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ABSTRACT

MICROAGGRESSIONS IN A WOMEN’S COLLEGE. UNDERSTANDING LANGUAGE, RACE, CLASS AND GENDER IN TEACHING SPANISH: A TESTIMONIO

SEPTEMBER 2016

THELMA MARÍA BELMONTE-ALCÁNTARA, B.A., UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO

M. Ed., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Ed. D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Theresa Y. Austin

With a microethnographic approach that foregrounds the particular uses of language and connects them with larger processes of social activity, this study examines moment-to-moment interactions between an instructor and a group of learners who participated in a particular lesson that was part of a language course where Spanish was used, learned and taught as a foreign language at a women’s college. Through the analysis of these interactions, I present my understandings of language, race, class and gender and how these social categories can be interrelated in the form of subtle attacks or microaggressions.

In the context of a private small college that was predominantly White and through my testimonio, this study affirms that the nature of microaggressions seems to be complex not only because the categories of language, race, class, and gender can be interconnected but also because the instructor and the language learners co-constructed them in dynamic power relations.
It also shows that there are different types of microaggressions. There are the microaggressions jointly constructed by some White learners and the woman instructor of color. These microaggressions were directed towards the instructor. Other microaggressions were jointly constructed by some women learners of color and the woman of color instructor. In this case, the microaggressions were directed towards the women learners of color. A third type of microaggression was jointly constructed by a White woman learner and a woman instructor of color. The attack was directed towards the White woman learner. Finally, this study demonstrates microaggressions shaped by and directed towards White women learners.

These findings create opportunities to reflect on the topic of microaggressions and the interconnections of the categories of language, race, class, and gender in the area of language education. This reflection stresses the need particularly for women of color educators and instructors to theorize and examine the language classroom. It also emphasizes the importance to be committed to the development of language curriculum and classroom practices that empower language learners who come from linguistically, racially, and economically diverse backgrounds.
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LIST OF TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(Adapted from Bloome et al., 2005; Pane & Rocco, 2009)

(.) untimed pause barely noticed < .2 seconds

>fast< noticeable faster talk

<slow> slower than surrounding talk

(laugh) indicates laughter

. a period indicates a stopping fall in tone

, a comma means continuing intonation

↑ an upwards arrow means rising intonation

! an exclamation point means animated or emphatic tone

.hh audible inbreath

hh audible outbreath

CAPITALS talk that is noticeably louder than surrounding talk

Under emphasis

I short pause

III long pause

‖ interrupted by next line

↑ Line 1 overlap

↓ Line 2

Vowel + elongated vowel

* voice, pitch, or style change

*words* boundaries of a voice, pitch, or style change

student unidentified student speaking

students many students speaking at once
**italics**  
words spoken in English

“word”  
indicates word directly read from the textbook

˝  
graham or pronunciation error

(undecipherable)  
uneasy or agreeable mumbling, or talking to themselves

[word]  
bracket enclose researcher’s description of nonspeech sounds/other features of talk
CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

A growing number of second language education researchers has embraced the assumption that language constructs and is constructed by a variety of social relationships, identities, and communities. They also assume that these constructions reflect and constitute inequitable relations of power at the wider level of society in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, class, language and other social categories. Only recently has attention been drawn to understand how some of these categories are interconnected to configure complex social relationships and identities that are variable, multiple and fluid.

Chapter 1 provides background information about the present study by locating it in the contexts of world language education and liberal arts institutions. It also offers a reflection on my experiences at the research site mainly the ways in which my previous experiences have shaped my research interests, my identity as a researcher and my ways of conducting this study. The research problem, purpose, guiding research questions, and the significance of the study are presented followed by an overview of Chapter 2-7.

The Study in the Context of Language Education

---

1 In this study, I try to use the term of world language education or language education to refer to the area of foreign language education.
The student composition in college classrooms across the United States has changed. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, the enrollment of White students in degree-granting institutions fell from 84 percent to 61 percent whereas the percentage of minority groups of Hispanics (4 to 14 percent), Asian/Pacific Islander (2 to 6 percent) and Black students (10 to 15 percent) rose from 1976 to 2011 (NCES 2013).

This reality in which monolingual native speakers of English are next to speakers of languages other than English in college classrooms has made a group of foreign language researchers question the validity of some concepts that have been used in the field. For instance, Kubota & Austin (2007), Osborn (2002, 2006), and Reagan and Osborn (2002) argue that the term “foreign language” supports the false idea that the United States is a homogenous country linguistically and culturally. Consequently, they advocate for the use of terms such as Languages Other than English (LOTE) and World Languages Other than English (WOLE) that reinforce the country’s linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity.

This questioning stems from the recognition of the “critical turn” which has been observed since the 1990s in areas of second language education such as the teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages or TESOL (Canagarajah 2006; Kumaravadivelu 2006; Pennycook 1999) and English for Specific Purposes or ESP (Benesch 2001). Only in recent years has it been observed in the field of language education. The acknowledgment of the “critical turn” leads to an understanding of critical which, according to second language researchers, is based on two main assumptions. First,
language constructs and is constructed by a vast range of social relationships. Second, these relationships reflect and constitute unequal relations of power that may be defined at the broader societal level in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, among other social categories (Norton 2008). In recent years, some second language researchers have started to assume that some of these social categories interconnect to configure complex social relationships and multiple and fluid identities (Kubota & Lin 2010). This recent work has taken place in the areas such of TESOL (Curtis and Romney 2006) and ESP (Kubota and Chiang 2013).

In addition to questioning the term of foreign language, some language researchers have explained how critical approaches can take shape in the area of world language education whereas others have examined how politics, ideologies, and power relations shape language teaching and learning. Kubota and Austin (2007) suggest that the problematization of norms that have promoted language teaching and learning may make language educators be concerned with critical perspectives. Norms such as the use of the standard language variety and authentic materials may trigger the interest of language researchers to examine the meanings that these norms construct and the ways in which power is enacted in the relationship between the norm and its counterpart. They also believe that language educators may be interested in the analysis of social categories such as race, and gender and how they interact with relations of power. On the other hand, Herman (2007), Karaman and Tochon (2007), Kramsch et al. (2007), Train (2007) and Wiley have focused on the areas of teaching materials and language policies and Kumagai (2007) in the area of classroom instruction.
From the type of scholarly work that has been done from frameworks and perspectives that acknowledge the “critical turn” in the language education field, this classroom-based study focuses on the racialized aspect of the native speaker norm and problematizes the meanings this norm constructs and the ways in which power is enacted in the relationship between the racialized aspect of the norm and its counterpart. The racialization of this norm allows the visibility of the interconnections between several categories such as language, gender and race and class. In the area of TESOL, the racialized aspect of the native speaker form is illustrated as follows: a White native speaker of English generally implies a speaker of the standard variety of English while a non-White native speaker of English implies a speaker of a non-standard variety of English (Kubota & Lin, 2010). Based on this information and considering the linguistic hierarchy that exists in the Spanish-speaking world where Castilian Spanish enjoys more prestige that Latin American Spanish, Caribbean Spanish and U.S. Spanish (Valdés et al., 2003), the racialized aspect of the Spanish native speaker norm considered in this study is as follows: a White native speaker of Spanish implies a speaker of the standard variety of Castilian Spanish followed by a White native speaker of the standard variety of Latin American Spanish, a White native speaker of Caribbean Spanish and a White speaker of U.S. Spanish. The non-White (black) and non-native speaker of Spanish implies a speaker of a non-standard variety of Castilian Spanish followed by a speaker of a non-standard variety of Latin America Spanish, a speaker of a non-standard variety of Caribbean Spanish, and a speaker of U.S. Spanish.

This racialized hierarchy of native and non-native Spanish speakership is neither static nor monolithic. It is important to remember that in addition to White and Black
native speakers of Spanish, there are mestizo and indigenous populations in almost all Latin American countries. Consequently, it is important to consider that the categories of White, Black, Mestizo and Indigenous are socially constructed in dynamic relations of power, function in a continuum and are interconnected with other categories. Additionally, it is believed that these categories are contextual, embedded in micro and macro social relations, and simultaneously expressed (Weber 2004).

**The Study in the Context of Language Study in Liberal Arts Institutions**

The college where this research study took place is a small liberal arts institution for women henceforth called Woodbridge College². Like the rest of liberal arts institutions, Woodbridge College offers a wide breath of courses in the physical and social sciences and in the humanities. With regards to the study of languages other than English, the college promotes its traditional study. Indeed, Kubota and Austin (2007) affirm that the rationales of liberal arts education, multiculturalism and pragmatism support traditional language study.

The belief of liberal arts education is endorsed when authorities promote the study of a language in terms of its linguistic and cognitive structure, historical knowledge, and cultural traditions. In this case, Woodbridge College authorities believe that the study of a language other than English contributes to the students’ awareness of linguistic and cultural differences. In their own words, “by laying down your [students’] native language and picking up one that is ‘foreign’ to you, you learn how linguistic and cultural

---

² This is a pseudonym. All the names used are pseudonyms except mine.

The rationale of multiculturalism is promoted when authorities point out that in language classes students not only study about other cultures and traditions but also participate in them. For instance, Woodbridge College authorities claim that “although students can learn about a different culture in many courses across the curriculum, in language courses they actively participate in it” (Ibid., p. 14). Finally, the belief of pragmatism is embodied when language study is justified in terms of the contributions that it makes to the students’ professional careers. The Spanish Department at Woodbridge College claims that “the Spanish language has also been an important part of graduating students’ careers in government, law, business, international affairs, education, journalism, medicine, and the performing arts, among others” (Ibid., p. 454).

In addition to promoting these rationales, I believe that Woodbridge College endorses the belief that one other goal of students’ educational experience is to function in the globalized world. Mitchell (2003) uses the concept of the cosmopolitan strategic subject to refer to the people who succeed in today’s society. More than ten years ago, Woodbridge College launched the Plan for 2010 which explains the college’s goal of engaging students to function successfully in the U.S. and abroad. College authorities announce that due to a series of domestic and international challenges, international education plays a major role in students’ education. Particularly, they believe that the internationalization of the curriculum can be reached by the following actions:

- Promoting study abroad experiences, internships, research opportunities, volunteer or paid work and cyberspace connections;
• Interjecting global perspectives into classes across the curriculum;
• Developing more interdisciplinary, comparative world studies courses;
• Incorporating study away more integrally into the curriculum and developing ways for students to share publicly and with one another their study away experiences;
• Integrating language study with other disciplines; reconsidering offering credit for self-instructional language acquisition; developing alternative pedagogies including intensive language immersion; and establishing a language proficiency expectation in more majors” (The Plan for 2010, 2003, p. 6)

Regarding these sets of actions that explain the rationale of cosmopolitanism, not only have I observed but participated in their execution as I worked at Woodbridge College as a Spanish language instructor. In the last decade, I taught a language course at Woodbridge College in which Spanish language students worked with students from an environmental science class. This group of environmental science students was interested in learning from a Latino grassroots organization. Since most of these students were monolingual, students in the Spanish class supported their peers by translating some of the documents written by the organization. In addition to this interdisciplinary collaboration, I observed the hiring of tenure-track professors who, in addition to literature, specialized in gender issues, cinema or history. Having expertise in one of these areas enabled these professors to teach not only courses that focused on literary analysis but culture-based courses. In the late 200s, I co-designed and co-implemented projects in which the Spanish Department and the Center for Social Justice at Woodbridge College partnered with Habitat for Humanity to take a group of language
learners to Spanish-speaking countries. The goal of these projects was to immerse language learners in the target country through their work with the local community. Consequently, I participated in the integration of language study (e.g. language immersion) with issues of social justice. Finally, at a public university, I collaborated in the creation of websites who aim was students’ self-instruction in the Spanish language. These websites showed different varieties of the target language through video clips of communicative situations in the everyday life of Spanish native speakers.

It is important to describe how Woodbridge College endorses these four rationales that promote traditional language study. However, it is equally significant to scrutinize these beliefs in order to make visible some of the ways in which they promote and hinder college language learning and teaching. Woodbridge College’s advocacy for the existence of different cultures, traditions, and languages is based on the belief that linguistic and cultural difference change human communication. According to Kubota (2004) this essentialist understanding of cultural difference may present a dichotomized view of the native and non-native cultures. In the case of the United States, this means a presentation of the American culture as a “homogeneous culture of English speakers with a shared set of values and social practices” whereas “the target culture of non-English speakers is rendered as truly “foreign” (p. 26). In other words, this view disallows the variations that exist within each culture and fails to recognize the politics and ideologies underlying the ways in which the non-native culture is interpreted.

In terms of the beliefs of pragmatism and cosmopolitan strategic subject, the actions that aim at the internationalization of the Woodbridge College’s curriculum
contribute to the production of functional citizens around the globalized world. However, these efforts are related to the investments that the global capital has made in the educational sector (Altbach and Knight 2007). Corral and Patai (2008) and Giroux (in Guilherme 2006) argue against the incursion of global capital in the sector because it undermines the ability of institutions of higher education, particularly liberal arts colleges, to provide students with an education that allows them to examine knowledge in critical ways. Corral and Patai argue that colleges and universities are creating good employees rather than good thinkers. They also believe that this trend is taking language departments and liberal arts institutions either to their reinstatement or to their elimination. In the first case, Corral and Patai refer to the trend that exists in many language departments in which literary analysis courses are being replaced with culture-based courses. Regarding the language departments’ elimination, these authors discuss the closure of the German department at the private University of Southern California, and the proposal to end German at the public Humboldt State University. With respect to the situation in college departments of Spanish, they claim that despite the high student demand, Spanish departments struggle to obtain resources from their institutions. Consequently, they argue that factors such as the lack of resources, the presence of culture-based courses and the unpreparedness of faculty to claim the value of language teaching and learning can contribute to the elimination of language education and liberal arts education.

Given this scenario where the rationales of liberal arts education, multiculturalism, pragmatism, and cosmopolitanism either promote or hinder college language learning and teaching, this microethnographic classroom study scrutinizes these
rationales and draws on theoretical frameworks and approaches that recognize the interplay between cultural and social processes at both the macro and micro levels of social activity to make visible some of the ways in which these levels are interrelated and understand the type of language learners and instructors who are privileged in terms of the categories of language, race, class and gender and the ones who are marginalized.

**Reflexivity of a Language Education Feminist Researcher**

I was born and raised in Mexico City in the late sixties. In the early 1990s, I was granted a fellowship to take undergraduate level courses and to teach my native language at Woodbridge College. This two-year experience changed my life completely. It was crucial in my decision to embark in my professional journey as language educator and to live in the U.S. for almost twenty years. In addition, Woodbridge College played a very important role in my professional life as I worked as a Spanish language instructor for 12 years.

In this section, I reflect on my experiences as an international student and a Spanish language instructor at Woodbridge College and acknowledge the influence they had on my identity as a researcher and on the main concerns of this study. This acknowledgment is crucial not only because the research site is precisely Woodbridge College but also because I am the language instructor of the course and the focal lesson analyzed here. I believe that this initial recognition marks the beginning of an act of feminist reflexivity as it is defined as “the process through which a researcher recognizes,
examines, and understands how her social background, positionality and assumptions affect the practice of research” (Hesse-Biber & Yaiser, 2004, p. 115).

