JOURNAL OF
Linguistic Anthropology

■ *Julia R. Daniels*
University of Washington
College of Education
juliardaniels@gmail.com

"There's No Way This Isn't Racist": White[1] Women Teachers and the Raciolinguistic Ideologies of Teaching Code-Switching

This paper analyzes data from a Participatory Action Research project with four White women teachers who work in U.S. secondary schools that serve predominately students of color. This critical analysis examines the consequences of the White women teachers' racialized identities for the language practices, language teaching, and racialized language ideologies in their classrooms. In particular, this paper focuses on the teachers' relationships to teaching their students of color to "code-switch" to English language practices deemed "standard." This paper uses the White teachers' relationships to teaching code-switching to their students of color as a prism through which to explicate the entangling of race and language in classrooms. [race, whiteness, language ideologies, raciolinguistics]

This paper maps the consequences of White women teachers' racialized identities for the language practices, language teaching, and racialized language ideologies at work in their classrooms. I rely on the linguistic practice of "code-switching"—as it is commonly taught and enforced in public schools (Flores and Rosa 2015)—as prism through which to examine the ways that four White women teachers engaged with and resisted the entangling of race and language in their own teaching.

This paper draws on a subset of data from a Participatory Action Research (PAR) project with four White female teachers in Northern California public high schools that served predominately students of color. The longitudinal structure of this project allowed me to be a participant observer in each teacher's classrooms over the course of seven months and to meet regularly with the teachers as a research group to co-construct understandings of Whiteness and critical White teacher subjectivity.

This PAR project began with the premise that while White women make up the majority of public school teachers in the United States (National Center for Educational Statistics 2015), their subjectivities rarely equip them to meet the needs of students of color (Delpit 2006; McIntyre 1997; Pruitt 2004). Rather, many White teachers unintentionally perpetuate racism in their classrooms—despite good intentions and decades of research meant to help White teachers understand and interrupt racism (e.g., Cochran-Smith 2000; Maher and Tetreault 1997; McIntyre 2002; Sleeter 2001).

Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, Vol. 28, Issue 2, pp. 156–174, ISSN 1055-1360, EISSN 1548-1395. DOI: 10.1111/jola.12186.

Theoretical and philosophical scholars of Whiteness and race have long called for qualitative research that turns the "research eye" back onto Whiteness itself (Morrison 1992; Applebaum 2010; Thompson 2010). This larger project moves beyond previous explorations of how White teachers make sense of and relate to their students of color (Chubbuck 2004; Marx 2006; McIntyre 2002; Powell 1997; Sleeter 2008; White 2012; Yoon 2013) and examines how White female teachers make sense of their own Whiteness: how White teachers understand the consequences of their own Whiteness for themselves and for their students of color. This paper, then, drawing on data from the first four months of this project, focuses specifically on the ways that the White teacher participants with whom I worked thought about, problematized, and enacted particular conceptions of Whiteness through their relationship to the concept of code-switching in their classrooms.

While important research examines the discourses of Whiteness (e.g., Bonilla-Silva & Forman 2000; Dickar 2000; Haviland 2008; Leonardo 2004), the subjectivities of White teachers (e.g., Jupp and Lensmire 2016; Lensmire 2017; Seidl and Hancock 2011; Ullucci 2012; Utt and Tochluk 2016), and the intersections of Whiteness and language (e.g., Foster 2013; Hill 2008), this paper puts those areas of research into critical conversation: This project examines the relationship between Whiteness and raciolinguistic ideologies in schools, and more specifically, within the language practices and pedagogies of White teachers who teach students of color. This paper interrogates the ways that Whiteness prevents critical engagement with raciolinguistic ideologies in the context of White teachers' language teaching and language practices.

I begin by providing background information on the larger PAR project, the teacher participants themselves, as well as the theoretical stances and empirical work that situate this project. I then move to an analysis of the insights and ideological assumptions that emerged from an analysis of the teacher participants' relationships to the concept of code-switching and to teaching code-switching in their classrooms. I conclude with a discussion of the consequences of these insights for our understandings of the effects of Whiteness itself on language use and language teaching in U.S. classrooms.

Literature Review

Critical Understandings of Whiteness

This analysis is rooted in a specific understanding of Whiteness—and therefore, in a particular framing and way of visualizing power at work in the world. The Foucauldian understanding of power taken up here—and so often employed in critical research on Whiteness (Ambrosio 2013; Applebaum 2010; Hytten and Warren 2003; Leonardo and Zembylas 2017)—examines how power and resistance are negotiated and mutually constitutive (Foucault 1972; Bartky 2002).

Foucault's conception of power stands in contrast to a traditional framing in which power is understood as owned and wielded by individuals and, often, institutions (Foucault 1972; Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982; S. Mills 1997; Stoler 1995). Rather, for Foucault, power has a "capillary form of existence . . . [and] reaches in the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes" (39). Foucault describes power as dispersed, resilient, and adaptive—rather than concentrated, "fragile," or static. A Foucauldian analysis of power therefore works to ". . . shif[t] our attention away from the grand, overall strategies of power, towards the many localized circuits, tactics, mechanisms and effects through which power circulates . . ." (Hall 2001:77) and allows us to understand power as contingent and relational, constantly (re)produced and negotiated via interaction and constituting dynamic subjectivities and experiences (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982; Foucault 1972; Hall 2001; S. Mills 1997).

Building on Foucault's (1972) framing of power, Frankenberg (1993) understands Whiteness as simultaneously a "set of linked advantages," "a standpoint from which White people look at ourselves, at others, and at society" and a "set of cultural practices that are ... unmarked and unnamed" (1). In other words, Whiteness is typically the "invisiblized" norm against which racialized difference is measured, constructed, and maintained (Bucholtz 1999; Leonardo 2009; Lipsitz 1998).

In accordance with Foucault's (1972) conception of power as dynamic, Thompson (2010), Applebaum (2010), and Frankenberg (1993, 1997) argue for a conception of Whiteness as a process, rather than a static label or category. Whiteness must constantly be (invisibly) remade in order to survive: "...Whiteness is always constructed, always in the process of being made and unmade. Indeed, its characterization as unmarked marker is itself an 'ideological' effect that seeks to cover the tracks of its constructedness, specificity, and localness, even as they appear" (Frankenberg 1997:16). As such, an important area of analysis—one that I attempt to take up here—works to expose exactly how Whiteness is "made" in classrooms and, particularly, through language practices and language expectations: continuously "rationalized," "legitimized," and "made ostensibly natural and normal" (C. Mills 1997).

