SUMMARY

Students begin to learn particular facts together with ways to talk about them as soon as they enter school. In this process, usually called language socialization or school-language socialization, students learn to use language in a specific culturally determined way in accordance with the customary teaching activities of a given school subject (Halliday, 1994; Mercer, 1995; Rymes, 2008). This thesis examines the process of students' socialization into school language which is of essential value as it is through it that subject matter is discussed.

The methodology used was linguistic ethnography. The strategy for data collection method was influenced by the fact that research in linguistic ethnography needs to meet the criteria of contextualisation and continuity. Consequently, the data were gathered primarily by direct participant observation and audio-recording of Czech language lessons in five different lower secondary school classes. Discourse in a lesson is a part of a long conversation within teaching and learning that can take place for weeks and months. The observation focused on all lessons related to one topic which created one thematic block.

The data corpus comprises of transcripts of audio recording and field notes taken in thirty nine lessons which covered five thematic blocks. Other methods of data collection were in-depth interviews with teachers and students along with work sheets for students. The data gathered were analysed by thematic categorisation, open coding and the usage of memos. This process resulted in induction of concepts which helped in the creation of categories that in turn enabled postulation of theories that describe the process of students' socialisation into school language.

The thesis argues that socialisation of students into school language consists of two processes. The first process is (re)construction of school lexicon, which can

be divided into four phases. The first phase is called *confused languages phase* due to the different usage of school languages between school teachers and students. Teachers dominate this phase and their discourse is highly nominative. Further, they rely on translation strategies in order to familiarise students with the content of concepts which are being used in their teaching. On the other hand, students' discourse is marked for absence of scientific terms which are substituted with pronouns and deixis when needed. The second phase is called *bilingual phase* due to the mixed languages that teachers use. They switch between translation of terms used in teaching and usage of their description in scientific language. Some scientific terms appear even in students' discourse; however, their usage is not yet accurate at this stage. The third phase is called *scientific explicit phase* and it includes students' usage of scientific terms in their explicit meaning. The fourth phase is called *scientific implicit phase* and it includes students' usage of scientific terms in their implicit and reduced meaning. It was also observed that a particular phase of a classroom influences the organisational pattern of communication.

The second process involved in socialisation into school language is the usage of language algorithms. Even though both teachers and students use school language in the same way at an end of a thematic block they reach this stage through different use of language algorithms. Those based on the principle of safeguard mechanism can be trained and tested with the use of language. In this process language functions as scaffolding which teachers use to guide their students. Usage of this algorithm enables one to clearly establish the correctness of students' response and therefore it is possible to understand the algorithm as an example of evidence-based language. On the other hand, algorithms based on language intuition give students more options to formulate their own understanding as language in these cases has no unified nature. However, this benefit comes at the cost of loss of a unified method (which can be followed by teachers) and evidence (which would enable one to clearly establish the correctness of students' response. Hence, it is more fitting to understand the usage of these algorithms as examples of language based on indication.

At the beginning of the process of socialisation into school language each of the afore-mentioned processes occurs separately from the other. Yet, once socialisation enters the *bilingual phase* the separated processes start to merge. At first students talk about algorithms with the help of teachers who add scientific terms into students' communication. Eventually, students are capable of independent talk on algorithms and use scientific terms at the same time. At this point, both processes are merged. Consequently, after they have achieved language mastery it is no longer necessary to further prove it. The algorithms therefore disappear from the school language while the scientific terms are still present in it albeit in a reduced form. Thus, both processes meet so that they can once again be separated in the end.

   The process of socialisation into school language functions as a homogenisation mechanism as it leads all the class members to become fluent users of school language in a unified fashion. Yet, this result in in contradiction with the notion that usage of school language determines students' success at schools. The thesis addresses this by specifying that success at school is not solely influenced with one's mastery of school language but also with their knowledge of school temporal structuring which can be induced from the current phase of school language. Socialisation of individual students is also influenced by their social identity and students who are being socialised into school language do so in a fashion that confirms their identity.