**International Student**

My two-year experience at Woodbridge College contributed to become aware of some of the beliefs I had about myself (and others) and the ways in which I view my reality. That is, I realized that my view of myself as a successful, educated, young, Mexican woman was constructed by a series of events that were closely related to my social, cultural and linguistic contexts in Mexico City: First, I was born and raised in the historic downtown area of Mexico’s capital. This means that I lived in the city that centralizes most of the country’s resources and that I came from the place where most of the emblematic public buildings and historical sites of the country are located and where most of the important economic, political and cultural events took place. Consequently, I was proud of being from Mexico City because that made me a “true” Mexican woman. Second, my K-12 education was the result of the private system of education. In Mexico, as in many other countries, a private K-12 schooling usually promotes the idea that students are better educated and prepared than students who attend public schools. Additionally, it supports the belief that by attending a private school; students from a working or a middle class upbringing could enter the ranks of the upper-middle section of Mexico City’s society. Third, I graduated from the country’s national autonomous university (UNAM) with a high GPA. Even though there are private institutions of higher education which enjoy national and international recognition, UNAM is still considered
the institution where the country’s academic and scientific knowledge is produced. Indeed, I am the first member in my immediate family to obtain an undergraduate degree. Fourth, I held a degree in economics and a major in econometrics which was considered somewhat uncommon for Mexican women twenty years ago. Finally, I studied English since elementary school and with time, I realized that it could be seen as a “language of empowerment” (Norton & Pavlenko 2004). That is, I believed that a proficiency in English offered me more and better economic, social, and educational opportunities. I confirmed this idea when my ability to understand, read, and speak English helped me obtain my first full-time job in 1992.

The emphasis on my academic accomplishments was, for the most part, a product of my parents’ belief in education. Although they did not obtain a college degree they believed that of I got one, it would help me achieve social and economic success. Even though my parents enrolled me in a private school, we were on the borderline between being working class and middle class. My father was born into a poor indigenous family in Oaxaca, one of the country’s poorest states. In his youth, he migrated to Mexico City to work. Since my father was from an indigenous background and lacked formal education, he enrolled in the army which helped him navigate through the indigenous and the working and middle class’ groups. On the other hand, my mother was born in Mexico City but her father came from a family of peasants who lived in a State that is two hours away from the capital city. My mother finished middle school and then she had a couple of part-time jobs. After working in the army, she worked for the Mexico City’s government as an administrative assistant or “secretaria” until she retired.
All this information helps see all the factors that contributed to understand the important role that education has played in my life and my view as a successful, educated, young, Mexican woman before living in the United States. Needless to say, the fact that I was granted a fellowship to study and work in an American college reinforced my belief that my socioeconomic status would improve if I furthered my education.

In addition to challenging my views of myself as a successful and educated woman, my first experience at Woodbridge College made me question my taken for granted views about women and women’s colleges. My K-12 education took place in one private school or “colegio” in Mexico City’s historic downtown. While the elementary and middle-school years were coed, the high school level was only for women or “señoritas”. During my high school year, I complained about the lack of cooperation and competitiveness of some of my women classmates. I also remember that I often mentioned how much I missed the interaction with my men classmates and friends. Thus, when I knew that I was going to attend a women’s college in the U.S., I thought that my social life was going to be boring and that my academic environment was going to be competitive and unsupportive. However, years later, I understood that my views about women’s colleges and women’s interactions were aligned with unquestioned yet powerful social notions of gender and sexuality that dominated in the contexts in which I grew up. More specifically, I believe that these ideas conformed to the views of heterosexuality and femininity as the social norms in which femininity was mainly understood as being unsupportive and competitive.
Remlinger (2005) explains how the social notions of sexuality and gender are constructed. She claims that along with the understanding that gender roles are constituted through everyday experiences and influenced by the societal meanings of what it means to be a man and a woman, the understanding of sexuality is also constructed when people enact gender relationships within a framework of what it means to be heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, etc. Therefore, my experience at Woodbridge College as an international student and teaching assistant helped me challenge my taken-for-granted understandings about gender and sexuality.

Throughout the years, I realized that in and through different social categories I have shaped my understandings of who I am, who others are as well as my relationships with others. I also realized that these categories enacted power relations that privileged certain people and limit other. For instance, during the time I lived in the United States, I continually questioned the social categories of language, class, age, citizenship and nationality with which I defined myself when I lived in Mexico City. This questioning helped me see that in and through these categories I enacted power against several social groups. These categories contributed to enact power against Mexicans who lived in rural areas and spoke varieties of Mexican Spanish that were viewed as non-standard. They also enacted power against elderly men and women, indigenous men and women, working class men and women and non-university-educated Mexicans.

While class, age, citizenship, and nationality played a significant role in defining how I viewed myself in Mexico City, the categories of language, race, ethnicity, and gender were important in defining who I was in the academic environments when I lived
on the East Coast in the United States. For instance, I had to become familiar with categories that were new to me such as “Latina”, “Hispanic”, “woman of color”, and “international student” (ESL speaker). That is, while in Mexico I was unaware that I conformed to the ideologies promoted by the dominant groups of society, in the United States I started to question these positions and to become aware that I was part of the social, cultural, and linguistic minority groups in the small college town where I lived.

The struggles I have experienced to accept, resist and change some of my social identities have helped me see that social categories are dynamic forces with which we, individuals, co-construct understandings about who they are, who others are and how we relate to other individuals. Not only have I experienced that these social categories are socially constructed but that they are contextual, dynamic, intrinsically linked to processes of unequal relations of power and interconnected in varied and complex ways.

**Language Instructor**

After my experience as Spanish teaching assistant and international student in the U.S., I returned to Mexico City. In the late 1990s, I returned to Woodbridge College as I was hired to work as a part-time Spanish language instructor. I worked in this capacity for six years and as a full-time instructor for the remaining six years.

Throughout the years I worked as a Spanish language instructor at Woodbridge College, I experienced the system that structures many Spanish language departments.

---

3 I was also the head of one of the residential dorms at Woodbridge College. In addition I had other part-time positions at other private colleges that are part of a college consortium.
This system divides faculty and language study into two areas. The language learning curriculum encompassed a sequence of two years of language study. These courses were taught by instructors, mostly graduate students, who were hired on a temporary basis and hold non-tenure track positions. On the other hand, the culture-based curriculum, that used to be a literary analysis curriculum, comprised the remaining two years of courses which were taught by professors who hold tenure or tenure track positions.

This hierarchical two-tiered system was maintained at the departmental level by four factors. First, the opinion professors had about themselves and toward Spanish language study. Second, the exclusion of most language instructors from the decisions Spanish language departments made about how the language curricula were designed. Third, the training most graduate students received to teach Spanish in college classrooms and finally, the language proficiency of professors and language instructors (Valdés et al., 2003).

I witnessed the indifference that most Spanish professors had toward language study. They viewed themselves as engaging in intellectual work and considered that language teaching did not require advanced academic study. Similarly, I also observed the exclusion of language instructors from the decisions made by the Spanish Departments in which I worked. Although I recognize that my seniority at Woodbridge College provided me with some advocacy to suggest some changes in the language learning curriculum, in the end, all language instructors were excluded from the important decisions that affected the language instructors and the Spanish Department. This exclusion was reinforced by the hiring practices that prevail in the Department. As I
have mentioned, most language instructors were hired under temporary basis mainly for the length of the academic year (9 months). In my experience, even though I was told that I had a two-year contract, I signed an acceptance letter to teach at Woodbridge College every year. Regarding the training that language instructors received to teach college language courses, I observed the predominance of the socio-cognitive and psycholinguistic perspectives. The fact that most language instructors were students who were pursuing graduate degrees in Iberian, Latin American or Chicano/a literature reinforced the prevalence of non-critical perspectives in language teaching. Von Hoene (2008) confirms that the teaching preparation of most graduate language instructors excludes “applied linguistics and related disciplines such as discourse analysis, stylistics, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, semiotics, among others” (p. 276). Finally, the language proficiency and the country of origin of Spanish professors and Spanish language instructors helped reinforce the division of Spanish curriculum and faculty. Spanish native speakership is a complex issue that is related to other characteristics of the faculty members such as the regional origin, the ethnicity, and social class (See also chapter four). As it has been said, generally speaking, speakers of Peninsular Spanish (Spain) are seen as being more prestigious than Latin American native speakers. In turn, Latin American speakers are seen as being more prestigious in relation to both native speakers from the Caribbean and U.S. born Latinos (Valdés et al. 2003).

My experiences as a Spanish language instructor at Woodbridge College shaped the main interests of this study. For instance, I am concerned with the hierarchical system that prevails in language departments and how the factors that promote this system also shape the identities of language learners and faculty. Similarly, I am interested in the
climate of language classroom and how it affects women learners and faculty of color particularly when the classroom is part of a predominantly White institution. Regarding this topic, Harris and González (2012) affirm that many women faculty of color in predominantly White institutions have found themselves to be “presumed incompetent” and to fulfill one of some of the following roles: the mother, the maid, the nanny, the cheerleader, the mascot, the secretary or the seductress.

Overall, I hope that the reflections about my experiences as an international students and language instructor at Woodbridge College show how closely related they are to the main concerns of this study. These experiences and the fact that I was also the instructor of the Spanish course and the focal lesson analyzed in this study also made me reflect constantly on the experiences’ influence in my identity as a researcher. In fact, the continuous reflection made me struggle to find my voice as a researcher. In other words, sometimes I questioned the validity of my own perspective and voice as well as the validity of the perspectives and voices of the rest of the class participants. In this sense, even though feminist reflexivity helped me question my views it also helped me value the truths I present in this classroom-based study. It helped me respect the ways in which the meanings, concepts and relationships were co-constructed or shaped by each other. As Hesse-Biber & Yaiser point out a feminist researcher “must acknowledge that she is not the essential woman and that the other realities and truths she may discover are just as valid and valuable as her own personal ones” (2004, p. 115).

---

4 I use “women faculty” or “women students” to highlight the understanding of gender as a social construct and distinguish it from the view of gender as a biological trait (female faculty or female students).
**Problem, Purpose of the Study, and Guiding Research Questions**

The Women’s College Coalition (2012) claims that women’s colleges play an important role in women’s decision to pursue an advanced degree and to assume leadership roles. It also affirms that women who attend women’s only institutions engage in higher levels of academic challenge, interact more with faculty, and have more understanding of diversity than women who attend at coeducational institutions.

These statements raise an interest in knowing what happens in classrooms at women’s colleges to support or question the idea that women’s colleges are unproblematic places to study and work. This concern becomes more immediate mainly because the number of women’s colleges has decreased since the 1960s. According to records presented by Harwarth (1999) and Women's College Coalition (2012), there were about 300 women’s colleges in the 1960s. However, this number dropped to 80 in 1998 and to 47 in 2012.

The present classroom-based research considers that classrooms are complex places and that the examination of people’s everyday experiences is a way to understand the complexity of classroom life. Indeed, the problem in problem-based research is defined by people’s everyday experiences. This focus stems from the epistemological belief that what people do enables and restricts what they know and what they know (and can do) depends on their particular location (See chapter three). Consequently, this belief helps question the idea that the classroom experiences of women at women’s college are homogenous and unproblematic. In other words, it allows the critical scrutiny of the
classroom experiences of a small group of women who participated in Spanish language course at Woodbridge College.

Drawing on critical frameworks on language and literacy and approaches such as microethnographic and discourse analysis (Bloome et al., 2005, 2008) that allow the examination of people’s everyday experiences, this study aims at examining the ways in which a group of participants of a Spanish language course at Woodbridge College construct (and are constructed by) their social identities particularly the interconnections between different categories of their social identities through the microaggressions that they co-constructed through their moment-to-moment interaction in the classroom.

The research questions that I used as a guide are:

1. What is happening in a college language lesson?
   a. How do classroom participants who are in face-to-face interaction construct and are constructed by the language and literacy events that exist in a Spanish language lesson?

2. How does face-to-face interaction construct the social identities of classroom participants in terms of social categories such as language, gender, class and race?
   a. What intertextual connections do participants in face-to-face interaction with each other jointly construct?
   b. How do these connections privilege some research participants and marginalize others?
   c. How are these connections involved in the social categories of language, gender, class and race?
d. How are these categories interconnected?

Significance of the Study

To the best of my knowledge, classroom-based studies that consider a linguistic and discourse analysis approach to language and literacy (Bloome et al., 2005, 2008) to analyze how a group of Spanish language participants jointly constructed the interconnections of their gendered, classed, and raced identities at a women’s college through their moment-to-moment interaction have not yet been conducted.

Upon acknowledging the “critical turn” or “the theorization of everyday social practice” (Baynham and Prinsloo 2001, p.83), this study joins the scholarly work done by researchers who are concerned with the theorization of classroom life. This contribution is important particularly when classroom-based research from critical perspectives still faces problems such as the theory-practice dichotomy and the complexity of classroom data (Leung, Harris and Rampton 2004; Norton 2008). It is equally important when the number of critical classroom studies in the field of language education is almost inexistent (with the exception of Kumagai 2004, 2007).

In terms of the microethnographic approach considered and the discourse analysis conducted, this study is appealing to areas such as 1) microethnography and 2) classroom discourse and identity construction. Regarding the field of microethnography (or ethnographic microanalysis of interaction), this study joins the work done by researchers who took insights from early microethnographic work in critical directions. These directions can be exemplified through the situational analyses that have drawn on both
linguistic and discourse analysis perspectives from almost twenty years. Consequently, the present study contributes to the work done by researchers who have applied the Bloome et al.’s (2005, 2008) microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of classroom language and literacy events which focuses on what language, discourse, literacy, and culture do and on the knowledge these ways of doing both privilege and limit (Carter 2007, 2008; Katz and DaSilva Iddings 2010; Pane and Rocco 2009; Shuart-Faris 2004). Also, this study can be appealing to researchers who are concerned with classroom discourse and identity co-construction. It joins the work done by classroom researchers who are interested in understanding the constructedness and multilayeredness of identities as discursively constructed notions (Ching Man 2008). Finally, it contributes to the conversation initiated by the second language researchers who have been interested in the interconnections of race, language, and culture (Kubota and Lin 2010) and the individual examination of raced (Ibrahim 1999; Kubota and Lin 2006), gendered (Norton and Pavlenko 2004; Pavlenko and Piller 2001), sexualized (Nelson 1999, 2008), and classed (Vandrick 1995) identities of second language learners.

In addition to the field of second language education, this research study contributes to the field of feminism as the theorization of everyday life experiences, particularly of women’s everyday experiences, has enabled feminist researchers to make visible the differences among women and men and between women and men. Since this study focuses on the classroom experiences of a group of women and attempts to show the plurality of everyday life in terms of the interconnections of gender, race, ethnicity, and language, it can be considered as an application of the work done by some feminist researchers who have conducted difference research and have considered multiple
standpoints to better understand the interconnected relations between gender, race, class, and sexuality (Hill and Sprague 1999; Schippers 2004; Weber 2004).

Finally, just as this dissertation has provided me with some insights about my own pedagogical practice, I hope second language and feminist researchers as well as college instructors and language practitioners become interested in moment-to-moment classroom interaction, critical frameworks and approaches, and feminist theory and practice. I hope this study’s findings and discussion encourage them to converse and analyze about these topics.

**Overview of the Chapters**

This chapter locates the present classroom-based study in the contexts of language education and language study in liberal arts institutions. I introduced myself as a critical language education researcher by explaining my previous experiences as an international student and Spanish language instructor at Woodbridge College, the research site. Through this description I show the interconnectedness that exists between these experiences and my identity as researcher and the concerns and general views that delineate this study. Additionally, I highlighted the importance of feminist reflexivity because I constantly struggled with my examination of my role as the instructor of the Spanish language course and the focal lesson considered here. This chapter also presents the research questions that foreground this study. The first question exemplifies the concerns with how face-to-face interactions are related to the language and literacy events that took place in a specific language lesson. Unlike the first question, the second
question focuses on the interconnections between uses of language and the social identities of classroom participants in terms of the categories of language, race, class, and gender mainly how these categories are interconnected and how they privilege some participants and limit others. This chapter ends with an explanation of the significance of this study for researchers and practitioners who are interested in the theorization of classroom life from perspectives that acknowledge the “critical turn”. It can also contribute to the research that draws on a microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of classroom participants. In addition to these areas that are in the second language field, this study can also contribute to the area of feminist research on difference.