White Teacher Subjectivity

Much important work draws on theoretical examinations of Whiteness to explore the structural and systemic effects of Whiteness (e.g., Du Bois 1995; Garvey 2004; Roediger 1991). In this paper, however, I draw on research that employs theoretical understandings of Whiteness in order to explore the subjectivities of White teachers—and the consequences of those subjectivities for White teachers' teaching. For example, White (2012), Sleeter (2008), and Marx (2006) all explore the experiences and dynamic subjectivities of White preservice teachers who engage in conversations about race, racism, and Whiteness as part of their teacher preparation. These projects offer insight into the "misconceptions, fears, and biases that White ... teachers bring to the profession" (Sleeter 2008:575)—and the ways White preservice teachers' Whiteness informs their interactions with and understandings of students and communities of color.

Within the body of literature exploring in-service White teachers, Chubbuck (2004), Powell (1997), and Yoon (2012) exemplify much of the empirical work articulating White teacher subjectivity. Chubbuck explores two White teachers' ideas about race and the disconnects between the teachers' actions in their classrooms, and the ideologies about race that they claimed in interviews. Similarly, Powell explores how White teachers developed and expanded their pedagogical practices to be more inclusive of students of color. In her research in White elementary school teachers' classrooms and in a teacher study group, Yoon explores the "discursive paradoxes" that connect and inform White female teachers' "beliefs, intentions, and actions" (1) in relation to their students of color. Powell, Chubbuck, and Yoon's work explores and begins to map White teacher' subjectivities by examining White teachers' "beliefs, intentions, and actions" in relation to their students of color (Powell 1997:467).

Parallel bodies of literature explicate what Picower (2009) calls the "tools of Whiteness": The strategies and tactics that White teachers employ to protect and maintain the ideologies and perspectives that Whiteness affords—even and especially in the face of the alternative or critical perspectives offered by multicultural education classes, courses on White privilege, and/or professional development exploring social justice education (Case and Hemmings 2005; DiAngelo 2012; DiAngelo and Sensoy 2012; Picower 2009). Explorations of these "tools of Whiteness" (Picower) allow us to better understand how Whiteness protects itself and therefore shields White teachers from perspectives that might reshape their understandings of racism and oppression. Much of the work cited above moves us toward understanding how "... white teachers [might] unlearn their own racial assumptions

and . . . engage in open, anti-racist conversations [w]ith students or with colleagues" (Yoon 2012:2)—and how we might challenge the very "tools" (Picower 2009) that White teachers use to protect their "racial assumptions" (Yoon 2012:2). This paper builds on such important research by looking explicitly at the relationship between Whiteness and language in White teachers' classrooms. In particular, this analysis explores the ways Whiteness protects itself by preventing teachers from embodying critical understandings of race and language—of raciolinguistic ideologies—in their classrooms.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies

Examinations of language ideologies—the "beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds" (Kroskrity 2006:498) that are "embedd[ed] . . . within broader social, cultural, historical, and political contexts" (Martinez 2013:278)—have long worked to explicate the relationship(s) between language and power. In research on language use, language expectations, and language pedagogy in schools, particular attention has been paid to the "co-naturalization" (Rosa 2015) of race and language (e.g., Alim 2005; Aneja 2016; Davila 2012).

Flores and Rosa (2015) employ the concept of raciolinguistic ideologies in order to explicate the ways that "certain racialized bodies" are conflated with "linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices" (150). In doing so, Flores and Rosa draw attention to the ways in which processes of racialization and domination are necessarily intertwined with language:

> . . . raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects . . . a raciolinguistic perspective seeks to understand how the white gaze is attached both to a speaking subject who engages in the idealized linguistic practices of whiteness and to a listening subject who hears and interprets the linguistic practices of language-minoritized populations as deviant based on their racial positioning in society as opposed to any objective characteristics of their language use.
>
> (150–151).

The concept of raciolingusitic ideologies, then, allows us to articulate the ways that language is constructed—via race and, in particular, Whiteness—as fixed, static, and objective even and especially in the face of its "co-naturalization" with race (Rosa 2015).

Many scholars have called into question the very notion of a "standard" or "standardized" English. Significant research illuminates the "constructedness" (Frankenberg 1997) and racialized roots of the standard ideal—as well as questions the existence of standard English as objective linguistic form that can be separated from the ways that race and processes of racialization inform language use and interaction (Bucholtz 1999; Charity Hudley and Mallinson 2014; Flores and Rosa 2015; Lippi-Green 1997; Rosa 2016; Ruth-Gordon 2011). Typically, the concept of standard English is constructed in contrast to an imagined and artificially homogenized "nonstandard" English (Bucholtz 1999). Such a contrast serves to highlight the ideological authority and imaged racial "neutrality" (Whiteness) of standard English even as it underscores the racialized nature and ideological "deviance" of "nonstandard" English (Bucholtz 1999; Flores and Rosa 2015; Lippi-Green 1997; Rosa 2016; Ruth-Gordon 2011).

Research on raciolinguistic ideologies builds on this work and allows us to question the ways in which language and race are understood and framed within the context of schools and educational research. For example, various traditions of Critical and Multicultural Education call for pedagogies that honor and build upon students' linguistic repertoires and practices—particularly the practices and repertoires of students and families of color (Paris 2012). The concept of raciolinguistic

ideologies, however, pushes that work further in that it positions schools as always already situated within raciolinguistic fields: both subject to and producers of the raciolinguistic ideologies at work in the world. As such, Flores and Rosa (2015) argue that educational practitioners and educational researchers need to engage with the consequences of those raciolinguistic ideologies—and in particular, the mutually constitutive relationship between race and language—for the particular language practices that are taught, embodied, and enforced in schools. This paper attempts to extend our understanding of raciolinguistic ideologies by examining the way that White teachers engage with—and avoid engagement with—the insights that raciolinguistic ideologies afford.

Research Questions: White Teachers and Code-Switching

In this analysis, I focus on the concept of code-switching—the teacher participants' talk about code-switching, the ways that they taught code-switching in their classroom, as well as they ways that they reflected on and understood that teaching during the first four months of this project. Code-switching refers to "the use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation" (Kamwangamalu 2010:116). However, the term is often used in the context of education to refer to an "appropriateness-based" (Leeman 2005) pedagogy and approach to language education (Flores and Rosa 2015). For the purposes of this analysis, I rely on this common conception of code-switching within the context of teaching and educational scholarship.

When students are taught to code-switch in schools they are typically taught that while "nonstandard varieties of English and nonstandard varieties of languages other than English ... are appropriate for out-of-school contexts," they must learn to employ "standard conventions [in schools] ... because these linguistic practices are appropriate for a school setting" (Flores and Rosa 2015:153). As part of learning to code-switch, students are often taught contrastive analysis: comparing a "nonstandard" variety or language with standard English in order to better understand and move toward a command of standard English (Kubota 2010; Young 2009).

