



Addressing Tensions in Textual Voice Construction

Marcela Ossa-Parra

Queens College - CUNY, marcela.ossaparra@qc.cuny.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.library.fordham.edu/jmer>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ossa-Parra, Marcela () "Addressing Tensions in Textual Voice Construction," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 12, Article 2.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5422/jmer/2022-2023.v12.39-56>

Available at: <https://research.library.fordham.edu/jmer/vol12/iss1/2>

This Article on Theory and Research is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Fordham Research Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multilingual Education Research by an authorized editor of Fordham Research Commons. For more information, please contact considine@fordham.edu, bkilee@fordham.edu.



Addressing Tensions in Textual Voice Construction

Cover Page Footnote

Acknowledgement:

Support for this project was provided by the Faculty Fellowship Publication Program sponsored by the Office of the Dean for Recruitment and Diversity of The City University of New York.

Author:

Marcela Ossa-Parra, PhD, is a Colombian teacher educator working as an Assistant Professor in the Elementary and Early Childhood Education Department at Queens College–City University of New York. She holds a PhD in Curriculum and Instruction from Boston College. She teaches bilingual education, literacy, and social foundations courses. Her research examines the relationship between identity, language, and literacy to inform the design of curriculum and instruction that centers and expands students' voices. Her studies have been published in *TESOL Quarterly*, the *Journal of Education*, and the *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*. She can be contacted at mossaparra@qc.cuny.edu.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5056-3704>

Addressing Tensions in Textual Voice Construction of Minoritized Students

Marcela Ossa-Parra

Queens College – CUNY

Guiding historically minoritized students in their textual voice construction entails navigating the tensions between these white-dominant monolingual voices and the diverse voices they bring to the classroom. This conceptual paper presents an ecological voice-construction process model that sheds light on how writers negotiate external and internal expectations in their writing. These expectations are derived from the political, sociocultural, dialogic, and personal contexts in which voice construction is situated. The model establishes four interrelated processes for negotiating textual voice corresponding to each context: negotiating power relations and ideologies, entering the conversation, engaging the reader, and connecting with the self. This model contributes as a reflection tool aiding writing instructors and researchers in identifying the voice-construction processes that they privilege in their instruction and considering how to address the tensions between socializing students in the academic genres and creating opportunities for innovation that center students' cultural and linguistic knowledge. Ultimately, this model provides a framework for designing integrated content and writing instruction that stimulates historically minoritized students to leverage all their cultural, linguistic, and experiential resources to construct authentic and authoritative textual voices that respond to and talk back to the expectations and conventions of the genre.

Keywords: voice, multilingual, SFL, undergraduate, writing instruction

Voice is a valued yet elusive feature in writing instruction. While researchers have questioned its explicit instruction since the concept of voice is hard to define and measure (e.g., Elbow, 2007), there is an increased awareness of its relevance in writing instruction for historically minoritized students (Canagarajah & Matsumoto, 2017; Zacharias, 2020). By historically minoritized students, I refer to multilingual and multi-dialectical students of color whose language practices and ways of knowing have been traditionally silenced in school contexts. The concept of textual voice captures how authors construct identities that respond to the diverse contexts in and for which their texts are produced (Matsuda, 2015). In this sense, authors make their textual voices in relation to the political, sociocultural, dialogic, and personal contexts in which their texts are situated (Tardy, 2012).

Textual voice construction in school contexts has privileged white-dominant norms defined in the academic genres (Chavez, 2021). Guiding historically minoritized students in their textual voice construction entails navigating the tensions between these white-dominant monolingual voices and the diverse voices they bring to the classroom. Bakhtin (1981) characterized these tensions as the forces of two different voices—the dominant and the alter—pulling in different directions. The dominant voice exerts a unifying and centralizing force aimed at ensuring compliance with academic genres. It establishes boundaries that demarcate what voices are heard and valued. The alter voice, also labeled as heteroglossia, exists in the margins of those boundaries, and exerts a diversifying force. The unifying forces of the dominant discourse and diversifying forces of heteroglossia are always in tension with each other.

These tensions manifest in distinct writing pedagogies for historically minoritized students, such as genre-based (Brisk, 2015; Harman, 2018) and translingual antiracist (Báez & Carlo, 2021; Chavez, 2021; Seltzer, 2019) pedagogies. Building on the notion of Third Space (Gutiérrez, 2008), I argue that the tensions in supporting historically minoritized students in their voice construction may be addressed by adopting an ecological perspective that integrates the interactions between the diverse contexts in which their textual voices are situated. In this conceptual paper, I propose an ecological textual voice construction process model that captures the situated nature of voice construction and synthesizes these pedagogical approaches. I derived this model from an action research study on integrated content and writing instruction in an undergraduate Social Foundations of Education course integrating content and writing instruction. In this course, I have sought to guide my students in building authoritative and authentic voices in their argumentative essays.

