was partially raising his hand when he starts to speak).
208   **F₁:** = this is exactly what we are doing. I read a lot about
209   my topic and I am certain about what I say and what I understand.
210   **F₂:** M₃ I grasp what you said [
211   **M₃:**   [because of this, I want to explain
212   that (…) =
213   **F₂:** = Yeah, yeah I read about this theory, but not too much. Thank
214   you for your explanation (M₁ and F₄ are raising their hands) =
215   **F₁:** = yes F₄, you didn't speak a lot. Go ahead.
216   **F₄:** Thank you. I just want to say that I agree with what you,
217   gender performativity and the community of practice theory [
218   **M₁ :**   [who (.)
219   who said that Butler and Wenger are lying? £ (General
220   laughter at this). I am not good like you at gender studies, but
221   I am sure about what I say, and read more about it.
222   **F₁:** Anyone who have a disagreement on this (…) yeah?

IV.4.2.2 Denotative Analysis:

In this extract, both F_1 and F_2 show evidence of the ability to speak extensively within this public context, but through running across some difficulties. F_1's lengthy turn which starts from line 167 is supported by the teacher who shows her momentous interest in F_1 and F_2's topic. She authorizes F_1 to take the floor besides to her legitimate right to chair the discussion and police the speaking turns perhaps because of this explicit backup. F_1 is able to speak extensively and freely impart her ideas without interruptions, until M_3's attempt to butt in (line 175) when saying "Spender". But, F_1 tends to employs latching when she immediately overlaps with M_3 utterance so as to resist his interruption and hinder him from "stealing" her turn. While offering a particular backing to her friend, F_2 is able to protect her extended turn as she is supported by the teacher and some of her peers such as M_1, F_3 and F_4 through head nodding and minimal responses. By line 186, F_1 uses overlapping to reinforce F_2's views. Then, M_3 interrupts F_1 to signal a challenge to her proposal of women's resistance to the social norms.

In both extracts, it appears that F_1 invades the leading space as she actively hands out licenses for the students to speak, if compared to F_2. By line 192, F_2 appears to struggle for the chairing position when F_1 seems to speak. At this point, F_3 signals that she agrees with F_1 by showing her approval and accordance with her opinion. Then, F_2 seems to speak extensively and illustrates her idea. By line 200, F_2 is interrupted by M_3 when he attempts to label the crux of her idea as "women's emancipation". Despite this, she resists his interruptions to take over her turn as she manages to complete her turn. She withstands the heckling and interferences of both F_4 and M_3. At this point (line 202), F_1 appears to speak out giving instructions to steer the classroom discussion, by inviting the students to regard the rules of "collaborative model". F_1 explicitly calls her peers to speak with an audible delivery to enable her to hear all the interferences. This explicit instruction covers a tacit sense of necessity to toe the line and respect his position as a chairing speaker who is the only one who can nominate others and regulate the speaking turns. She calls for lifting hands to allow all students to participate.

In calling F_1 to be more evaluative and critical (line 205), M_3 uses the politeness marker "excuse me" to clarify his point in a respectful language to mitigate the potential complaint or criticism. As another linguistic strategy to enact dominance and confidence, F_1 employs authoritative double voicing (this is exactly what we are doing). Then, she responds assertively and dismissively (I am sure about what I say and what I understand).

This point indicates that although F_1 uses double voicing to avoid potential conflict with M_3, she can still assert her authority and expresses her certitude. In contrast with F_1's dominance and resistance to the dissenting arguments, F_2 voices supportive comments to M_3 in order to achieve cooperation and solidarity with her peers, including those with opposed estimations. By line 213, F_2 uses latches and simultaneous speech to preserve solidarity with M_3 by utilizing double voicing (I read about this theory but not too much).

At the point where F_2 is recognizing the illustration of M_3, M_1 and F_4 appeared to be raising their hands waiting for nomination to take the floor. In a latched turn, F_1 opts F_4 to take the floor. It sounds that F_1 is very active than F_2 in keeping an eye on the students' attempts to take control turns as a chairing strategy. F_1 seems to have won the backup of F_4 who conveys her agreement on what was reported by F_1. By line 218, M_1 interrupts F_4's exegesis and deploys humor when saying (who said that Butler and Wenger are lying?). As a dominant speaker, he uses it to monopolize the floor in a smiley voice. This engenders a general laugh from the rest of the group.

By line 220, M_1 shuffles strategic double voicing (I am not good like you at gender studies) perhaps to mitigate his dominant positioning when interrupting, and single voicing (but I am sure about what I say …) to reveal his confidence and persistence. Then, F_1 pursues her chairing role by estimating and creating scenarios.

IV.4.2.3 Connotative Analysis

In both extracts, F_1 and F_2 evidence their positions as dominant speakers as they occupy the floor by extended contributions resisting some interruptions in some occasions. Gender performances in the EFL classroom cannot be assessed as a fixed category because this would be generalizing the experiences of male and female students. Thanks to the "community of practice" framework, we gain the opportunity to analyze students' co-construction of identity from the

201

calibration of day to day social membership and activities. Students' multiple identities are not equally significant at any particular moment in time, one or more may spear-head at several and different times. Besides, the students' construction of identities and their relatively fluctuating positions depends on a complex interplay of subject positions broadly governed by a range of competing discourses. To consider, first of all, the discourse of "peer approval" appears to play a key role in allowing students such as F_1 and F_2 powerful positions within the classroom, in which they employ the available discursive practices to construct an "effective" speaker identity.

The description of F_1 and F_2's linguistic interactions demonstrate that F_1 negotiates an authoritative position for herself within the group, which is actively constructed by the "side-kick", in the words of Baxter (2006a) _ from F_4 many times, especially when objected by M_1 and M_3. Yet, the students' interviews indicate that F_1 and F_2 benefit from peer approval in a disparate manner, as it is revealed below.

….

F₄: I know both F_2 and F_1 and they present well, they have both support from our friends, but I think that F_1 is more popular and is more supported by the peers.

F₂: When I saw and watched our presentation, I saw that I was a bit passive, not like F_1 (…) she is active and powerful when she feels that she is famous and all others support what she says even if she is serious in some cases.

Interviewer (Me): Do you really see a difference in the degree of F_1 and F_2's popularity?

F₄: Yes, I think so. F_2 is gentle and good. F_1 is very known and popular since her first year of studies. I don't know, but I think that F_1 is always strong and confident because she knows that everyone knows her and they support her, except in some cases … it depends on the contexts and lessons.

….

It is observable from the video-recoding and the above extracts that F_1 receives support from F_3, F_4 and M_1 in most cases. Besides, F_2 also benefits from the backing of M_1, M_3, F_3 and F_4. To reiterate, the discourse of "approval" is employed by speakers in order to get approval and support (Baxter, 2003) when they are speaking, and this is associated with learning and positioning. It is conspicuous that F_1 and F_2 receive approval, so as they are recognized within the class group and they gain a position: *"a conceptual repertoire and a location from persons"* (Davies & Harre, 1999, p. 35).

As for F_1, peer approval generates "bullying" for her and boosts her to take constantly the floor, reject and triple with some opinions, especially those considered as dissenting to her own view. Despite the fact that F_2 is popular and possesses a particular backup from her peers, she seems that she did not manage, like F_1, the leadership position as if the "side-kick- received by other peers is not adequate to constitute her own position as powerful. In the students' interviews, it is evidenced that F_2 considers that she has failed to be noticed by the teacher, and has reconstructed this in terms of her subject's positions within the competing discourses of "peer" and "teacher" approval. When I catechize about what students think about their oral performances, F_2 replies:

F_2: F_1 is very famous than me and she is preferred by everyone. She is my friend and I am happy for her, but she succeeds to convince others and express her arguments without any complications I think that F_1 got more support than me.

Me: which support do you mean?

F_2: Miss F_1 knows more than me how to convince you, this is why you supported her many times than me and you called her to speak many times also. I got a good mark in the written exam, but I must learn more how to be a good speaker next time.

…

Thanks to her bravery, F_2 recognizes what she feels about her positioning in terms of the discourse of teacher approval. She seems to feel that she herself does not conform to the teacher's model of a "boffy" (from "boffin") student (Baxter, 2003), while she believes that F_1 preferential access to the floor and his leadership position is the result of her compliance with the model.

In the previous denotative analysis, it is indicated that F_2 seems to put herself in a position in which she feels to be obliged and compelled to vie with F_1 to win teacher's attention. The case of F_2 hears a resemblance to the case of Rebecca, in the study of Baxter (2003), who perceives herself as relatively powerless compared wither female peer in terms of the discourse of teacher approval, but to be relatively powerful in terms of peer approval. In my survey, F_2 is empowered by the discourse of peer approval, whilst she seems to fail to keep her confidence and the notions of popularity in the discourse of teacher "approval". In this sense, F_2 sees to be not qualified to be favored by the teacher if compared with F_1, and this undermines her chances to negotiate leadership positions. As Baxter (2003) discloses, the discourses of "gender" are significant as they are inter-textually linked with and infused by traces of the others. That is to say, gender

differentiation discourse jostles with other institutionalized or less formalized discourses within the classroom. Indeed, the extent to which both F_1 and F_2 are able to gain speaking turns and their manipulations towards overlapping and interruptions, can also be read in terms of their subject positioning within the competing discourse of 'gender differentiations' and 'leadership talk'. According to Baxter (2003), from a feminist post-structuralist perspective, it can be argued that female linguistic interactions may be confined to the dominant definitions of femininity shaping the subject positions available to females like F_1 and F_2. My analysis of the two extracts above displays evidence of how these definitions might chain F_1's spoken performances and position her as embodying a subordinate oppositional femininity.

It is possible to reason from a "difference as strength" school of feminist socio-linguistics (eg. Holmes, 1992; Tannen, 1992, 1995, Coates, 1993) that girls resort to a more co-operative style of linguistic interaction, so that when a female tends to "do power" which is considered to be a masculine trait, she will be threatened to be marginalized by members of the group. This reiterates Brown's (2003) finding that overconfident girls can encounter pejorative labels. Along this line of thinking, girls reveal a greater compliance, than their male counterparts, to the rules of collaborative talk. This is the case of F_2 when she takes notice of being a good listener eschewing interruption and disrupt others' terms like M_1 and M_3 did in the extracts, and even F_1.

Dominance theorists (Spender, 1980; Swann and Graddol, 1988) might expound this by suggesting that boys have learnt a range of rule breaking strategies and verbal bravado to gain control of the conversation within the public context. Besides, girls are often constructed as the more supportive sex (Baxter, 2003). This seemed to be evident in F_2's tendency to offer male students such as M_3 (in the previous extracts) considerably more interactional backing than she receives in return. This may be corroborated by previous research by both dominance theorists (e.g. Fishman, 1980) and difference theorists (e.g. Jenkins and Cheshire, 1990).

In the second extract, we see how F_2 builds upon an argument introduced by M_3 in line (145), she seems to adopt the linguistic strategy "double voicing" when supporting F_1 and M_1's views which appear to be paradoxical. She uses this in order to view acceptance for her ideas while retaining the support of other peers. In her study, Baxter (2014) states that much more consistent use of double voicing is mirrored in the discourse of less dominant members of the women's group.

F_2 exhibits an explicit understanding of how potentially disempowering constructs, such as good listening and submissiveness, are deemed to be more compatible with female's identity whereas constructs of non-conformity and resistance to the gender/social norms are regarded to be compatible with a male's identity, as these comments underlines.

….

F_2: I am not very active, but I know very well that as a woman I have to be flexible, if I do not speak or interrupt, this does not mean that I don't know, but this is a good behavior.

Me: So, you wanted to speak?

F_2: Yes … a lot and sometimes I know that I am right but I have to listen to others and give them their space to speak, M_1 if raises his voice, he is a man, I should be intelligent and convince others in a feminine way.

…

From a feminist post-structuralist perspective, females appear to be powerfully located according to the discourse of collaborative talk because this considers co-operation and supportive speech. On the other hand, according to the discourse of "gender differentiation", females are stereotypically expected to be passive speakers and good listeners (e.g. Swann and Graddol, 1995) which consequently might lessen a position evaluation of their contribution (Baxter, 2003).

Moreover, males don't just merely fail to support their female peers in classroom discourse; they actively strive to encumber females' linguistic interactions (Baxter, 2003). In both extracts, M_1 and M_3 appear to wield a number of rule breaking ploys to challenge or counter-attack F_1's points of view. In this sense, Baxter (2003) argues that, according to conventional discourse of differentiation, males are very often constructed as the "wittier" (p. 121). In the first extract, M_1 employs strategies such as heckling and jeering to undercut the rather more serious points made by F_1 and F_2 in some instances. M_3 tries, in the second extract, to assert his arguments via interruptions and overlapping with F_1's turns, which permits him to have a greater vocal space. Feminist CDA directs a critique to the discourses which maintain a patriarchal social order, which calls for the need to "feminist humanist" vision of a community, in which gender does not predetermine or intercede our practices and our identities (Lazar, 2005 b, p. 6).

Alternatively, a feminist post-structuralist perspective would opine that the discourse of gender differentiation works through the institution of the school and the classroom to sabotage the potential powerful subject positions which may be achieved by females through linguistic interactions (Baxter, 2003). This serves males when they are permitted to occupy the extensive space having the major vocal scope inasmuch as females adhere to the rules of collaborative talk. Nevertheless, the complexities and the paradoxes produced by these discourses cannot definitively construct subject positions without engendering counteracts of opposition, or supplementary challenges according to post-structuralist analysis (ibid).

In this case, F_1's attempts to resist M_1 and M_3's overlapping and interruptions, strengthen her possibility to construct his dominant identity as an EFL student. Baxter (2002b) reports that female's leadership is seeming as "out of order" whereas it is quite acceptable for male students to be dominant speakers in public settings. Despite of the popularity of F_1 and her benefits from peer approval, some students convey a certain amount of dissension towards F_1's leadership styles of interaction as the following students comment in the interviews:

….

M_1: Yes, I am not against convincing others and persuading the audience, but F_1 seems to exaggerate, we are here to discuss things, I was obliged to interrupt her because she did not stop, I could not let her break my right to take the floor.

F_3: F_1 is my friend and she works well, but I think that she was a bit harsh (haha). I think that M_3 is always against her because he is a man and he did not agree on her behavior like of man.

F_2: F_1 is good in presenting, but I think it is important to be flexible a little bit more not like other men, M_1 and M_3 has the right to speak in a loud voice, but we, we can express what we think in a flexible way.

Me: what do you mean by a flexible way?

F_2: Femininity, yes, I mean femininity, I study gender and I know that this is always important in Chlef, I mean Algeria in general. By this token, Holmes (2006a) stresses that women who endeavour to exercise power can be facing a "double kind" because power is associated with masculinity and female leadership is still highly, controversial construct within a patriarchal society.

….

F_1's *pièce de résistance* in his class discussion lies in her linguistic styles which are associated with masculinity such as overlapping with other speakers, having lengthy contributions, directly

expressing her opinion and resisting males' inferences by other interruptions. According to Baxter (2006a), the kind of marginalization, which faces F_1, reflects the sometimes repressive nature of norms which constitute dominant forms of femininity. Matching up with this, F_1 can be treated as embodying "a subordinate oppositional femininity" (Baxter, 2006a) as being overconfident in constructing her leadership. As mentioned before, F_1's peer approval and her popularity innervates her authoritative identity and behaviour, but this *façade* of cordiality seems to pass from sight in the discourse of "gender differentiation" when she withstands male interruptions and confront their legitimate dominance. When the discourse of 'leadership talk' barely starts to place F_1 in a powerful position, gender differentiation scenario sways her towards marginalization and disempowerment.