The teaching of code-switching is a commonly accepted and enforced practice in U.S. public schools and it is often framed as a uniformly positive, necessary, and racially neutral teaching practice (Wheeler and Swords 2006). Young (2009) points out that teachers are in fact often encouraged to avoid making connections between race and language when teaching their students to code-switch: Wheeler and Swords write that teachers should "refrain from referring to race when describing code-switching. It's not about race" (161). Advocates of teaching code-switching frame it as an "asset-based" alternative to "deficit approaches" to language teaching that focus on the "inadequacies" of nonstandard languages and language varieties (Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici, and Carpenter 2006). For proponents, the teaching of code-switching does not send students the message that nonstandard language varieties are inferior or "inadequate"—only that nonstandard language varieties are inappropriate for school contexts and prevent social mobility (Delpit 2006).

During the first four months of this project, the teacher participants and I spent a great deal of time discussing our relationships to language and to the language practices they taught and supported in their classrooms. In our collaborative work, the teacher participants and I focused on the idea of code-switching, a practice that all four teachers were required to teach in their classrooms. More specifically, across all four schools in which the teachers taught, their department chairs and/or school administrators required the teachers to teach their students—all students of color who spoke and wrote a variety of dialects and languages and had diverse linguistic repertoires—to code-switch to a "standard English" when speaking or writing in school.

In the context of this paper, then, I focus my analysis on the following question: *What raciolinguistic (Flores and Rosa 2015) ideologies were communicated and revealed through the teacher participants' talk about and teaching practices with regard to code-*

switching? In accordance PAR methodologies and approaches, the teachers and I co-constructed this question—as well as the broader research questions that situated this project and defined our work together. In the following section, I outline the traditions of research, data collection, and analysis as well as the research context of this project.

Methods

Traditions of Research

While this project draws on several traditions of qualitative research, it is most firmly rooted in a rich tradition of PAR and was therefore a collaborative effort with the four teacher participants. At its root, PAR is committed to "systematic inquiry that is collective, collaborative, self-reflective, [and] critical" and seeks to articulate new "philosoph[ies] of practice" (McCutcheon and Jung 1990:148); this commitment reflects the ethical and ideological roots of this study. While there are numerous approaches to collaborative or action research, the approach to PAR taken up here followed a tradition of critical educational research that promotes "self- and critical awareness about researchers' and participants' lived experiences" and "alliances between researchers and participants" (McIntyre 2003:28–29) and therefore reflects a tenet of this project: Teacher self-reflection and self-understanding are fundamental to constructing new understandings of Whiteness that might produce more equitable outcomes for students of color.

In many ways, however, the design of this study stands in contrast to traditional conceptions of PAR. PAR studies often emerge from within marginalized communities and are led by community "insiders" who seek to collaboratively transform or better understand some part of the communit(ies) to which they belong (Herr and Anderson 2015). This particular project differs from that norm in two significant ways:

First, I do not position the community of White teachers with whom this research was conducted as marginalized. Certainly I understand the subjectivities of the White women teachers with whom I worked as complex and multifaceted. White women teachers may experience marginalization even as they wield privilege—however, while Whiteness does not preclude identities that are marginalized or oppressed, it does always complicate and inform those identities (Frankenberg 1993). I therefore focused my work with White female teachers on their relationships to and engagement with their own Whiteness and the power that thus moved through them.

Second, this research project did not emerge organically from within a community of White women teachers. While the teachers and I co-constructed the specific research questions on which we focused, I did initiate the research group, facilitate our conversations when developing research questions, and suggested a specific research structure. At the same time, however, my own professional history (as a former teacher and White woman), my previous antiracist professional development work with White teachers at the schools at which I taught, and my ongoing work with (mostly White) preservice teachers spurred this project into action. The urgency I felt as a White woman teacher to better understand my own Whiteness—and the effects of my own developing understanding of that Whiteness on my classroom—was mirrored in the urgency I witnessed in the White women teachers with whom I worked on this project.

In many ways the methodological approach to this project sits at the intersection of numerous methodologies and traditions of research. However, I relied most fundamentally on PAR because of its unique commitment to understanding the potential of researchers' and the participants' collective exploration of shared a reality (Bergold and Thomas 2012; Erickson 2006; Kelly 2005; Kindon, Pain, and Kesby 2007)—in this case, of Whiteness. My own position as a White woman—and a former White teacher of students of color—was fundamental to my methodology, to the

relationships I was able to develop with the teachers, and, therefore, to the insights that we collectively developed.

In addition, this project is rooted in several complementary (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999) traditions of research—teacher inquiry (Campano, Ghiso, Yee, and Pantoja 2013; Lytle and Cochran-Smith 1992; Lytle 2008), critical qualitative research (Merriam 2009; Patton 2002), and poststructuralism (Lather 1992; Merriam 2009; Sondergaard 2002)—that served to deepen the approaches and perspectives that PAR offered. The research tradition of teacher inquiry allowed me to frame the teachers in this project as "knowers" and to center their processes of reflection and analysis (Campano, Ghiso, Yee, and Pantoja 2013; Lytle and Cochran-Smith 1992; Lytle 2008). At the same time, the traditions of poststructuralist and critical qualitative research allowed us to examine and engage with the complexities and impossibilities of "knowing" Whiteness and subjectivity (Utt and Tochluck 2016).

Research Design and Data Collection

Beginning in mid-August 2016, I began observing the four teacher participants weekly, spending one day each week in each teacher's classroom. In addition to weekly observations, I also engaged in weekly semistructured interviews with each teacher in which we debriefed and explored how the teacher was enacting her Whiteness in her classroom; weekly collaborative planning meetings with each teacher in which we discussed new strategies for teaching and engaging with Whiteness in the classroom; and biweekly (every two weeks) research group meetings with all four teachers in which we explored literature on Whiteness, discourse, and teacher subjectivity, discussed our developing understandings and teacher subjectivities, and generated new strategies for engaging with Whiteness and understanding the consequences of that engagement for our students of color (it is important to note that the strategies the teachers developed for engaging with Whiteness in their classrooms were not the focus of this particular analysis). I audio recorded all classroom observations, semistructured interviews and individual planning meetings with each teacher, and biweekly research group meetings with all teachers. In addition, I collected artifacts from each teacher's classrooms that spoke to the teachers' understandings of their Whiteness and collected artifacts from our research group meetings.

Data Analysis

PAR allows researchers to work in collaboration with research participants to engage in analysis—and, in many ways blurs the traditionally rigid lines between data collection and data analysis. In this study, regular group meetings allowed us to both generate new "data" (the transcripts of our group research meetings served as data and a source of new insight and exploration), even as we collaboratively analyzed data from classrooms (transcripts or anecdotes from the teachers' classrooms). In PAR, data analysis is in a recursive relationship with data collection: "The process is neither static nor completely under the researcher's control" (Herr and Anderson 2015:129). As a PAR researcher, then, my commitment was to the "spiraling synergism of action and understanding." (Herr and Anderson 2015:87).