The proposed model is ecological because it situates voice construction in the political, sociocultural, dialogic, and personal contexts in which texts are produced (Tardy, 2012). In addition, it establishes four interrelated processes for negotiating textual voice in these different contexts: (1) negotiating power relations and ideologies—addresses the political context; (2) entering the conversation—addresses the sociocultural context; (3) engaging the reader—addresses the dialogic context; and (4) connecting with the self—addresses the personal context. Finally, the model synthesizes translingual antiracist (Baez & Carlo, 2021; Chavez, 2021; Seltzer, 2019) and genre-based pedagogical approaches (Brisk, 2015; Harman, 2018), which have each privileged different contexts of voice construction.

With this model, I seek to address the tensions between the unifying and centralizing forces of the academic genres and the innovative forces that students bring to the classroom. Addressing these tensions entails acknowledging their existence and building awareness of how the different contexts in which texts are situated shape authors' voices. The proposed model serves as a framework for recognizing the different forces shaping the process of building an authoritative and authentic textual voice. Furthermore, this model informs the design of integrated content and writing instruction that invites historically minoritized students to leverage their cultural, linguistic, and experiential resources to respond to and talk back to the expectations and conventions of academic genres.

I first provide a theoretical context for the proposed model, which discusses the conceptualization of textual voice construction and its relationship to identity. This theoretical context also includes the pedagogical approaches informing the ecological textual voice construction process model. After this, I present the model with an illustration of how it deepened the understanding of my pedagogical decisions in the undergraduate Social Foundations of Education course integrating content and writing instruction. Implications for practice and research on textual voice construction in integrated content-writing instruction follow this.

Textual Voice as a Negotiated Identity

Current conceptions of identity in written discourse draw on sociocultural approaches that view identity as socially situated and negotiated in interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Gee, 2012). Rather than an inherent characteristic of the author's ideas or style, textual voice is conceived as a discursively and dialogically constructed identity that comprises textual and non-textual features and is ultimately perceived by the reader (Matsuda, 2015). Textual features include the linguistic and multimodal resources authors use to present their ideas, interact with their audience, and organize and design their texts. Non-textual features capture how authors negotiate different identity positions (e.g., ascribed social categories and roles taken up in the text) and their experiences as they make linguistic and discursive choices for their texts (Canagarajah, 2015).

The reader plays a crucial role in textual voice construction, since, as they engage with the text, they construct their own interpretation of the writer's textual voice (Matsuda, 2015; Sperling & Appleman, 2011; Tardy, 2012). As Matsuda (2015) establishes, "The writer's identity does not singularly reside in the writer, the text, or the reader; rather, identity is part of the interpersonal meaning that is negotiated through the interaction among the writer and the reader mediated by the text" (p. 145). The interactions between the writer, the reader, and the text are situated in the four embedded contexts mentioned before (personal, dialogic, sociocultural, and political). These contexts shape authors' choices regarding how they draw from textual and non-textual features when creating their texts (Canagarajah, 2015; Matsuda, 2015; Tardy, 2012). These contexts are described below.

The Personal Context

The personal context brings forth the writer's "autobiographical self" (Ivanič & Camps, 2001, p. 31), which encompasses how authors connect with their identities and experiences and choose how they will represent themselves in their text. For example, the personal context informs the writer's interest in a particular research topic or argument. It also includes how writers negotiate non-textual features such as the identity positions they ascribe to themselves (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation) and the roles they take up in their texts (e.g., novice, expert, critic, reporter) (Canagarajah & Matsumoto, 2017). Finally, another aspect of the personal context is reflected in multilingual writers' choices regarding how they represent their linguistic identities and achieve rhetorical purposes by leveraging various registers and

languages from their linguistic repertoires (Espinosa & Ascenzi-Moreno, 2021; Velasco & García, 2014).

The Dialogic Context

This context locates textual voice in a dialogue where authors bring together their voices with past and future voices. In this sense, while the author's voice creates new meanings, it also revoices and reworks other authors' past meanings (Bakhtin, 1981; Sperling & Appleman, 2011). The author's textual voice also contains future voices as it deploys different resources to engage readers and anticipates their responses to their ideas. Readers also contribute to this dialogic process by negotiating the texts' meaning, which may not necessarily represent the author's intended meaning.

The Sociocultural Context

The sociocultural involves the contexts of text production, such as the genre, the social milieu, and the audience's expectations. Culturally defined genres shape a text's purpose, stages, and language features (Brisk, 2015), thus establishing boundaries for voice construction by defining what counts as valid texts in particular cultural contexts (Bakhtin, 1981). Authors' textual voices are also shaped by the social milieu for and from which texts are produced (Tardy, 2012). For example, students construct their textual voices in response to the expectations that their instructors set for their texts, while researchers construct theirs in response to the expectations of the journals where they seek to publish their work. The audience for whom the text is produced also shapes the textual voice. Authors will adjust their textual voices according to the anticipated interests and expectations of the community they expect to reach with their texts.