Additionally, M_1 seems to adopt simple voicing to enact power over F_1 and F_2, and to compete for approval of the best idea as in the second extract (line 220). Although the strategy of single voicing is indexed in the enactment of leadership of F_1, she employs double voicing (particularly the authoritative type) to manage competition and conflict between speakers in indirect and acceptable ways. According to Baxter (2014), the use of double voicing can serve to do leadership in a very different kind to the single voiced version. In this tenor, F_1 comments:

F_1: When I was allowed by you Miss (the teacher) to present and chair the conversation, I must control the conversation and normally I don't accept any interruptions, in the future if I will teach my pupils, so I will let them play as they know. I must be confident and may be aggressive, I mean sometimes, but this is not possible in every situation. For example, I tried to make the misunderstanding with M_1 and M_3 less severe by reaching the agreement in a soft manner. Otherwise, I will create a battle. But I never forget my chairing task.

….

Reckoning on this, F_1 seems to be aware of the need to turn her explicit level of conflict and tension to the strategy of "double voicing" to gain more co-operation and solidarity. So, F_1 appears to embed her use of double voicing strategies within single voiced discourse where her assertion and resistance are implemented. Although it is not so lucid in the discussion, F_1's subordination occurs outside the formal public speaking (not during the debate) because she was supported by most of her peers during her speaking. The interviews release a sheltered space for the students to indicate F_1's marginalization because leadership in public context is usually

gendered masculine, so they are uncomfortable with a strong female leader (Baxter, 2006). When F_1 adopts a masculine leadership style, she will be considered as transgressing norms of dominant femininity and contradicting it to form an oppositional form.

With references to the oral evaluation of this construction of identities, teachers of the department of English who participate in this investigation mark disparate assessment criteria that decide students' grade in their "oral presentation" examination:

Assessor (x): F_1 is always a voluble speaker and she is confident in mainly her presentations. I was impressed by her dominant way to control the discussion, she resists all interruptions, and sometimes in clever ways, what was important to her is to keep chairing role. In contrast to F_2 who show his competence, but she was unable to control the conversation. She presents her part of work, but she accepts the arguments without any significant counteracting as if she takes everything for granted. If I will evaluate them, I will give F_1 the highest mark. Her linguistic strategies are the best criteria for a good teacher.

Assessor (y): Their presentation was good; I was convinced by their arguments. But it is clear that F_1 vehemently expresses her opinions, she interrupts a lot and she did not leave space for others as a future teacher, she must learn how to equitably distribute the speaking turns, so that to allow her students to express themselves, even if she disagrees with their views.

IV.5 The architecture classroom:

As almost identical with the EFL classroom, I adopt an ethnographic approach by which I employ methods of data collection consistent with participant observation such as observing students' presentations and "by there", making field notes and conducting interviews to have the supplementary data for the connotative analysis. To have a dense description, I select what I reckon the "significant moments" for five students whom I have labeled Ma_1, Ma_2, Fa_1, Fa_2, Fa_3, from Master 2 students' video and audio recordings. The selected students are put under the survey lens to unveil the contextual factors shaping their identities. I limit my case study to these four students of only one group to capture and explore the complexities and the multi-faceted nature of how female architects use language to perform leadership and construct their identities

in a masculine domain. This does not mean that I disregard male students' interactions how they are positioned in different contexts and how they negotiate their identities.

I tried to pick out "the significant moments" in which students are shaped by their subject positions within a range of competing discourses such as: "double bind discourse", "masculinity in architecture", "teacher /peer approval" and "the scientific discourse of architecture". I will foremost adopt FPDA to highlight how students are positioned as powerful within one particular discourse (e.g. male students enacting power over their female peers), and may well be positioned as powerless within an alternative discourse.

In this study, I mainly took the form of being a "passive" observer by sitting at the back of the workshop when taking notes and observing. At the very beginning, I expressed myself, explained the intent of the survey, and stated my role as a researcher. I tried to elaborate more on my objectives that have been already displayed in the ethical consent. I participated at the meeting where I exposed the video recordings of the analyzed extracts, aiming at assembling multiple voices in the study and exploring how the assessment would be made for the students. At the end of this meeting, I learnt to be positive and tactful when I was asked about my impressions.

My ethnographic approach, to the research design involved spending time at the research sites, extensive observation, taking notes and conducting interviews with the participants. Every week, they had a workshop which lasted approximately five hours with some intervening breaks. Owing to the space in the thesis, I directly translate the extracts which were taken in French with code-switching to Arabic. I recognize that I'm not an expert in translation, nor a professional translator, and I opt to employ Baker's (1992) concepts of "equivalence" and "non-equivalence" to facilitate the task for me. According to her model, equivalence does not necessarily mean similarity, for languages differ greatly in many aspects. Baker (1992) references that the problems of "non-equivalence" between languages and how this might manipulate translation enclose the following:

- Source language concepts that are not lexicalized in the target language; so that the notion has no appropriate wordings to express it despite its existence in the culture.

- Cultural specific concepts in the source language which are non-existent and therefore untranslatable to the target language.

- The case when certain features and language structures in the source language (e.g. suffixes, prefixes, etc.) which are not indexed in the target language.

To deal with these problems, although the translation was not a major issue, I employed strategies such as: paraphrasing or applying a more general word or concept. When students sometimes code-switch from the French language to Arabic, I count on substituting some words with others that have the same impact in the target language. When voicing their opinions in the French language, I did find difficulties in finding the equivalent lexemes in scientific English. I followed "direct translation" procedure (Gutt, 1991) in which the target text is produced directly from the original text. I tried to respect that all linguistic properties, communicative clues and stylistic qualities are protected from deterioration, so that readers arrive at the intended interpretation of the original text.

IV.5.1 The case of Ma$_1$ and Ma$_2$:

Extract one:

The following extract is taken from the first part of the project exhibited by Ma$_1$, Fa$_1$ and Fa$_3$ about "the elimination of prefabricated houses in the city of Chlef". Aside from the fact that this project is a rudimentary proposal for their Master surveys, they implement a performance as if they are architects who try to persuade dwellers of prefabricated houses to implement a new urban project. This extract encompasses other female students, but it centers Ma$_1$ and Ma$_2$ positioning and their evaluation by the assessors. The connotative analysis will cover the cases of Ma$_1$, Fa$_1$ and Fa$_3$ who were presenting with a particular reference to the other students such as Ma$_2$ and Fa$_2$.

The extracts will be directly translated to English. The speakers where presenting and discussing the project in French and Arabic. This switching is marked by underlining to signify the switch from French to Arabic. This extract starts mainly after 22 minutes of presenting their work. I find that the 'significant moments' of these students can be detected along the discussion with the class teacher and their peers.

223   **Fa₁:** If we ameliorate the quality of spare for all of
224   us and creating meeting spaces, we will obtain the social
225   cohesion [
226   **Ma₂:**   [yes, this is a good project (But how you can convince
227   all citizens that you will succeed after eliminating all the
228   prefabricated houses?)
229   **Fa₃:** Everyone who feels the danger which tou::ches his life,
230   will be obliged to understand, I think we explained the main
231   Risk of "asbestos" and the contamination of the residents' lives
232   **Fa₄:** I liked your idea, but are you going to build other houses,
233   We are not all the same, I mean the number of members of the families =
234   **Fa₃:** = There is a housing crises in Algeria, and in Chlef as we
235   Study, we are not playing, people must understand that the
236   Eradication of prefab is to ensure [
237   **Ma₂:**   [forget that I am an architect,
238   I am simple citizen, and I want to understand who you want to do
239   (demonstrates with hands)
240   **Fa₃:** = As architects, you must understand what we said about.
241   The social collective housing, but for the citizens of Chorfa (the region
242   they study in Chlef), I will explain to them how their houses will cause
243   to them cancer [
244   **Ma₁:**   [We need to think of the citizens (…) if we want to
245   convince the inhabitants about destroying their houses, we need more
246   than speaking about cancer and asbestos =
247   **Fa₃:** Yea, but they don't listen to you of you (…) [
248   **Ma₁:**   [no but then
249   we need to address issues of housing crisis in Algeria and
250   explain (…) if we find it useless (…) we would need
251   another base to reach the top (Teacher encourages his
252   comments with "yeah, great", and overlapping supportive comments

253   from most of the students) [
254   **Fa₃:**   [let's let's just concentrate on (…) (she
255   moves over the screen where the building model is displayed in
256   the plan view) let's see exactly what we shall do with
257   the inhabitants (…) I was thinking if you take into account (…) =
258   **Ma₁:** = Yea, but we have a serious project a serious project
259   the relocation of the residents (Fa₄, Fa₂ and Ma₂ are raising
260   their hands to have the floor)
261   **Ma₁:** Yes, Fa₄ I think you still have something to say, yes,
262   please, we are listening (…)
263   **Fa₄:** I liked your idea (…), but I need to know more (…)
264   **Ma₁:** Yea, but if you are trying to be safe, does it matter whether
265   You do it? =
266   **Fa₃:** = That's what I said before (0.2) (…) =
267   **Ma₁:** = Fa₄ you want a proof about the new housing policy (…) [
268   **Fa₃:**   [This

269   needs tens of years to be implemented, not easy not easy (err) =

270   **Ma₁ :** = (…) so let's talk more about (…) so we nee::d to

271   focus on the target areas of sustainability (…). So, what I suggest is (…)

272   **Fa₃:** I know ↑ that this is petrifying for residents that they lose

273   their houses, but they m::ust admit the project.

IV.5.1.1 Denotative analysis:

In this extract, Fa₁ inaugurates the discussion in addressing the significance of respecting social cohesion and creating citizen consultation prior to the *de facto* implementation of the project. It appears that Fa₁ is silent in this extract where the zealous debate is released by Ma₁, Ma₂ and Fa₃. By line 226, Ma₂ interrupts Fa₁ indicating his admission of their project, but he seems to claim for more elucidation about the social strategy to stimulate citizens about the project, and how can they explain the new housing design to them.

Fa₃ takes the initiative to respond to Ma₂'s question as well as Fa₄'s one. In line 235, Fa₃ uses a deontic model verb forms (must understand) to assert and hold her own perspective without leaving room to any query or   growl from the students who are supposed to be acting the role of the real inhabitants of the prefabricated houses. By line 237, Ma₂ interrupts Fa₃ by a heckling comment about the necessity to explain the nature and the reasons behind this housing project; he calls for the exigency (use of a deontic model verb) to glide to a level of all citizens who cannot grasp the urban project from an architectural lens. Most of the students show approval and support of Ma₂'s view. In replying to Ma₂'s question, Fa₃ maintains the view that citizens have to be alarmed about the risk of having cancer from the asbestos products found in prefab homes. In line 244, Ma₁ interrupts Fa₃'s comment and uses a deontic model assertion (we need to think of the citizens) to set out a strong sense of conviction to his alternative reasoning. Fa₃ replies with (yeah, but …) as an adversative comment to indicate her variance.

From line 248, Ma₁ repeatedly contests Fa₃'s perspective and, by implication, aims to take a leading role in the discussion. His dismissive response "No" is followed by a combination of a deontic model verb (we need to address) and the inclusive pronoun "we" which signals that he intends to speak on behalf of his peers (Fa₁ and Fa₃). His proposition appears to be accepted by the teacher and his peers by sending supportive comments.

By line 254, Fa$_3$ interrupts Ma$_1$ with a mitigated directive (let's just concentrate …) to call for a mutual attempt to solve his issue. In the meantime, she employs impulsive body languages (she moves over the screen) as if she gives for herself a prerogative to represent her peers and takes the leading role to take decisions. She is still positioning herself as the leader who in charge of the planning process.

By line 257, it is clear that Fa$_3$ is trying to regain and keep control of the planning and the presentation (I was thinking if …). Although Ma$_1$ and Fa$_3$ are conducting the same project, they actually exchange confrontations in debating their personal agendas to convince the targeted people. Ma$_1$'s emphatic repetition of "serious project" implies that he emphasizes his opinion that was not recognized by Fa$_3$. When students such as Fa$_4$, Fa$_2$ and Ma$_2$ are raising their hands for nomination, Ma$_1$ takes the chairing role and picks up Fa$_4$ to take the floor, asking her to replenish her previous comments.

Fa$_4$ conveys her approval of Ma$_1$'s agenda, but she asks for more illustration. In line 264, Ma$_1$ takes the bravery to initiate a potential oppositional argument in the face of any possible fear pressure when he plays the role of "agent provocateur" (Baxter, 2000a) as he directs the attention of supporters of his argument like Fa$_4$ to the potential merit of an alternative or resistant point of view. Then, Fa$_3$ uses overlapping to butt in Ma$_1$'s comment by employing authoritative double voicing (That's what I said before). By 268, Fa$_3$ also interrupts Ma$_1$ when he is addressing Fa$_4$ about her request for more illustration of the policy. In line 270, Ma$_1$ again creates an overlap with Fa$_3$'s comment to play the leading role by proposing and building (let's talk more), refocusing the discussion and making decisions (so, we meet to) and speculating (so, what I suggest is).

At the end of the extract (line 273), Fa$_3$ uses authoritative double voicing to heighten impact and display personal power (Baxter, 2014), especially when she is pressed. This type of double voicing can be tricky to be recognize linguistically, and often depends on tone (ibid). In this case, it can be identified by linguistic expressions of authority (Fairclough, 1989) such as the use of meta-pragmatic or qualifying clauses (I know that it is petrifying), followed by a deontic modal phrase (they must admit the project).

Extract two:

273   **Fa₁:** If you have got better ideas, we will be happy to take
274   it into consideration.
275   **Ma₂:** Your project <u>is not easy and it is not easy that inhabitants</u>
276   <u>will understand</u> the new housing policy.
277   **Fa₁:** £ the government will not leave you alone £ everything will
278   be taken in charge (…) the apartments on the ground floor are
279   reserved for [
280   **Ma₂:**   [yeah, <u>so you want to respect</u> the Algerian Earthquake
281   regulation (…) <u>emm yeah you could also do</u> (…) or <u>you could</u>
282   <u>do (…) to save time.</u>
283   **Fa₁:** yes, a good idea, but this might not be consistent with the
284   inhabitants needs [
285   **Ma₂:**   [<u>what about us?</u> [
286   **Ma₁:**   [<u>we have told you</u> today
287   <u>you are</u> the citizens of Chorfa, <u>we have said that, haven't we</u>?
288   **Ma₂:** (haha) ok, ok, so <u>we are acting here, so under what</u>
289   conditions <u>I give you the accord to destroy</u> my house?(…)
290   **Fa₁:** £ my lovely citizen [so
291   **Ma₁:**   [in order to explain (err) (.) ok Fa1 you can
292   continue =
293   **Fa₁:** = no, no, thank you, the floor is yours [
294   **Ma₁:**   [continu our idea
295   <u>and then I will illustrate</u> (…)
296   **Fa₁:** we will be happy if we reach a citizen consultation through

297   (…) [
298   **Ma₂:** [as an owner of the prefab house, I need to know more
299   to be convinced =
300   **Ma₁:** = just ↑ <u>bear in mind that</u> (…) <u>take</u> this report about the
301   visual and physical impermeability of the district (walking towards
302   Ma₂'s table and putting the report on his table) =
303   **Ma₂:** = thank you, sorry just <u>another quick point</u> (…) =
304   **Ma₁:** = no, no <u>this is not</u> among our hypotheses (…) so what
305   I suggest is (…) (Minimal responses and explicit agreement from
306   the teacher and the students

IV.5.1.2 Denotative analysis:

In this extract, Fa₁ opens this part of discussion by using the strategy of double voicing as it is marked by inviting responses to achieve more effective relationships while serving her perspective. In line 275, Ma₂ indicates his complaints about the project of the group, but he was directing this comment to Fa₁ who has just invited her peers to participate. Then, in line 277, Fa1

214

responds in a smiley voice to his query reporting that they take into regard the government assurance in their presumed project.