The second chapter presents the different perspectives on language and literacy research. It emphasizes the understandings of: literacy as a social practice, critical literacy and critical sociolinguistic and discourse analysis perspectives. It locates the study within this last set of perspectives. This overview is also useful as it helps draw the similarities and differences between all the perspectives. This chapter also introduces four theoretical introductions or points of departure that help introduce the approach used in this study.

The third chapter presents the layers that shape the design of the present study. Through the concepts of chronotope, race, racism, racialization, microaggressions, whiteness and the areas of feminist standpoint, and difference research; this chapter establishes the epistemological and theoretical underpinnings of this study. The explanation of these areas and concepts lead to the other two levels of research design: the approach (methodology) and the strategies (theoretical tools) levels. In terms of the
theoretical tools, this chapter presents the tools presented by David Bloome and his colleagues as well as feminist reflexivity. It also presents some the limitations of the microethnographic approach and ends with a summary.

The fourth chapter explains why Woodbridge College was selected as the research site and describes the strategies for collection and analysis of ethnographic data. It also presents the two sets of ethnographic contexts in which the study is located. The first set of contexts includes: the college consortium, Woodbridge College, and the Spanish Department. The main focus of these contexts is an academic year in the late 2000s. The second set of contexts focuses on the fall semester and it includes: the elementary Spanish course section 04, the first days of the semester, the research participants, room 109 and the structure and content of the specific language course. Finally, the chapter ends with a summary.

The fifth chapter explains the rationale to select the focal lesson. It also introduces the micro-ethnographic contexts in which the focal lesson is located. The description of these contexts is useful to understand the sets of relationships that research participants co-constructed in the classroom setting. These micro-contexts are: the layout of room 109 on October 10th and the content of the focal lesson. This chapter also describes the strategies for collection and analysis of microethnographic data. The strategies of data analysis are located into stages and thus, these stages are also described. Before this chapter ends, it presents some ethical considerations and the limitation of the study.

The sixth chapter presents the examination of four segments of language activity that were taken from the focal lesson. They exemplify patterns and irregularities observed
in room 109. The analysis of each segment consists of two parts. The first part includes the analysis of the theoretical tools whereas the second part is analysis of the practices at the larger (or discourse) level of activity.

Lastly, the seventh chapter discusses the main findings of this study. It also presents my reflections in terms of the interconnections of the social categories of race, language, class and gender and microaggressions. Mainly, I reflect on the understanding of microaggressions from critical frameworks of language and literacy and the meaning this understanding has on me as a language instructor, a researcher and a woman of color.
CHAPTER 2
PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE AND LITERACY

Introduction

Generally, the understanding that educational researchers have of language is aligned with the ways they view literacy and vice versa. When language is viewed as a closed or semi-closed system of linguistic, verbal, or nonverbal signs; literacy is usually understood as the acquisition of a set of linguistic skills or cognitive processes needed to read and write. Likewise, when researchers consider language a dynamic force that shapes and is shaped by individuals’ identities and the social relationships they establish with others, literacy is viewed as a practice or an act which is linked to society’s structures and institutions. Within these last understandings of language and literacy, some researchers emphasize the importance on the particular and focus on the ways in which language is used in the classroom setting to make visible the plurality and complexity of classroom life.

In order to understand this focus, this chapter presents an overview of the main perspectives on language and literacy. It emphasizes the understandings of: 1) literacy as a social practice, 2) critical literacy, and 3) sociolinguistic and critical discourse analysis perspectives. The assumptions, goals, and importance of each set of perspectives are explained through the description of some classroom-based studies.

Within the third set of perspectives, critical sociolinguists and critical discourse analysts have developed interdisciplinary perspectives on language and literacy. The present study is located within critical sociolinguistic and critical discourse analysis
perspectives because it considers a microethnographic approach as it foregrounds the particular uses of language and it conducts a discourse analysis of language and literacy events in the classroom setting. Consequently, this chapter explains four introductions or points of departure that help introduce the approach considered in this study. Finally, it ends with a summary.

**Perspectives on Language and Literacy Research**

Perspectives on language and literacy include approaches that emphasize that literacy is practiced on social contexts. Overall, these perspectives draw on sociolinguistics, ethnographic of communication, the relationship between language use and power, among other disciplines. The perspectives considered here are: 1) literacy as a social practice, 2) critical literacy, and 3) approaches that combine sociolinguistic with critical discourse analysis.

**Literacy as a Social Practice**

The understanding of literacy as social practice has been influenced by the work done by Brian Street in 1984 in which he distinguishes between the autonomous and the ideological models of literacy. In the autonomous model of literacy, literacy is viewed as a set of neutral and decontextualized skills that can be applied to any context. In other words, most formal literacy instruction functions within the autonomous model. In the
ideological model, literacy is understood as a set of practices that are situated in specific contexts and related to society’s cultural and power structures. Consequently, the view of literacy as a social practice is within the ideological model.

In general, researchers who draw on the understanding of literacy as a social practice and conduct classroom studies have been interested in: 1) the social situatedness of classroom literacy practices, 2) the ways in which participants use literacy practices within the very same classroom community constructed through these uses, and 3) the relationship between literacy practices outside-the-classroom with literacy practices inside-the-classroom (Bloome, 2008).

Regarding research that focus on the nature of classroom literacy practices, many classroom studies have shown that students’ socialization to read and write in specific ways. Borko & Eisenhart (1986) focus on some students’ reading group experiences and their conceptions of reading. In addition to showing that students become socialized to doing reading in specific ways, these researchers argue that students acquire a social identity associated with their group (high-group or low-group). This means that students’ social identity is a result not only of their membership in the reading group but also of their engagement in reading in ways that are consistent with the group’s ways of doing reading.

In terms of research that examine how participants use classroom literacy practices, some studies have showed that this type of literacy practices are used for schooling, academic disciplines, and community action (Bloome, 2008). Applebee (1984) and Nystrand (2006) advocate for the expansion of opportunities for reading and writing
in the classroom setting. For instance, Nystrand argues that the classroom context needs to be restructured in order for students to provide extended responses to readings and to carry out complex tasks. As to the uses of classroom literacy practices for academic purposes, in 1990 Brian Street identifies two models of literacy socialization. The skills model focuses on teaching students the abilities they need to acquire the literacy practices of the academic discipline. This type of instruction requires that the skills be isolated and in sequence to achieve mastery in the discipline. In contrast, the socialization model emphasizes students’ engagement in literacy practices with other more knowledgeable students, so that as these students become experts or skilled and members of an academic community. Indeed, Street & Street (1991) present the category of school literacy practices to refer to the practices promoted or sanctioned by the school. In fact, this concept includes not only the social practices of reading and writing but other academic practices. Regarding the use of classroom literacy practices for community action, Egan-Robertson & Bloome (1998) show how the classroom context they examine changes from one that emphasizes instruction to one that foregrounds community action. In this case, community action includes students’ engagement in a series of literacy practices such as ethnographic and linguistic study to identify important issues in their communities, report them and take action to change them.

Regarding the third area of research, studies that examine the relationship between literacy practices both outside and inside the classroom, Heath’s classic ethnographic study (1983) shows the ways in which children from three different communities use written and oral language that derive from the literacy practices and the culture that exist in their own particular community. The recognition that literacy
practices outside the classroom influence classroom literacy practices has encouraged researchers to examine the literacy practices of students from cultural and linguistic minority communities. Ogbu & Simons (1998) argue that there are differences in how students from voluntary and involuntary minority communities respond in the classroom. They point out that students from communities that have migrated voluntarily to the target country choose to adopt a cooperative stance with the literacy practices in the classroom while students from communities that have been brought by force to the target country may oppose to participating in them.

Researchers who are part of the New Literacies Studies (NLS) group have added to the understanding of literacy as a social practice. NLS was formed a decade ago by researchers such as Barton & Hamilton (2000), Baynham & Prinsloo (2001), Gee (2000), and Street (1999). NLS researchers acknowledge the social turn and support the belief that literacy practices “are always and already embedded in particular social forms of activity” (Baynham & Prisloo, 2001, p. 83). The emphasis of NLS researchers on bringing the local nature of literacy to the foreground implies the recognition that literacies are multiple, vary according to time and space, and are contested in relations of power. One other implication is the question of whose literacies are dominant and whose literacies are marginalized or resistant (Street, 1984).

Barton & Hamilton (2000) present six propositions about the nature of literacy in order to develop the understanding of literacy as multiple, variable and dynamic in power relations.
• Literacy is a set of social practices, these social practices are observable in events which are mediated by written texts.
• There are different literacies associated with different domains of life.
• Literacy practices are patterned by social institutions and power relations and some literacies are more dominant, visible and influential than others.
• Literacy practices are purposeful and embedded in broader social goals and cultural practices.
• Literacy is historically situated.
• Literacy practices change and new ones are frequently acquired through processes of informal learning and sense making, as well as formal education and training.

These propositions show that while literacy events are observable, literacy practices are not. This means that literacy practices are inferred as they are connected to unobservable beliefs, values, attitudes and power structures. Barton and Hamilton explain that literacy as a social practice is viewed as multiple, patterned by social institutions, historically situated, and that the focus is on how the local context shapes larger processes of social activity.

Baynham & Prisloo (2001) identify the following areas in literacy research that draws on NLS perspectives: 1) community-based literacy practices, 2) workplace literacy practices, 3) literacy practices and policy discourses on literacy, 4) literacy practices, new technologies and media, 5) home-school literacy practices, 6) literacy and schooling, and 7) academic literacy practices.
In terms of community-based literacy practices, Prinsloo & Breier (1996) examine the everyday literacy practices of marginalized communities in South Africa particularly their relationship with the literacy expectations of schooling. Similarly, Barton & Hamilton (1998) analyze the unobserved everyday literacy events and practices of a community in Lancaster in the United Kingdom. Regarding studies that examine literacy practices in the workplace, Farrell (2000), Gee, Hull, & Lankshear (1996); Hull, Jury, Oren, & Katz (1996); Jones (2000), O’Connor (1994), and Scholtz & Prinsloo (2001) show the richness of literacy practices in workplaces in the USA, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Australia.

In the area of literacy practices and policy on literacy, Hamilton (2001), Hammond (2001), Kell (2001), and Lo Bianco (2001) are concerned with the interface between literacy research and literacy policy formation and assessment. Hamilton demonstrates the usefulness of a NLS perspective to policy development in assessment. She considers that a NLS perspective provides a validity check regarding the ways in which what is assessed relates to literacy in context. She also claims that the NLS’ research methodologies (Lankshear et al., 1997) are useful to examine the processes of policy formation.

Regarding the area of literacy practices and new literacies and media, some researchers have investigated the impact of new technologies on everyday literacy practices at home, school, and work (Hawisher & Selfe, 1999; Snyder, 2001; Snyder & Lankshear, 2000). Snyder draws on a three-dimensional model of literacy and on research on the redrawning of boundaries between the visual and verbal in forms of CMC.
(computer-mediated-communication) to present the “Digital Rhetorics” project (Lankshear et al., 1997). With this research, Snyder responds to the need expressed by Baynham & Prinsloo (2001) of empirical work that considers the uses of NLS methodologies to examine the claims some of the claims made by NLS researchers.

Examples of research studies that examine the relationship between home and school literacy practices and the relationship between literacy and schooling include Heath’s classic ethnographic research mainly because, as it has been said, it shows the different “ways of knowing” that culturally and socially diverse students bring to the classroom. Also, Gee (1996), Luke & Kale (1997), and Street & Street (1991) believe that literacy teaching can be shaped differently so that it includes the literacy practices that minority students bring to classrooms. These findings in addition to some work done in the area of critical literacy (see below) demonstrate that formal schooling usually contributes to view literacy as a set of decontextualized skills and to understand knowledge as being validated through standardized tests. Consequently, these researchers advocate for a critical view of knowledge and literacy and support the goal to include all students as a way to reduce social and educational inequalities.

Finally, the area of academic literacy practices has become an attractive area of research as there has been an increased interest in understanding how knowledge is constructed in tertiary institutions (Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001). NLS researchers are also concerned with the advancement of students from minority backgrounds into institutions of higher education.
The understanding of literacy as a social practice or that knowledge is socially constructed has been examined somewhat extensively in theoretical and empirical terms. Literacy as a social practice researchers have been interested in studying the nature, the uses of classroom literacy practices and the connections between literacies inside and outside the classroom. In fact, this perspective has grown as researchers from the group of New Literacy Studies (NLS) view literacy as being multiple, variable and dynamic in power relations. Literacy research from a NLS perspective has been conducted and there are studies that focus on the classroom setting. In the section that follows, the focus is on the critical literacy perspective.

**Critical Literacy and Literacy Research**

Critical literacy theorists are interested in the relationship between texts (mainly written texts), the social world and power relations (Beach, 2005, Wallace, 2001). Beach argues that this examination can be done through the inclusion of social institutions. In his own words, the focus of critical literacy is on the “ways in which different literacies as social and cultural practices are constituted, valued, and promoted through different institutions” (2005, p.418). In terms of the goals of critical literacy, Freebody (2005) and Mellor & Patterson (2005) identify two objectives. First, the students’ examination of how language and texts shape ideological perspectives. This is what critical literacy theorists understand as students’ critical thinking. Second, the attempt to change social institutions and the ways in which students think about them.
Underlying critical literacy on students’ instruction makes critical literacy share many similarities with critical (responsive) pedagogy mainly because both areas are committed to finding ways to empower students. Consequently, these two areas find concepts such as “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & and Gonzalez, 1992) and “third space” (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, Script, 1995) useful⁵. In addition to being related to critical pedagogy, critical literacy has been informed by different perspectives such as sociolinguistics sociocultural perspectives on language and language learning, economics, and sociology.

Critical literacy theorists who draw on sociolinguistic or sociocultural perspectives may choose to examine how cultural practices are produced and shaped by ideological orientations (Cushman, 1998; Gonzalez & Melis, 2000; Guerra, 1998; Gutierrez, Asato, Santos & Gotanda, 2002). For instance, Cushman documents how poor women acquire literacy practices for coping with bureaucratic social service institutions. Gonzalez & Melis and Gutierrez et al. analyze the influence of language ideologies such as the “English-Only” movement on the ESL or bilingual programs. Critical literacy theorists who draw on sociological approaches may be concerned with the social inequities constituted by assymetrical relations of power that prevail in the society at large. For example, Fine & Weis (1998), Gee & Crawford (1998), and Hemphill (1999) examine the influence of class on literacy development and identify different types of literacies valued in contexts defined according to class.

⁵ The concept of “third space” illustrates the learning space in which dominant and nondominant literacy practices co-exist dialectically. “Funds of knowledge” emphasizes the value of the home and cultural practices of minority students.
These perspectives have contributed to the advancement of the field. However, some critical literacy theorists have realized that students’ empowerment or teachers’ enactment of institutional power cannot be prescribed as if it were a monolithic or universal force. Consequently, they have drawn on perspectives that acknowledge a more dynamic and complex view of power and its relationship with language such as poststructuralism, critical race theory, and feminist media studies. These different disciplines have made an impact on the interests of critical literacy theorists and researchers. Critical literacy researchers who draw on poststructuralist perspectives are mainly concerned with the analysis of language use, subjectivity, and discourses. For instance, they highlight how writers adopt different identities (Fecho, 2002) and how readers adopt a range of shifting and multiple positions in terms of gender identities (Davies, 1993; Walkerdine, 1990; Weedon, 1987). Based on the claim that critical race theory examines the construction of racism as a social and institutional process and the ways in which categories and hierarchies of power privilege certain groups, researchers such as Barnett (2000) argues that discourses of “Whiteness” are often used in literacy practices to exert order and rationality mainly because disorder and irrationality are associated with “not-White” discourses. Finally, critical literacy researchers who draw on feminist media studies perspectives may be interested in the construction of gendered identities through responses to and construction of media texts (Alvermann, Moon, & Hagood, 1999; Finders, 1997; Luke, 1996).