Political Context

Finally, the political context encompasses the power relations and ideologies mediating textual voice construction (Sperling & Appleman, 2011). Dominant ideologies privileging monolingualism, standard registers, and exclusive academic genres impose boundaries and constraints defining what counts as valid voices for producing knowledge (Chavez, 2021). However, these dominant and centralizing voices exist in tension with the voices from the margins, which seek to diversify and expand the possibilities for expression and knowledge production within the dominant academic genres (Bakhtin, 1981).

Constructing a textual voice within these contexts entails navigating the tensions between conforming to externally defined expectations and the author's own expectations and purposes. However, these tensions are not necessarily evident, since deeply ingrained white-dominant monolingual ideologies have established the academic genres as the norm and standard for success. To guide students in the construction of their textual voices, it is necessary to build awareness of the existence of these different contexts and how they shape their textual voices. This awareness will open possibilities for considering how historically minoritized multilingual voices can transform normative ways of creating knowledge.

Guiding Historically Minoritized Students in their Textual Voice Construction

The personal, dialogic, sociocultural, and political contexts of voice construction provide an ecological perspective that captures the complex interactions in negotiating a textual voice. In classroom contexts, these complex interactions are wrought by the tension between imposing the external expectations of the academic genres and enabling opportunities for exploration and innovation (Hyland, 2012; Matsuda, 2015). Translingual antiracist (Báez & Carlo, 2021; Chavez, 2021; Seltzer, 2019) and genre-based (Brisk, 2015; Harman, 2018) pedagogies present two distinct approaches to writing instruction for historically minoritized students, each privileging different contexts. While translingual antiracist pedagogies privilege the personal and political contexts, genre-based pedagogies privilege the dialogic and sociocultural contexts. Below I explain each in more detail.

Translingual Antiracist Writing Pedagogies

As mentioned above, translingual antiracist writing pedagogies privilege the political and personal contexts of voice construction. In terms of the political, they highlight the detrimental role of monolingual and monocultural ideologies in historically minoritized students' textual voices. Academic genres are conceived as gatekeepers defining whose voices count and positioning "writers of color as outsiders forced to imitate whiteness to earn the badge of literacy" (Chavez, 2021, p. 27). To counter the assimilating forces traditionally driving writing instruction, translingual antiracist pedagogies challenge the idea that to succeed academically, students need to learn to code-switch and choose the standard English variety for academic contexts (Báez & Carlo, 2021), as well as leave their experiences and other ways of knowing for other contexts.

Instead, a new vision of academic success is proposed that highlights the fluidity in which diverse languages, experiences, and ways of building knowledge may be integrated into texts. Rather than code-switching, students are encouraged to engage in translingual practices in which they leverage their entire linguistic repertoires (e.g., registers, dialects, languages), experiences, and knowledge to make meaning, perform their identities, and achieve rhetorical purposes (Báez & Carlo, 2021; Canagarajah, 2013; Seltzer, 2019; Velasco & García, 2014). The concept of translingual sensibilities encompasses how students view their language practices and navigate and resist ideologies that position these practices as deficient (Seltzer, 2020). To deepen students' translingual sensibilities, it is relevant to select texts that reflect diverse language practices (e.g., multilingual, multi-dialectal, and multimodal), leverage students' out-of-school language practices, and engage them in writing projects that encourage them to integrate these practices into their school texts (Seltzer, 2020).

Translingual antiracist writing pedagogies highlight the personal context of voice construction, since this is where writers of color can connect with their translingual sensibilities and develop their writing identities. Espinosa and Ascenzi-Moreno (2021) propose that "writing instruction should focus on developing a strong writing identity and an understanding that one's writing is more powerful if it has a

purpose and conveys the author's authentic meaning to the intended audience" (p. 138–139). To support students in developing strong writing identities, it is necessary to recognize and integrate their experiences, ways of knowing, and cultural and linguistic resources. By embracing their whole selves in the writing process, students can connect with who they are and what they want to share in their texts.

The following principles provide a framework for designing writing pedagogies where historically minoritized students expand their understanding of the political contexts shaping their texts while also nurturing their personal contexts: (1) center the experiences of people of color; (2) democratize the classroom; and (3) recognize the emotional processes involved in writing (Chavez, 2021). To center the experiences of people of color means creating reading lists with the works of authors of color and expanding the notion of what counts as valid texts by including other genres and modalities in addition to the written academic genres. Centering students' experiences is also encouraging storytelling, where students have the opportunity to be heard and get in touch with their creativity. Freewriting practices also center students' experiences and ideas by inviting them to write without adhering to models and conventions. The conventions are introduced later once students have a better sense of the meanings they want to convey.

Democratizing the classroom involves establishing a learning community where knowledge is co-constructed. For example, genre conventions are negotiated rather than imposed as an external source of knowledge. The evaluation process is focused on understanding the meanings that students intend to convey in their texts rather than on judging whether they followed the instructor's predefined criteria or ideas of "good writing." In this sense, the instructor opens up multiple opportunities for dialogue that enable students to build their awareness of their intended meanings and how they can convey them in their texts.