By line 280, Ma$_2$ breaks Fa$_1$'s explanation; he uses a deontic modal statement (so you want to respect) in order to tacitly interrogate her by recapping what she said about the Algerian earthquake framework. Next, Ma$_2$ tries to evaluate his peers' perspectives, and while addressing their suggestions, he shows that he may have a leading argumentation (emm yeah you could also do).

By line 283, Fa$_1$ employs a mitigating double voicing (yes, a good idea but …) to smooth what might have been a difficult moment of disagreement. It seems that this is a "negative politeness strategy" (Brown and Levinson, 1987). A means of softening an implied inconsistency to save Ma$_2$'s face, but he again interrupts her, asking her an enigmatic question (what about us) which serves to mislead Fa$_1$. To wit, this question is obscure in that it is not recognized whether Ma$_2$ means "us" as architects or as presumed citizens in this discussion. At this level, Ma$_1$ interposes and answers him deeming that Ma$_2$'s question was about them as architects. This is why he talks over him with a rhetorical question (we have said that, haven't we?) that is almost undoubtedly intended as a question. Indeed, he aims to remind Ma$_2$ about the importance of respecting their objective of performing as if they are with the real residents of the prefabricated houses. In line 288, Ma$_2$ produced a kind of canned humor through his laugh, and he indicates his compliance and acknowledgment of Ma$_1$'s objective. He followed this by another question to uncover more arguments that convince him as a citizen.

In line 290, Fa$_1$ attempts, again, to address her peers by "My lovely citizens" so as to maintain a pleasant atmosphere throughout the discussion, and to create an intimate and familial working environment in their community of practice. Before finishing her last word, Ma$_2$ interferes to elucidate mainly the same point, but he invites Fa$_1$ to carry on her idea. She refuses to "steal" the floor from him by saying "no, no" and she employs "Thank you", a politeness strategy to facilitate communication and build a relationship. Inviting Ma$_1$ to speak in a polite speech style serves to signal that Fa$_1$ does not intend to resist his interruptions, and she employs this respectful language to stress the sense of belonging without any kind of opposition or challenge.

Then, Ma$_1$ insists on leaving the floor to Fa$_1$ not because he is unable to sustain the speaking turn, but perhaps because he is confident about establishing himself as a leader of the group and a technical expert. From this point on, Ma$_1$ utilizes a direct and assertive language (continue your idea, and then I will illustrate) to demonstrate his control over the group. In line 296, Fa$_1$ indexes the use of "mitigating double voicing" (we will be happy if we …) to reduce the social distance (supposedly that she is addressing the real citizens of the distract understudy), and to achieve more effective relationships while serving their project. Again, Ma$_2$ interrupts Fa$_1$'s explanation demanding more arguments to be convinced. Then, from line (299) to line (304), we can see evidence of latched turns where Ma$_1$ and Ma$_2$'s turns are followed with no noticeable pausing.

By line 300, Ma$_1$ uses a range of directives to confront Ma$_2$'s sequential claims for elucidating the same point. Ma$_1$ mixes bald directives (bear in mind, take this) with more mitigated commands (so what I suggest) in line 305. His linguistic dominance of the discussion is clearly approved by the rest of the group as signified by their range of minimal responses and explicit agreement. By line 304, Ma$_1$ adopts single voicing to respond assertively to Ma$_2$'s question with the repeated negation (no, no). He constructs himself in a superior position to assert their project and turning down any suggestions (this is not among our hypotheses).

IV.5.1.3 Connotative analysis:

According to FPDA, these students are constantly negotiating for positions of power, determined by the range of competing discourses available to them, or within which they find themselves positioned (Baxter, 2003). It is noticeable that architecture students are also negotiating and constructing their identities depending on the complex interplay of subject positions governed by competing and interesting discourses. Each of the five discourses characterized in this context – double bind, masculinity and architecture, teacher / peer approval, scientific discourse and double voiced discourse – plays a key role in the ways in which students are constituted as persuasive or effective through their spoken interactions.

As in the EFL classroom, the discourse of "teacher approval" hands a space for constructing dominant identities and reinforcing the chairing position of Ma$_1$, for instance. My supplementary

216

data of interview joins the view that confident personalities and speaking out in public context is hatched by the teacher's backing and approval:

Ma$_2$: Ma$_1$ is confident, he knows what he wants, but to be honest, he is lovable by our teacher, especially Mr. (xxx). He is sure that everything is accepted and he will not be vexed. I am not very close to the teacher, I feel that there is a distance between us, this is why I don't say many things, even when I present my work, I don't speak a lot, I say only simple and clear things, because I am afraid of being embarrassed. If the teacher does not know you and he does not like you must be on the edge, and don't have risks.

Fa$_4$: If you are known by the staff and popular among your friends, this facilitates your communication with them. Ma$_1$ is very popular student, we all respect his thinking, he always leads his group, this is why the teacher assents him.

…

These comments mark that there is an intimate relation between the degree of popularity and teacher approval with the effective contribution in the public context. Moreover, there is evidence that Ma$_1$ occupies an authoritative position as a speaker and chairman of the group, and that to a great extent is broadly being produced through a discourse of peer approval.

The extracts hint that Ma$_1$ is a popular student among his peers. His privileged access to the floor seems to be guaranteed by his dominant subject position within the discourse of 'peer approval' as someone who is "favored" enough to gain the buttress of almost all the other group members. In contrast, Ma$_2$ appears to be someone who is rather less popular and therefore has to strive to have access to the floor in the presence of Ma$_1$. The supplementary data of the interviews report the following comments which may endorse this illustration:

Teacher$_1$: Ma$_1$ is … a very popular student, he is well-known of his competence in the field of architecture, in all his project presentations, I feel that he is confident and he knows how to take control of the project he displays, always, he speaks out without any perplexity. The group in which he is working is comprised only of females, so he plays a dominant role of a chief. All his peers respect his leadership, even his female partners, they accept his prominence of the group … and this is good for them, especially when they are working on the actual site of the project, they need such a dominant and influential man with them.

Me: Do you think that your female students are always in need of Ma$_1$ as a male architect with them?

Teacher₁: haha … No, I did not mean it (…) no because I am a man, but I think that in Algeria and particularly in the city of Chlef, female students need to be protected by a man when working on site and getting in touch with male engineers and male builders, I think that some of my female students faced such problems last year … Fa₁ and Fa₂ complained about that.

…

Along this, Ma₁'s lack of self-doubt about his prerogative to assume the leadership role is broadly protected along the discourse of teacher / peer approval. In contrast with him, Ma₂ struggles to make himself observed in the discussion. Being a teacher's favorite and popular among peers is not at Ma₂'s disposal. Thus, he is seen to have a relatively powerless positioning across these two discourses. The intertextuality of the discourses of teacher approval and masculinity in architecture is evidenced in the teacher's comment.

By analogy with Baxter's (2003) findings, certain dominant male students have not only found systematic ways through speech in public contexts of constructing their identities as popular and likable, but, from the perspective of the discourse of "masculinity in architecture", have attain a certain privilege to enact power and verbal dominance. From a feminist perspective, the engineering community of practice is historically based on male norm and closely interlinked with male gender roles which generate females' exclusion from the participation and reification in the social group.

The teacher's comment brings to light that female and male students of architecture have different access to the participation into the community of architecture, and that Ma₁ stands for the social image of an architect and the culture of architecture educational institutions which are masculine. Bergvall (1996) indicates that in light of engineering education, there is one valid identity of being an "engineer" in this Cofp, which is labeled as "masculine". The masculine culture of architecture can justify the powerful position of Ma₁ and his licit leadership role of a group of female architects so that they are caught in the tension between conflicting gender norm and the professional demands of architecture. Thus, they will be seen as "norm breakers". The discourse of "masculinity and architecture" appears to empower Ma₁ and disempower female students as facing the "double bind" when they participate in the masculine site, the situation that will be scrutinized in the following extracts.

Besides, the discourse of "masculinity and architecture" permits Ma$_2$ to violate collaborative talk rules to interrupt and tamper Fa$_3$'s turn of her explanation. In both extracts, there is evidence about Ma$_2$'s dominance and assertiveness over Fa$_3$'s speaking turns, which can be regarded as extensions of the unequal power relations and language practices in which women are positioned as the "other", while men are accorded *"autonomous and varied linguistic status"* (Thorne et al., 1983, p. 90). He employs a range of dominance strategies in the way he speaks with Fa$_3$ such as using display talk, interruptions, not listening and verbal putdowns. There is a complex and convoluted interplay of factors whereby Ma$_1$ is positioned as relatively powerful or powerless within a grid of competing discourse. The interviews' data will illuminate the interplay of positioning:

Fa$_3$: I always hate this; I don't understand why males attack only us. I think that you say how Ma$_2$ did not accept my arguments as if I was playing, but he … he holds his tongue … I am sorry but I cannot support this. But I don't know exactly if Ma$_1$ could silence him because he is friend of because he is a man and I am a woman.

Teacher$_1$: Yes, I noticed that Ma$_2$ criticizes a lot Fa$_3$ and he fails to listen to her perspective visually, he is very calm, but if I am not mistaken, he reviews females more than males. But Ma$_1$ succeeds to take control of the conversation and clarify things to Ma$_2$.

Fa$_2$: Ma$_1$ is very popular and Ma$_1$ cannot challenge him even if he did understand and even if he is not convinced.

Ma$_1$: Ma$_2$ is my friend. I know him, he is very calm, he does not like speaking in public with the teacher, but I am sure that he does not trust female students' thinking, he told me that they are emotional. haha … they think only about colors and decoration.

…

From my prolonged observation of this architecture group, I have noticed that Ma$_2$ is a reticent, but a very articulate student with his female peers, and this can be perhaps interpreted by his courage to construct his masculine identity as an architect with Fa$_3$ through verbal bullying, interruptions, heckles and criticizing comments. However, Ma$_2$ becomes alternatively silenced when gliding to the discourse of teacher / peer approval. He did not know how to enact his gender identity in a way that would be approved by his peers and the teacher. The pre-dominant position of Ma$_1$ through the discourse of approval leads to a rather "ineffective" contribution of Ma$_2$. Supposedly, He has not the need to compete with Ma$_1$ as he felt with Fa$_3$.

We can view that Ma_2's attempt to maintain the masculine domination over femininity as an internalization of norms constituting "hegemonic masculinity" which is defined by Connell (2005) as the construction of gender which tallies with the legitimacy of patriarchy to guarantee the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. Conceivably, Ma_2's setback of negotiating the dominant masculine discursive practices in talk such as heckling and challenging comments may relegate him to a non-hegemonic form of masculinity. Connell (2005) argues that males are supposed to construct a non-hegemonic masculinity if they undermine the norms of a dominative hegemonic masculinity. Connell most often theorizes non-hegemonic masculinities in terms of complicit, subordinate and marginalized masculinities. Marginalization refers, according to Connell (2005), to the interplay of gender with other structures such as class and race. In this case, the pre-dominance of Ma_1's popularity and agency may give grounds to Ma_2's powerless subject positioning along the authoritative position of Ma_1 while asserting his dominance through verbosity with him, Ma_2 is seen to be marginalized of embodying a subordinate masculinity.

Although the teachers of architecture do not reveal interest in focusing on the listening and speaking strategies of their students, I tried to trigger their evaluation of the speaking strategies of the students through the interviews.

….

Teacher$_1$: Ma_1 is the most popular student, he knows how to state his perspective, and he is confident in displaying his project, but Ma_2 is not very influential, he did not succeed in evaluating the group's agenda. I think that his ideas are not organized, this is why he could not convey exactly what he thinks, he did not give scientific logical arguments.

Teacher$_2$: There is a great difference between Ma_1 and Ma_2. The first is like a leader, if you want, of the project and he controls in an excellent manner the discussion. But Ma_2 did not convince me when he was checking the validity of their projects, the architect needs an assertive and scientific arguments to take part.

….

IV.5.2. The case of Fa$_1$, Fa$_2$ and Fa$_3$:

Extract one:

This extract is also taken from the presentation of Fa$_1$, Fa$_3$ and Ma$_1$ about their project "the elimination of prefabricated houses in Chlef". We will focus on the three females' F$_1$, F$_2$, and F$_3$ linguistic interactions and identities construction with a particular reference to Ma$_3$ and Fa$_4$.

307 **Teacher 2:** I think Fa1 wants to say something
308 **Fa$_1$:** Yes sir, yes, let me show you that the panels are 2D
309 planer elements that will be utilized to build structural
310 Walls, floors and [
311 **Fa$_3$:**   [Hybrids usually combine panel and molecular
312 prefabrication systems (…) <u>Do you follow me</u>? I insist on concentrating
313 <u>as much as possible</u> (…) =
314 **Ma$_3$:** = sorry sorry just a quick question? <u>I was thinking about the</u>
315 Rehabilitation and construction (…) [
316 **Fa$_3$:**   [no, no, I did not mean that (…) =
317 **Ma$_1$:** = sorry Fa$_3$ (…) ↑ I said that before when we started thinking
318 about this project (…) your idea costs a lot (.) your idea costs
319 a lot =
320 **Fa$_3$:** = I did not know that we need all this (looking away from Ma$_1$
321 and at other peers) =
322 **Ma$_1$:** = yes this is why we have to think in a logical way, we
323 have to put emotions ↑ away an::d [
324 **Fa$_3$:**   [#↑ I know my work, I
325 am not here to (.) to (.) I am an ↑ architect, not a psychologist [
326 **Ma$_1$:**   [so you ↑ <u>can convince us</u>
327   <u>about the</u> demolishment of our houses (Fa4 hands up).
328 **Fa$_3$:** yes, F$_4$ (.) yes =
329 **Ma$_1$:** = Fa$_4$ yes please
330 **Fa$_4$:** <u>I want to ask you about</u> asbestos in our prefab houses.
331 **Teacher$_1$:** yes Fa$_1$, I think you explored this issue (.)
332 **Fa$_1$:** yes Madam, I did(.) a very very good question Fa$_4$ (.)what
333 I said ↓ before means that (…) let me explain (…) Ok, right? =
334 **Ma$_1$:** = that's what I said before (…)
335 **Fa$_1$:** yes, yes you explained (…). the future pattern for asbestos
336 which is associated LC and asbestoses should follow (…)
337 but, but it should decrease at a faster rate (.) there is a
338 possible connection between mesothelioma and asbestos exposure.
339 some studies report that carcinoma of the lungs is found due
340 to asbestos (.) inhaled asbestos fibers are are (.) er removed
341 by (err) . I mean (err) (…) this process may be
342   or may happen when asbestos fibers are engulfed by macrophages
343   are engulfed by macrophages (A keen attention and listening

344   from the teacher and peers) (.). I will be happy to hear your inquiries
345   **Ma₁:** Let's turn to the reconstruction of the dwellings, so what
346   I focus on and (err) (.) (…).

IV.5.2.1 Denotative analysis:

This extract is initiated by the teacher's invitation of Fa₁ to hold the floor and convey what she wants to express. Then, Fa₁ employs mitigating double voicing strategy such as the directive "let me show you" to pursue her perspective and demonstrate the validity of their project with sustaining the peers' solidarity. By line 311, Fa₁ is interrupted by Fa₃ who utilizes authoritative double voicing (do you follow me?) to heighten the impact after "stealing the floor" from Fa₁, and to enact personal power. She also incorporates assertive commands through bald directives such as (I insist on concentrating as much as possible).