In terms of classroom-based research from critical literacy perspectives, Comber & Simpson (2001) affirm that despite the important work done by critical literacy theorists, there are “few theorised accounts of enacted classroom practices” (p. ix). In
order to narrow this gap, these researchers edit a collection of classroom-based studies which are grouped in the following themes: the relationship between practices and identify formation (Janks, 2001; Martino, 2001; Stein, 2001), textbook production and curriculum (Bigelow, 2001; Cheah, 2001; Clarence-Fincham, 2001; Cruddas & Watson, 2001; Lin, 2001; Mellor & Patterson, 2001) and power relationships in classroom talk around text (Dyson, 2001; O'Brien, 2001; Sahni, 2001; Vasquez, 2001; Wallace, 2001).

In the first theme, Martino explores how various forms of masculinity influence the ways in which a group of high school students respond to two texts. His analysis enables him to discuss the implications for the development of strategies for targeting masculinity and homophobia in the critical literacy classroom. He suggests that critical literacy educators need to use texts strategically to teach boys to read for masculinity and to help them reflect on the effects of masculine power in their lives. He also considers that in order for boys to reflect on issues of masculinity, literacy practices must acknowledge their feelings, values, and opinions. Martino advocates for a “whole-school approach” as it is not only the teachers but also the school at all levels that need to be commited to the interrogation of masculinity and the promotion of gender equity.

Within the studies that explore the relationship textbook production and the curriculum from critical literacy lenses, Lin shows how a group of Cantonese children who are in an ESL reading lesson in Hong Kong contest the traditional curriculum by preferring their own narrative practices. Likewise, Cheah illustrates the ways in which a teacher in a ESL class in Singapore negotiates the official curriculum and incorporates
different literacy practices. She argues that the acknowledgement and appreciation of the local context foreground what counts as literacy for children.

Finally, regarding the theme of power relationships in classroom talk around a text, Wallace believes that critical literacy comes in two ways: 1) the awareness and interpretations of texts and 2) the talk that is constructed about these texts. Drawing on a critical language awareness perspective, Wallace examines the power exercised by the teacher in the adjudication of students’ interpretations of texts and shows how critical interpretations of texts can be negotiationed in a second language classroom in a British university. With the interest that this group of second language learners be co-discussants, she argues that the teacher’s dual role as principal and author is crucial to negotiate critical literacy development. She explains that as principal the teacher scaffolds the class and shapes it so that it is recognized as such while as author both the teacher and the students are empowered because they assume responsibility for the authorship of their contributions.

Although this collection of classroom-based studies contributes positively to the discussion of research of classroom language and literacy, critical literacy faces challenges and presents some ambiguities. Wooldridge (2001) reflects on the critical literacy work that she and a group of teachers have done and argues that critical literacy practitioners are likely to encounter challenges at three different levels: the classroom or textual practice, the curriculum, and the teaching practice. At the textual practice level, they find that the practice of critical questioning is very useful because it helps students reconstruct their own understandings. However, they point out that teachers’ knowledge
base (and lack of) is crucial as it can lead teachers to do what they intended not to. For instance, while questions such as “who is silenced here?” can be vital for students’ reconstruction of traditional images, the teachers’ interest of not excluding any student could lead to the essentialization of women as if they all have the same desires, needs, and experiences.

At the level of curriculum planning, Wooldridge points out that although an issues-based approach (problem-based approach) is compatible with the critical textual practices that teachers implement in their classrooms, the challenges teachers encounter are also related to the teachers’ background knowledge or lack of it. This means that despite the intentions of critical literacy teachers of involving all students in meaningful and real actions, they can be intrusive. Finally, regarding a critical reading of teachers’ teaching practices, Wooldridge recognizes the need for teachers to see themselves as curriculum decision makers. She believes that teachers tend to attribute the decisions they make to somewhat else such as the syllabus and the educational system. For this reason, she concludes that although the task of doing a critical reflection is quite difficult and disconforting, critical literacy helps denaturalize teachers’ teaching practice. In fact, this researcher lists the principles teachers need to consider for the implementation of a critical literacy approach. First, she considers that a critical literacy approach is not about transmitting an alternative meaning because meaning does not lie only in the text. Second, she believes that critical literacy teachers need to think of tasks that reaffirm the idea that there are multiple interpretations and realities. These tasks need to equip students to question certain aspects of the way society and to help students to be engaged with the learning they acquire and do something with that learning. From this
perspective, she affirms that a crucial part of the critical literacy approach is the way teachers give students access to texts.

One of the main differences between the literacy as a social practice perspective and the critical literacy perspective is that the critical literacy theorists incorporates the role of social institutions and power in the social construction of literacy. Throughout the years, critical literacy perspective have validated their claims at the theoretical and empirical levels.

In the following section, I present a group of researchers who draw on both sociolinguistic and discourse analysis perspectives to foreground the local context and to analyze the relationship between the local context and processes of social activity at the macro level.

**Critical Sociolinguistic and Discourse Analysis Perspectives**

Some sociolinguists and educators have been concerned with what the social construction of knowledge really means. Particularly, they are interested in how knowledge construction is accomplished and how it influences individuals to participate in a range of social contexts and to have access to social knowledge. Bloome (2005), Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz (1992) and Green (2005) argue that this concern has taken them into a theoretical debate which has changed their view of language and their idea of how language enters in educational studies. Indeed, there is a new research agenda as the nature of inquiry is now the relation between language and education (Bloome, 2005) which has developed research approaches that draw on a combination of discursive,
ethnographic, and linguistic perspectives to analyze moment-to-moment interactions in classroom settings (Green and Dixon, 1994 and Bloome et al., 2005, 2008).

Bloome et al. (2005, 2008) and Dixon & Green (2005) have recognized the examination of everyday life and the need of its theorization. They consider concepts such as literacy events and literacy practices that were described earlier and have designed approaches for the analysis of classroom language. They focus on how classroom participants use language, how these uses shape their classroom interaction and how they reproduce (or not) discursive patterns of social relations in society. In sum, these analyses highlight the discursive nature of language and literacy practices.

Dixon and Green (2005) along with other researchers have developed the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group whereas Bloome et al., (2005, 2008) have presented a microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of the classroom language and literacy events. The work done by the Santa Barbara group has been used to analyze oral and written texts while Bloome et al.’s microethnographic approach has been used to analyze conversational data and oral texts. In the following, I explain these approaches separately.

The Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group

This group was founded in the early 1990s. Green & Dixon (1994) define it as a community “of teachers, researchers, and students who are concerned with understanding
how everyday life in classrooms is constructed by members through their interactions, verbal and other, and how these constructions influence what students have opportunities to access, accomplish, and thus, “learn” in schools” (p. 231).

The Santa Barbara researchers draw on several conceptual frameworks such as feminist theory, linguistics (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and systemic linguistics), poststructuralism, critical theory, anthropology, education, cognitive sociology, and sociology (conversation analysis, ethnomethodology, critical theory, and cognitive sociology) (Lin, 1994). They believe that social practices present patterns that are consistent across time and social events. The recognition of social patterns does not imply the belief that social practices are static. Rather, they are dynamic. They believe that classroom participants draw on knowledge of prior practices to participate in the classroom. They also assume that participants negotiate the ways in which classroom events are constructed.

According to Dixon & Green (2005) ethnographic and discourse analysis perspectives are useful to examine the construction of classroom texts. Particularly, this set of perspectives helps them examine 1) traces in the texts of classroom life, 2) how students take up and use these texts (oral, written, and visual) as resources in accomplishing new tasks, and 3) how these texts are talked (acted) into being collectively and individually (p. 351). In order to identify discursive and material (experiential) traces on which classroom participants draw in producing texts, Dixon & Green rely on the concepts of intertextuality and intercontextuality and a process of backward and forward activity (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Fairclough, 1993; Kristeva, 1986). In these
researchers’ view, their interactional ethnographic approach is extremely useful because without the analyses they “would not have been able to achieve the level of emic understanding or to make visible the ways in which the words and actions of the class were historically tied across time and events and served as resources for individuals within the collective as they participated in and produced work through the events of daily life” (pp. 380-381).

In 1994, Green & Dixon edited an issue of the Journal *Linguistics and Education* in which Brilliant-Mills (1994), Floriani (1994), Gutierrez (1994), Heras (1994), and Lin (1994) presented classroom-based studies which exemplify the main concerns of the Santa Barbara group. Brilliant-Mills draws on the three-dimensional theoretical framework presented by Fairclough (1993), an ethnographic approach, and a sociolinguistic analysis (Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992) to analyze how students and teachers define what counts as mathematics, mathematical actions, and being mathematicians. She argues that what it means to do mathematics in a bilingual sixth-grade classroom includes: observing, defining technical terms with a context of use, discussing in [small] group, reporting to group, analyzing solutions or information; presenting evidence, writing about math, and defining specific elements about the problem. Regarding what counts as a mathematician in this context “is intertextually connected to being a student within and across the patterns of everyday life in all areas of the curriculum” (1994, p. 328). The explains the value of this type of situational and historical analysis by concluding

Without analysis of the local, how members construct the social and discursive practices would not be visible.
Without the historical analysis, the relationship between and among particular dimensions of classroom life that become members’ knowledge would not be visible. Through the juxtaposition and dialectic relationship of local and historical events, a representation of the processes of membership and resources members bring to a new situation can be explored and what counts as knowledge (of mathematics) identified. (Ibid., p. 329)

Gutierrez (1994) draws on activity theory (Leont’ev 1981a, 1981b; Vygotsky, 1978) and conversation analysis (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990) to frame a series of ethnographic studies that illustrate different relationships among language, context, and literacy learning. She argues that the differences she recognizes in patterns of interaction and discourse, social relationships, discourse practices, knowledge systems, and participants’ beliefs point to different ways in which the “writing process” is constructed. She identifies three “recurrent patterns of activity” during the classroom event “journal sharing” which she names the recitation, the responsive, and the responsive/collaborative scripts. Her analysis of these scripts supports her claim that teachers play a crucial role in enhancing or hindering students’ possibilities to learning to write. She also argues that a minor change in the pattern of interaction has a major impact on what occurs subsequently within the event. In terms of the main differences across classrooms she concludes that:

… only in the responsive/collaborative classroom did the students have the opportunity to take up a broad range of interactional and conversational roles and relationships that helped them construct extended oral and written texts. (p. 362)
Finally, Lin (1994) combines discourse and ethnographic analysis as well as cognitive and symbolic anthropology to examine the ways in which the teacher and students shape the events that took place in seventh-grade English class. Similar to Gutierrez, Lin claims that the teacher plays a central role in helping students construct the understanding of what counts as the “language and all of its uses”. This researcher points out that her interest in the language and discursive worlds classroom members construct through their interaction exemplifies an analysis of the language of the classroom. This analysis differs from analyses of the language in the classroom whose focus is on the language resources participants bring to the classroom. Consequently, the teacher and students of this seventh-grade classroom construct a body of common knowledge about academic content and social life. In her own words, this body of knowledge includes

a) intertextual relationships between one event and another, one type of task and another (e.g. reading, writing, speaking, and listening to others), and various types of written texts used in the classroom; and b) roles and relationships among members and with academic content. Through such relationships and the patterns of interactions within an event and across events, the teacher and students constructed social and discursive practices that supported the academic and social processes of the classroom. (p. 403)

Having explained the work done by the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, in what follows, I focus on the characteristics of the approach developed by David Bloome and his colleagues.
One way to introduce the microethnographic approach is through its views on multidisciplinarity and language and literacy. As to language and literacy, Bloome (2005) believed that descriptions of people’s everyday life require an understanding of language and literacy from within all of the complex worlds within which language and literacy events take place. This view from within or “in the doing” has, at least, three implications. First, it foregrounds the particular which refers to “what happens in a particular place, at a particular time and with a particular set of people, engage in a particular activity and event” (p. 276). Second, it implies the conceptualization of people as actors on and in the worlds in which they live. In other words, people have the possibility to respond and be efficient in terms of change, stability and resistance and to be responsible for the actions they take in support of the worlds in which they live. Third, this view has implications for researchers as they need to revise constantly the theories and methodologies that direct the critical study of language and literacy. One other implication for researchers is that they are required to stand simultaneously in differing worlds such as the world of academia and other worlds. Regarding the view of multidisciplinarity, it is not viewed as the convergence among differing disciplines as in the Santa Barbara research group. Rather, it is understood as the need of these conflicting disciplines to keep language and literacy “out there, strange, alien, unabsorbed” (Ibid., p. 277). This lack of alienation among the disciplines supports the researchers’ need to constantly revise the theories and methodologies that guide their descriptions of language and literacy. This revision implies the view of theoretical constructs as points of
departure or introductions for the critical inquiry of language and literacy. These points of departure support the dual (material and discursive) nature of classroom events by looking toward themselves and toward the object of inquiry (language and literacy).

Since the microethnographic approach will be explained in detail in the third chapter, in what follows, I explain four points of departure in order to exemplify the microethnographic approach developed by Bloome et al. (2005, 2008). These theoretical introductions are: particularity, material, history, and time. After presenting these concepts, I describe some empirical studies that draw on the microethnographic approach.

Particularity and Material

The emphasis on the particular stems from Becker who is interested in “things which wash out at higher levels of generality” (in Bloome, 2005, pp. 84-85). Based on this claim, critical sociolinguists advocate for the visibility of specific differences. Bloome (2005) believes that this interest in the particular is a political act because many schools and most current educational policies and research do not acknowledge the situatedness of people and events.

The construct of material is drawn from sociocultural perspectives on learning and learning development particularly Volosinov (1929/1973) who believes that language has material or experiential basis. In his own words, he writes that
every phenomenon functioning as an ideological sign has some kind of material embodiment, whether in sound, physical mass, color, movements of the body, or the like. In this sense, the reality of the sign is fully objective and lends itself to a unitary, monistic, objective method of study. A sign is a phenomenon of the external world. Both the sign itself and all the effects it produces (all those actions, reactions, and new signs it elicits in the surrounding social milieu) occur in outer experience. (p. 11)

Based on the idea that any sign has a material embodiment, it is believed that the material existence of any use of language depended on its ratification by others. Consequently, critical researchers need to be aware of the distinction between a no ratification of any use of language (e.g. an utterance) and either its negation, ignoring or the nonratification of its linguistic meaning. In terms of the material or experiential aspects of an event, these are given historically and are also created, made, and re-made throughout the event. For example, the material aspects of a classroom event include the physical setting, the artifacts, the participants, technology and the participants’ behavior (Bloome, 2005).

History and Time

The beliefs that the meanings are created, social identities are formed and that the material aspects that are given importance in an event influence or limit other events lead to consider that historical influences limit the options, meaning, language, and material goods that are available to the participants in an event.
From this perspective, it is assumed that critical researchers need to unpack many types of historical influences. There are large historical influences such as the creation of the school, the school’s view of teacher and students’ roles, the schools view of knowledge and the acquisition of it, etc. Examples of historical influence at a small scale include the events that preceded on the same or on previous days. Based on the different historical influences, it is important that researchers unpack all the levels at which events are related because events are established at many levels. In addition, since historical relationships are socially constructed and materially related, it is believed that participants must explain and react to the historical relationships they have constructed. That is, participants act and react within the context in which they are participants. In Bloome’s words, in order to understand the dynamics of a classroom event, “researchers need to analyze the historical forces that have channeled specific people to a specific place at a specific time to accomplish a specific set of task” (2005, p. 282).

Finally, the construct of time is understood in terms of Bakhtin’s (1935/1981) concept of “chronotope” which considers a very close relationship between time and space. Bloome believes that “chronotope” is a very powerful construct that helps frame human agency and the relationship of individuals to the world in which they live in. It can also help initiate the discussions about the forms in which time and space are conceptualized in classroom language and literacy events.