Recognizing the emotional processes involves opening spaces for sharing the uncertainties, fears, and frustrations that may arise in the writing process. Chavez (2021) refers to this principle as "mothering work" (p. 47), where writers find a safe space to get in touch with their feelings about writing and learn to deal with them. This "mothering work" entails supporting writers in building routines and writing strategies despite feeling blocked and uninspired. Writers learn to recognize the ideas and feelings that prevent them from writing and from telling themselves that "they will write anyway" (p. 67) despite these ideas.

In summary, translingual antiracist writing pedagogies situate voice construction in its political and personal contexts by challenging externally imposed knowledge that has historically silenced writers of color and by centering their experiences. As Báez and Carlo (2021) propose, "we as educators need to encourage [students'] expressive voices in our classrooms. Their ideas are important, their thought process is important, and their stories are what makes their writing unique to them" (p. 122). By centering students' voices, translingual antiracist pedagogies stimulate authenticity in textual voice construction. As students connect with their

unique voices, they will find the power to define how they will use the academic genres to convey their intended meanings.

Genre-Based Writing Pedagogies

While translingual antiracist pedagogies privilege the political and personal contexts of voice construction, genre-based pedagogies privilege its sociocultural and dialogic contexts. Informed by systemic functional linguistics (SFL), this writing pedagogy views the genre as a context for producing texts according to socioculturally defined purposes, organization, and conventions (Brisk, 2015; Harman, 2018). SFL approaches language as a semiotic system through which people build experience, interact with others, and organize thought through texts (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, as cited in Brisk, 2015). This meaning-based approach to language provides an analytic framework and teaching tool for understanding the language resources writers have available within each genre to convey their ideas, interact with their audience, and structure their texts (Harman, 2018). In this sense, genre-based pedagogies enable students to unpack a text's inner workings and access concrete meaning-making tools that may potentially increase their sense of agency and control of the genres they are learning (Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2010).

The Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC) is an instructional framework for SFL-informed genre-based pedagogy (Brisk, 2015; Harman, 2018) comprising three phases: (a) deconstruction, (b) joint construction, and (c) independent construction (Martin & Rose, 2005). In the deconstruction phase, students read and analyze texts to build content and genre knowledge. The joint construction phase involves working together to create a text that integrates the newly constructed genre and content knowledge. When working together, students have opportunities to further refine their content and genre knowledge and compose a text that reflects their understanding. Finally, in the independent construction phase, students use their knowledge of the content and the language resources studied during the deconstruction and joint construction phases to write their own texts.

Through these phases, students build their awareness of the socioculturally defined contexts for their textual voices in particular academic genres and receive guidance on the language features that enable writers to construct a dialogic context for their texts. By providing explicit guidance on the language choices that authors make in the context of the genre and fostering student-teacher and peer-to-peer interaction, the TLC combines the SFL perspective on language as a system of choices to communicate meaning and Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective on learning through interaction (Harman, 2018).

The study of the argument genre, which is one of the prevalent genres used in academic contexts, includes building the content knowledge for proposing an argument and reviewing its purposes, stages, and prevalent language features (Pessoa, 2017). In the United States, the following stages are proposed to achieve the argument's genre-persuasive goal: (1) orientation that includes a background, thesis statement, and preview of the reasons; (2) a series of reasons, each supported by evidence, and, within

these reasons, author consideration of counterarguments and rebuttals; and (3) reinforcement of the thesis statement (Brisk, 2015).

To refine their knowledge of the argument genre, in the deconstruction phase, students analyze arguments to determine how the authors accomplished their purpose, developed their stages, and selected language features consistent with their genres. It is also relevant to consider how authors create a dialogic context for their arguments that enables them to advance their claims and involve the reader (Martin & White, 2005). These dialogic movements contract or expand the dialogic space. Authors contract the dialogic space to claim the authority to establish their perspective and draw readers toward their ideas. When authors expand the dialogic space, they invite other voices and views into the text by, for example, grounding their ideas in external voices (e.g., citations) or being more tentative about their claims (Mitchell & Pessoa, 2017).

In summary, SFL-informed genre-based pedagogies provide analytic and instructional tools for situating voice construction in sociocultural and dialogic contexts. The TLC offers a framework for scaffolding the development of content and genre knowledge. This knowledge supports students in building authoritative voices aligned with socioculturally defined genre conventions. In addition, the TLC stimulates content knowledge development, thus expanding students' ideas and understanding of the issues they are addressing in their texts.

Grappling with the Tensions in Textual Voice Construction

The two distinct approaches to voice construction in translingual antiracist and genre-based pedagogies reflect the tensions between the centralizing and unifying forces of the genre and the innovating forces of the voices students bring to the classroom (Bakhtin, 1981). Translingual antiracist pedagogies draw from the personal and political contexts of voice construction to ignite innovation by stimulating students to get in touch with their experiences and their cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge to create unique, authentic voices that may transgress genre conventions (Báez & Carlo, 2021; Chavez, 2021; Seltzer, 2019). Genre-based pedagogies situate voice construction in its sociocultural and dialogic contexts to build authoritative voices and enter the conversation in their fields. Genre-based pedagogies have been critiqued for perpetuating the dominant, monolingual approaches to writing traditionally valued in academia (Harman & Khote, 2018).