By line 314, Ma₃ overlaps with Fa₁'s turn asking her a question after using a politeness marker "sorry, sorry" which may not necessarily feature which are accepted by both speaker and hearer as constituting an apology. In this case, this politeness marker may be seen as indexing a "surface" apology (Brown and Levinson, 1987), so as to be clear to both of them that it is not sincere. Then, Ma₃ follows his politeness marker with proposing a solution to the problems of rehabilitation (I was thinking about …). Yet, he was interrupted by Fa₃ by using single voicing and responding assertively with the reiterated negation to achieve her leadership over the group. He rejects Fa₃'s idea and his categorical assertion implies that there are gaps in Fa₃'s reasoning which seems to be unsuccessful and does not meet the financial criteria (your idea costs a lot). By using the single pronoun "I", Ma₁ appears to establish himself the leader of the group and the technical expert of the project. This part of criticism symbolizes the fact that the politeness marker "sorry" may carry resources of being insincere and ironic. In line 320, Fa₃ responds with an indirect assertion (I did not know …). By looking away from Ma₁ and at others, she seems to feel the need to gain support from the rest of the group. In line 322, Ma₁ encroaches Fa₃'s turn by using a combination of categorical assertions and a deontic model verb (this is why we have to think in a logical …). He attempts to display his confident subject positioning dismissively calling Fa₃ to be logical and keeping away from the emotional manner of perceiving things.

In a creaky voice, Fa₃ interrupts him with bald assertion (I know my work) to defy and flout Ma₁ deprecation of her scientific knowledge alleging that she is emotional, irrational and lacking

professionalism which is needed in architecture. In line 326, Ma$_3$ utilizes an indirect speech act (so you can convince us …) perhaps to request for more clarification rather than creating a tussle about who is rational and who is emotional.

When Fa$_4$ was raising her hand waiting for nomination by the presenters (Ma$_1$, Fa$_2$ or Fa$_3$), both Fa$_3$ and Ma$_1$ face an interposition when nominating Fa$_4$ to have the floor, as if they share a struggle about the leadership position. When Fa$_4$ poses her question about the issue of asbestos in the prefab houses, the teacher validates the floor for Fa$_2$ and emboldens her to answer Fa$_4$'s query. She then uses an affirmative statement (yes, I did) and an elaboration of her work (what I said before means …). This was after using a meta-comment in which Fa$_1$ attends very positively to her classmate Fa$_4$'s "face needs" (Brown and Levinson, 1987) with the compliment (a very very good question). Again, Fa$_1$ uses mitigating double voicing strategy in (let me explain), and the tag (ok, right) for the sake of ensuring unanimity with her peers.

In line 334, Ma$_1$ overlaps with Fa$_1$'s turn and uses authoritative double voicing (that's what I said) to interrupt her and derogate her explanation by flatly asserting his predominance in grasping the principles of the project. In line 335, Fa$_1$ uses mitigating double voicing to affirm Ma$_1$'s comment (yes, yes you explained), and she retains a prolonged turn (335 – 344) to expound the issue of "asbestos" adopting a scientific jargon. Her explanation grabs the teacher and peers' heed so that her turn is invulnerable to be interrupted.

In line 345, Ma$_1$ calls for re-directing the attention of the audience to the issue of "reconstruction" by a "hidden polemic" double voicing which swiftly indicates a slippage to a single voicing. He continues to gain the territorial advantage by reporting what he did with indexing the first person singular pronoun "I" so as to shut out Fa$_1$ and Fa$_3$ from decision making.

Extract 2:

347   **Fa$_3$:** no, don't do that (…) don't think like that (.) no =
348   **Fa$_2$:** =would that be a good way of describing it? (…)
349   but the inhabitants can not get (.) get it, don't they? =
350   **Fa$_3$:** = follow me, follow, they must get the idea, they
351   must, end (err) (.) you have to believe first =
352   **Ma$_1$:** = Fa$_2$: Look (.) listen, litsten (…) £ I spent nights and
353   nights to think about this project (hhh) don't ruin everying £
354   **Fa$_2$:** yes ye [
355   **Fa$_3$:**   [I think that [

356   **Fa₂:**   [yea <u>but we don't have</u> empty
357   ground:: for ↑ all the new projects. (Teacher's supportive head nodding to)
358   **Fa₁:** I searched for that (…) I agree with you (…) this is why
359   we are here (.) <u>not to impose things</u> (.) if you have any
360   suggestions, that should be so good.
361   **Ma₃:** yea, that could work but we are saying that (…)
362   **Fa₁:** You are right Ma₃ (.) let's just understand (…) =
363   **Fa₃:** = Yeah, <u>but this is just how you build it</u> (…) let's
364   let's look at (moves over where Fa₂ is standing and tries
365   to lean in front of her) (…) I was thinking about (…) =
366   **Ma₂:** = oh here, I think <u>that you mean</u> (…) <u>I am afraid</u>
367   <u>that you find it</u> difficult (emm).
368   **Fa₁:** <u>Most the</u> processes carried out to to (.) in order to generate
368   HBIM consist of mapping architectural elements onto laser scan
370   (…) using BIM software such as Autodesk Revit and
371   Graphisoft ArchiCAD (.) 3D points describing a façade is suitable
372   for visualization (…) (supportive minimal responses by teacher and peers)
373   Teacher = Good, Good.
374   **Ma₁:** Let's follow this point (…) [
375   **Fa₂:**   [I don't master this like
376   you, but (.) but why are you sure about (…)? =
377   **Ma₁:** = now, I hope I will be clear (…) do you follow me?
378   anyone who does not understand? Who is against?
379   **Fa₂/Fa₄:** (indecipherably echoing his points)
380   **Fa₂:** no, I don't agree (…) I am thinking about the application
381   of (…) (supportive comments from the teacher, Ma₃, Fa₄ and others).

IV.5.2.2 Denotative analysis:

At the beginning of this extract, Fa₃ disagrees with a decision of the group (the other peers who are listening), saying explicitly (No, don't do that) and reinforces her dissent by adding (Don't think like that). In line 348, Fa₂ voices her contribution in a tentative rather than a challenging manner (would that be a good way …) and makes an effective use of mitigating devices such as tag questions (line 349). In line 350, Fa₃ intervenes and employs bald directives (follow me …) to assert her leadership, and a very aggressive directive addressed to Fa₃ (they must get the idea …) and repeats the deontic modal verb (must) to express an obligation which appears to derive from her autocratic argument.

In line 352, Ma₂ ignores Fa₃'s comment and addresses Fa₂ with assertive directives (look, listen, listen) to express his confidence in doing the leadership role. Then, with a "humorous tone", Ma₁ narrates his story of the long nights in preparing the project. This scenario of humour

224

can be perhaps considered as a key source for conducting leadership and constructing participants as equal (Holmes and Stubbe, 2003). Humor may be, in terms of authority, an adequate strategy for alleviating the impact of "face-threatening acts" such as commands and disapproval" (Baxter, 2010).

From line 354 to 356, there are interruptions realized respectively by Fa_2, Fa_3. In line 354, Fa_2's response is very clipped (ye ye) which may signal her dismissive response. In line 355, Fa_3 intervenes and tries to interpose her suggestion (I think that), but Fa_2 heckles her and replies with (yea, but …), the opposing, conjunction indicating her dissent and joins it with an evaluative and categorical assertion (we don't have empty ground …) with a particular accentuation of unavailability of adequate space. From line 358 to 360, Fa_1 utilizes double voicing to reduce the distance and achieve more effective relationships while serving her project.

In line 361, Ma_3 utilizes the epistemic modal verb (that could work) to show allegiance to Fa_1's proposal and line of thinking, but he switches to a single voicing in making categorical assertions (we are saying that …). Then, Fa_1 uses accord affirmation of Ma_3 and mitigating double voicing (you are right Ma_3 (.) let's just understand …). By line 363, Fa_3 establishes her resistance to Fa_1's perspective with the phrase (yeah but) to symbolize a shift of rhetorical direction, and she employs mitigating double voicing (let's look at) to attract her attention of the audience and do the leadership role. By doing this, she adopts an invasive body language (moves over where Fa_1 is standing and tries to lean in front of her) in order to hide her and seize the space to "steal the floor". By line 366, Ma_2 overlaps with Fa_3 and uses epistemic modal verb (I think that …) to voice his evaluations accompanied by the negative politeness from (I am afraid) as mitigating the effect of an inevitable "face threatening act" for Fa_3.

In line 373, the teacher offers Fa_1 a sense of approval by using compliments (good, good) after having given an in-depth detailing in the use of the software in the project (from line 368 – 372). In line 374, Ma_1 uses mitigated directives (let's follow this point) to regain the audience's attention and occupy the authoritative position. He was interrupted by Fa_2 (line 375) where she uses self-deprecating comment (I don't master this like you) as a double voicing strategy prior indexing a direct question (why are you sure about? …) which might be converted to a more single voicing strategy.

In line 376, Ma$_1$ uses mitigating double voicing (I hope I will be clear) to build cooperation with his peers, and follows it with a range authoritative double voicing phrases (do you follow me? anyone who does not understand? who is against?) In line 380, Fa$_2$ expresses his explicit disagreement (no, I don't agree) with Ma$_1$'s perspective as a very confrontational interaction, followed by pragmatic particles such as (I am thinking …) to manage the conflict and negotiate for a consensus.

IV.5.2.3 Connotative analysis:

Throughout the two extracts and even the previous ones of Ma$_1$ and Ma$_2$, Fa$_3$ utilizes normatively masculine strategies to assert her authority as the most voluble speaker in the discussion. Examples of such strategies would be challenging, arguing, confronting, controlling topics, giving direct statements when sharing knowledge, interrupting, releasing aggravated directives and holding the floor. Perhaps the most significant strategies of her use of traditionally masculine modes of speaking to her utilization of the bald assertion (I know my work, I am not here to …) to resist Ma$_1$'s deprecating claim in line 322. While Fa$_3$'s linguistic choices highly mirror her desire to adopt traditionally linguistic strategies to play the chairing role such as: directives, imperatives and checking statements, she occasionally employs traditionally feminine linguistic strategies such as: mitigating double voicing, consulting and negotiating.

As for Fa$_2$, she seems to make use of a linguistic repertoire constantly shifting between a range of stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine linguistic strategies. Fa$_2$ was not concerned with the presentation as Fa$_1$ and Fa$_3$; she was a listener who was supposed to evaluate and discuss it with the others as she alternates between assertive and facilitative language. She swings between holding information, issuing dismissive responses and refusals to concepts especially with Ma$_1$, explaining and justifying and using mitigating double voicing.

I would argue that Ma$_1$ and Ma$_2$'s ability to disempower Fa$_2$, Fa$_3$ and even Fa$_1$ who appears to be very supportive is partly to do with their subject positioning within the discourse of "double bind". Women who opt for exercising and chairing power can be seen as facing a "double bind" (Holmes, 2006, pp. 34-35). This can be explained by the fact that power is associated with masculinity which by definition opposes femininity. Popular conceptions of leadership have a

decidedly male bias (Holmes, 2006). In her study of female engineering students, Bergvall (1996) reports that when females are confident and assertive, they are kept out as transgressing the norms; and if they are facilitative, their work may be taken for granted and not approved.

The interviews data indicate how female students are subjected to the forces of traditional stereotypes by some students, even though, some of them assert that the classroom is a gender neutral community of practice with alike opportunities for both women and men.

….

Fa$_4$: Fa$_3$ uses very strong styles when she discussed her project, she wanted to assert herself, but this is not possible in architecture.

Fa$_2$: For us, it is not easy, we female architects don't understand if we stay gentle and soft to say "good" to us, or work as real architects and be punished after that in different ways. You can see in their speech and behavior.

Ma$_3$: I don't think that there exists something like woman and men here, this is science, the one who does well the one who is on the top, otherwise I don't believe in this. As an example, the first student who has the highest average is a woman.

Fa$_5$: We are all the same. Don't believe in this tale of women are not suitable for architecture.

Fa$_3$: I don't care. I am an architect and a woman. If they have a problem, this is her problem.

…

They are generally unaware of the complexities of gender and power in the spoken interactions in the cofp of "architecture". Thus, while gender appears to be a crucial issue, students appear to ignore how they are multiply positioned according to competing discourses.

The analysis shows that Fa$_3$ was one of the outspoken and confrontational students in the group, and her masculine leadership style appears to engender her marginalization from the group because she attempts to embody a subordinate oppositional femininity. Her overconfidence which is reflected in her confrontational communicative style makes her as socially ostracized because of going beyond the boundaries of dominant femininity as the following comments illustrate:

Fa$_1$: Fa$_3$ is criticized by her own peers by being too assertive and aggressive, as architects, we need to speak in an attentive way to convince others, and as females we to remember that we are women and in Algeria.

Ma$_2$: Fa$_3$ is like a man. I did not understand what she said. But I saw that she was shouting and attacking everyone. Accept or I will kill you. Even Ma$_1$, the man did not do it.

Fa$_2$: I like imposing my opinion even if others disagree, but we have to be flexible from time to time. If Fa$_3$ did this, she would not be attached.

…

According to Fa$_2$ comment, the 'double bind' discourse cuts across the 'double voicing' discourse, in which it is believed that female architects, in order to save themselves from being imprisoned in the dilemma of the "double bind", they have to adopt linguistic resources of double voicing. I reckon that the mitigating linguistic strategies women are supposed to display are: The use of politeness, hedging strategies, meta-comment and so on. Aside from identifying 'double voicing' as a main competing discourse in the architecture community, I found that most female statements employ the strategy of 'double voicing' for many reasons, as it may be unintentionally employed. For instance, Fa$_2$ uses a repertoire of double voicing skills in order to handle confrontational situations with Ma$_1$ and Fa$_3$. In enacting her agency, she switches between enhancing and reducing her authority in particular moments. She is assertive and acts as "agent provocateur" to anticipate an emerging conflict, but soothes it into a resolution.

Fa$_1$ indexes a lot of use of mitigating "double voicing" to create an intimate and familial working environment and consider her peers' emotional well-being and face needs. She mainly uses traditionally feminine linguistic strategies, and throwing away all masculine attributes that might segregate her. In contrast, Fa$_3$ concentrates on using single voicing strategies for the sake of perusing her own perspective at the expense of her peers, especially in direct conflicts and to compete for acceptance and control over the group (see Baxter, 2014, p. 62). Fa$_3$ appears to repeatedly employ authoritative double voicing perhaps to signal that her authority is not being sufficiently respected. As the presenters of the project, they deem themselves as leaders who should be in charge of evaluating and taking decisions. In this case, the one who utilizes this strategy to resist subordination or disrespect may guarantee an empowered positioning. But repeated use of authoritative double voicing could be disempowering (the case of Fa$_3$) as it indicates a lack of co-operation and solidarity within the team. This can be regarded as a linguistic "insecurity" (Baxter, 2014, p. 100).

Accordingly, Fa$_1$ and Fa$_2$ are relatively positioned powerful in the discourse of 'double voicing' in terms of his function of counterpoising their perspectives and the others' views. Yet,

Fa$_3$'s use of single voicing or authoritative double voicing in almost all her interaction, is often unacceptable by male and female peers. Female architects are supposed to use mitigation, according to the observation and interviews data, for tempering this dissent and create negotiation rather than direct conflict. Although Fa$_3$ attempts to invade and dominate "the linguistic space", Fa$_1$ does not resist or challenge this sway, by not conveying objection directly, this speaker appears to be "passive aggressive", unable to voice their opinions directly and explicitly.