In terms of empirical research, Carter (2008), Katz & DaSilva Iddings (2010) and Pane & Rocco (2009) exemplify the use of the microethnographic approach to the
discourse analysis study of classroom language and literacy events. Pane & Rocco show the importance of critical microethnography as an approach that helps change the conditions that reproduce unjust educational practices. These researchers affirm that the analysis of “moment-to-moment interactions enables a better understanding of practices and expectations embedded in the classroom in order to create spaces to transform oppressive educational practices that maintain the status quo” (2009, para. 14). They explain that a better understanding of how uses of language both promote and limit opportunities for literacy learning is essential particularly when teacher-student interactions are concerned with antisocial and/or disruptive behavior.

Carter (2008) draws on Bloome et al.’s approach and a Black feminist perspective (Collins, 2000) to examine the way in which Black female identity is positioned and contested in a 9th grade language arts classroom. The two questions that guide her analysis are:

1) What are the various ways in which African American female identity is portrayed within students’ comments?

2) What textual evidence supports their interpretations and portrayal of Dee? (p. 120)

Dee is the character of Alice Walker’s short story “Everyday Use” who is an educated African American female who returns home. In her analysis, Carter shows that students’ interpretations about Dee are not supported in the text. Rather, they represent larger ideological stances which position negatively the identity of Black American females. This means that unlike an interactional sociolinguistic analysis which often
focuses on the topics that arise in the conversations between the teacher and students and the shifts in these topics (Smith, 2008), Carter focuses on the ways in which classroom participants position Dee and argues that both the teacher and students have positioned Dee as a false and selfish person. Instead of seeing Dee’s possibilities and strengths (as well as of the other female characters in Walker’s story), students position Dee in ways that are compatible to the negative construction of African American women.

Finally, Katz and DaSilva Iddings (2010) draw on Bloome et al.’s approach to analyze the linguistic and racial identities of linguistically diverse students through two case studies. The first study is about two recent immigrant Mexican students (and their families) who are in a English-dominant second-grade classroom. The second study analyzes the narratives of a group of African American children in preschool and kindergarten. Regarding the first study, the researchers analyze classroom interactions between peers and oral narratives of students’ family members and the classroom teacher during parent-teacher conferences. They find that the home and school role of the two immigrant children are separate and conflicting in strengthening their linguistic and ethnic identities. For instance, Oswaldo, one of the students, is positioned as a competent and helpful son by his mother, but he is perceived as an unsuccessful ELL student at school. As to the second study, the researchers focus on the children’s oral and written narratives from their activities of writing in their journals and telling stories to their classmates and teachers. They find that in these activities the African American children position themselves with people who are important in their lives. These students use relational terms, icons and pictorial representations, and explicit naming, and describe the story’s location. According to these researchers, the contrast between these two studies
emphasize the integration of the students’ racial, linguistic, and cultural experiences. They argue that these two cases suggest three factors that can be crucial in facilitating the integration of the home/school identities of children from linguistically diverse backgrounds. First, the creation of classroom activities that are text- and oral-based as these activities are considered opportunities to bring aspects of students’ home practices to the classroom setting. Second, teachers need to play the role of mediators of activities that position children as competents in their homes and classroom communities. The last factor refers to the meaningful inclusion of all children within classroom practices.

**Summary of the Chapter**

The perspectives of literacy as a social practice and critical literacy have three main implications for the inquiry of language and literacy: authentic literacy instruction, redefinition of literacy and the understanding of power and literacy (Kerry, 2012). These perspectives make visible the need to create materials that learners use outside the classroom and teach accordingly. As to the redefinition of literacy, these perspectives highlight the awareness that texts are used to achieved certain goals and purposes. Finally, these perspectives have shown the ways in which power relationships contribute to determine which literacy practices are available to a given context, which are dominant and privileged, and which are marginalized.

Despite the growing theoretical work that has been done from these perspectives, the number of theorized accounts that illustrate concerns such as the situatedness of classroom practices and the uses of classroom literacy practices is
reduced. Indeed, the number is almost inexistent in the case of classrooms where a language is being learned as a world (foreign) language. As it has been said previously, the theory-practice dichotomy and the complexity of classroom data makes classroom-based research more difficult. Given this need for more classroom-based research, the sociolinguistic and discourse analysis approaches presented by the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group and David Bloome and his colleagues are crucial for the critical inquire of language and literacy. First, these approaches have been specially designed to the examination of language and literacy events in classroom settings. Second, they draw on a combination of linguistic and discourse analysis perspectives. This means that the consideration of a sociolinguistic approach help foreground the uses of language whereas the conduction of a discourse analysis of classroom language and literacy events helps illustrate how the local context shapes larger layers of social activity and which literacy events and practices are dominant and which are marginalized.

While researchers of the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group have developed an approach that has been applied to the analysis of written and oral texts in the classroom, David Bloome and his colleagues have developed an approach that is more compatible with the characteristics of classroom conversational data and oral texts.

Since this study focuses on moment-to-moment interaction, the Bloome et. al’s approach is considered. This approach is characterized by its views of multidisciplinarity and language and literacy. The view of language and literacy from within means that the focus is on the process or “in the doing”. Multidisciplinarity means that the perspectives to examine language and literacy contribute to make them alien or strange. This particular
approach views theoretical constructs as theoretical points of departures that require constant revision by researchers because these theoretical points of entry turn toward the object of inquiry and toward themselves.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN: EPISTEMOLOGIES, THEORIES, APPROACHES, AND STRATEGIES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

While the previous chapter focuses on the different approaches to language and literacy research and locates the present study within the sets of sociolinguistic and discourse analysis perspectives, this chapter explains the four levels that shape its design.

This chapter starts by explaining the construct of chronotope. It also presents the areas of discourse analysis studies, feminist standpoint and difference research as well as the concepts of race, racism, racialization, microaggressions, and whiteness. These areas and concepts help establish the epistemological and the theoretical grounds and connect with the approach (methodology) and strategies (theoretical tools) levels. Third, it describes the microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of classroom language and literacy events which includes the constructs of personhood and event. Fourth, it presents the five theoretical strategies (tools) presented by Bloome et al. (2005, 2008) and the tool of feminist reflexivity (Harding, 2007). Finally, and before concluding with a summary, this chapter presents the limitations of the microethnographic approach.

Chronotope

In addition to Bloome (2005), Kamberelis & Dimitriadis consider the construct of chronotope for critical inquiries of language and literacy. They use it to redefine the
conduction of qualitative inquiries. In their own words, chronotope is a heuristic that describes the “lines of forces that locate, distribute, and connect specific set of practices, goals, and groups of actors” (2005, p.25). Therefore, “chronotope” embodies the beliefs and assumptions about the world, knowledge, the human subject, the subject-object relation, language and meaning that researchers view as common or expected when they are making their qualitative inquiries. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis also believe that chronotope is useful in four ways. First, it helps researchers remember the historical and institutional dimensions of their inquiries. Second, it enables them to examine their own internalization of the assumptions and principles of the chronotope or chronotopes with which they operate when conducting their critical qualitative studies. Third, it helps them recognize that they can change the set of beliefs embodied in the chronotopes. Finally, it enables researchers to work in interdisciplinary ways.

As the researcher of this study, the construct of chronotope helped me revise my own understandings of the epistemologies, theories and the microethnographic approach as well as conduct the discourse analysis of the classroom language events considered here. It also helped me develop aligned principles that connected the levels of this study and kept its multidisciplinary nature.

Kamberelis and Dimitriadis identify the following four chronotopes: Chronotope I (Objectivism and Representation), Chronotope II (Reading and Interpretation), Chronotope III (Conscientization and Praxis), and Chronotope IV (Power/Knowledge and Defamiliarization). Although the boundaries among and between the chronotopes are flexible and fluid, Chronotope I is more aligned with the goals of quantitative research
whereas chronotopes II, III, and IV are more compatible with qualitative inquiries (See Figure 3.1.).

**Chronotope I**

**Objectivism and Representation**
Knowledge is a "mirror of nature":
Correspondence theory of truth
Subjects and objects are separate and non-constitutive
Language is a neutral vehicle of thought

**Chronotope II**

**Reading and Interpretation**
Knowledge is socially constructed but value neutral
Consensus theory of truth
Subjects and objects are separate but mutually constitutive
Language is constitutive of thought but value neutral

**Chronotope III**

**Conscientization and Praxis**
Knowledge is socially constructed and inextricably linked to power relations
Truth is produced through dialogue within an "ideal speech situation"
Subjects and objects are separate but mutually constitutive
Language constitutes thought and is a function of existent power relations

**Chronotope IV**

**Power/Knowledge and Defamiliarization**
Knowledge is an effect of existent power relations
Truth is an effect of power/knowledge
Subjects and objects are both produced within existent relations of power
Language is a force among other forces that produces the real

**Figure 3.1** Chronotopes of Qualitative Inquiry (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 28).
Among these three last chronotopes, chronotopes II and III are grounded on social constructionist theories of the human subject, knowledge, truth, language and meaning. The main difference between chronotope II and chronotope III is that whereas the assumptions in chronotope II do not consider power, the assumptions embodied in chronotope III include it. Finally, the set of assumptions that are embodied in chronotope IV are grounded in postmodern and poststructuralist theories. These theories do not aim at the empowerment of individuals nor do they support a perfect or flawless sense of the human subject. Rather, they acknowledge the subjects’ flawed existence. I locate this study in the set of beliefs embodied in chronotopes III and IV. I believe that the view of language and literacy from within that is used in this study is compatible with the sets of beliefs embodied in chronotope IV. However, I acknowledge that power and consequently, social categories can also be static. For this reason, I also locate the study within the sets of beliefs embodied in chronotope III. This recognition implies the acknowledgement of conflict and uneasiness throughout most the stages of research.

Before describing the sets of beliefs embodied in the two chronotopes, it is important to define the different levels of research design considered in this study. Kamberelis and Dimitriadis deploy the concepts of epistemology, theories, approach, and strategies because they consider that these terms reflect and construct their dynamism and variability. They define epistemology as “knowledge and how people come to have knowledge” (2005, p. 13) whereas they believe that theories are “abstract sets of assumptions and assertions used to interpret and sometimes explain psychological, social, cultural, and historical processes and formations” (Ibid., p. 15). Their definitions of approach and strategies will be introduced in a later section.
Chronotopes III and IV

Chronotope IV breaks with respect to chronotope III in its view of power and knowledge. Chronotope IV assumes that power is inextricably linked to knowledge, not simply related. This power/knowledge link stems from the work done by French philosopher Michel Foucault (1977, 1980, and 1984).

Rather than viewing power as a monolithic and static force that can be overthrown and replaced (chronotope III), Foucault believes that power reaches to the very grain of the social subjects. Instead of viewing power as being reached outside in the social world (chronotope III), he believes that it runs throughout subjects’ social body. In his words, power is “a multiple and mobile field of force relations where far-reaching, but never completely stable effects of domination are produced” (1980, p. 102). In a later work, Foucault points out that power is maintained and reproduced within micro social and political processes, and considers that power has different origins and locations. In his own words, power “traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network that runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression” (1984, p. 61). Also, he argues that power operates through what he calls “technologies of self” (Foucault, 1997). This means that despite people’s attempts to challenge asymmetrical relations of power, people are complicit in their construction and in assigning differential value to different subject positions. In other words, people themselves work on their own regulation of their thoughts and conduct. This implies the situatedness of the social practices in which people engage in everyday life within larger
layers of society or discourses. These discourses dispose people to position themselves in some ways and not in other ways. For this reason, Foucault affirms that power is as a “matter of both being positioned by proximal and distal social forces and responding to being positioned in unique and agentic ways” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 47).

The belief that power is relational and productive leads to Foucault’s thought that power and knowledge are intrinsically linked. He argues that instead of indexing truths, knowledge claims index effects of truth which are produced and naturalized within specific discourses or “regimes of truth”. Since knowledge and truth effects are intrinsically linked to power and it is not possible to step outside the “regimes of truth” completely, Foucault believes that the action for liberation and emancipation considered, for example, in chronotope III is ineffective. Instead, he considers that action or praxis is material, local, relational, and pragmatic.

In terms of the constitution of social subjects, Foucault believes that discourses are “grids of specification” for categorizing the human subject in relation to the social subject. Many theorists draw on Foucault’s work and consider that human subjects are neither totally autonomous nor coherent in nature. They also believe that discourses are forms of power that produce the individual and the social body and that subjectivity is produced in and through residual institutional discourses that offer the possibilities to develop and limit subjects’ everyday experiences (chronotope IV). For instance, Lacan (1977) believes that subjects have a “sutured” nature of existence to institutionalized and naturalized discourses and practices. He argues that this nature contributes to the belief that discourses speak and write through subjects.
The idea that discourses speak and write through subjects more than the notion that what subjects speak and write derives from their minds raises some questions about the issue of subjects’ agency. However, it is assumed that social subjects have some agency. However, two claims moderate it (chronotope IV). First, the belief that language practices always occur within larger social contexts (discourses) that exist somewhat independently of any specific instance of these practices. Second, the idea that the intentions subjects have are—to some extent—effects of the institutional discourses in which they are already situated. This means that subjects do not create their intentions *ex-nihilo* (out of nothing). Rather, their intentions are created as a function of their condition of interpellated subjects. In Kamberelis & Dimitriadis’ words “individuals participate in the struggle to construct discourses of self, others, and world but always from within the limits of the discourses that simultaneously produce them” (2005, p. 50).

Regarding the view of language and meaning, chronotope IV supports the idea that language and meaning do not exist in people’s mind. They exist in the multiple and interrelated set of discursive systems in which people are situated. For Foucault, language and text (or “print literacy”) are important to the extent that they are forces (among other forces) that produce “truth effects”. Discourse practices or “regimes of truth” are not seen in terms of dialogic relations (chronotope III) but in terms of power or constant struggle (chronotope IV). Since discourse practices are viewed as producing never-intended effects because they are connected with a multiplicity of forces, language and literacy are seen as intrinsically entailing struggles for power and legitimacy. What is more, since language and literacy do not produce a flawless sense of social life and society,
researchers’ main concern is to understand how discourses emerge, gain legitimacy, and function to produce what subjects believe is true.

The beliefs that power is relational and productive, agency of subjects is moderated and that language, meaning and literacy exist in the multiple and interrelated set of discursive systems foreground the intrinsic instability and vulnerability of the social world. Research within chronotope IV considers Wittgenstein’s dictum “to look rather than “to think” which means that researchers do not explicate an event with preconceived theories or models before looking to what they have (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). This research does not aim at deconstructing a set of discourses or practices to then replace it with a better one. It does not aim at privileging systems and structures or empowering individuals and groups that have been marginalized (Chronotope III). Rather, research conducted within chronotope IV has the goal to expose the possibilities and consequences of various discourses with their accompanying ideologies, practices, and preferences and ultimately, it supports the belief in possibilities for producing different human subjects.

The assumptions embodied in chronotope IV help understand the view of literacy from within or “in the doing” and its implications. They demonstrate that the understandings of constant struggle and the multiplicity of discursive and material forces require researchers’ constant revision.

In the next section, I introduce the areas of discourse analysis studies, feminist standpoint and difference research. I intend to connect and further clarify some of the claims embodied in chronotope IV. Mainly, the view of language and literacy entailing
struggles for legitimacy, praxis as local, material, relational and pragmatic as well as the goal of mapping social contexts.

**Discourse Analysis Studies**

The area of discourse analysis studies is a field defined by people’s everyday experiences. It is built on the areas of linguistics (e.g. Fairclough), anthropology (e.g. Geertz), literacy studies (e.g. Bakhtin, Volosinov), ethnography of communication (e.g. Gumperz), social theory (e.g. Bourdieu, Foucault), cognitive science (e.g. Bransford et al.), theories of space and time (e.g. Adam), and sociohistorical psychology theory (e.g. Vygotsky, Wertsch). Its usefulness can be measured in terms of whether or not discourse analysis studies provide entry points for understanding classroom events in new ways.