I have grappled with these tensions in my Social Foundations of Education course, integrating content and writing instruction. I teach this course in an urban public university that serves a culturally and linguistically diverse student body. Most of my students are bilingual or multilingual and have varied transnational experiences (some were born in the United States to immigrant parents, others grew up in the United States, and others came later in their lives). This course introduces students to the field of education by providing a historical and philosophical understanding of the role of schooling in society in general and in the United States in particular. Students critically analyze the relationship between schooling and issues related to identity, language, race, and power and how these issues impact schooling in diverse communities. In addition, the course is classified as writing-intensive, meaning that

instructors need to devote time to writing instruction contextualized in the course assignments. In courses with this focus, writing helps students understand course materials and concepts and gain writing experience and confidence.

In my course section, I have focused on the argument genre by asking students to write essays as summative assessments. In addition, students keep a weekly journal where they reflect on their reactions to the course readings, make connections with their experiences, and raise questions. During the past four years, I have conducted an action research study examining how my pedagogical decisions shape students' textual voice construction (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Stenhouse, 1975). With this action research, I have sought to gain insights into how to design integrated content and writing instruction that gives students the confidence, knowledge, and inspiration to construct authentic and authoritative textual voices. My interest in textual voice stems from the desire to create meaningful instruction that stimulates multilingual students to get in touch with their ideas and experiences and expand them using the content learned in class. This interest is deeply rooted in my own experiences as a bilingual scholar negotiating a textual voice in English.

In the six iterations of this action research, I have tried different instructional hypotheses and engaged in critical reflection about my practice. I have realized that my focus on the argument genre reflects my own writing journey. I learned early in my writing trajectory that appropriating the argument genre conventions was the key to academic success. Another insight I have gained in this action research is that my focus on the argument genre has prompted my students to accommodate their textual voices to external expectations. The focus on this genre has hindered my goal of providing a meaningful context where students can connect the writing they do for my course with their own expectations and experiences. The integration of a translingual antiracist approach into my writing instruction has enabled me to broaden my understanding of the different contexts shaping historically minoritized students' voice construction and grapple with the tensions in this process.

Other scholars have reconciled these tensions in a Third Space that connects school literacy practices with the students' and their communities' literacy practices (Gutiérrez, 2008). For example, Harman and Khote (2018) propose a critical SFL praxis incorporating historically minoritized students' cultural and semiotic repertoires into the Teaching and Learning Cycle. This approach entails scaffolding genre and content knowledge construction while stimulating students to adapt this knowledge to their ways of knowing and being. Canagarajah's (2015) pedagogy of negotiated voice also illustrates a Third Space where instructors adopt the role of facilitators who support students in negotiating their identities and provide a safe environment for creativity and experimentation while also familiarizing students with dominant genres.


An Ecological Process Model for Understanding Textual Voice Construction

The concept of Third Space encompasses the diverse and apparently contradictory contexts in which textual voice construction is situated. Based on the understanding of textual voice as a situated and negotiated process (Matsuda, 2015;

Tardy, 2012) and on the notion of Third Space (Gutiérrez, 2008), I propose an ecological process model that synthesizes translingual antiracist and genre-based pedagogies. This model includes the different contexts of voice construction (e.g., personal, dialogic, sociocultural, and political) and encompasses four interrelated processes: negotiating power relations and ideologies, entering the conversation, engaging the reader, and connecting with the self (see Figure 1). These processes are represented as concentric circles that situate each process in the four contexts of voice construction.

Figure 1

Textual Voice Construction Ecological Process Model



This section presents the processes included in the model and an illustration of how it has illuminated my understanding of the approaches I have taken to guide my students in their textual voice construction. By situating voice construction in its different contexts, the model proposed in this paper provides a broader and more complex understanding of the different processes involved in constructing textual voices. In addition, it contributes a framework for reflecting on the different forces and contexts shaping authenticity and authoritativeness in textual voice. The examples from my content and writing instruction in the Social Foundations of Education course illustrate how this model has allowed me to critically analyze my instructional decisions, identify the textual voice processes I have privileged, and propose new instructional hypotheses for my action research.

Negotiating Power Relations and Ideologies

The outermost circle in the model includes the negotiation of power relations and ideologies, which situates voice construction in its political context. This process entails recognizing the ideologies that establish what counts as valid and authoritative

textual voices in academic contexts. By unpacking these ideologies, historically minoritized students build an awareness of how experiences of not finding the words or the inspiration to write is not a personal issue but rather a historical process through which their voices have been systematically silenced (Chavez, 2021). This awareness also stimulates them to recognize the tensions between the unifying and centralizing forces of the academic genres and their innovative forces. As they negotiate these tensions, they realize that their cultural and linguistic knowledge is a counterforce that brings new ways of knowing and disrupts tradition. Negotiating power relations and ideologies stimulates writers to release their creativity and construct authentic voices, since they gain perspective on the forces that have historically shaped their voices and get in touch with their own roles in shaping these forces.