In the architecture community, when the female student strives to use mitigating strategies to lessen categorical assertion and confrontation, she might be positioned in a "double-bind, non-un" situation (Bergvall, 1996). Thus, Fa$_1$'s fluctuation between being relatively powerful and relatively powerless in other moments, along the discourse of "double voicing", signals that the "double-bind" and "double voicing" discourses are intertextually associated in the architecture classroom. Ma$_1$ comment in my interviews illuminates this point:

Ma$_1$: Fa$_1$ is excellent and she knows what she wants. She is supple and has a popularity among her friends. She did not confront others, but this is not helpful in our work. If you do not defend you view, you will not be believed and respected.

…

Fa$_2$ seems to calculate the multiplicity of 'double voicing' structure. Her linguistic styles reflect categorical assertions to make her voice heard, and mitigating strategies to moderate the force of confrontation.

….

Teacher$_1$: I know that Fa$_2$ is intelligent. She says to others that he has something to say and to be heard, but she wins acceptance and she can win being approved.

Ma$_1$: Fa$_2$ wants to discuss everything, she cannot stop if she does not agree. She knows how to assert herself without attacking other.

….

Furthermore, it appears that not all students in the class are treated in the same way. In the first extract, the class teacher nominates twice Fa$_1$ to have the floor and to deliver her perspective and lines of reasoning. In the second extract, the teacher praises her explanation that can be considered as a kind of approval which may empower her as it is reported in the interviews.

….

Fa₁: I am sure about my background but the backup of our teachers is important for me. If I am respected by them, I don't need to make a lot of efforts in the conversation. It suffices to possess a heavy scientific background.

Teacher₂: Fa₁ is the sleeping giant. She has excellent ideas and ways of analyzing, but she did not assert herself. Some students talk more than they benefit. If you listen to her, you can understand the adequacy of her work. Her peers also like her presentation and her knowledge.

Fa₃: The teacher favors Ma₁ and Fa₁, he always calls them to speak even if they are the presenters and they don't need that anyone invite them to speak. Fa₂ is also famous.

….

Accordingly, Fa₁'s access to the floor is ensured by her dominant position within the discourses of teacher / peer approval as someone who is "popular" and diligent enough to gain the support of almost all the classmates and the teacher. Drawing upon the supplementary data of my students' interviews, I gleaned that Fa₃ recognizes that Fa₁ has a preferential access to the floor and approval because she is favored by her teacher and peers. This may expound the fact that she feels the need to assert her presence and employ empowering linguistic strategies so as to recompense her powerless positioning in other subject positions.

While all the discussion of Ma₁, Fa₁ and Fa₃ project revolves around the issue of eliminating the prefabricated houses and replacing them with a sustainable construction, I became aware of the significance of the 'scientific discourse of architecture'' where certain females such as Fa₁ and Fa₂ tend to integrate a particular scientific jargon to illustrate their perspectives.

In both extracts, Fa₁ uses a highly specialized scientific language to impose her idea and silence the predominant voices which deprecate her scientific capacities. In extract one and starting from line 335, Fa₁ attempts to resist Ma₁'s overlapping and interruptions with a lengthy turn illuminating the issue of 'asbestos and cancer' in a knowledge-based community. She perhaps finds this scientific jargon an effective strategy to make her voice heard after the attempt of crushing her by Ma₁ (That's what I said before …). In the interviews, Fa₁ elaborates more in this point:

Fa₁: I think you noticed that all students interrupt each other and they don't respect the speaking turns. Everyone wants to say his word and make him the voluble speaker. They think that saying anything will make them prominent. It is not a signal of specialism and knowledge. I did not interrupt, I have my scientific knowledge and the mastery of the French language as a weapon to

make everyone listen to me. They say that architecture is a masculine domain, but science is available to us. I cannot be a man but I can be a scientist.

….

Here, the discourse of 'scientific discourse' is intertextually linked with that of 'masculinity'. As stated earlier, I name this discourse as 'masculinity in architecture' rather than 'gender differentiation' in the EFL classroom because the issue of masculinity in the architecture realm extremely appears to interpolate the great majority of the members of this cofp. Rather exposing gender differences, the architecture classroom encompasses the fact that females necessarily confront masculine norm while negotiating their gender and professional identities. According to Bergvall (1996), female engineers must be masculine engineers and tally with the shifting expectations of what it means to be a female engineer.

In manipulating her highly specialized technical knowledge, Fa_1 is relatively positioned as powerful and capable of silencing others (including male peers), and retain a space for her even if she is confronted by the gender norms that define architecture as a masculine domain. The patriarchal ideology about the subordinated positions of women are enacted daily and routinely in talks (Bourdieu, 1991). From a feminist CDA perspective, ideologies of gender are the representations of the gendered social practices that are produced from particular locations of patriarchal dominance. Social forces of patriarchal power and ideology are clearly maintained in the discourse of 'masculinity in architecture'. Yet, FPDA perspective would argue that Fa_1 is able to accommodate or resist relatively powerless subject positions within the discourse of "masculinity". So, she is struggling between multiple gender positions, some relatively empowering and others less to gain recognition and acceptance in this community.

Fa's use the specialist knowledge to position herself as powerful in light of the complexities of constructing and enacting multiple gender positions through discourse. Albeit the fact that architecture teachers are not interested in assessing their students' oral performances, I request from them to give me a kind of evaluation for those students wondering if their speaking strategies will touch, even lightly, the students' marks.

….

Teacher₁: Fa_1 is very a competent student, she masters her project, but she did not defend well her perspective. May be her force lies in her excellent scientific explanation. But she is very

good. Fa$_3$ interrupts a lot and don't give others the space to speak. I think that she will fail in convincing others, she is too aggressive. Fa$_2$ is not like Fa$_1$ in her knowledge and language expertise, but she knows how to say her word without making a ruin.

Teacher$_2$: Fa$_3$ is very assertive, the architect should be like that, but here in Algeria, the woman faces many obstacles. You see, she is excluded by her peers just because she speaks in a loud voice and impose her view. Fa$_1$ and Fa$_2$ are very good, Fa$_1$ usually has the best mark, but if I don't know her, I say that she is out. But when she started to explain, you can know her level. Fa$_1$ is very supple and has a soft voice. Fa$_2$ tries to be confident.

....

IV.6. Conclusion

Adopting feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis, I tried to explore how women are not universally and uniformly subordinated by a patriarchal order. My analysis encompasses four students from the EFL classroom (two males and two females) and five from the architecture classroom (two males and three females). Each community of practice incorporates a web of competing and interwoven discourses along which students negotiate their identities, relationships and positions. In dealing with denotative and connotative analysis, I explored the multiplicity of gender identities and the (re) construction of different femininities and masculinities when shifting between inter-textualized and competing discourses. The classroom community of practice is deemed as a "site of struggle" in which a plurality of voices makes competing judgments about different ways that students speak and interact. My analysis unveiled how certain marginalized or resistant voices are relatively powerfully positioned in particular contexts, and how dominant voices are relatively powerlessly positioned in other contexts.

The crux of my study is based on gender perspectives, but I explored how students construct themselves as "effective students" in public speaking when presenting their projects. I had an interest in exploring how students attempt to meet the assessment through negotiating their gender identities as fluctuating between ceaseless shape-shifting subject positions. All students exhibit "significant moments" in which they are simultaneously positioned as relatively powerless, and relatively powerful within alternative and competing discourses.

General conclusion

Focusing on the construction of gender identities in the EFL and architecture classrooms, I considered the barriers and opportunities encountered by females in gaining recognition in education, where the assessment of male and females' speech is often evaluated in a distinct way. Drawing upon a study of two classrooms (EFL and architecture-, at university of Hassiba Benbouali, Chlef), it reports that both males and females' students are multiply positioned according to competing discourses; sweeping generalization about the legitimate differences between men and women's social power. Yet, this does not deny that the lens of gender differences is adopted by both teachers and students in viewing many aspects of the classroom practices. To reflect this, I found it riveting to recognize from my observation and interview data the extent to which students and teachers naturalized their experiences in the classroom according to constructs of gender differentiation. It did not only ascribe gendered behavior to biological sex to reinforce gendered stereotypes, but also it conflates "effective speech" or doing leadership with masculinity.

What I have been seeking to do along this investigation is to reveal how and why females can be silenced in particular classroom contexts, and how they resist certain institutional discourses along multiple positioning by a web of competing discourses. Through the course of my observation, I became aware about the fact that students' speech seemed to be framed not by a single set of speech characteristics or community skills, but yet an interlocking interplay of discourses and discursive practices.

Although my awareness that self-reflexivity requires foregrounding the discursive practices in the contexts, I subconsciously recognized the significance of the interaction of four discourses in the EFL classroom setting: the discourse of "gender differentiation" which lucidly fosters investigating the core of my quest. This discourse seems to model a set of ways of differentiating students' identities primarily according to their gender. I noticed how a discourse of gender differentiation evolved along the comments of both teachers' and students' generalizations about males' and females presumed peculiar behaviors.

Whilst females are criticized if they employ a masculine leadership interactional styles, they will be considered to adopt a social *faux-pas* which violates the norms of dominant femininity. The second discourse is "the leadership talk" which refers to the students' negotiation to occupy the leading position and the interviewees' comments when pointing to the use of "leadership" in the classroom discussion and how language is seen a key part to construct leadership roles. Then, "The collaborative talk" discourse, which values cooperative speech styles and good language skills, is often explicitly articulate by the class teacher prior any oral performance. Yet all students share a consensus about the need to respect collaborative forms of talk in the classroom interactions.

"Peer/teacher approval" is another discourse which denotes the ways in which students' relations with each other are set and conveyed in terms of notions of popularity and personal confidence. Peer approval seemed to be interwoven with teacher approval which refers to the teacher's favor or privilege of one student over another.

Furthermore, my observation and study in the architecture classroom encompasses five competing discourse: "double bind", "masculinity and public speaking", "teacher/peer approval", "scientific discourse", "architecture and double voicing" discourses. By the "double bind" discourse, I refer to the paradox female students face when intending to exercise power and utilize assertive speech styles which are associated with masculinity which by definition objects femininity. Inasmuch as unequal power relations are reflected in the architecture classroom, female students encounter a dilemma because their feminine onus disqualifies them for leadership positions. Likewise, a particular theme began to emerge in my field notes and interview data, which recorded an intimate relationship between effective speech (leadership) and masculinity. The discourse of "double bind" was almost predicted, but the discourse of "masculinity and public speaking" particularly struck me as reiterating the association between masculinity and authoritative speech.

The discourse of "peer approval" is also of paramount importance in which social relations in the classroom are governed by the backing and support of its participants. This discourse is interwoven with other discourses to either empower students with interactional power or restrict their possibilities for doing authority.

235

"Scientific discourse of architecture" - The ways female architects employ the scientific knowledge and technical jargon to control the floor and assert their positions – was perhaps much more of a surprise. Finally, the "double voicing discourse" – a legitimate strategy to either negotiate complex power relations or to "save safe", is another crucial discourse which is contextually situated and inextricably linked to other discourses in the EFL classroom.

Interestingly, what we can reap from the analysis of the EFL classroom is that both M_1 and M_2 are deemed as popular students whose presentation is one of the most resplendent one, yet M_1 is specifically delineated by his effective role in discussing their project. He is peculiarly featured in the data presented as exerting a *savoir-faire* and aplomb in asserting his line of reasoning and convincing others. Whilst M_2 is seen to making extended contributions without any heckling from the audience and being a good listener to others turns, M_1 is considered to be more effective by manipulating a sheer number of strategies to be more active, more risk-taking and to flexibly maintain peer approval and persuading others of the rightness of his viewpoint. M_1 also makes prolonged contributions, but what displayed him as a witty is his ability to hold the floor, challenging others, speaking out with self-assurance, resisting interruptions to preempt and seize the floor, creating scenarios, making decisions and playing an active role of an "agent provocateur" in which he sustains an opposing argument.

Snippets of evidence from my analysis mirrors how M_1 tends to oscillate back and forth from enacting leadership and politeness. He employs humor in a complex and subtle ways as a useful strategy to dwarf power differences and create an open-minded atmosphere from entertainment. Yet in an overlapping comment with F_2 (line 153), M_1 employs humor, perhaps, to even steal the show by diverting attention away from F_2's claims, or to send a gentle teasing of his peers (F_1 and F_2) while attempting to accentuate his view.

As M_1 is powerfully positioned along the discourse of approval and leadership, the use of humor in his speech is likely to be approved by the teacher and peers and therefore listened to. Along the "collaborative talk" discourse, M_1 appears to powerlessly positioned as he fails to listen to others' inferences and his butting in others turns. Yet, he is powerfully positioned as he uses supportive speech, and inviting less voluble speakers such as F_6 and M_6 and offer them an opportunity to break their silence and speak out. As it is observed, M_2 is powerfully positioned as there is an interplay between the "discourse as approval" and the one of "collaborative talk" as he respects others' viewpoints and shares out talk time to the audience without any kind of involvement without his peers questioning.

On the basis of the finding as well, both F_1 and F_2 demonstrate their positions as active players in their presentation. It is observable from the video-recording that F_1 and F_2 were fighting to win the teachers' attention. Whilst F_2's preferential access to the floor seems to be guaranteed by her dominant positioning with the discourse of peer approval, it appears that she is overlooked by the teacher who offers support and reinforcing comments to F_1. Aligning with this scenario, the winner of teacher's favoritism is empowered and has a privileged access to the floor.

Interestingly, F_1 is likely to celebrate peer approval as being actively constructed by the "side-kick" from the rest of the group, particularly when challenged by M_1 and M_3. Yet, this façade of niceness was seen to fade within the discourse of gender differentiation. The interview data clearly indicate that F_1 is criticized of being transgressing the standard of cooperative talk of the classroom interaction when negotiating the leadership position. F_1 strives to construct her authoritative position through systematic case making skills and parallel processing of inviting peers to intervene and make decisions and orders. She plays the "agent provocateur" role by asserting her ideas and bravely raises issues of oppositional arguments. She seems to be always prepared to resist heckling and deprecating comments, and speaks extensively to invade the floor.

The competitive speech styles of F_1 such as assertive disagreements and challenging utterances are often interpreted by her peers and assessor (Y) as a lack of conformity to the rules of classroom discussion, and more strikingly to her dominant femininity. Then, it is apparent how the discourse of gender differentiation disempowers her as she faces the "double bind" as competitive strategies in public speaking which is stereotypically considered to be incompatible with female's identity. Girls are often constructed as the more supportive speakers in which they seem to offer males considerably more interactional backing and support more than they receive as the extracts illustrate the case of F_2's cooperative styles with M_1 and M_3.

In light of F_1's use of commanding talk in a way that is not still approved as a means of interaction for females, she appears to threaten or go beyond the codes of dominant femininity. Hence, F_1 opposed the traditional paradigm of women's absence of self-assurance, and more strikingly contested the dominant position of masculinity and subordinate position of femininity within the classroom. To recap the contradictory positioning of F_1 and F_2, the discourse of "collaborative talk" sets them in a powerful position because it estimates good listening skills and well-disposed speech, whilst these female students are powerlessly positioned within the discourse of "gender differentiations" on the account of their dominant femininity association with submissiveness and cooperation.