The constructs of multidisciplinarity and discourse are central in this field. Regarding multidisciplinarity, in the previous chapter it was mentioned that multidisciplinarity can be viewed as the endeavor in which differing disciplines keep the object of inquiry alien and unabsorbed. This view is considered in the area of discourse analysis studies. Indeed, this understanding implies that discourse analysts accept the challenges that come with borrowing the concepts. In terms of the category of discourse, it is defined as the heuristic that “focuses attention on how people adopt and adapt the language and the cultural practices historically available in response to the local, institutional, macro, social, and historical situations in which they find themselves” (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 3). This view of discourse enables the question “who is using language and other semiotic tools to do what, with whom, to who, when, where, and
how?” (Ibid., p. 3). This definition is aligned with the belief that subjects have agency from within the limits of the discourses that simultaneously produce them (chronotope IV).

Discourse analysis studies is foregrounded by the following four epistemological and theoretical frames: 1) the critical turn, 2) the local events and their relationships to broader cultural and social processes, 3) the recognition of social and historical contexts, and 4) the assumption that discourse processes always involve power relations (Bloome et al., 2008).

**Critical Turn: Views on Language, Language Event, and Literacy Event**

The acknowledgement of the critical turn implies the examination of the role of language in and through people’s experiences in everyday life. Drawing on Volosinov, it is believed that the reality of language lies on (verbal) interaction. Language becomes alive

In its concrete connection with a situation, verbal communication is always accompanied by social acts of a nonverbal character (the performance of labor, the symbolic acts of a ritual, a ceremony, etc.)…. Language acquires life and historically evolves precisely here, in concrete verbal communication, and not in the abstract linguistic system of language forms, nor in the individual psyche of speakers. (in Bloome et al., 2008, p. 11)
Consequently, language is viewed as being through material or experiential verbal communication. Regarding the role of language in people’s everyday life experiences, it is used for the following purposes (Ibid., pp. 17-18).

- To construct the realities of the everyday life of students, teachers and others both in classrooms and in other educational settings related to them
- To construct the relationships among individuals, groups, institutions, teachers, parents, ethnic groups, businesses, churches, and governments
- To construct and exercise relations of power among people, groups and institutions
- To create and exchange economic, social, cultural, political, and symbolic capital.
- To define and create knowledge, including academic knowledge, disciplinary knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and everyday world knowledge.
- To define and constitute research including educational studies and discourse analysis studies.

This understanding of language and its uses helps understand the claim that “any use of language (spoken, written, electronic, etc.) involves complex social, cultural, political, cognitive, and linguistic processes and contexts –all which are part of the meaning and significance of reading, writing, and using language” (Bloome, 2005, p. xvii). These loose definitions of discourse and language enable researchers to foreground the ways in which people use language and acknowledge the relationships between these language uses and the shape of people’s social identities and realities.
Local Events and Their Relationships to Broader Cultural and Social Processes

Discourse analysis studies recognize the relationship between the local events and broader cultural and social processes. Researchers in this area assume that they do not conduct analyses at both levels. Rather, they emphasize one level over the other and thus, they consider two models of analysis of the micro and macro levels of social activity (Bloome et al., 2008).

The first model foregrounds the ways in which macro social processes influence what occurs in the micro level whereas the second model foregrounds the micro level processes and includes macro level processes within the micro-level analysis. In other words, in this model “discourse processes at the level at the level of face-to-face events constitute and define macro level processes” (Ibid., p. 23). The main advantage of this model is the foregrounding of micro level processes. However, it can be criticized for not appreciating the influence of macro social processes on the local events. The questions that guide this research exemplify the foregrounding of micro level processes and its importance in shaping macro level processes (See chapter one).

Social and Historical Contexts: Views on Context and Culture

The third epistemological and theoretical frame is guided by the recognition of the social and historical contexts as it is considered that discourse and discoursing take place in these contexts. Therefore, it is necessary to explain the concepts of context and culture.
With the warrant that there is no discourse analysis that captures a context in its totality, context is defined as “a set of socially constructed relationships among one social institution and other social institutions; between one time and other times, and so on” (Bloome et al., 2008, pp. 30-31). The emphasis on relationships implies that knowing where and when a social event takes place is a multi-layered task because events exist within a dynamic ethnographic context. Regarding the concept of culture, the field of discourse analysis studies supports a view of “culture as a verb” which views culture as dynamic and kaleidoscopic. It focuses on what culture does (Heath & Street, 2008). This view is highly compatible with the concept of context that was just described and with the view of language and literacy from within.

The understanding of culture as a verb implies the recognition of the following five principles which guide researchers in constructing the “ethnographic context” in their search for interconnected patterns (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 32): First, gradations of change in habits and beliefs correlate with shifts in structures and uses of language and multimodal literacies. Second, “essential” meanings or explanations that come in institutionally grounded terms must be open to scrutiny in historical and operational frames. Third, singular or “essential” discourse forms and illustrative materials that are formalized, authorized, named, and valorized must also be open to scrutiny. Fourth, insiders use tacit meaning-making processes that they take for granted, and their explanations of these often bear little relationship to realities of uses. That is, they may be expressing ideals of behavior rather than manifest, or actual, behavior. Fifth, the norm in (almost) all contexts is that ethnographers coordinate the regularities of patterns of several systems of symbolic structure at the same time.
Overall, the concepts of context and culture enable the understanding that language and contexts construct and reflect on meaning, power relations, identities, and other relationships.

**Discourse Processes and Power Relations**

This last epistemological and theoretical frame acknowledges that discourse processes always involve power relations. The area of discourse analysis studies recognizes that the power relations people create when they interact with each other can be relations of coercion or domination as well as relations of solidarity, care, and unity. It also recognizes the importance to examine the power relationships that people construct in their interaction and the ways in which people background power hierarchies. However, even though discourse processes always involve power relations not every discourse analysis study has to examine power (Bloome et al., 2008).

In terms of power as a heuristic for the discourse analysis of language and literacy events, power is viewed as both a product and a process. As a product, power refers to the imposition of a social group by force. Power as a process refers to the foregrounding of the situated nature of power relations of people and institutions. In this view of power as process “the particular social contours of a particular situation frame the power relations among participants and among social institutions” (Ibid., p. 39).

Having explained the construct of power, it is important to return to the category of discourse because it is assumed that discourse processes always involve power...
relations. The following review of the four main understandings of discourse helps highlight the ways in which the field of discourse analysis studies view discourse and the ways in which it differs from other types of discourse analyses. These four views are: 1) discourse as text, 2) discourse as language-in-use, 3) discourse as identity, and 4) discourse as truth, rationality, and common sense (Bloome et al., 2008).

There are discourse analysts who view text as a unit of written or spoken words; mainly researchers in the literacy as a social practice, critical literacy and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspectives. Unlike these discourse analysts, Bloome et al., (2008) view text as a space where people create meaning. They draw on Volosinov’s (1929/1973) understanding of language which assumes that language brings with it the meaning and contexts of its previous uses and that it reflects and refracts them.

Many discourse analysts in the areas of literacy as a social practice, critical literacy and CDA use the concept of language-in-use to refer to the ways in which people use language in their moment-to-moment interactions and in the events that are part of their everyday lives. These researchers focus on particular aspects such as how people in interaction with each other transform events, identities, and institutions. They are also interested in the ways in which people change the social relationships among themselves and between themselves and others. In discourse analysis of classroom life, their focus is on the social and linguistic practices that give meaning to classroom life and identities and standards for believing, talking, etc. to classroom participants. However, another understanding of discourse as language-in-use attends to the particularities of language-in-use and the recurrences of social practices. These discourse analysts aim at creating a
“contextualized understanding of how language is used to “do social work” whether the social work is creating social relationships; establishing or assigning social identities; structuring relations of power; dividing labor; distributing rewards, resources, and privileges; or just passing through time” (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 50).

Regarding the understanding of discourse as identity, identity has been seen as a role that an individual assumes or a role that is assigned within a social group or network. Many discourse analysts believe that a discourse produces social identity through the roles and positions discourse makes possible, through the tools discourse provides for individuals to use in assuming and assigning themselves and others to various positions, and in the boundaries discourse creates between members and nonmembers of a social group or network. Discourse has also been considered a way to be in the world. Gee’s (1996) distinguishes between Discourse and discourse. For this discourse analyst the lowercase discourse refers to ways of using language at the micro level (language-in-use) while the uppercase discourse refers to processes at the macro level (language-in-use and “other stuff”). In addition to Discourse and discourse, Gee makes the distinction between primary Discourses and secondary Discourses. He views primary Discourses as the ways to which individuals are socialized early in life, for example as members of particular families. Secondary Discourses are the ways to that individuals are apprenticed later in life as members of social institutions such as schools and churches as well as other institutions at local, state, national and international levels. Gee also argues that differences between an individual’s primary Discourse and secondary Discourse can create identities aligned with members and nonmembers of a social group or network. That is, when the Discourse of a social institution such as a school conflicts with an
individual’s primary Discourse, the individual can be at risk of being positioned as different or inferior. Consequently, the individual may have to choose between the identity aligned with the primary Discourse and the identity associated with the secondary Discourse.

Understanding discourse as a way to be in the world shows the relationship between identity issues, language and literacy practices. These identity issues stand inside of the power relationships embedded within the discourse of a social institutional setting. Consequently, the identity that an individual assumes (or it is assigned) is aligned with a set of privileges, responsibilities, and obligations and with the positive and negative consequences that result from acting on these privileges, responsibilities and obligations. However, in the area of discourse analysis studies researchers focus on people’s actions. Rather than viewing discourse in terms of what it is, the main focus is on what people do. As it has been said, the aim is to answer the question “who is using language and other semiotic tools to do what, with whom, to whom, when, where and how?” (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 3).

Finally, the view of discourse as truth, rationality and common sense occurs when discourse refers to “systems of concepts, ideas, and social practices, an ideology, that appears natural, obvious, and without question” (Ibid., p. 53). As it has been said, when a discourse seems to be common sense, it exerts the kind of power that controls what people think, feel, believe, etc. Discourse privileges certain definitions of knowledge in ways that hide or exclude other definitions. From this perspective, part of the task for researchers in the area of discourse analysis studies is to know “how, what, and when a
discourse becomes taken as truth, common sense, and rationality, how it naturalizes that common sense and rationality; how it marginalizes and obfuscates alternatives, and how is privileged by the truth, common sense, and rationality promoted by the discourse” (Ibid., pp. 54-55). Given the difficulty to engage in such analysis, discourse analysts have to re-search or see again to go beyond the understanding of what is natural and rational. One way in which discourse analysts can re-search the rationality of a dominant discourse is by examining the contradictions that are not adequately explained. One other way is to examine how and where surveillance is maintained. In this case, analysts may focus on the linguistic devices that discourses use to promote and reinforce their rationality.

Having reviewed the ways in which discourse has been used, it can be said that discourse has usually referred to specific ways of using language and ordering social categories of identity and knowledge. It is as if discourse is being produced, animated or as if it were a noun (“discourse as a noun”). However, in the area of discourse analysis studies where researchers are encouraged to see discourse analysis as a process of re-searching, they support the view of “discourse as a verb”. This view focuses on what discourse does and not on what it is or what it is related to. That is,

instead of viewing discourse as a set of concepts, structures, and practices, at either a micro level or macro level, as a verb discourse can be viewed as actions that people and institutions take in response to each other; and more specifically, actions done with language and other semiotic systems in order to create, recreate, change, and maintain identities, roles, and social contexts that people live within (and without). (Bloome et al., 2008, pp. 58-59)
The emphasis on the concerted actions people take through language and other semiotic systems is quite complex. Examination of the process in which people create each other and the institutions in which they live is never fully completed. The area of discourse analysis studies aims at mapping this complexity.

The description of the four epistemological and theoretical frames that support the area of discourse analysis studies has clarified the belief in the richness of people’s events. These frames create a dialectic between the events’ particularities and the discourses considered by society’s stakeholders. The description has also been useful to understand that the main contribution of discourse analysis studies can be measured in terms of whether the area provides entry points for understanding classroom events in new ways or not (Bloome et al., 2008). The following section focuses on the area of feminist standpoint.

**Feminist Standpoint**

Feminist standpoint can be understood as an epistemology, a set of theories and a research approach. I describe these understandings because I see the connections between these ways of understanding feminist standpoint and this study particularly when feminist standpoint is understood as an approach.

**Feminist Standpoint Epistemology and Theories**
The work by Haraway (1978, 1981, 1989), Harding (1983, 2003), Hartsock (1983, 1998), Jaggar (1983) and Rose (1983) made invaluable contributions to the early developments of feminist standpoint in the 1970s and 1980s. These theorists were interested in understanding why research in biology and the social sciences that was guided by feminist principles and perspectives produced sexist and androcentric results. Mainly, they focused on the relations between institutional power and the production of androcentric knowledge claims. Their work represented their efforts to have guidelines for feminist research that contributed to the empowerment of oppressed groups (Harding, 2007).

As an epistemology, feminist standpoint foregrounds the everyday life experiences of women. This foregrounding stems from the idea that the disadvantaged position that women have in society makes them have vantage points which provide more complete insights about society. It particularly draws on Hegel’s view that oppressed individuals have a dual perspective: their own perspective developed through their experience and their oppressors’ perspective.

When feminist standpoint is viewed as an epistemology and a set of theories it offers a useful understanding about the following interconnected themes (Harding, 2007). These five themes were acknowledged earlier in this chapter as they are embodied in Chronotopes III and IV. First, feminist standpoint helps researchers focus on Foucault’s power/knowledge link and the ways in which societies are structured. It centers on the constitution and maintenance of the power/knowledge link by emphasizing the role of experiential life and assuming that what people do enables and limits what they know and
what people know and can do depend on their particular location. Second, feminist standpoint examines the practices that solidify and distribute the power in society. This useful examination is “a kind of laboratory” in which feminist standpoint researchers “explore how different kinds of assigned or chosen activities enable some insights and block others” (Ibid., p. 50). Third, feminist standpoint researchers are able to see beyond dichotomies and see people’s struggles. It is believed that feminist standpoint is achieved through struggle. Fourth, feminist standpoint helps researchers understand the importance of struggle. In Harding’s words, feminist standpoint “must be struggled for against the apparent realities made to appear natural and obvious and against the ongoing political disempowerment of oppressed groups” (Ibid., p. 51). Fifth, feminist standpoint is successful when a degree of freedom is achieved. Rather than believing in the achievement of complete freedom and liberation from dominant understandings, feminist standpoint researchers believe that possibilities of liberation are achieved when an oppressed group becomes “a group “for itself”. That is, possibilities of liberation are achieved when the oppressed group “see the importance of engaging in political and scientific struggles to see the world from the perspective of its own lives” (Ibid., p. 51). This perspective illustrates Foucault’s opinion about praxis as being local, material, relational, and pragmatic.

**Feminist Standpoint Approach**

Feminist standpoint makes contributions to all the stages of the research process which can be identified as: 1) selection of the research problem and the design of the research project, 2) conduct of research, 3) writing up of the research findings, and 4)
dissemination procedures. However, it is considered that the contributions of feminist standpoint are particularly valuable for the first stage of research (Harding, 2007).

Feminist standpoint researchers scrutinize the interests and values of research. In Harding’s words, feminist standpoint approaches help bring the design of the research project or “context of discovery” under control. She writes

Standpoint methods recognize that some kinds of passions, interests, values, and politics advance the growth of knowledge and that other kinds block or limit it. Politics can be productive of the growth of knowledge as well as an obstacle to it as, to be sure, it often is. Which such political engagements promote and which limit the growth of knowledge? The hypothesis standpoint analyses make plausible is that vigorous commitments to democratic inclusiveness, fairness, and accountability to the “worst off” can also advance the growth of knowledge. (Ibid., p. 55)

In Harding’s opinion, the commitments that contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge imply a redefinition of the concept of objectivity mainly because it has been too week. In her words, she writes:

One can never completely get “outside” one’s cultural group to float freely completely above historical and cultural specificity, as the conventional epistemologies and philosophies of science have assumed. But finding or creating even just a little critical distance from “the normal” can be sufficient to enable new critical perspectives to come to light. Thus, standpoint theory enables us [researchers] to see that the conventional notions of objectivity have been too weak to achieve their goals. (Ibid., p. 56)
Harding believes that through the concept of “strong objectivity” feminist standpoint researchers are able to scrutinize the belief that the maximization of neutrality is needed in order to achieve objectivity. Consequently, it is considered that feminist standpoint approaches are useful because researchers bring the value-neutrality belief under control and thus, they become aware of the social values, interests, and assumptions that take place in the research process.