My practice has focused on building knowledge about power relations and ideologies as part of the course content. Still, I have not given prevalence to negotiating power relations and ideologies in my students' textual voice construction. When I started teaching this course, I updated the reading list to increase the presence of authors of color in the syllabus. In addition, I include multimedia featuring diverse educators, and our discussions focus on issues of equity, inclusion, and representation. However, the reading list focuses solely on academic texts. I have not included multilingual or multi-dialectical texts nor asked students for suggestions for readings and materials that represent them. This would create possibilities to bring in their knowledge and innovate the course materials based on what is relevant and meaningful to them (Chavez, 2021). In addition, they would have the opportunity to experience the ideas of inclusion and representation they are expected to enact in their future classrooms.

Entering the Conversation

Entering the conversation is the second outermost circle, which situates voice construction in a sociocultural context. To enter a conversation in a novel sociocultural context, it is necessary to learn the language practices and knowledge valued in this context. This will create a common ground for sharing ideas and moving the conversation forward. Entering the conversation in academic contexts entails working with the academic genres. These genres provide a common ground for building knowledge by establishing the text's purposes, stages, and language features (Brisk, 2015; Hyland, 2012). In addition, it is necessary to situate the text in the conversation by considering and integrating other voices in the field. In this sense, building content and genre knowledge provides students with the necessary background and tools to enter the conversation in the field and carve spaces for their voices to be heard.

I have privileged the sociocultural context of voice construction by using the TLC as a framework for guiding students in the construction of the genre and content knowledge that I believe they need to build authoritative textual voices and start entering the conversation in the field of education. The voice-construction model has enabled me to situate the TLC in a broader context and critically examine its implementation. I realized that I was imposing my expectations, leading my students to construct textual voices that responded to these expectations.

While I stimulate my students to build their perspectives and take a stance regarding the content addressed in the course, I have approached the knowledge of the argument genre in a top-down manner. For example, in the first two iterations of the action research study, I started the semester by defining the argument genre and establishing my expectations for the three major writing assignments. I did not open spaces for my students to share their knowledge and experiences with argumentative writing. In the current iteration of this work, I am working on decentering my voice and inviting my students to co-construct our expectations for the argument genre. To accomplish this, I have engaged them in co-constructing the evaluation criteria and in assessing their own essays. I still need to provide my feedback and have struggled with balancing their perspectives with my own.

Engaging the Reader

The third circle in the model, engaging the reader, creates a dialogic context for the text. In this dialogic context, writers position themselves and their readers in relation to the ideas presented in the text. As mentioned above, in the argument genre, the author accomplishes this positioning through different dialogic moves through which they achieve the persuasive purposes of this genre (Martin & White, 2005). Enhancing awareness of the language resources available for creating a dialogic context for their texts provides students with greater control over their textual voices (Mitchell & Pessoa, 2017). This entails reflecting on their language choices for introducing their claims, presenting evidence and evaluating ideas, and determining whether these choices are actually aligned with their intentions.

I have sought to work with my students to build awareness of the language resources we may use to engage our readers. This entails conducting a fine-grained analysis of the language choices more experienced writers make to build a dialogic context for their arguments in which they meaningfully integrate other authors' voices (e.g., include citations), position themselves and their readers, and engage their readers. To accomplish this, during the deconstruction phase in the TLC, I have had students analyze how authors introduce their claims and evidence. However, the students typically focus on the content by establishing the claims and evidence rather than on the language features the authors used.

To gain a deeper understanding of how I can teach my students to conduct this fine-grained linguistic analysis, I have analyzed some of my students' work to determine how they position themselves and their readers in their essays. I am refining the analytic tool that will enable my students to engage in this analysis to broaden their awareness of how they construct a dialogic context in their texts. This will allow them to gain more control of their language choices to accomplish the positionings they wish to achieve in their texts and engage their readers according to these positionings.

Connecting with the Self

The innermost circle, connecting with the self, situates textual voice construction in its personal context. Connecting with the self is at the core of voice construction, since this is where writers get in touch with their perspectives, beliefs, and experiences.

When writers connect with themselves, they let their ideas flow and forget about external conventions. Chavez (2021) describes this process as going inward and listening to oneself by “turning off the translator, disobeying writing rules and channeling life back into their words” (p. 74). By going inward, historically minoritized students gain awareness of the reasons that motivate their writing, how they want to position themselves in their texts, and the diverse cultural and linguistic resources they may leverage in their writing. Connecting with the self enables them to construct authentic voices based on the critical awareness of the contexts in which they situate their texts and the intentional use of the rich cultural and linguistic resources they have available.

In my practice, I stimulate my students to connect with themselves by having them keep a weekly reading journal where they share the ideas they found interesting, surprising, or confusing in the readings and make connections between them and their experiences. In addition, the students use the ideas presented in the readings to analyze their prior or current educational experiences. However, in my analysis informing the 2021 iteration of the action research, I realized that the essays were not fully integrated into the weekly activities but were summative assessments at the end of the unit. Therefore, for the 2022 iteration, I reformulated the essay prompts to provide a better context for my students to use the knowledge built in this course to understand their past educational experiences and their future roles as teachers and advocates for their students.