In connection with the teachers' assessment of the students' oral performances, I noticed that M_1 who is the most powerfully located within the four discourses is the most likely to be assessed as effective. Both assessor (x) and assessor (y) indicate that M_1 and M_2 are effective speakers who have a protected speaking space for themselves with an ability to construct persuasive presentation. Yet, assessor (y) points to the nuance between these students' oral performance. He marks out that M_1 appears to outperform in moving flexibly between different styles of engagement. Assessor (y) then suggests to give M_1 a higher grade than M_2 for his versatility of employing language in a dynamic and influential way. Concerning females' group, assessor (x) prefers F_1's self-assurance in utilizing the "commanding talk" by drawing upon a wide range of speech types. Whereas, F_2 is described by assessor (x) as failing to play an active role in

demonstrating a persuasive argument. Rather, she was prepared just to listen and collaborate with others without any sense of imposing her thinking, according to assessor (x). However, the criteria of being effective to take command of the situation was blatantly changed by assessor (y) when it came to F_1, was perhaps much more of a surprise. Assessor (y) interprets F_1's holding the floor and resisting interruptions as inadequate. This evaluation may perhaps foster the classroom discourse of differentiation which may position female students in powerless positions. It is quite reasonable for male students to be dominant speakers in public contexts, but for females is seen as a surpass to the outline of dominant femininity.

Within the context of architecture, the use of FPDA approach showed me that students are multiply located within a web of complex network of competing discourses as they construct their identities. Again, the type of the speaker most likely to be assessed as effective by peers and teachers is Ma_1 who is popular and influential in speaking out; he employs a multifaceted style with an amalgam of collaborative and commanding talks. Ma_1 exerts a variety of speaking contributions such as resisting interruptions, challenging others and controlling turns by counting to either seize or liberate the speaking floor.

Overall, Ma_1 appears to comply with the paradigm of being relatively powerfully positioned across the discourses of "masculinity" and "approval"; this can be clearly illustrated by the respect received from class teachers and most of his peers. Besides his assertive and dominant identity is re (constructed) in light of deeming the architecture classroom and leadership positions as a male territory. Paradoxically, Ma_1 may be relatively powerless within the discourse of the "scientific discourse" when it is employed by Fa_1, in some contexts, as a tactic to empower herself and alleviate male's dominance.

As for Ma_2, he appears to be a reticent and unpopular student and constructs different types of masculinities when maintaining the "hegemonic masculinity" over his female peers and shifting to a non-hegemonic masculinity when silenced and marginalized by the authoritative position of the male peer (Ma_1). By way of elaboration, Ma_2 is relatively positioned as powerful within the

discourse of "masculinity" and architecture, but this positioning may become relatively powerless within the discourses of "approval" and "popularity" and the scientific discourse as well. We can reckon from this examination that Ma_2 was unsuccessful in enacting his gender identity in a way that would be approved by his peers. His lack of peer approval explicitly exhibits how the positioning of Ma_2 was influenced to engender his powerless positioning within the other discourses. An insight worth attending to even now, female students in architecture construct differently their gender identities by using different tactics to position themselves and creep into the architecture world. The findings report that Fa_1, Fa_2 and Fa_3 are relatively powerlessly positioned with the discourses of "double bind" in which they feel disempowered because of the social norms that exclude them from playing an assertive role in the masculine domain.

Although the powerful position Fa_1 seems to occupy within the discourse of teacher/peer approval in having a preferential access to the floor, she opted to adopt the cooperative interactive style by being a good listener, avoiding confrontational styles and employing supportive comments and encouraging feedback. The discourse of "double voicing" thereby relatively positions her in a powerful position as they attempt to manage confrontational situations and build solidarity. The "double voicing" discourse may be a resemblance to the "collaborative talk" of the EFL classroom in which it values cooperative speech to dilute their enactment of authority which is stereotypically illicit for females.

Yet, the study revealed that Fa_1 was capable of silencing Ma_1 who is one of the more out-spoken students by her prolonged turn using a highly specialized technical knowledge to tacitly confront him. The extracts of the supplementary data of interviews evidence that Fa_1 used to employ the French language and scientific jargon as a *caché* for her effectiveness as an architect which permits her to creep in and participate in this Cofp. Fa_1's unrivalled position as different with her technical knowledge seems to resist the gender differentiated discourses of masculinity and architecture that continue to devalue female participation in this masculine world.

As a listener, Fa₂ constantly shifted between a range of stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine strategies to construct her identity in response to the discursive practices and the context. Fa₃'s interactional style contains a number of features more associated with competitive styles of speaking such as her use of blocking assertions, assertive disagreements, heckling comments, challenging utterances and resisting interruptions. Again, the results raised my awareness about the fact that Fa₃'s dominant speaking role was regarded to be offensive by her peers and the teachers as well. The question which was raised here: is any form of female authority/leadership contestable because of the patriarchal norms of the society? If this is the case, it follows that a classroom discourse of "masculinity and architecture", which heightens gender differentiation. It is clear that Fa₃ receives social marginalization for infringing the boundaries of dominant femininity. For this reason, it comes into view that Fa₃ challenges the norms that women are passive speakers and as an alien in the architecture world. This *per se* contested the dominant position of masculinity and subordinate position of femininity with the classroom context.

Interestingly, what I can reap from the current scrutiny is the frequent use of single and double voicing as a linguistic strategy for students in both classrooms. The findings yield insights about the relative power. The case study sets forth that M₁, Ma₁ and Fa₃ use single voicing to "do power" with the other peers. This strategy is seen to help Ma₁ and Fa₃ to pursue their own project, even if it is at the expense of the others. Because she is powerlessly positioned with the discourse of approval, Fa₃ is observed to employ single voicing to compete for acceptance of her chairing position and her ideas.

In indexing the enactment of leadership, Ma₁ and Fa₃ adopt it to confront the challenging arguments of their peers and to harness their agency in making decisions and providing information. Alternatively, Ma₁, Ma₂ and Fa₃ use authoritative double voicing to boost and deepen the display of personal power, especially when the speaker like Fa₃ feels threatened to be excluded of peers within the discourses of "double bind" and "masculinity". Her struggles for power, which is associated with masculinity, led her to use this linguistic gambit to remind her peers that she is in charge of explaining the project and that she would not accept subordination and disrespect. The supplementary data of the interviews brighten up how Fa₃' repeated use of

authoritative double voicing perhaps disempowered her with no remedy to the peers' lack of cooperation and backup. Then again, mitigating double voicing is seen to be used by F_1, F_2, Fa_2 and Fa_3 to handle conflict situation and to attain more effective relationships with their peers. This type of double voicing is extensively used by female students as a discursive strategy to reduce social distance and create equilibrium of power and politeness in the classroom context.

This scenario demonstrates a compelling way that the study of double voicing in these classrooms is evident in exploring how female students adopt it to negotiate gendered power relations in this context. Owing to the fact that gendered discourses (re) position women and men in different and unequal ways within public and institutionalized discourses, it appears that some female speakers may occupy leadership identities in linguistically unassertive ways.

The case study revealed that the most outspoken and assertive members (M_1, Ma_1 and Fa_3) tended to adopt single voiced strategies to negotiate their leadership position and enact competitiveness. In that, Fa_3 shifted uncomfortably between single voicing and authoritative double voicing in an attempt to negotiate her chairing position within the public discussion.

It has been demonstrated that playing a leadership role as a public speaker is associated with "doing power" as a masculine characteristic. Thus, double voicing may be a self-reflexive mechanism as a form of resistance to females' subordination. Accordingly, women can use strategically double voicing to harbour their enactment of leadership and construct themselves as less bullying to men. Overall, double voicing is used by some female students as a discursive strategy to reinforce or reduce their authority in "significant moments", and to alleviate difficult and potential conflictual situations. The frequent use of double voicing by female students, in my study, reckons that they are conceivably mindful about the significance of following certain strategies as a linguistic route to engage in a masculine world, and to offer voice to those peripheralized and silenced by androcentric attitudes to women.

My use of feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis offers me an explanation of the multiplicity of gender identities and the realization that there are different feminists and masculinities which are often context-bound. This study has argued that female students who conspicuously display an authoritative role over other male or female peers are subject to a discourse of gender differentiation and masculinity which makes them vulnerable to possible exclusion and marginalization. By way of contrast, the same discourse of differentiation enhances males' powerful positioning in public contexts. Female students who strive to adopt assertive and confrontational speech styles are being placed on the edge of relegation as if they are transgressing the speech norms of females. This may elucidate why females find it hard to speak out in public context and construct leadership positions in later life. Further, an articulate and dominant speaker like Ma_2 seems to be unable to enact his masculinity through public speaking in peers or teacher approved ways. However, voluble and confident speakers like F_1 and Fa_3 may face discursive constraints along their subject positioning available to them because they are constructed as female speakers in public contexts.

The use of FPDA approval helps me to leave space for the multiple and competing voices in the classroom as a "site of struggle"; this highlights the ways various research partners make competing judgments and interpretations about the oral performances of the students. In view of the absence of a clearly set examination criteria for oral performances, there was no consensus of opinion which resulted in the fact that the basis on which participants make their judgments varied in a considerable way. Yet, students and teachers in the classroom are also responding as subjects who are multiply positioned within competing discourses. This can be the main reason behind the conflicting opinions of students and assessment of teachers. There are a number of unsolved issues concerning the interpretation of the speakers positioning within spoken discourses. In having an in depth understanding of these complex issues, this query helps me to direct a limelight on female voices and accounts which may be relatively silence or silenced compared to their male or possible female peers. Thus, highlighting differences in femininities

and masculinities offers space for the silenced voices perhaps because they are aiming to challenge or subvert the dominant discourses that relegate them. It was only in the course of undertaking the research that I explored why certain female students found difficulties in having equal basis with their peers. The promulgation of gender stereotypes that conflate effective speech with masculinity appears to evoke certain discourses that tend to silent and marginalize certain females. Besides the fact that the analysis unveils the resistant readings of the dominance of male peers by their female counterparts, some female students also displayed a kind of discomfort with the subservience of girls by the overbearing authority of some males. This analysis allows for a greater richness of perspectives in understanding the complex and ambiguous issues in constructing identities. Interestingly, I have gleaned that most teachers tended to value characteristic such as self-assurance, outspokenness, male humor and parallel processing of different styles of engagement.

The FPDA commentaries tend to adumbrate the necessity to look closely for the evaluating criteria of "speaking and listening" skills, and to hunt for a clear-cut distinction between a dominant speaker in public contexts and an "effective" one. Drawing on data analysis, both students and teachers agree on the fact that the influential student should contribute in the large class discussion with an audible voice and self-confidence to challenge and interrupt others. To borrow the word from Baxter (2000), "speaking out" must be indexed in the linguistic strategy of an effective speaking such as holding the floor and contributing in prolonged turns.

The findings display M_1, F_1 and Ma_1 as flexibly moving between different linguistic tactics by extending their leadership roles and being able to "parallel process" (Baxter, 2000) by sharing their opinions to the gist of the discussion. Further, playing the role of "agent provocateur", by being prepared to challenge the dominant view in order to shift the scope of the discussion, is also among the features which were displayed in the students who have been assessed as effective speakers. Then, M_1 is the most popular and influential speaker who tends to avail the power of humor to entertain and strengthen the legitimacy of his arguments. In terms of authority, it is reported by some studies (Coates, 2004) that humor may be a deft strategy to perform many functions such as negotiating leadership or sustaining the group solidarity.

This may help the departmental team to conceive and resolve novel approaches to teaching and assessing oral performances in the EFL classroom. Although it is still off the record, the assessors of the architecture department appear to recognize that the curriculum policy requires to take some account on the speaking strategies of their students which are of permanent performance for their future profession.

Focusing on polyphony, I could catch that my students become motivated to reflect how influential the speakers are in their discussions, and to cogitate about the competing discourses that may fluctuate in the settings. This would offer them the opportunity to reason why certain students succeed to speak out and others fail. For the constructive purpose, students can analyze their own and each other's performance after a given oral practice. By watching the video recordings of their performances, it seems to enlighten them to meta-analyze their positioning within a net of discourses and singling out what is well done and what might be learnt from other speech styles. Generally speaking, permitting students to participate and compete in difficult discussions such as "gender issues" might be a valuable vehicle to learn how to "hold the floor" and speak out to resist interruptions and heckling comments.

With regard to the EFL content, teachers began to think about a transformative project in the curriculum. They tend to offer a possible strategy to teaching students effective speaking skills through the medium of drama, where students are given the opportunity to personate some characters from the novels and plays they studied, which may be more dominant and authoritative. We find that this teaching twist might be of a great service to those students who are reticent or reluctant to speak, either males or females. This could be placed under the umbrella term of Baxter (2000) "Running the gauntlet".

In endeavour to reconcile my research findings with my statue as an EFL teacher, I tried to raise the question of the ways in which certain males and females were being silenced and left out by particular classroom discursive practices. This scheme should count the ways in which a

number of sub-textual practices in the classroom are to encumber females' use of linguistic skills in oral performances. The staff has addressed issues surrounding the "double bind" female students face when adopting commanding positions as speakers. It has been pointed out that if we strive to deploy a fruitful curriculum policy, we cannot overlook the socio-cultural and educational discourses that routinely position females in a deferential position. We discussed how some female students were discouraged and objecting their inevitable disregard from competitiveness for leadership positioning. The staff seemed to be overwhelmed by the supplementary data, and it is thoroughly convinced of the significance of designing standard criteria for oral assessment with a remarkable attempt to transform the agenda of gender segregation and inequalities that so many females continue to stand up.

The quest of this dissertation has been partly to reconnoiter the construction of identities through discourse in the classroom community of practice. On the grounds of FPDA's focus upon gender, power and discourse, it made it possible for me to analyze the negotiation of power relations between students making sense of the differences between females in terms of their verbal and non-verbal interacting. FPDA permits me to explore, in sustaining discourses of gender differentiation, the ways in which some female students are multiply positioned to resist or challenge certain educational and gender discourses. Assessing the supplementary data can elucidate why certain students are deemed more powerful and influential than others in public speaking contexts. This leads me to argue that female students are not universally and uniformly disempowered and subordinated by the patriarchal order. This study reveals the multiplicity of students' gender identity as they construct multiple femininities and masculinities.

This plurality also exhibit how students may utilize generic linguistic strategies as they are multiply positioned according to the competing discourses I identified in both communities, at times as powerful and at other times as powerless. The bottom line is that the entrenched ways in which gender differentiated practices sustain to deprecate females' participation in the spoken discourse and diminish their chances in the examination criteria.

Again, this complex background recognized that students as speakers potentially have the agency to shift between contradictory discursive positions according to the context. Arguably for women to gain their dominant position with confidence in public settings, they must first be taught how to deconstruct the gendered power relations dwelling in many social and educational discourses. Thus, teaching gender issue matters and makes a difference in evolving valuable assessment criteria for oral skills.

References

Abdelhay, B. (2008). *Males' and Females' Voice Quality in Mostaganem Spoken Arabic: A Community of Practice Perspective*. Unpublished ph. D Thesis, University of Oran.

Adams, A, and Tancred,P. (2000). *"Designing Women: Gender and the Architectural Profession."* Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Apple, M. (1993). *Official Knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative Age*. (New York, Routledge).

Ashley, M. & Lee (2003). *Women Teaching Boys*, Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Attardo, S.; L. Pickering; F. Lomotey & Sh. Menjo (2013). Multimodality in Conversational Humour. *Multimodality and Cognitive Linguistics.Special Issue of Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 11:2, 402-416.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.

Baker, P. (2008). *Sexed Texts: Language, Gender and Sexuality*. London: Exquinox.

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (TX: University of Texas).

Bakhtin, M.M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans). Minneapolis: University of Michigan Press.

 Barbe, K. (1995). *Irony in Context*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Barthes, R. (1973). *Mythologies* (London: Granada).

Baudrillard, J. (1988). *The Violence of The Global. In: The Spirit of Terrorism*. Verso Publishing, pp 86-105.