The idea that feminist standpoint brings the context of discovery and the value-neutrality beliefs under control help understand how it attempts to minimize the inherently unequal relationship between the researcher and the researched. Since it is believed that researchers have the control of almost everything in research, that disempower research subjects by producing inaccurate research results and that researched subjects are further disempowered because they are already marginalized socially and politically; feminist standpoint approaches can be seen as an answer to the following questions “how can the kind of disempowering and distorting power of the researcher, apparently inherent in the research process, be blocked to prevent such colonialization of research?, and how can this be accomplished without losing the valuable “powers of the stranger”? (Harding, 2007, p. 53)

The usefulness of feminist standpoint approaches lies on the scrutiny they do of the values and interest of a research project, the rejection of the maximization of neutrality, and the obstruction to the reproduction of the colonial relationship between the researcher and the researched subjects. However, this usefulness is accompanied by a
series of criticisms. Mainly, these criticisms are: 1) the automatic privilege for “women’s ways of knowing”, 2) relativism, and 3) essentialism (Harding, 2007).

Regarding the critique that feminist standpoint automatically privileges women’s ways of knowing, Harding points out that although almost all feminists value the role of women’s experiences in the production of feminist knowledge; experience and knowledge do not mean the same. Knowledge “requires kinds of critical reflection and collaborative legitimation that are not characteristic of women’s or anyone else’s experiences (Ibid., pp. 60-61). In terms of the issue of relativism, feminist standpoint raises fears of it because it argues that all knowledge claims and the standards used for the legitimization of knowledge are socially situated, particularly the claim that some kinds of values, interests, and assumptions can advance the growth of knowledge. However, according to Harding, there are four points that support the claim that feminist standpoint does not advocate for relativism. First, feminist standpoint claims should be valued in terms of whether or not the vantage points raise new questions, expand the horizon of knowledge, and emphasize undetected assumptions. In other words, “the adequacy of standpoint claims should be judged on the efficacy of their consequent practices” (Ibid., p. 58). Second, any standpoint claim has meaning in a particular context. The fact that feminist standpoint projects are designed to produce a different kind of knowledge does not imply that the empirical grounds to evaluate its efficacy should be removed. Third, feminist standpoint researchers conduct research in similar ways as individuals in everyday life who make choices in conditions of great urgency and with insufficient evidence to feel totally certain about the choice made. Fourth, all
knowledge claims are socially situated. Consequently, it does not make sense to insist that the knowledge claims supported by modern science are not.

In terms of the essentialist (and Eurocentric) fears raised by feminist standpoint, particularly by the claim that feminist standpoint projects start off from women’s lives, there is work that shows the researchers’ commitment to have a better understanding of reality.

Concepts such as “intersectionality”, “interconnectedness” and “matrices of oppression”, women’s race, sex, heterosexuality, and class are introduced as starting points to compare and understand the interlocking relationships between them (Bhavnani, 2007; Collins, 2000; Weber, 2004). Hesse-Biber, Leavy, and Yaiser (2004) also remind critics of feminist standpoint approaches that by starting off with the lives of marginalized people, feminist standpoint approaches examine the lives of both marginalized people and people who belong to dominant groups. As it has been explained, the use of a marginalized position as a starting point leads to the maximization of objectivity. Therefore, the value of feminist standpoint approaches stems from the fact that feminist standpoint does not produce knowledge about marginalized groups for the use of dominant groups to maintain asymmetrical relations of power. Rather, feminist standpoint aims at producing a different body of knowledge, knowledge that is produced and legitimized by the marginalized groups.

**Race, Racism, Racialization, Microaggressions, and Whiteness**
In this section, I describe the ways in which issues of race have been treated in the field of second language education and introduce the concepts of race, racism, racialization, whiteness and microaggressions. With the exception of the terms of whiteness and microaggressions, these concepts have started to be considered in the field of second language education.

Issues of race have begun to be considered in the area of TESOL mainly by researchers who want the second language field to include not only the areas of TESOL and bilingual education but also the foreign, heritage, and immigrant language education areas. Kubota & Lin (2010) argue that in the area of TESOL racial difference has tended to be replaced by the view of cultural difference where cultural difference has been understood in terms of the difference between the conventions that English language learners (ELLs) grew up with and the expectations held by members of the target society (English native speakers). In addition, some TESOL researchers have problematized the aspects of dominance (proficiency) and norm (mainly the linguistic aspect) of the native speaker construct and thus, they have not paid attention to the racialized aspect. Based on these views of race from critical frameworks and approaches, Kubota (2004) reflects on the ways in which cultural difference has been understood in the areas of contrastive rhetoric, foreign language education, and culturally relevant teaching. She affirms that cultural difference has multiple meanings which serve various political and ideological purposes. She also demonstrates that the view of cultural difference is based on an essentialist and normative understanding of culture. For instance, she considers that two of the 5Cs (culture and comparisons) of the National Standards for foreign language learning in the U.S. promote a positive view of culture because cultural difference is
viewed as a catalyst for gaining insight into a culture. However, upon encouraging learners to gain knowledge about a different culture, there is a risk that language instructors (and learning materials) present a polarized view of the two cultures. Consequently, this essentialist understanding of culture denies the differences that exist within each culture. Based on Young’s (1990) view of cultural difference, Kubota advocates for an understanding of cultural difference as a relational and discursive construct that is shaped by power.

Regarding the critical inquiry of issues of race in second language education, some researchers have drawn on critical race theory (CRT), critical multiculturalism and critical pedagogies to point out that an essentialist understanding of cultural difference parallels colonialism which has racism at its core. They have also problematized the native speaker construct that shapes the identity of the English native speaker as a White speaker and the identity of the non-English native speaker as a speaker of color. CRT has helped second language researchers claim that there is no biological evidence that determines the existence of race. For critical race theorists, race is a socially and discursively constructed category. From this perspective, what is the difference between race and racism and between race and ethnicity? According to Kubota and Lin (2010), ethnicity has been viewed as the politically correct word for race and similar to race, it presents problems of definition and boundaries. For instance, if it is assumed that ethnicity denotes sociocultural characteristics, where can researchers draw the boundaries between ethnicity and culture?
Solórzano, Ceja & Yosso (2000) draw on CRT and consider that racism is both a belief and a system. They draw on Lorde (1992) who defines racism as “the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance” (p.61). They also consider Marable (1992) who affirms that racism is a “system of ignorance, exploitation, and power used to oppress African Americans, Latinos, Asians, Pacific Americans, American Indians and other people on the basis of ethnicity, culture, mannerisms, and color” (p.61). These definitions show that racism exists when one group believes itself superior and has the power to carry out the racist behavior. In addition, they show that racism does not only affect one group but several racial and ethnic groups. It is important to point out that there are different kinds of racism such as structural racism and epistemological racism. Indeed, Solórzano, Ceja & Yosso consider that racism can interconnect with sexism, classism, homophobia and other social categories.

Racialization is also known as racial formation. Generally speaking, racialization focuses on the process that produces and legitimizes racial difference. According to Kubota and Lin, racialization does not necessarily lead to racism because the agent involved is not from the socially powerful or dominant group. The work by Solórzano, Ceja and Yosso (2000) is significant for this study because it focuses on the microaggressions suffered by a group of college students. These researchers examine the role of microaggressions in the racial climate of these students’ campus. In their opinion, microaggressions are “subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and/or visual) directed toward people of color, often automatically or unconsciously” (p. 60). Regarding the racial climate of institutions of higher education, they affirm that a positive racial climate
includes four elements: 1) the inclusion of students, faculty, and administrators of color; 2) a curriculum that reflects the historical and contemporary experiences of people of color; 3) programs to support the recruitment, retention and graduation of students of color; and 4) a college/university mission that reinforces the institution’s commitment to racial diversity. Based on their qualitative analysis of focus groups, they affirm that there are three types of microaggressions that take place in tertiary academic spaces: inside the classroom, outside the classroom and within social spaces on campus. They also claim that microaggressions have several negative effects. The more immediate ones are the negative racial climate and the struggles of African American students with feelings of self-doubt, frustration and isolation.

Regarding critical sociolinguistic research on whiteness, Bucholtz (2011) focuses on the various forms that a group of White teenagers perform race through their talk. She considers that in order to understand whiteness it is important to pay attention to the power it has to authorize the subordination of other racialized groups. Whiteness is hegemonic in many situations and it exerts its power by being unnoticeable or unmarked. In other words, whiteness is positioned as the racial norm and it is almost invisible when it is compared to other racial categories. One other ideological characteristic of whiteness is that it is devoid of culture which on one hand can reinforce its unmarked status and its structural power, but on the other hand, it can leave many White Europeans with the sense of not having a culture. According to Bucholtz, this idea of whiteness as cultural lack is supported by the idea of whiteness as cultural blandness in which signifiers such as Wonder Bread, vanilla, and mayonnaise contrast with the “spicy” and “colorful” terms associated with other racialized groups. In addition to the structural advantages it confers,
its ideological invisibility and its asymmetry in relation to other racialized groups, whiteness is situated and situational. This means that whiteness is located in specific times and places and embodied by specific people who can reproduce, revise or reject the dominant ideologies. Whiteness is also multiple which means that it has a range of different meanings in diverse contexts. Whiteness is also unstable. For example, the position of whiteness in the racial system of the United States has changed in the last fifty years from the civil rights movement to shifts in immigration patterns to the face of national political leadership.

Upon explaining her view of Whiteness, Bucholtz analyzes a high school on the West Coast and divides the White student population in preppies, hip hop fans, nerds, and alternative youth. These groups exist along the dimensions of cool/uncool, mainstream/nonmainstream, and black oriented/white oriented. Preppies have a form of social prestige associated with academics and extracurricular activities which enable them to have control of the school’s social space and to be popular among the student community. Preppies use “be all” as a quotative marker. Although preppy girls use it as default quotative marker, it is also used by some nonpreppy teenagers as a marker of negative evaluation. “Be all” is associated with popular White girls somewhat similar to “oh my god!” which according to Chun (2007), is used by White preppy girls and students of color in a Texas high school. There are other White teenagers who affiliate with hip hop and draw on resources of African American language and culture to construct their identities. Nerds choose to position themselves as intelligent through some linguistic practices such as superstandard English, intellectual display, and metalinguistic humor. By avoiding slang and embracing superstandard English, these students distance
themselves from the preppies, their cool White counterparts, and from most African American students.

Bucholtz (2011) examines the discourse of colorblindness and affirms that there are three discursive strategies in their discourse which are: the evasion of racial terms, the disavowal of racism and the displacement of race by other issues. These strategies help White students navigate in conversations related to issues of race. The interactional use of these strategies by this group of White students enables them to position themselves as attuned to racial issues and as nonracist. For this reason, this researcher believes that they are “doing nonracism” (p. 230). However, she also considers that these strategies are used in order for this group of White student to do race talk in terms of narratives of fear, conflict, and resentment with which they position themselves as racially disadvantaged and disempowered in relation to African American teenagers. Despite that the group of European American students in her study are not in significant danger, what is salient is that in their everyday experience they are not numerically and culturally dominant and are made aware and ashamed of their whiteness. Consequently, these discursive strategies of racial reversal reflect the White students’ embeddedness within larger American discourses of race.

**Difference Research**

Since this study suggests that the interconnectedness of the social categories of language, race, class and gender takes place through face-to-face interaction particularly through the microaggressions co-constructed by research participants, it is necessary to
present the recent developments that in the area of the interconnections of social categories.

Although there has been progress in the second language education field mainly in the area of issues of race, as far as I know, there has not been scholarly work that shows the interconnectedness of this category with others. However, in the area of feminist theory and practice, the field of difference research (also known as the race, class, gender and sexuality field) has started to generate discussions about the ways to understand the nature of the relationships between race, class, gender and sexuality and the ways in which these relationships manifest in everyday life.

Weber (2004) argues that the scholarship produced by this field questions traditional interpretations of the lives of the oppressed and dominant groups. Also, she mentions that researchers have both an insider and an outsider’s view and that they avoid grand theorizing about the nature of the hierarchies in the categories of race, class, gender and sexuality. In her view, the scholarship in the field presents six themes which are: contextual, socially constructed, systems of power relationships, related to micro and macro processes of social activity and simultaneously expressed. Also, this scholarship emphasizes the interdependence of knowledge and activism.

Contextual means that the meanings of race, class, gender and sexuality are never fixed. Rather, they vary across historical time periods, nations and regions. One other aspect to consider is that their meaning in everyday life cannot be fully captured. Critical examination of the categories of race, gender and sexuality reveals that they are not based neither in polarized opposites nor in biology traits but are socially constructed and that
their meanings evolve out of group struggles. In these struggles, dominant groups define race, gender and sexuality as ranked dichotomies where White, heterosexual men are deemed superior. Regarding the social category of class, it has not been based on biological traits, polarized opposites or a binary. Rather, it can be determined by talent and hard work. In other words, class has been seen as a ladder of income and resources where people can slide up and down depending on their work and talent. This view does not deny the view that class can also be defined in terms of relations of production in which one group owns the means of production and another group does not.

In addition of being specific and socially constructed hierarchies, race, class, gender and sexuality are relations of power. These categories are power hierarchies in which one group exerts control over another. Regarding the characteristic of being social structural and social psychological, race, class, gender and sexuality are constructs that have meaning at the level of the everyday life of individuals and the level of social institutions. Consequently, researchers examine the nature of these categories and their relationships at both levels. One other characteristic is that race, class, gender, and sexuality operate simultaneously in every situation. At the individual level, we experience our lives and develop our social identities based on our location. In addition, these systems of power relationships are connected to each other and are embedded in all social institutions. Finally, race, class, gender and sexuality scholarship emphasizes interdependence of knowledge and activism.

Race, class, gender and sexuality scholarship have benefited from the use of concepts such as “intersectionality”, “interconnectedness” and “matrices of oppression”
(Bhavnani, 2007; Collins, 2000; Weber, 2004). These concepts support the introduction of women’s race, class, gender and sexuality as starting points to understand the interlocking relationships between them and show the commitment of feminist researchers to have a better understanding of reality as they are interested in projects that start off from women’s lives. In this research study, I concur with Bhavnani (2002) when she affirms that the conceptualization of difference varies depending on the terms used. She explains that the term “intersectionality” draws on the crossroads metaphor which directs the attention to the intersections of roads and to the directions in which they travel and meet. She affirms that “intersectionality” tends towards the constitution of the subject as a victim. Unlike this term, she believes that the term of “interconnections” suggests more movement and fluidity. In her words, she writes “interconnections that configure each other also imply a notion of active engagement, with a consequent attribution of agency of the subjects of the configurations” (p. 641). From this perspective, I use interconnections instead of intersectionality.

**Microethnographic Approach to the Discourse Analysis of Classroom Language and Literacy Events**

Bloome et al.(2008) believe that discourse analysis is “a set of ways of seeing” their microethnographic approach can be understood as a formation that enables seeing language and literacy events in classrooms and that enables researchers to see them from within. From this perspective, I believe that the concept of approach is more compatible than the concept of methodologies. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) define approach as
a systemic and dynamic scientific formation that provides some structure for carrying out qualitative research. Therefore, it helps researchers foreground the practice of conducting research. The concept of approach is also compatible with this microethnographic approach mainly because the perspective from within implies the no separation between theoretical and methodological issues as well as the belief that researchers stand in differing worlds (See also chapter two).