The data gathered in this project was analyzed using critical discourse analysis (CDA), or to use a term that highlights the connection between analysis and theoretical orientation, Critical Discourse Studies (Flowerdew 2013). CDA draws explicitly from Foucault's (1982) poststructuralist understandings of discourse and power and is therefore uniquely suited to an analysis of power (Flowerdew 2013; Mills 1997). Discourse Analysis (DA) is concerned with discourse, a dynamic term that relies and builds on Foucault's conception of discourse as "A group of statements which provide a language for talking about … a particular topic at a particular historical moment" (Hall 2001:72). DA explores the relationship between an individual's talk, practice, and talk about that practice (Foucault 1971; Gee 1999;

Mills 1997). In addition, DA looks at the language(s) or ways of being that individuals avoid or experience as prohibited (Foucault 1971; Mills 1997).

CDA builds on the work of DA by paying particular attention to the ways in which power is negotiated through individuals' and communities' talk and practice (Flowerdew 2013; Rogers 2004). While some scholars rely on CDA to draw attention to and better understand the consequences of particular textual and grammatical features (Fairclough 2003; Flowerdew 2013), others rely on CDA to bring social and linguistic theories into critical conversation with each other (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; van Leeuwen 1996; Wodak 1996) so as to "uncover hidden assumptions," "debunk . . . claims to authority" and highlight the workings of power (Flowerdew 2013). In this particular analysis, the teacher participants and I focused our attention on the ways that Whiteness worked to protect itself through the teachers' language and talk about particular language practices.

The extent to which the teachers and I formally analyzed data together depended largely on the teachers' interest and varying availability across the months that we met. The teachers often chose to spend our group research meetings analyzing transcripts of interviews and meetings by engaging in open coding (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995) —and they often chose to spend that time developing new strategies and new vocabularies (not explored or addressed in this particular analysis) to talk about Whiteness in their classrooms. In many ways, either use of our time engaged with CDA in that we explored the themes and relationships that emerged across our talk about Whiteness and teacher subjectivity, our enactment of Whiteness and teacher subjectivity, and our talk about that enactment. Regardless of the formality of our analysis, our conversations explored the ways of talking about and practicing Whiteness that were present in—and absent from—our conversations and collaborative work.

In addition to collaborative analyses I also individually analyzed transcripts of our interviews, individual planning meetings, monthly collaborative meetings, and classroom observations and collected and analyzed artifacts from teachers' classrooms and from our collaborative meetings. In following the traditions of CDA to which I subscribed (Bloome et al. 2010; Dutro 2010; Stygall 2001), I focused my analysis on the links and discrepancies between language and the daily realities of teaching and Whiteness and the ways that power informed those links and discrepancies. As with many PAR studies, I presented whatever data I analyzed independently to the teacher participants in an effort to deepen, clarify, and complicate whatever insights I developed (Herr and Anderson 2015).

The teachers and I developed the coding scheme(s) on which we will relied—across both our collaborative analyses and my independent analyses—together. Over the course of our months together we open-coded text of their teaching, our one-on-one conversations, and our research group meetings and eventually moved to axial coding (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995) in order to further structure and organize our analyses. For instance, when examining transcripts of the participants' teaching and interactions with their students during our research meetings, the teachers and I developed the code "erasing difference" to indicate moments—several of which are analyzed in the "findings" section of this paper—when the teachers (or I) worked to erase, deny, or avoid acknowledging the ways in which our experiences, lives, subjectivities, or language practices as White women were different from those of our students. Eventually, we developed more specific codes to indicate the particular strategies through which we effectively worked to "erase difference" in and through our interactions with students. For example, we worked to identify moments when the teachers or I made "existential assumptions" or assumptions about students' realities in order to construct equivalencies (Fairclough 2003).

Participants and Context

The four teacher participants taught in four different high schools across two schools districts in Northern California. The demographics of the school districts

and high schools within which these women taught reflect the broader demographic trends of public education: White women teaching in majority-students-of-color classrooms (California Department of Education 2015). The participants taught different subjects and grade levels and brought different levels of teaching experience—and therefore allowed us to explore Whiteness across classroom contexts. Table 1 (below) summarizes the teacher participants' years of teaching experience and subject areas, as well as demographic information for their respective schools.

Findings

"No Way This isn't Racist"

In our initial research meetings, the teacher participants and I discussed the concepts of language, discourse, ideology, and Whiteness, and read excerpts from of a variety texts that explored these concepts: Applebaum (2010), DiAngelo (2012), Frankenberg

Table 1
Teacher participants' years of experience, subject areas, and school demographic information[2]

Name	School name/type	Schools demographics		Subject and grade	# of years taught
Emma	9th–12th grade public high school	37% Black 35% Asian 23% Hispanic 2% Filipino 2% White 1% Pacific Islander	88% Free/ Reduced Lunch 22% English Language Learner	10th grade History	9 years
Kylie	9th–12th grade public high school	82.2% Hispanic 7.3% Black 5.8% Asian 1.6% Filipino 2.2% White .7% Pacific Islander .1% American Indian	86% Free/ Reduced Lunch 66.5% English Language Learner	11th and 12th grade Leadership	6 years
Amy	K–12th grade public charter school	81% Hispanic 12% Black 3% Asian 2% White 1% Two or more races 1% Filipino	84% Free/ Reduced Lunch 61% English Language Learner	10th grade Humanities	4 years
Kim	9th–12th grade public charter high school	91% Hispanic 6% Black 2% Asian	95% Free/ Reduced Lunch 22% English Language Learner	9th grade English	1 year

(1993, 1997), Gee (1998), Hall (1996, 2001), Leonardo (2009), Lipsitz (1998), Thompson (2010), Flores and Rosa (2015), and Baldwin (1979). During our third research meeting, we read excerpts from articles by Flores and Rosa (2015) and Baldwin (1979). These excerpts called into question the belief that assuming particular linguistic practices—speaking in a standard English, for example—necessarily alters the ways a person of color is heard or treated by a "white listening subject." In other words, the authors argue that language and race are intertwined and question the assumption that "modifying the linguistic practices of racialized speaking subjects is key to eliminating racial hierarchies" (Flores and Rosa 2015:155).

The teacher participants expressed uniform discomfort and uneasiness with the expectation that they teach their students to code-switch—and their discomfort was a frequent topic of conversation in both our research meetings and individual interviews. The teachers expressed a distinct concern with the impact of a White female teacher—and speaker of a racialized standard English—insisting that their students of color speak and write in particular ways and policing their students' language practices.

It is important to note that while the teacher participants engaged deeply with the particular concerns addressed in the Flores and Rosa (2015) and Baldwin (1979) excerpts, their concerns were slightly different (although intersecting). The Flores and Rosa and Baldwin excerpts focused on the false assumption that teaching students of color to employ particular language practices would alter the ways that a student is heard or treated by a "white listening subject." In other words, the authors argue that race and language practices are mutually constitutive. The teacher participants, however, in many ways extended these authors' arguments, by pointing out that race and language are entangled not only in language use but in the teaching of particular language practices. In other words, the teachers were more concerned with the consequences of a White teacher reproducing violent power dynamics by teaching students of color to speak in ways that mirrored the White teacher's perception of her own speech.