Baxter, J. (2000a). Going public: teaching students to speak out in public contexts, *English in Education*, 34 (2), pp. 26-34

Baxter, J. (2000b). Teaching girls to speak out: an investigation of the extent to which gender is a pertinent discourse for describing and assessing girls' and boys' speech in public contexts. Unpub. PhD thesis, University of Reading.

 Baxter, J.   (2002a). Competing Discourses in the Classroom: a Post-structuralist Discourse Analysis of Girls' and Boys' Speech in Public Contexts'. *Discourse and Society* 13 (6): 827–42

  Baxter, J.   (2002b). A Juggling Act: a Feminist Post-Structuralist Analysis of Girls' and Boys' Talk in the Secondary Classroom', *Gender and Education* 14 (1): 5–19.

Baxter, J.   (2003) *Positioning Gender in Discourse: A Feminist Methodology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter, J.   (2006a). 'Putting Gender in its Place: A Case Study on Constructing Speaker Identities in a Management Meeting', in Barrett, M. and Davidson, M.(eds) *Gender and Communication at Work*, pp. 69–79 (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing).

Baxter, J.   (2006b). 'Do we have to agree with her? How high school girls negotiate leadership in public contexts', in J. Baxter (ed.) Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter, J.   (2006c). *Speaking Out: The Female Voice in Public Contexts* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Baxter, J. (2008a). 'Is it all tough talking at the top? A poststructuralist analysis of the construction of gendered speaker identities of British business leaders within interview narratives', *Gender and Language* 2 (2): 197–222.

Baxter, J.   (2008b). '*Feminist Post-structuralist Discourse Analysis: a new theoretical and methodological approach?'* In J. Sunderland et al. Theoretical and Methodological Approaches to Gender and Language Study. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 243–55.

Baxter, J.   (2010). *The Language of Female Leadership*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter, J.   (2011). 'Survival or success? A critical exploration of the use of "double-voiced discourse" by women business leaders in the UK', *Discourse & Communication* 5 (3): 231–245.

Baxter, J.   (2014). *Double-Voicing at Work : Power, Gender and Linguistic Expertise*. Basingstoke, Uk. Palgrave.

Baxter, J.   (2018). *Women Leaders and Gender Stereotyping in the UK Press: A Poststructuralist Approach.* Press, Birmingham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter J., Al A'ali H. (2016). *Women Leaders in the UK by Judith Baxter. In: Speaking as Women Leaders*. Palgrave Pivot, London.

Baxter Magolda, M. (1992). *Knowing and Reasoning in College : Gender-Related Patterns in Students' Intellectual Development.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing.* NY: Basic Books.

Bem, S. (1993). *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate in Sexual Equality* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Bergvall, V. L. (1996). Constructing and enacting gender through discourse: Negotiating multiple roles as female engineering students. In Victoria L.Bergvall, Janet M. Bing and Alice F. Freed (eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. New York: Longman, 173–201.

Bergvall, V. L. (1999). Towards a comprehensive theory of language and gender. *Language in Society*, 28, pp. 273–93.

Bing, J.M. and Bergvall, V.L. (1998). The question of questions: beyond binary thinking. In V. L. Bergvall, J. M.Bing, & A. F. Freed (eds), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice (pp. 1 – 31). London: Longman.*

Bohn, E. and Stutman, R. (1983) Sex role differences in the relational control dimension of dyadic interaction, *Women's Studies in Communication* (6) : 96-104.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). O*utline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1972. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédée de trois études d'ethnologie kabyle.* Geneva: Droz].

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1995). Structures, Habitus and Practices. In The Polity Reader in Social Theory (pp. 95 110). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Trans. Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brannon, R. (1976). *The male sex role—And what it's done for us lately*. In R. Brannon & D. Davids (Eds.), The forty-nine percent majority (pp. 1−40). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brewis, J. (2001). Telling it like it is? Gender, language and organizational theory. In Robert Westwood and Stephen Linstead (eds.), *The Language of Organization.* London: Sage, 283–309.

Brown and Yule (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987 [1978]) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (1999) Bad examples: transgression and progress in language and gender studies. In M. Bucholtz, A.C. Liang, and L. Sutton (eds), *Reinventing Identities: the Gendered Self in Discourse* (New York: OUP), pp. 3–24.

Bucholtz, M. (2004). *Changing Places: Language and Woman's Placein Context. In Robin Tolmach Lakoff, Language andWoman's Place: Text and Commentaries*,rev.and expanded edn, ed. Mary Bucholtz,121–128. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buckingham, D. (2000a) *After the Death of Childhood: Growing Up in the Age of Electronic Media* Cambridge, Polity Buckingham: Open University Press.

Butler, J. (1990) Gender trouble, feminist theory, and pyschoanalytic discourse. In L.J. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge).

Butler, J. (1991) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge).

Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and Linguistic Theory (2nd edition).* London: Macmillan.

Cameron, D.   (1997). Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 47–65.

Cameron, D.   (1998). "Is there any ketchup, Vera?": Gender, power and pragmatics. *Discourse & Society*, 9(4), 437–55.

Cameron, D. (2005). Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics* 26.4: 482–502.

Cameron, D. (2006) 'Theorizing the female voice in public contexts',in J. Baxter (ed.) *Speaking Out: The Female Voice in Public Contexts*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues,* 55, 81–99.

Casper, M.L., a Moore, L. J. (1995). Inscribing bodies, inscribing the future: Gender, sex, and reproduction in outer space. *Sociological Perspectives*, 38(2), 311-33.

Castañeda-Peña, H. (2008). Interwoven and competing gendered discourses in a preschool EFL lesson. In K. Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson and J. Sunderland. (ed.) *Language and Gender Research Methodologies*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Charlebois, J. 2010, 'The Discursive Construction of Femininities in the Accounts of Japanese Women, ' *Discourse Studies*, vol. 12: 699714.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W. and Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. 2nd Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chouliaraki L., and Fairclough, N. (1999.) *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP).

Coates, J. (1989). Gossip revisited: Language in all-female groups.In Jennifer Coates and Deborah Cameron (eds.), *Women in their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. London: Longman, 94–122.

Coates, J. (1993). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. London, UK: Longman.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women Talk: Conversation between Women Friends*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers. Coates, J. (1998). *Language and Gender: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. & D. Cameron (eds.) (1989). *Women in Their Speech Communities*. Longman.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools, Teachers College Record, 98(2), 206-235.

Connell, R. (1990). Iron man: The body and some contradictions of hegemonic masculinity. In *Sport, men and the gender order*, edited by M. Messner and D. Sabo. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Connell, R. (1995).Masculinities. Sydney: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (2002).Gender. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell R. (2003). Masculinities, change and conflict in global society: Thinking about the future of men's studies. *Journal of Men's Studies* 11 (3): 249-66.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities.Second Edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Connell, Rawyn and James W. Messerschmidt. (2005). "Hege-monic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Soci-ety* 19:829-859.

Cooper, R. (1989). Modernism, post-modernism and organisational analysis 3: The contribution of Jacques Derrida. *Organisation Studies*, 10(4), pp.479–502.

Crozier, J. and Anstiss, J. (1995). 'Out of the spotlight: Girls' experience of disruption',in LLOYD-SMITH, M. and DWYFOR DAVIES, J. (eds.) *On the Margins: The Educational Experience of 'Problem' Pupils,* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books, pp.30–47.

Cutler, A. & Scott, D. R. (1990), "Speaker sex and perceived apportionment of talk", *Applied*
Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1991) `Positioning' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 21 1-18.

Davies, B. (1989). "The Discursive Production of the Male/Female Dualism in School Settings." *Oxford Review of Education* 15.3: 229-41.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and personhood. In R. Harré, & L. van Lagenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 32-52).

Davis, J. (2002) "Boys to Men: Masculine Diversity and Schooling". Paper presented at the *School Leadership Centre of Trinidad and Tobago*.

De. Beauvoir, S. (1949). *Le Deuxième Sexe*, Vol. I and II. Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Dealey, J. Q. and Ward, F. (2009). <u>A Text-Book of Sociology</u>.New York.

Deaux, K. (2001). Social identity. In J. Worell (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of women and gender* (pp. 1059-1067). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Derrida, J. (1978) *Writing and Difference* (London: RKP).

Derrida, J. (1987). *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds* (Brighton: Harvester).

Diamond, J. (1996) 'The Roots of Radicalism', *The New York Review of Books*, 14 November, pp. 4-6.

Dillabough, J,A, and Arnot, M. (2002). Recasting Educational Debates about Female Citizenship, Agency and Identity. *The School Field* 13(3/4): 61–90.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1997). *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dryburgh, H., (1999). "Work Hard, Play Hard: Women and Professionalization in Engineering – Adapting to the Culture", *Gender and Society* 13(5), pp. 664-82.

Duranti,A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eckert, P and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1995). Constructing meaning, constructing selves: Snapshots of language, gender and class from Belten High, in K.Hall and M.Bucholtz. (eds), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, 459-507. London: Routledge.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and Burnouts: Social Categories and Identity in the High School*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). "Think Practically and Look Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-based practice", in *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 21:416-90.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Communities of practice: Where language, gender and power all live. In Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtzand Birch Moonwomon (eds.), *Locating Power: Proceedings of the Second BerkeleyWomen and Language Conference.* Berkeley, April 1992. University of California: Berkeley Women and Language Group, 89–99.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1995). Constructing meaning, constructing selves: Snapshots of language, gender, and class from BeltenHigh. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender Articulated: Languageand the Socially Constructed Self.* London: Routledge, 469–507.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EDEXCEL (1998). *GCSE Syllabus 1999: English* (London: EDEXCEL Foundation).

Edley, N. and Wetherell, M. (1997) 'Jockeying for Position: The Construction of Masculine Identities'. *Discourse and Society*, 8(2): 203-217.

Edwards, A. (2005). 'Let's Get beyond Community and Practice: The Many Meanings of Learning by Participating.' *Curriculum Journal* 16(1): 49–65.

Edwards, D. (1997). Discourse and cognition. London: Sage. Harper, S. R ., Harris, F., III, & Mmeje, K . (2005). *A theoretical model to ex plain the over- representation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. NASPA Journal*, 42 (4), 5 6 5 -5 8 8.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. ethnography. *Human Relations*, 45(1), pp. 97–120.

Fairclough, N. L. (1989a). *Language and Power*. Essex, UK: Longman.

Fairclough, N. L. (1989b). Language and Ideology. *English Language Research Journal*, 3 :9–27.

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

Fairclough, N. L. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis. London : Longman.

Fairclough, N. L. (2000b) "Discourse, social theory and social research: the discourse of welfare reform", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.2.

Fairclough, N. L. (2001a). *Language and Power*. UK: Person Education Limited.

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

Fairclough, N. L. (2003). Analysing Discourse : Textual Analysis for Social Research. London :   Routledge.

Fairclough, N. L. (2004). Critical Discourse Analysis in Researching Language in the New Capitalism: Overdetermination, Transdisciplinarity and Textual Analysis. In: Harrison (C.) & Young (L.) eds. *Systemic Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum. Fairclough, N. L. (2006). *Language and Gobalization*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997) Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction* (London: Sage), pp. 258–84.

Faulkner, W., (2000a). "The Power *and* the Pleasure? A Research Agenda for'Making Gender Stick' to Engineers", *Science, Technology, & Human Values,* 25(1), pp. 87-119.

Faulkner, W., (2000b). "Dualisms, Hierarchies and Gender in Engineering", *Social Studies of Science,*30, 5, 759_92.

Faulkner W. (2001). The technology question in feminism: a view from feminist technologystudies.*Women's Stud. Int. Forum* 24:79–95.

Faulkner, W. (2006). *Gender in/of engineering*. In ESRC (Ed.): University of Edinburgh.

Faulkner, W., (2007). "'Nuts and Bolts and People': Gender-troubled Engineering identities", *Social Studies of Science, (37), 3: 331-356.*

Faulkner, W., (2009a). "Doing Gender in Engineering Workplace Cultures: Part I – Observations from the Field", *Engineering Studies,* 1(1), pp. 3-18.

Faulkner, W., (2009b). "Doing Gender in Engineering Workplace Cultures: Part II – Gender (in)authenticity and the (in)visibility Paradox", *Engineering Studies*, 1(3), pp. 169-189.

Ferguson, H. (2001). Men and masculinities in late-modern Ireland. In *A man's world? Changing men 's practices in a globalized world*, edited by B. Pease and K. Pringle. London: Zed Books.

Fishman, Joshua, A. (1978). Positive Bilingualism: Some overlooked rationales and forefather. In J.Alatis (ed*.) International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, (pp. 42-52).

Fishman, P. (1983) Interaction: the Work Women Do. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Flachs, A. (2013). Gardening as ethnographic research: Volunteering as a means for community access. *Journal of Ecological Anthropology*, 16(1), 97–103.

Fouad, N.H. (2009). *Motherhood and Work ? Examining the dilemma faced by women in architecture.* Retreived November 30, 2010, from www.constructionweekonline.com.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*

Foucault, M. (1978) The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction. United States: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge* (Brighton: Harvester Press).

Foucault, M. (1981). Omnes et Singulatism : "Towards a criticism of Political Reason", in S. Mc murrin (ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol.2 Salt Lake Cit : University of Utah Press.

Foucault, M. (1984) What is enlightenment? In P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader* (London: Penguin).

Foucault, M. (1995). Discipline andpunish. The birth of the prison. (Trans. A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage Books.

Fowler, B. and Wilson, F. (2004). "Women Archi-tects and Their Discontents." *Sociology* 38, no. 1, 101-119.

Francis, B. (1998). *Power Plays: Children's Constructions of Gender, Power & Adult Work* (Stoke-on-Trent, Trentham Books).

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, Girls and Achievement: Addressing the Classroom Issues*, (London, Routledge/Falmer).

Francis, B. (1999). Lads, Lasses and (New) Labour: 14-16 year old student'responses to the 'laddish behaviour and boys' underachievement'debate, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20: 357-373.

Gardner, H. (2004). *Changing minds : The art and science of changing our own people's minds*. Boston, MA : Harvard Business chool Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gastil, J. (1994). A definition and illustration ofdemocratic leadership. *Human Relations*, 47, 954-971.

Gee, J. P. (1986). Units in the production of narrative discourse. Discourse Processes, 9, 391–422.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to Do Discourse Analysis: A tool kit*. New York: Routledge.

Gibbon, M. 1999. *Feminist Perspectives on Language*. London: Longman.

Giles, H. & Smith, P. M. (1979). Accommodation Theory: Optimal Levels of Convergence. In H. Giles & St. Clair (eds.), *Language and Social Psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. pp. 294-299.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language contexts and consequences*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Gold, R.L. (1958) Roles in Sociological Fieldwork. *Social Forces*, 36, pp. 217–23.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, New York, International Publishers.

Grant, J. (1993). *Fundamental Feminism: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Gutt, E. (1991).*Translation and relevance.Cog-nition and context*. London: BasilBlackwell.

Haddouche F,. (2012). Master of English Literature and Civilization. Retrieved from the University of Hassiba Benbouali Canvas.

Hall, K. and Bucholtz, M. (eds) (1995) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Constructed Self* (London & New York: Routledge).

Hall, R.M. and Sandler, B.R. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Project on the status and education of women, Association of American Colleges.

Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning,* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Socialsemiotic Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography* (London: Routledge).

Hannah, A. & Murachver. T, (1999). Gender and Conversational Style as Predictors of Conversational Behaviour, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18 (2): 153-174.

Haraway, D (1991). 'A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist- feminism in the Late Twentieth Century', pp. 149–181 in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature.* New York: Routledge.

Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse Analysis. Language 28 (1), 1-30 *Harvard Educational Review,* 66, 2, pp. 303–17.