While these new essay prompts provide more opportunities for the students to connect the ideas studied in the course with themselves, it is also necessary to provide more opportunities to reflect on their identities. For the 2023 iteration, I am substituting the argument genre with narrative genres (e.g., *testimonio* and autoethnography) to provide a context where students may explore their identities and educational experiences in light of the theories and concepts studied in class.

In this section, I presented the textual voice construction ecological process model and used it as a heuristic to critically analyze my instructional decisions and the tensions I have grappled with in guiding my students in constructing authoritative and authentic voices. This model has allowed me to critically analyze my instructional decisions, identify the textual voice processes I have privileged, and propose new instructional hypotheses. As shown in this section, I have privileged the “entering the conversation” process. The model has helped me identify how to expand my writing pedagogies to include the other processes. While my instructional decisions are unique to my own experiences, the readers may find ideas that echo their own experiences. As Brookfield (2017) proposes, “The details and characters may differ from case to case, but many of the tensions and dilemmas are the same” (p. 70). In addition, this illustration may provide insights into how the model may be used as a reflection tool aiding writing instructors and researchers in identifying the voice construction processes they privilege in their instruction and considering how to address the tensions between socializing students in the academic genres and creating opportunities for innovation that center students’ cultural and linguistic knowledge.

Conclusion and Implications

Textual voice construction is a complex identity negotiation process mediated by the different contexts (political, sociocultural, dialogic, personal) in which writers produce their texts. Guiding historically minoritized students in their textual voice construction brings forth the tensions between the unifying and centralizing forces of the academic genres and the innovating forces brought by the linguistic, cultural, and experiential diversity students bring to the classroom. Genre-based and translingual antiracist pedagogies contribute distinct approaches for guiding students in their textual voice construction, each prioritizing different contexts. However, it is possible to reconcile these tensions and synthesize these pedagogical approaches by creating a Third Space where students' knowledge, resources, and experiences are centered while, at the same time, they build content and genre knowledge.

In this article, I proposed the ecological textual voice construction process model as a heuristic for building awareness of the different contexts mediating textual voice construction and identifying the processes prioritized in our writing pedagogies. I illustrated how I have used the model to deepen my understanding of the tensions I have grappled with when guiding my students in my Social Foundations of Education course in constructing authentic and authoritative textual voices. Authenticity is tied to the political and personal contexts of voice construction. It entails addressing the ideologies and power relations that have historically excluded the voices of historically minoritized students and embracing alternative voices that bring diversity and innovation. It also entails connecting with the self to get in touch with the stories, experiences, and cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge that will drive innovation and creativity. Authoritativeness is related to the sociocultural and dialogic contexts of voice construction. Authoritativeness has been traditionally associated with assimilating into white-dominant academic genres (Lee, 2019). Historically minoritized students of color will have stronger resources to enter the conversation and create a dialogic context in their texts if they are aware of the political and personal contexts in their voice construction.

To guide students in constructing authentic voices, it is necessary to engage them in the inner and outermost circles of the textual voice construction ecological process model: connecting with the self and negotiating power relations. To engage students in the process of connecting with themselves, we should approach their knowledge, resources, and experiences as the forces that give life to our curriculum. We can integrate students' knowledge into the classroom by designing activities in which they critically consider the course content in light of their own experiences and perspectives. Examples of these activities are writing journals to share reactions about the readings, conducting observations where students connect the course content to real-life situations, and reflections where they make connections between their experiences and the course content. In addition, we must revise our reading lists to ensure they represent diverse voices and invite students to propose readings and areas of study.

Expanding the course materials creates opportunities to deepen students' awareness of the political contexts in which they construct their voices and engage them in the process of negotiating power relations and ideologies. To support students in this awareness, instructors can engage their translingual sensibilities (Seltzer, 2019). This entails inviting students to reflect on how their identity positions shape their views of themselves as writers and explore the different contexts where they enact these identities.

In the work on their translingual sensibilities, students gain awareness of which identity positions are typically welcomed in academic contexts and which they have learned to leave outside this context. In this sense, students can discuss the boundaries established in academic contexts and enact agentive roles in negotiating these boundaries. This negotiation would open possibilities for constructing authentic voices in which students are invited to bring their different identity positions into their writing and experiment with new ways of expressing themselves (Báez & Carlo, 2021; Chavez, 2021; Seltzer, 2019).

Furthermore, guiding students in the process of negotiating power also entails understanding how we, as instructors, are enacting and reproducing broader societal power relations in our classrooms. We must build awareness of our writing journeys and how they influence our instructional decisions. Our knowledge about our own writing journeys will shed light on our beliefs about what counts as valid writing in our course.