For instance, during the research meeting when we read the Flores and Rosa (2015) and Baldwin (1979) excerpts, Amy shared concerns that when teaching students to "code-switch" White teachers are inevitably building on a history of White people shaming and policing the language practices of people of color: "It's so sad … No matter what we do, on some level White teachers are saying you're talking ghetto, stop. Stop being uncivilized. Not in so many words but basically that" (9/18/16). Similarly, Emma expressed deep concerns about a White teacher teaching her students of color to write and talk "specific ways": "All [students] see is their White teacher teaching them a specific way to speak and be. I think the damage that does is so significant. There's no way this isn't racist when we do that" (9/18/16).

For Emma and Amy—and for the other teacher participants—their identities as a White women complicated the act of teaching students of color to code-switch, or to speak in particular ways in specific contexts. Many White teachers qualify their arguments for code-switching by saying that students only needed to learn standard English so that they can change the systems that demanded rigid language practices in the first place (Delpit 2006; Flores and Rosa 2015). However, for Kylie, Amy, Kim, and Emma, this qualification did not absolve the situation of its racist undertones and history. Rather, the teacher participants framed White teachers teaching students of color to alter their language practices as deeply racialized and perpetuating racialized harm—regardless of the justification.

Racialized Ideological Tropes

For the teacher participants, teaching code-switching as a White teacher was a tricky business. During our research meetings and interviews, the teachers expressed deep concerns with the racist patterns reproduced when they taught their students of color to code-switch and spoke regularly about the "racist consequences" of teaching particular language practices to students of color as White women. At the same time,

however, all four teachers held and enforced consistent expectations that their students code-switch when speaking or writing in school.

In each of their respective school sites, Amy, Kim, Kylie, and Emma were expected to teach and enforce "code-switching" in their classrooms by school administrations. According to Kim, for instance, teaching code-switching was "basically considered a standard" at her school (9/18/16). Similarly, for Amy, teachers "absolutely have to teach code-switching. That's just assumed" (9/18/16). At the same time, however, all four teachers regularly resisted many of the expectations or demands of their administrations within the confines of their own classrooms. Both Amy and Kim, for example, refused to enforced school policies dictating that teachers never accept any "late" student work (assignments turned in after the deadline). Similarly, both Emma and Kylie regularly deviated from the curriculum that they were required to follow in their classrooms, adding or removing entire texts and giving students much more control over the content and structure of the assignments they completed. As Amy put it, "There are lots of rules I don't follow. Things the school says I'm supposed to do that I just don't do" (11/15/16). As a result, the teachers' choices to continue to enforce code-switching rules in their classrooms, were rather remarkable—especially in the face or their insights concerning the potentially "racist" consequences of teaching code-switching as White women.

In analyzing the teacher participants' choices to continue teaching "code-switching" and, more specifically, the justifications they offered to students and to each other for those choices, I found that the teacher participants relied on two ideological tropes in the context of their teaching: 1) The teachers focused exclusively on what they believed their students of color "needed" to know—not on what they imagined students might "need" to learn given the racialized identities of their White teachers; and 2) The teachers relied on their own language practices and experiences to inform how they thought and talked about language with their students—and in doing so erased the impact of their Whiteness and denied the mutually constitutive relationship between race and language. I explore each of these ideological tropes below.

What Students of Color "Need" to Know

Despite their stated concerns about teaching code-switching as White teachers, all four teacher participants explicitly taught students to code-switch into a standard English in their classrooms. Amy, for instance, told students that when making presentations to the class they needed to "speak proper, speak formally" (10/11/16). Kim regularly told her students that they needed to use "formal English in [their] writing" (9/12/16). When I asked the teachers about this practice during our research meetings, they each talked about the ways that they understood code-switching as "necessary" for their students:

Kylie If students want to ascend to a place in power where they can actually enact change they have to learn how to play the game. They have to modify the way they speak in order to eliminate the racial hierarchies because they have to get to a place of power to make change. (9/22/16)

Kim If a student wants to go to college and they're a student of color and they have to take the ACT and write an essay, they have to write in academic white language in order to do that. That's just an example. They need to do that in order to achieve their goal and right now the way the system is set up there's not a way around that for my 9th graders who want to go to college. They're going to have to write that essay ... Writing in this way isn't to make yourself a better person or to make you smarter but to weave your way into this system and give you some agency in the situation. You have to play by these rules so that then you can kinda change the rules once you've gotten there. (8/31/16)

AMY Teachers are preparing students for college and if students use this language in college then they're gonna be seen as a low income student. We don't want to silence students but we need to prepare them for the job market and college. (9/18/16)

In reflecting on and justifying their teaching practices, the teachers talked exclusively about what they believed their students of color needed to know and be able to do in order to "make change," "go to college," or be prepared "for the job market." In other words, the teachers relied on common (Delpit 2006; Flores and Rosa 2015) justifications for teaching code switching to students of color—justifications that draw on teachers' beliefs and assumptions about their students' "needs." In relying on these assumptions, however, the teachers largely ignored the impact of their own Whiteness on their students' learning experiences. The teachers focused exclusively on what they believed their students of color needed—not on what they believed students of color might need from White teachers. In other words, in focusing on the importance of students *learning* to code-switch, the teachers erased their own racialized role and effect as White teachers in *teaching* students of color to code-switch. The teachers argued only that their students needed to know how to code-switch—not that they, as White women, could teach their students to do so without causing "harm" or "violence." In so doing, teachers avoided engaging with the ways in which (they had previously argued) it would be harmful for White women to teach students of color particular ways to speak and write.

"I Was the Same as You"

All four of the teachers regularly referenced their own language experiences and practices when teaching and talking about language with their students. More specifically, the teachers referenced their own experiences as justifications for code-switching and for teaching code-switching in their classrooms. For instance, in the following exchange with her student, Joel, Amy explicitly references her own experiences and connects those experiences to those of her students. The following exchange took place in the context of a larger conversation in which Amy explained to her students that she wanted them to be conscious of their language choices in their upcoming presentations and speak as if they were "in a college class and have poise and know what [they] are talking about":

Amy So Joel I heard what you were saying that tension of having to speak in a certain way to make people listen to me, right? In high school I was the same as you. I was like, I'm gonna talk how I want, the way I talk to my friends. It's different than what my teacher was expecting which was this-okay learn little Amy! Learn to speak in academics, in an academic way! And I was just like hmmm, no!

Joel But we really don't speak like that our whole life.

Amy No! Absolutely not!

Joel So then why-

Amy Do you think I- the same way that I present at a conference is the way that I speak to my friends? No.

Joel You always be talkin' like that. I don't know about that.