Hausman, B. L. (2001). Recent transgender theory. *Feminist Studies*, 27, 465-490.

Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Hendricks, C. and Oliver, K. (1999). *Language and Liberation. Feminism, Philosophy, and Language.* State University of New York Press, SUNY Series.

Henley, N. and Kramarae, C. (1991). "Gender, Power and Miscommunication", in N. Coupland, H. Giles, and J. Wiemann. (eds) *Miscommunication and Problematic talk*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holmes, J. (1992). Women's talk in public contexts. *Discourse and Society* 3(2): 131–50.

Holmes, J. (1992). (1994). Improving the lot of female language learners. In J. Sunderland (ed) *Exploring Gender: Questions and Implications for English Language Education*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Holmes, J. (1992). (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (1992). (1998). Why tell stories? Contrasting themes and identities in thenarratives of Maori and Pakeha women and men. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 8(1): 1–29.

Holmes, J. (1992). (2000). Women at work: Analysing women's talk in New Zealand workplaces. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistic*s (*ARAL*) 22(2): 1–17.

Holmes, J. (1992). (2005a). Leadership talk: How do leaders 'do mentoring', and is gender relevant? (To appear in special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics*, edited by Karin Aijmer and Anna-Brit Stenstrom.).

Holmes, J. (1992). (2005b). Workplace narratives, professional identity and relational practice. In Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin and Michael Bamberg (eds.), *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J. (1992). (2006a). *Gendered Talk at Work*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, J. (1992). (2006b). 'Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1): 26–50.

Holmes, J., Meyerhoff M. (2008). *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Holmes, J. and Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk*. London: Longman.

Howe, A. (1992) *Making Talk Work*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D.

Hymes (Eds.). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp.35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). Foundations in Sociolinguistics : an ethnographic approach, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Identity. (2011). Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary. Retreived from http://.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ identity.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity*. Amesterdam: John Benjamins.

Jackson, D. N. (2002, December 5–7). Evaluating g in the SAT:Implications for the sex differences and interpretations of verbaland quantitative aptitude. Paper presented at the *International Society for Intelligence Research*, Nashville, TN.

Jenkins, N. & Cheshire, J. (1990). 'Gender issues in the GCSE oral English examination: Part 1', *Language and Education*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 261-292.

Johnson, S. and Meinhof, U.H. (eds) (1997). *Language and Masculinity* (London: Blackwell).

Jones, A. (1993). Becoming a 'girl': post-structuralist suggestions for educational research, *Gender & Education*, 5(2), pp. 157–66.

Jones, A. (1997). Teaching post-structuralist theory in education: student resistances, *Gender & Education*, 5(2), pp. 261–9.

Jones, D, (2000). Gender trouble in the workplace: 'Language and gender' meets 'feminist organisational communication'. In Janet Holmes (ed.), *Gendered Speech in Social Context: Perspectives from Gown & Town.* Wellington: Victoria University Press, 192–210.

Jorgenson, J., (2002). "Engineering Selves: Negotiating Gender and Identity in Technical Work", *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15(3), pp. 350-380.

Josselson, R. (1987). *Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kessler, S., Ashenden, D. J., Connell, R. W. & Dowsett, G. W. (1985). Gender relations in Secondary Schooling', *Sciology of Education*. 58 (1): 34-48.

Kiesling, Scott F. (2001). 'Now I Gotta Watch What I Say': Shiting Constructions of Gender and Dominance in Discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11: 250–73.

Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gen-der identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.),*Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141). NewburyPark, CA: Sage.

Kimmel, M.S.& Messner, M.A. (2007). *Men's lives* (7thEd). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kosh, J. (1996). Gender study of private school students attitudes and beliefs about school life. Resources in education (RIE).

Kress, G. & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology.* London: Routledge & Kogan Paul.

Kress, G.R. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice.* Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Kvande, E. (1999). "In the bely of the beast": Constructing Femininities in Engineering Organizations" *European Journal of Women's Studies* 6(3) : 305-328

Labov, William (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 354–96.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we Live by Chicago* : The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, R, T. 1990. *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives.* New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. Language in Society. 2.45-80.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. New York: Harper and Row.

Lave, J and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge.* University Press: Cambridge.

Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice , in *Mind, Culture and activity*, vol. 3 (3), pp. 149-176.

Lawrence, S. G., N. P. Stucky & R. Hopper. (1990). The effects of sex dialects and sex stereotypes on speech evaluations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 9: 209-224.

Lazar, M. (1993). Equalizing gender relations: A case of double-talk. *Discourse and Society,*4, 443–465.

Lazar, M. (2000). Gender, discourse and semiotics: The politics of parenthood representations. *Discourse and Society,*11, 373–400.

Lazar, M. (2004). (Post-)Feminism in contemporary advertising: A global discoursein a local context. Paper presented at *the Discourse, Globalisation and Gender Identities Conference*, Cardiff, UK.

Lazar, M. (2005). *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology In Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Lazar, M. (2006). "Discover the power of femininity!": Analysing global "power femininity" in local advertising. *Feminist Media Studies*, 6, 505–517.

Lazar, M. (2007). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies* 4: 141-167.

Linstead, S. A. (1993). From Postmodern Anthropology to Deconstructive Ethnography. *Human Relations*, *46*(1), 97-120. DOI: 10.1177/001872679304600107.

Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender and Language: Theory and Practice*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. (2009). Interacting with sexist men triggers social identity threat among female engineers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 96, 1089-1103.

Mabry, L. (2008) "Case study in social research," in Pertti Alasuutari et al. (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 214–27.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994a). (In)visibility: Sexuality, race and masculinity in theschool context. In D. Epstein (Ed.), *Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education* (pp. 152–176). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994b). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Macmillan.

Mahony, P. (1985). *Schools for the Boys. Co-education Re-essessed*, London : Hutchinson.

Maltz, D.N and Borker, R.A (1982). A Cultural Approach to Male–Female Miscommunication, in J.J Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. PP. 196-216.

Matthew, Jill J. (1984). *Good and Mad Women: The Historical Construction of Femininity in Twentieth Century Australia*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

McWilliam, E. (1997). Performing between the posts: authority, posture and contemporary feminist scholarship. In W.G. Tierney and Y. Lincoln (eds) *Representation and the Text: Reframing the Narrative Voice* (Albany: State University of New York Press), pp. 219–32.

Mills, S. (1999). Discourse competence: Or, how to theorize strong women speakers. In Christina Hendricks and Kelly Oliver (eds.), *Language and Liberation:Feminism, Philosophy, and Language.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 81–97.

Mills, S. (2002).Third Wave Feminism Linguistics and the Analysis of Sexism and Naming Practices. *Plenary lecture at IGALA 2*, University of Lancaster, UK.

Mills, S. (2003). Caught between Sexism, Anti Sexism and Political Correctness: Feminist Women's Negotiation with Naming Practices, in *Discourse and Society*. Pp. 87-110.

Mills, S. (2006). Gender and Performance Anxiety. Published in Baxter J ed. *Speaking Out: The Female Voice in Public Contexts*, Palgrave, Basingstoke .

Mills, S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Montgomery, M. (2008). *An Introduction to Language and Society*. New York: Routledge.

Moodie, T. D. (1994). *Going for Gold: Men, Mines, and Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Morreall, J. (1991). Humor and work. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 4*(3-4), 359-373.

Norris, C. (1990). *What's Wrong with Post-modernism: Critical Theory and the Ends of*

Philosophy. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*, 203–210.

Olitsky, S. (2007). Facilitating identity formation, group membership, and learning in science classrooms: What canbe learned from out-of-field teaching in an urban school? *Science Education*, 91(2), 201–221.

Orenstein, P.(1995). *School girls: Young women, self-esteem, and the confidence gap*. New York: Doubleday.

Owens, J. (2000). *"Gender-Differentiated Household Resource Allocation--Empirical Evidence in Senegal."* Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan.

Paechter, C.F. and Head, J.O. (1995) Power and gender influences on curriculum implementation. Paper presented at *American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting*, San Francisco, April 1995.

Paechter, C. (1998). *Educating the other: gender, power and schooling*. London: Falmer Press.

Parker, P. S. (2005). *Race, gender and leadership: Re-envisioning organizational leadership from the perspectives of African American women executives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pavlenko, A. & I. Piller (2001). New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender. In: Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., Piller, I. & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.) *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Peters, R.S.(1965). "Education as initiation", in ARCHAMBAULT, R.D. (ed.) *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 87-112.

Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. (G. Roberts, Trans.). NY: Grossman Publishers. (Original work published 1972)

Plante, I., Théorêt, M. & Favreau, O. E. (2009). Student gender stereotypes: Contrasting the perceived maleness and femaleness of mathematics and language. *Educational Psychology*, 29(4), 385-405

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics*, 18: 581-618.

Randall, V. (1987). Women in Politics, Macmillan, London. relations in secondary schooling', *Sociology of Education,* 58, pp. 34–48 *Research* (London: Longman).

Robinson, K.H. (1992). 'Class-room discipline: Power, resistance and gender. A look at teacher perspectives', *Gender and Education,* 4, 3, pp. 273–87.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* edited by Rebecca Rogers, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum: 1-18.

Rozin, P., Bauer, R., & Catanese, D. (2003). Food and life, pleasure and worry, among American college students: Gender differences and regional similarities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 132-141.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York: Guilford.

Sadiqi, F. (2003). *Women, Gender and Language in Morocco*. Leiden. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.

Sadker, M. a Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How America's school cheat girls*. New York: Charles Scriber's Touchstone Press.

Salminen-Karlsson, M. (1999). Bringing Women into Computer Engineering. *Curriculum Reform Processes at Two Institutes of Technology*, Linköping, Linköping University.

Saussure, F. de (1974). *Cours de linguistique générale* (édition critique par R. Engler, t. 2). Wiesbaden : Otto Harrassowitz.

Schein, V. E. (1975). The relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 95-100.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. secondary schooling, Sociology of Education, 58, 34-48.

Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L., & Ambady, N. (1999). Stereotype susceptibility: Identity salience and shifts in quantitative performance. *Psychological Science,* 10, 81–84.

Silva, Elizabeth B. (2005). Gender, Home, and Family in Cultural Capital Theory. *British Journal of Sociology* 56 (1): 83-102.

Smith, P. M. (1985). *Language, the sexes and society*. London: Blackwell.

Soars,.,& Soars, J.(1989). *Headway.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Spender, D. (1980). *Man Made Language*, London : Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Spender, D. (1982). *Invisible Women: the Schooling Scandal*. London: The Women's

Stanworth, M. (1983). *Gender and Schooling*. London: Hutchinson.

Steele, C. M. (1992). Race and the schooling of Black Americans, *The Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 68-78.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613-629.

Steele, C. M., & Arouson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellec- tual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811. *Studies of Science*, 30(5), pp. 759-92.

Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Swann, J. (1992). *Girls, Boys and Language.* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Swann, J. (1993). Observing and recording talk in educational settings. InD. Graddol, J. Maybin and B. Steirer (eds) *Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters and OUP), pp. 26–48.

Swann, J. (2003). Schooled language: Educational policy and practice. In Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Gender*. Oxford: Blackwell, 624–44.

Swann, J. and Graddol, D. (1994) 'Gender inequalities in classroom talk', in GRADDOL, D., MAYBIN, J. and STIERER, B. (eds.) *Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 151–67.

Swann, J. and Graddol, D. (1995). Feminising classroom talk? In S. Mills (ed.) *Language and Gender* (London: Longman).

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In J. A. Williams&S. Worchel(Eds.),*The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talbot, M. (1998). *Language and Gender: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK and

Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and Gender.* Wiley: Polity Press.

Talmy, L. (2011). "Cognitive semantics: An overview." In Semantics: *An international handbook of natural language meaning*, edited by Claudia Maierborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner, 622-642.

Tannen, D. (1982). *Ethnic Style in Male- Female Conversation*, Language and Social

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand:Women and Men in Conversation*. London: Virago.

Tannen, D. (1993). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1995). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men at Work: Language, Sex and Power* (London: Longman).

Tannen, D. (1999). *The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue*. New York Ballantine.

Taylor, S.D, (2004). 'Predictive genetic test decisions for Huntington's Disease: context, appraisal and new moral imperatives', *Social Science and Medicine*, 58(1), pp. 137-149.

Thompson, J. (1983). *Learning liberation. Women's response to men's education*. Guildford, UK: Biddles.

Thorne, Barrie, Kramarae, Cheris, Henley, Nancy. (Eds.), (1983*). Language, Gender and Society*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Discourse, Power and Access, in C.R. Caldas (ed.) *Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge .

Van Dijk, T. (2001). 'Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity', in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 95–120.

Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Context. A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walden, R. and Walkerdine, V. (1985). *Girls and Mathematics: From primary to secondary schooling,* London: Heinsemann.

Walkerdine, V. (1990) *Schoolgirl Fictions* (London: Verso).

Wardhaugh, R. (2009). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Warner, M. (1993). Introduction. In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp. vii-xxxi). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wearing, B. (1996). Gender: *The Pain and Pleasure of Difference*. Melbourne: Longman.

Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, Language and Discourse*. Routledge. New York.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell

Weedon, C. (1996). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Maiden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist Practice and Post-structuralist Theory*. 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell).

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (1998). 'Gender Practices: Steps in the Analysis of Men and Masculinities'. In K. Henwood, C. Griffin and A. Phoenix (eds.) *Standpoints and Differences: Essays in the Practice of Feminist Psychology*. London: Sage.

Whitson, D. (1990). Sport in! he social construction of masculinity. In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men and the gender order. Critical feminist perspectives.* (pp. 19-29). Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext*. Oxford : Blackwell.

-Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knefelkamp, L. L.(1978). Arthur Chickering's vectors of development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (pp. 19-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.-Wigfield A, Eccles JS, eds. (2001).*The Develop-ment of Achievement Motivation*. San Diego,CA: Academic Press.

Williams, J. and Giles, H. (1978). The changing status ofwomen in society: An intergroupperspective. In Henri Tajfel (ed.) *Differentiation between Social Groups*. London: Academic Press,pp. 431–46.

Wilson, A. (1996). How We Find Ourselves: Identity Development and Two Spirit People. *Harvard Educational Review*: July 1996, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 303-318.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2002). Interdisciplinarity, Gender Studies and CDA: GenderMainstreaming and the European Union. *Plenary lecture at IGALA 2*, Lancaster University, UK.

Wodak, R. (2005). Gender mainstreaming and the EuropeanUnion: Interdisciplinarity, gender studies and CDA. In M. M. Lazar (Ed.), *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse* (pp. 90–113). London: Palgrave.

Wodak, R. (ed.) (1997). *Gender and Discourse. London*: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. and Meyer,M. (2009)."Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology."Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. 1-33.

Wolfram,W/Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Wood, J., T. (2000). *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Woods, N.(1988). Talking shop: sex and status as determinants of floor apportionment in a work setting. In Coates, 3 & Cameron, D. (eds) *Women in their speech communities*, 141-157. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Yin, R,. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, R. L. (1999). *Understanding Misunderstanding: A Practical Guide to More Successful Human Interaction.* Texas University Press.

Zimmerman, D. H., and West, C., (1975). *Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. pp: 105- 129. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Appendix Transcription Conventions (Jefferson 2004)

(.) Micropause

(1.1) Pause in tenths of a second

[ ] Start/finish of overlapping speech or interruption

= Latching

_ Emphasis

 (*Sighs*) Non-verbal behaviour; editorial comment

↑↓ Rising or falling intonation

 (ha) Syllable of laughter

:: Drawing out of the word/syllable

creaky voice such as when someone is upset

£ Smiley voice

(…) Omitted speech