The two middle circles in the textual voice construction model (entering the conversation and engaging the reader) provide insights into the processes involved in constructing an authoritative textual voice. To support students in entering the conversation in their fields, it is relevant to engage them in conversation about the genres as sociocultural contexts for their texts. For example, we can engage students in collaborative deconstructions of select mentor texts aimed at defining the purposes and stages of the genres we are teaching. This co-constructed knowledge of the stages and purposes of the genre can be extended by inviting students to propose the evaluation criteria for the texts produced within this genre and engaging them in self-assessment of their texts. This shared process enhances the agency students have over their voice construction, since they propose the evaluation criteria.

We can guide students in the process of engaging readers with their texts by enhancing their awareness of the language choices authors use to create a dialogic context in their texts. To accomplish this awareness, students can analyze authors' language choices in excerpts from the course's readings illustrating how authors position themselves and their readers. Another way of building this awareness is having students analyze their language choices in their own texts and discuss how they could refine their choices to achieve their purposes.

It is necessary to conduct more research on voice construction to deepen the understanding of how the processes and contexts presented in the textual voice-construction ecological process model support historically minoritized students in constructing authentic and authoritative voices. Future studies should include students'

perspectives on their textual voices and how they construct them. For example, it is necessary to ask students whether and how they engage in the different processes proposed in the model. This line of inquiry would help align the model with students' writing experiences. Along this same line, it would be relevant to gather other faculty's perspectives on the model. Another line of research is the design of more action research to explore instructional designs based on the voice construction model. These action research studies provide a context for continuing to refine and expand our knowledge on the design of "Third Spaces" as productive contexts for constructing authentic and authoritative textual voices that respond to and extend the academic genres.

References

- Báez, E., & Carlo, R. (2021). Encouraging student voices: Toward a voice-based and antiracist culture from the MA program to basic writing. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 40(1), 99–126. <https://doi.org/10.37514/IBW-I.2021.40.1.05>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.
- Brisk, M. E. (2015). *Engaging students in academic literacies: Genre-based pedagogy for K-5 classrooms*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781317816164>
- Brisk, M. E., & Zisselsberger, M. (2010). We've let them in on a secret: Using SFL theory to improve the teaching of writing to bilingual learners. Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 111–126). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843239>
- Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey Bass.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A socio-cultural, linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2015). "Blessed my own way": Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 122–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.09.001>
- Canagarajah, A. S., & Matsumoto, Y. (2017). Negotiating voice in translingual literacies: From literacy regimes to contact zones. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(5), 390–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1186677>
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge, and action research*. Routledge.
- Chavez, F. R. (2021). *The Anti-Racist Writing Workshop: How to decolonize the creative classroom*. Haymarket Books.
- Elbow, P. (2007). Voice in writing again: Embracing contraries. *College English*, 70(2), 168–188.
- Espinosa, C. M., & Ascenzi-Moreno, L. (2021). *Rooted in strength: Using translanguaging to grow multilingual readers and writers*. Scholastic.
- Gee, J. P. (2012). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Routledge.

- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing sociocritical literacy in the Third Space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Hodder Arnold.
- Harman, R. (2018). Transforming normative discourses of schooling: Critical systemic functional linguistic praxis. In R. Harman (Ed.), *Bilingual learners and social equity: Critical approaches to systemic functional linguistics*. (pp. 1–20). Springer.
- Harman, R., & Khote, N. (2018). Critical SFL praxis with bilingual youth: Disciplinary instruction in a Third Space. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 15(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2017.1318663>
- Hyland, K. (2012). Undergraduate’s understandings of stance and voice in final year reports. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 134–150). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137030825_9
- Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1–2), 3–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0)
- Lee, S. H. (2019). Use of implicit intertextuality by undergraduate students: Focusing on monogloss in argumentative essays. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 13(1), 150–178. <https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.30651>
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2005). *Designing literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding asymmetries*. In R. Hassan, C. Matthiessen, & J. Webster (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language* (pp. 251 - 280). Equinox.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2015). Identity in written discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 140–159. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000178>
- Mitchell, T. D., & Pessoa, S. (2017). Scaffolding the writing development of the Argument genre in history: The case of two novice writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 30, 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.10.002>
- Pessoa, S. (2017). How SFL and explicit language instruction can enhance the teaching of argumentation in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 100(36), 77–78.
- Seltzer, K. (2019). Reconceptualizing “home” and “school” language: Taking a critical translingual approach in the English classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(4), 986–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.530>
- Seltzer, K. (2020). “My English is its own rule”: Voicing a translingual sensibility through poetry. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 19(5), 297–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1656535>
- Sperling, M., & Appleman, D. (2011). Voice in the context of literacy studies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 46(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.46.1.4>
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. Heinemann.
- Tardy, C. M. (2012). Current conceptions of voice. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genres* (pp. 3–48). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137030825>

Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270>

Zacharias, N. T. (2020). Voice construction and development of a multilingual student writer: A Bakhtinian perspective. *RELC Journal*, 51(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218810548>

Acknowledgement:

Support for this article was provided by the Faculty Fellowship Publication Program of the City University of New York.

ORCID <https://orcid.org//0000-0002-5056-3704>