Amy That's cute that you think that-

Joel I'm just sayin! (10/11/16)

In the above exchange, Amy describes her own reaction when told, as a young White woman, to shift her speech away from the way she spoke with her friends to a

more formal "academic way". For Amy, this experience connects to the ways she imagines Joel—and other students—feel when she tells them to give their presentations as if they are "in a college class." Joel, however, questions this connection by pointing out that he imagines Amy's language when speaking with her friends as quite similar to the way she speaks "at a conference" or the way she spoke when in school as a young person.

In vehemently denying Joel's point, Amy ignores a fundamental way in which her experiences differ from those of her students: Amy ignores the ways that her position as a White woman means that whatever variation(s) of English she speaks or spoke, her language practices are always coded as "appropriate"—and even "standard" (Flores and Rosa 2015). As a result, the shift in language she was asked to make as a child was limited and did not require a shift in the power-laden and racialized ways that she was perceived or received by the world. In other words, in denying Joel's point and in equating her experiences with those of her students, Amy denies the ways that her identity as a White woman shaped and shapes her linguistic experiences and the ways that she relates to the experience of code-switching.

Similarly, in the exchange below, Kylie spoke to her students about her reasons for asking them to code-switch to a standard English in their writing and speaking in school. Throughout the beginning weeks of the school year, students had questioned Kylie's insistence on particular language choices and practices, often asking Kylie to explain why she believed it was important for students to write and speak in standard English. On an early morning in October, Nancy, a student who self-identified as Latina, raised her hand:

Nancy Why do we have to write that way in our essays? Why can't we write how we write?

Kylie Well some people expect you to speak in a certain way to prove that you've got it together. And me too, right? I do not go to our school board meetings and talk to them in the way that I would talk to my colleagues. Like, I have to know how to navigate it, too (10/12/16).

In this exchange, which took place while Kylie stood at the front of the class fielding a variety of students' questions about their upcoming writing assignment, Kylie equated her own experiences as a White woman teacher shifting her language—and the logics behind those shifts—with the experiences and logics of her students of color. In invoking the phrase "me too, right?" Kylie seemed to want to make her students see her experiences as similar to their own.

Just like Amy, Kylie drew on her own experiences and logics to justify the language practices that she enforced with her students. Kylie's apparent logic for shifting her language practices—which she does not explicitly articulate—indexes ideas about professionalism, legitimacy, and credibility (Fairclough 2003): Kylie implies that in shifting her own language practices she communicated that she had "it together" and therefore buffered her own credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of the school board.

While Kylie may have perceived shifts in her language practices as legitimizing a "professional" identity or appearance when speaking "to the school board" she ignored the role of her own Whiteness in securing that perception. In other words, Kylie ignored the ways in which her Whiteness always afforded and protected a perceived "professionalism" and legitimacy while her students' racialized subjectivities often precluded such perceptions—regardless of language practices (Flores and Rosa 2015). In other words, Kylie ignored the ways that her students' experiences as people of color fundamentally shifted the ways that they were heard and experiences by others—just as Amy and Kylie's experiences as White women fundamentally determined the ways that they were heard and experiences by others (Flores and Rosa 2015).

Discussion

These findings allow us to see the ways in which these White teachers' embodied understandings of the relationship between race and language—and between Whiteness and language, more specifically—allowed them to justify enacting a practice that they otherwise labeled as "racist." In our conversations, Amy, Emma, Kylie, and Kim expressed insight into the ways that race and language were co-constructed in their classrooms and in the world. In fact, all four teachers talked explicitly about the impact of their own Whiteness on the language practices they believed they should enforce in their classroom: Amy, Emma, Kylie, and Kim all articulated a belief that their Whiteness meant that teaching students of color to code-switch could be violent and "damag[ing]." And yet, all four teachers resisted embodying those insights in their classrooms and reverted to language teaching practices that belied their understanding of the effects of Whiteness and race on teaching and language.

Certainly there are a variety of reasons that Amy, Emma, Kylie, and Kim choose to continue teaching students to code-switch in their classrooms (at least during the period of time described in this paper) despite their insights into the harm that this might do. The teachers' school contexts and the pressure they received from school administration, fellow teachings, and looming high-stakes testing were perhaps all contributing factors. However, regardless of their complex reasons for continuing to teach code-switching, the teachers relied on specific racialized tropes in order to justify that pedagogical choice to their students and to our research group.

The teachers justified—to both their students and to our research group—their decisions to continue teaching students of color to code-switch by relying on ideological tropes rooted in a belief that language and race are separate: that both the experience of shifting one's language and consequences of those shifts are uniform and aracial, and that the racialized subjectivities of the people enforcing and enacting particular language practices are irrelevant.

Undergirding these racialized ideological tropes, Whiteness itself served as barrier to embodying a critically conscious language teaching practice. Whiteness protects and maintains itself though its positioning as neutral and invisible—the "invizibilized norm against which difference is measure and constructed" (Lipsitz 1998). For the White teachers in this study to embody a pedagogical language practice in which the entangling of race and language were acknowledged, they would have had to violate the constructed "invisibility" of Whiteness within their classrooms: The teachers would have had to enact an understanding that Whiteness had profound consequences and effects for language teaching and learning and for the particular language teaching and language practices that they might take up in their classrooms. In other words, Whiteness itself worked to prevent teachers from enacting alternative language teaching in classrooms by preventing the White teacher participants from transforming their abstract understanding of the effects of Whiteness into profoundly necessary and possible pedagogical alternatives. If, as Thompson (2010), Frankenberg (1993), and Applebaum (2010) argue, Whiteness is always in the process of remaking and preserving itself, then the teachers' commitment to justifying teaching practices they deemed "racist" was itself a site of that preservation and remaking.

In our ongoing conversations about the perspectives shared in this analysis, Amy, Emma, Kylie, and Kim expressed concerns about the ways they struggled to disrupt Whiteness "at work" (Yoon 2012) in their pedagogical and language choices and meaning-making—even and especially in the face of their critical understandings about the effects and consequences of Whiteness. In discussing the analyses explicated in this paper, the teacher participants understood their justifications of teaching code-switching—in the face of their own insights into the raciolinguistic realities within classrooms—as a sign of their own "tethering" to Whiteness. In a recent meeting, Amy expressed concern that Whiteness "limits our belief in

alternative realities … especially in our ability to bring those realities into our classrooms" because it prevents us from understanding and visualizing the "consequences of Whiteness on all parts of our lives, our language, our pedagogies" (1/14/17).

Conclusion

This analysis represents a snapshot in time: An explication of the ways that Whiteness functioned in and through Amy, Kylie, Kim, and Emma's language teaching and talk about that teaching over a period of four months. Similarly, this analysis provides a snapshot of the ways that these White women teachers thought about, made sense of, and recognized their classrooms and language teaching as sites at which Whiteness continued to "work" (Yoon 2012). The four teacher participants in this project continue to make new and different choices in their classrooms—particularly with regard to the language practices, language expectations, and language teaching that they take up. In other words, the insights shared here are a piece of a larger story, still unfolding. The eventual decisions that the White teachers in this project made and continue to make with regard to teaching (or not teaching) code-switching are in some ways tangential to this project. The goal of this paper has not been to support or reject a particular language teaching practice, but rather to frame Whiteness and racialized subjectivities as fundamental to the logics and consequences behind all language teaching practices (Daniels and Varghese in revision), and to question the ideologies that falsely separate race and language. Analysis of the insights offered by the White teacher participants keep us from artificially neutralizing any language practices and direct us toward the very ideologies that support such false interpretations.

Amy's insights into Whiteness as a force that "limits our belief in alternative realities" as well as our ability to embody "those realities" in classrooms (1/14/17) speaks to the ways that Whiteness continues to live and preserve itself in classrooms through White teachers. White teachers' language teaching classrooms are in many ways laboratories for explorations of the intersections of Whiteness and language; these classrooms are sites at which Whiteness works to preserve itself through language teaching. Our ability to disrupt the preservation of Whiteness rests on our commitment to exploring, understanding, and interrupting the racialized tropes that protect particular language teaching practices—like the teaching of code-switching—from critical scrutiny.

Notes

1. Throughout this paper, I capitalize both "White" and "Whiteness." While there is little consensus regarding capitalization in the fields of Whiteness Studies or Critical Race Theory, I capitalize both these words in order to highlight their (often invisible) role in shaping White individuals' and communities' identities—and their profound effects on individuals and communities of color.

2. The demographic information provided is a contested, overly simplistic, inadequate, and artificially static representation. Students' racial or linguistic identities cannot be captured in a series of percentages nor can these percentages represent any of the complex and dynamic ways in which race and language were reproduced and contested in the teacher participants' classrooms. In addition, these numbers do not capture any of the other identities—gendered, religious, etc.—that students brought to class. Nonetheless, I rely on these insufficient and often marginalizing labels in order to provide an—artificial—snapshot of a few of the experiences and subjectivities embodied in the teacher participants' classrooms.

References

Alim, H. Samy. 2005. "Critical Language Awareness in the United States: Revisiting Issues and Revising Pedagogies in a Resegregated Society." *Educational Researcher* 34(7): 24–31.

Aneja, Geeta. 2016. "(Non)native Speakered: Rethinking (Non)nativeness and Teacher Identity in TESOL Teacher Education." *TESOL Quarterly* 50(3): 1–20.
Applebaum, Barbara. 2010. *Being White, Being Good: White Complicity, White Moral Responsibility, and Social Justice Pedagogy*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
Baldwin, James. 1979, July 29. "If Black English Isn't a Language, Then Tell Me, What is?" *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/03/29/specials/baldwin-english.html.
Bartky, Sandra L. 2002. *"Sympathy and Solidarity" and Other Essays*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
Bergold, Jarg, and Stefan Thomas. 2012. "Participatory Research Methods: A Methodological Approach in Motion." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 13(1).
Bloome, David, Stephanie Power Carter, Beth Morton Christian, Sheila Otto, and Nora Shuart-Faris. 2010. *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events: A Microethnographic Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Tyrone A. Forman. 2000. "'I Am Not a Racist But. . .': Mapping White College Students' Racial Ideology in the USA." *Discourse and Society* 11(1): 50–85.
Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. "The Whiteness of Nerds: Superstandard English and Racial Markedness." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 84–100.
California Department of Education. 2015. *Fingertip Facts on Education in California*. CalEdFacts. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts
Campano, Gerald, Maria P. Ghiso, Mary Yee, and Alicia Pantoja. 2013. "Toward Community Research and Coalitional Literacy Practices for Educational Justice." *Language Arts* 90(5): 314–326.
Case, Kim, and Annette Hemmings. 2005. "Distancing Strategies: White Women Preservice Teachers and Anti-Racist Curriculum." *Urban Education* 40(6): 606–626.
Charity-Hudley, Anne H., and Christine Mallinson. 2014. *We Do Language: English Language Variation in the Secondary English Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Chouliaraki, Lilie, and Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Chubbuck, Sharon M. 2004. "Whiteness Enacted, Whiteness Disrupted: The Complexity of Personal Congruence." *American Educational Research Journal* 41(2): 301–333.
Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan L. Lytle. 1999. "The Teacher Research Movement: A Decade Later." *Educational Researcher* 28(7): 15–25.
Daniels, J. R., and Manka Varghese (in revision). "Troubling Practice: Teacher Subjectivity and Practice-Based Teacher Education." Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Davila, Bethany. 2012. "Indexicality and 'Standard' Edited American English: Examining the Link between Conceptions of Standardness and Perceived Authorial Identity." *Written Communication* 29(2): 180–207.
Delpit, Lisa. 2006. *Other People's Children: Culture Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
DiAngelo, Robin. 2012. "Nothing to Add: A Challenge to White Silence in Racial Discussions." *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege* 2(1): 4–17.
DiAngelo, Robin, and Oslem Sensoy. 2012. "Getting Slammed: White Depictions of Race Discussions as Arenas of Violence." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 17(1): 1–26.
Dickar, Maryann. 2000. "Teaching in Our Underwear: The Liabilities of Whiteness in the Multicultural Classroom." In *Freireian Pedagogy, Praxis, and Possibilities: Projects for the New Millennium*, edited by Stanley Steiner, H. Mark Krank, Peter McLaren, and Robert Bahruth. New York: Falmer Press.
Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Paul Rabinow. 1982. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Du Bois, W. E. B. 1995. *The Souls of Black folk*. New York: Signet Classic.
Dutro, Elizabeth. 2010. "What 'Hard Times' Means: Mandated Curricula, Class Privileged Assumptions, and the Lives of Poor Children." *Research in the Teaching of English* 44(3): 255–292.
Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Erickson, Frederick. 2006. "Studying Side by Side: Collaborative Action Ethnography in Educational Research." In *Innovations in Educational Ethnography*, edited by George Spindler and Lorie Hammond, 235–257. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge.

Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. "Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolingusitic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2): 149–172.
Flowerdew, John. 2013. *Discourse in English Language Education*. New York: Routledge.
Foster, John D. 2013. *White Race Discourse: Preserving Racial Privilege in a Post-Racial Society*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
Foucault, Michel. 1972. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Vintage Books.
———. 1982. *The Archaeology of Knowledge: And the Discourse on Language*. New York: Vintage Books.
Frankenberg, Ruth. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. 1997. "Introduction: Local Whitenesses, Locating Whiteness." In *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, edited by Ruth Frankenberg. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Garvey, Marcus. 2004. "Hon. Marcus Garvey Tells of Interview with the Ku Klux Klan." In *Selected Writings and Speeches of Marcus Garvey*, edited by Bob Blaisdell. Mineola, NY: Dover Books.
Gee, James P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
Godley, Amanda, Julie Sweetland, Rebecca S. Wheeler, Angela Minnici, and D. Brian. 2006. "Preparing Teachers for Dialectically Diverse Classrooms." *Educational Researcher* 35(8): 30–37.
Hall, Stuart. 1996. "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay, 1–17. London: Sage.
———. 2001. "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse." In *Discourse Theory and Practice: Reader*, edited by Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J Yates. London: Sage.
Haviland, Victoria S. 2008. "'Things Get Glossed Over': Rearticulating the Silencing Power of Whiteness in Education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 59(1): 40–54.
Herr, Kathryn, and Gary Anderson. 2015. *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty*. London: Sage.
Hill, Jane H. 2008. *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
Jupp, James C., Theodorea R. Berry, and Timothy J. Lensmire. 2016. "Second-Wave White Teacher Identity Studies: A Review of White Teacher Identity Literatures from 2004 through 2014." *Review of Research in Education* 86(4): 1151–1191.
Kamwangamalu, Nkonko. 2010. "Multilingualism and Codeswitching in Education." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, edited by Nancy Hornberger and Sandra Lee McKay, 116–142. New York: Multilingual Matters.
Kelly, P. J. 2005. "Practice Suggestions for Community Interventions Using Participatory Action Research." *Public Health Nursing* 22(1): 65–73.
Kindon, Sara, Rachel Pain, and Mike Kesby, eds. 2007. *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place*. New York: Routledge.
Kroskrity, Paul V. 2006. "Language Ideologies." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by Alessandro Duranti, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Kubota, Ryuko. 2010. "Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Writing: Contrastive Rhetoric." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, edited by Nancy Hornberger and Sandra Lee McKay, 265–289. New York: Multilingual Matters.
Lather, Patti. 1992. "Critical Frames in Educational Research: Feminist and Post-Structural Perspectives." *Theory into Practice* 31(2): 87–99.
Leeman, Jennifer. 2005. "Engaging Critical Pedagogy: Spanish for Native Speakers." *Foreign Language Annals* 38(1): 35–45.
Lensmire, Timothy. 2017. "Ambivalent White Racial Identities: Fear and an Elusive Innocence." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 13(2): 159–172.
Leonardo, Zeus. 2004. "The Color of Supremacy: Beyond the Discourse of 'White Privilege.'" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 36(2): 137–152.
———. 2009. *Race, Whiteness, and Education*. New York: Routledge.
Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
Lipsitz, George. 1998. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Benefit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Lytle, Susan L. 2008. "At Last: Practitioner Inquiry and the Practice of Teaching: Some Thoughts on *Better*." *Journal for Research in the Teaching of English* 42(3): 373–379.

Lytle, Susan L., and M. Marilyn Cochran-Smith. 1992. "Teacher Research as a Way of Knowing." *Harvard Educational Review* 62(4): 447–475.
Martinez, Ramon Antonio. 2013. "Reading the World in *Spanglish*: Hybrid Language Practices and Ideological Contestation in a Sixth-grade English Language Arts Classroom." *Linguistics and Education* 24(3): 276–288.
Marx, Sherri. 2006. *Revealing the Invisible: Confronting Passive Racism in Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge.
McCutcheon, Gail, and Burga Jung. 1990. "Alternative Perspectives in Action Research." *Theory into Practice* 29(3): 144–151.
McIntyre, Alice. 1997. *Making Meaning of Whiteness: Exploring Racial Identity with White Teachers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
———. 2002. "Exploring Whiteness and Multicultural Education with Prospective Teachers." *Curriculum Inquiry* 32(1): 31–49.
———. 2003. "Participatory Action Research and Urban Education." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 36(1): 28–39.
Merriam, Sharan B. 2009. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Mills, Charles. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Mills, Sara. 1997. *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*. New York: Routledge.
Morrison, Toni. 1992. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. New York: Vintage Books.
National Center for Educational Statistics. 2015. *Race/ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
Paris, Django. 2012. "Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Chance in Stance, Terminology, and Practice." *Educational Researcher* 41(3): 93–97.
Patton, Michael Q. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Picower, Bree. 2009. "The Unexamined Whiteness of Teaching: How White Teachers Maintain and Enact Dominant Racial Ideologies." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 12(2): 197–215.
Powell, R. 1997. "Then the Beauty Emerges: A Longitudinal Case Study of Culturally Responsive Teaching." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 13(5): 467–484.
Pruitt, Linda P. 2004. "The Achievement (K)not: Whiteness and 'Black Underachievement.'" In *Off White: Readings on Power, Privilege, and Resistance*, edited by Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda Powell Pruitt, and April Burns, 235–244. New York: Routledge.
Roediger, David. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness*. London: Verso.
Rogers, Rebecca, ed. 2004. *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. New York: Routledge.
Rosa, Jonathan. 2015. "Racializing Language, Regimenting Latinas/os: Chronotope, Social Tense, and American Raciolinguistic Futures." *Language and Communication* 46: 106–117.
———. 2016. "Standardization, Racialization, Languagelessness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies across Communicative Contexts." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 26(2): 162–183.
Roth-Gordon, Jennifer. 2011. "Discipline and Disorder in the Whiteness of Mock Spanish." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(2): 211–229.
Seidl, Barbara L., and Stephen D. Hancock. 2011. "Acquiring Double Images: White Preservice Teachers Locating Themselves in a Raced World." *Harvard Educational Review* 81(4): 687–709.
Sleeter, Christine. 2008. "Preparing White Teachers for Diverse Students." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts*, edited by Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, and D. John McIntyre, 559–582. New York: Routledge.
Sondergaard, Dorte Marie. 2002. "Poststructuralist Approaches to Empirical Analysis." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 15(2): 187–204.
Stoler, Ann L. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Stygall, Gail. 2001. "A Different Class of Witnesses: Experts in the Courtroom." *Discourse Studies* 3(3): 327–349.
Thompson, Audrey. 2010. "Reading Black Philosophers in Chronological Order." In *The Center Must Not Hold: White Women Philosophers on the Whiteness of Philosophy*, edited by George Yancy, 27–50. Plymouth, UK: Lexington.
Ullucci, Kerri. 2012. "Knowing We Are White: Narrative as Critical Praxis." *Teaching Education* 23(1): 89–107.
Utt, Jamie, and Shelly Tochluk. 2016. "White Teacher, Know Thyself: Improving Anti-Racist Praxis through Racial Identity Development." *Urban Education*, 1–28.

Van Leeuwen, Theo. 1996. "The Representation of Social Actors." In *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, 32–70. London: Routledge.
Wheeler, Rebecca S., and Rachel Swords. 2006. *Code-Switching: Teaching Standard English in Urban Classrooms*. National Council of Teachers of English.
White, Edie. 2012. *Whiteness and Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge.
Wodak, Ruth. 1996. *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.
Yoon, Irene. 2012. "The Paradoxical Nature of Whiteness-at-Work in the Daily Life of Schools and Teacher Communities." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15(5): 587–613.
Young, Vershawn. 2009. "Nah, We Straight: An Argument against Code-Switching." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 29(1–2): 49–77.