As its name suggests, this approach foregrounds the daily life of classrooms and centers its attention on the role that language plays in the construction of classroom events, in peoples’ lives and in the conduction of classroom and literacy research.

Regarding classroom life, it is believed that

Classrooms are complex places where teachers and students are viewed as active agents. Although teachers and students must act within the events, contexts, and settings in which they find themselves, and although they must react to the actions of others and the social institutions of which they are part, they nonetheless act on the worlds in which they live. (Bloome et al., 2005, p. xvi)

Classrooms and classroom life can be seen as places where different languages co-exist. For instance, there is the language used by students and teachers, the language of school and school district policies, the language of texts and textbooks, the language of parents and students, the language of when parents interact with each other, etc. There is also the language that is object of the classroom lessons (e.g. learning to read, write, and learning to use the academic discourse at the undergraduate level) and the language that is a means of learning (e.g. the language that is learned through classroom discussions,
lectures, reading, writing, etc.). One other language is the language of research, as it is through language that researchers conduct interviews, analyze observations, videotapes, and other data and it is through language that researchers conceptualize, write up, and report their research.

This variety of languages and their roles in classroom life illustrates its dynamic and complex nature. Two key concepts are implied in this approach: personhood and events.

**Personhood**

Williams (1977) claims that an understanding of language always includes an understanding of the human being. Based on this claim, it is considered that personhood is socially constructed through symbolic action. Whenever people interact with each other, they are establishing “a working consensus for how they define each other and what characteristics they assign to each other merely through the recognition of being a “person” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 3). This means that when teachers and students are in the classroom they are defining and negotiating language, personhood and language and literacy events. Teachers and students define language and literacy “...through the association or nonassociation of language with culture, social structure, and action; through a hierarchy of language varieties (e.g. dialects, registers); through standardization; and by locating language in the mind, in social interaction, in a textbook, and so on” (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 3). Personhood is foregrounded on three aspects (Ibid., p. 4):
• People are active agents in and on the worlds in which they live. They are strategic. This view does not deny that people are influenced by factors beyond their control or by historical circumstances. Also, it does not deny that there may be occasions when people lack the ability to analyze the social and economic situation in which they live as well as to view themselves as efficacious. However, people create and recreate the worlds in which they live; purposefully struggle with each other over meaning, action, material, and social relationships; resist the imposition of unwanted control; and fashion alternative ways of living their lives that eschew given structures and strictures. They retain the potential of agency even in situations in which agency is unlikely or typically absent.

• People locate themselves both locally and globally, both in the present and historically. Although people engage in face-to-face encounters, they are not unaware that there are broader contexts and dynamics that influence and are influenced by what they do in their daily lives.

• There is no separation of people from what they do; from the events of which they are a part. People are situated. That is, they act in terms of the situation in which they find themselves while simultaneously creating that situation.

    **Event**

While personhood emphasizes the definitions and negotiations of language and personhood when people interact with each other, the concept of event emphasizes what happens when people interact. In other words, if it is assumed that people act and react to each other and that in these occurrences language, literacy, and meaning are being
defined and negotiated; event is defined as a “bounded of series of actions and reactions that people make in response to each other at the level of face-to-face interaction” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 6). This understanding enables researchers to view people and their language use doing language and literacy even though people’s actions and their language use also construct the event in which they are embedded. This understanding of event does not imply that two or more people have to be present physically and proximally to create an event. Rather, it implies that a person (whether with others or alone) acts and reacts in response to other people. This view implies the following assumptions (Ibid., p. 7):

- People, not an individual, are acting and reacting to each other. People is the basic unit of analysis.
- The understanding of people’s reaction to an action is similar to Bakhtin’s, 1935/1981, and Volosinov’s , 1929/1973, view of a “response”. That is, people react to actions immediately previous, to actions that occurred sometime earlier, to future actions, and to sets, groups, and patterns of action. Any action, including a reaction, inherently includes within it a consequence. From this perspective, a nonaction can be a reaction.
- The actions and reactions people take to each other are not necessarily linear. Actions and reactions may occur simultaneously.
- People may act and react to each other through sequences of actions and not just through individual actions.
- The use of language is an action as it is something people do to each other, to themselves and it is part of the way they act on the situations in which they find
themselves. Meaning and significance are located in the actions and reactions people take to each other. Inasmuch as there is no separation of people from events, there can be no separation between meaning, significance, and action.

This view does not imply that people do not think and reflect on the meaning and significance of actions and events. Rather, it implies that people’s thinking and reflection are part of an event and are constituted by social relationships, language and history.

These principles support the view of people and language as inherently social and other oriented and the view of meaning as being situated in the social event. This emphasis on the event helps researchers identify the context within which the people both acting and reacting is taking place. In addition, this understanding of event is compatible with other constructs such as literacy event, personhood, and language.

Regarding the compatibility between event and literacy event, while event emphasizes what people do and accomplish when they interact with each other, literacy event refers to the space in which there are significant uses of written language and other related semiotic systems. In terms of the compatibility between the constructs of event and personhood, the conceptualization of events as spaces in which practices and people interact with each other is aligned with the view of people as agents of those events and

---

6 The understanding of literacy event as a learning space is needed when a research inquiry focuses on the practices that exist within a particular context, that is, when the focus is on what and how people interact with each other as it is the case of the present study. When the research focus is on the articulation of literacy practices, the conceptualization of literacy as being part of broader practices is more useful (Bloome et al., 2005). This view of literacy in which literacy is part of broader social practices is what researchers of literacy as a social practice, critical literacy theorists, and NLS researchers usually advocate for.
practices. Similarly, the understanding of event as spaces enables the understanding of language as what takes place in that space. Since it has been said that language has a material presence to which people respond and reacting and refracting previous events, language can also be seen as “something people do to each other, and to themselves and is part of the way that they act on the situations in which they find themselves” (Bloome et al., 2008, p. 11).

Having explained the compatibility among the different constructs that are implied in the microethnographic approach, it is important to summarize the theoretical principles which guide the discourse analysis of the classroom language and literacy events:

- Through the actions people take in response to other, people construct what they are doing, what it means, who they are, and what the social significance of the event they are creating is.
- Language is constituted by words, nonverbal language, prosody, pictorial forms and the symbolic manipulation of materials. Language is the primary tool people use in constructing event, meanings, identities, and social significance.
- Through their interactions, people construct relationships between and among texts (intertextuality), contexts (intercontextuality) and discourses (interdiscursivity).

**Theoretical Strategies to the Discourse Analysis of Classroom Language and Literacy Events**
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Since the situatedness from within implies the situatedness of the methodological issues, the strategies to conduct a discourse analysis of classroom language and literacy events can be seen as a theoretical discussion that repeatedly turns on itself (Bloome et al., 2005). This view is compatible with Kamberelis and Dimitriadis’ definition of strategies. In their words, strategies refer “to the specific practices and procedures that researchers deploy to collect and analyze data and to report their findings” (2005, p. 18). This definition applies to Bloome et al.’s five theoretical tools as well as to feminist reflexivity which is another strategy used in this study. The first five theoretical tools are: contextualization cues, boundary making, turn-taking, negotiating thematic coherence, and intertextuality. After the description of these five tools, the strategy of feminist reflexivity is presented.

**Contextualization Cues**

Based on Gumperz (1986), Bloome et al. (2005) argue that when people are in social events they interact in ways in which their intentions can be understood by others. In other words, whereas acts refer to what people do, contextualization cues refer to the visible ways in which people signal their intentions and meanings. Intentions, instead of referring to the process a person goes through to encode a thought into language and send it to another persona who then attempts to decode it as precisely as possible, refer to the sense that people act on the situations in which they participate. From this perspective, they lie closer to people’s agency. Similarly, meanings do not refer to the encoding and
decoding of people’s thoughts. Rather, they lie in the actions people jointly take to construct the social event.

Contextualization cues include verbal, nonverbal, prosodic signals and the manipulation of artifacts (Green & Wallat, 1981; Bloome 1989). Since contextualization cues are the visible and understood part of the event, they constitute the material basis for understanding what is happening in the event (See Table 3.1.).

It is important to point out that the identification of contextualization cues does not imply the understanding of their meaning, the speaker’s intentions or the listener’s interpretation. The meaning and the function of a contextualization cue depends on many factors such as participants’ shared understanding of the context, what has happened, what is being anticipated to happen, and the linguistic conventions for interpretations in that situation.

According to the work done by several researchers, people are usually unaware of the contextualization cues they use, their meaning, and the idea that contextualization cues depend greatly on people’s background. Research has also shown that the use of contextualization cues is dynamic and variable and that its different uses can be related to issues of power relations (Au, 1980; Bloome et al., 2005; Gilmore, 1987; Michaels, 1981; and Scollon & Scollon, 1981).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Signals</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Register shifts</td>
<td>• Postural configurations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Syntactical shifts</td>
<td>• Distancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesics</td>
<td>Paralinguistic/prosodic signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>Volume shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial expression</td>
<td>Tone shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye movement</td>
<td>Rhythmic shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye gaze</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact, lack of eye</td>
<td>Stress patterns and stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contact or shifts in contact</td>
<td>pattern shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Velocity shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body movement</td>
<td>Pausing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial direction</td>
<td>Intonation patterns and intonation pattern shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakinesic shifts (style of</td>
<td>Stylizing patterns of intonation and stress (e.g. using an intonation and stress pattern from a different type of situation and overdoing an intonation and stress pattern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body movement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Partial List of Contextualization Cues (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 10)

**Boundary Making**

This strategy stems from the assumption that people know the boundaries so that they can understand what is happening as well as how to construct meaning when they interact in a social event. Bloome et al. affirm that “boundaries are part of the way people have of signaling to each other what is going on, the social relationships of people to each other, and what meanings are being jointly constructed” (2005, p. 14). The assumption that boundaries are jointly constructed implies that they have to be socially constructed, proposed, and ratified; must be actively maintained and are contestable.

These understandings are compatible with the belief that what counts as a social event depends on what is within the boundaries of the event as constructed by the
participants. However, the identification and interpretation of the boundaries of an event is a complex challenge for at least two reasons: First, researchers’ interpretations need to be based “on the same “data” that people in the event use, with the same sense of indeterminacy and openness to reinterpretations based on what happens later in the event” (Ibid., p. 18). Second, when people interact with each other, they construct action, meaning, and significance at multiple and embedded levels.

Given the complexity of this task, it is necessary to acknowledge different uses of the term event and different levels of boundary-making construction. Regarding the view of event, it “can refer to the event of an interaction, to a storytelling event, to the classroom period as a whole” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 13). As to the levels in which people construct boundaries, and drawing on the work by Green & Wallat (1981), the different levels of interaction are: message unit, interactional unit, phases, and an entire event.

Message unit is the smallest unit of conversational unit. It is assumed that participants “must signal to each other what is in a unit so that others will know how to assign meaning to their (linguistic, prosodic, and nonverbal) behavior” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 19). The theoretical warrant for identifying the boundaries of message units is that researchers must use the same means people use to construct communication and meaning. Message units can be identified by contextualization cues and can be determined by what is in the unit itself. Message units differ from sentences, utterances, and turns of talk. Message units are not sentences because message units are not determined by words alone. They are not utterances because utterances are mainly
defined by signals such as pauses and other prosodic features and from an illocutionary perspective (what the speaker wants to accomplish). Rather, message units are mostly defined from a perlocutionary perspective (what impact the linguistic behavior has on listeners). Finally, message units are not turns of talk. Even though it is important to consider turns of talk, they do not provide sufficient information to understand the social construction of conversational meaning and action. In addition, since turns of talk are defined by changes in who is speaking, several message units can be included in a single turn of talk.

Interactional unit is one level up the message unit. For Green & Wallat (1981) an interactional unit is a “series of conversational tied message units” (Bloome et al., 2005, p.22). Thus, it can be seen as the smallest unit of joint social activity. In terms of which message units form an interactional unit, it depends on the contextualization cues and the verbal aspects of the message units. Interactional units can be suspended, reinstated, overlapped and abandoned.

One level up from interactional unit is phases of an event and the event itself. Phases of an event are sets of interactional units. The boundaries of phases and of events themselves are signaled and named. In the classroom setting, teachers usually define the phases of a lesson or a class.

In sum, when people interact with each other, they create multiple and embedded levels of units of interaction. They do not only signal these levels but they also create their boundaries. They use these boundaries as resources which guide their interaction with each other and their joint creation of action, meaning and social significance.
**Turn Taking**

Drawing on Au (1980), Philips (1972) and Shultz et al. (1982), it is assumed that turn taking occurs within the event being analyzed and that it should focus on participation structures. Participation structures are “shared expectations among participants regarding the patterns of turn-taking protocols for a particular type of situation or event” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 28). This view implies that an event partly defines the participation structures and vice versa. It also shapes the understanding of the Initiation-Response-Evaluation/Feedback (IRE/F) pattern.

The IRE/F structure is considered an interpretative frame which not only guides teachers and students in their participation in classroom events but also helps them interpret what is happening. It is also viewed as occurring in many different ways as it is believed that it indexes a social institution and the roles people adopt. For this reason, researchers must pay attention to the pattern of turn-taking and keep in mind that “the social function and meaning of an IRE/F sequence or any participation structure, depend on what people in interaction construct the function and meaning to be” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 33).

**Negotiating Thematic Coherence**

Thematic coherence refers to the organization of a set of meanings in and through an event. These meanings may be textual, interpersonal, and ideational. Thematic coherence occurs when the meanings generated in and through the event have a
relationship to each other so that people in the event view the event coherent. For instance, participants decide whether an event has thematic coherence by asking what is happening in the event and what everyone is talking about. However, when participants question and/or contest what is happening, there may be little thematic coherence in these events. In addition, there may be events which have multiple overlapping themes at multiple levels.

Thematic coherence cannot be assumed, it has to be identified. However, this task is difficult as themes and thematic shifts are socially constructed, proposed, and ratified. Researchers can create lexical chain maps through which they examine the ways in which classroom participants signal thematic coherence as well as thematic shifts. Analysis of thematic coherence usually reflects issues such as instructional styles and pedagogical philosophies. It can be useful in the examination of “hidden” social processes such as the construction of gendered identities, establishing social hierarchies, promoting individualism, etc. (Bloome et al., 2005).

Intertextuality

Intertextuality refers to the juxtapositions of texts. It occurs when “a reference in one [text] refers to another text; two or more texts share a common referent or are related because they are of the same genre or belong to the same setting; or one texts lead to another” (Ibid., p. 280). Intertextuality occurs when a word, phrase, stylistic device or other textual feature in one text refers to another text. In addition to taking place at the text level, intertextuality can take place at the sentence and genre levels.
Intertextuality is an important concept mainly because participants are unaware that they are juxtaposing texts. In general, discourse analysts are interested in knowing the ways in which intertextuality is involved within the social construction of the event and the stances participants take toward intertextuality. Intertextuality is composed of intertextual links. In order to claim that intertextual links are socially constructed, they must be proposed, acknowledged, recognized, and have social consequences. From this perspective, it is believed that intertextuality is the construct with which the material aspects of an event are identified and traced and thus, it focuses on how participants construct relationships, how identity is socially constructed as well as provides invaluable insights about the ideology of any social event.

For Bloome (2005), there are different inquiries about the social situatedness of intertextuality. These inquiries can emphasize the intertextual process, the intertextual substance, and the intertextual rights that exist within a social event. Regarding inquiries about the intertextual process, they refer to the ways in which the intertextual connections are made. Their focus is on the forms of language that are used and the patterns of response and reaction. Examinations of intertextual substance focus on the set of texts that are being juxtaposed particularly at the levels at which they are connected (e.g. lexical, textual, structure and genre levels) and the meanings these texts hold for participants as separate texts and as juxtaposed texts. Finally, inquiries of intertextual rights are concerned with the distribution of privileges and restrictions on the proposing, acknowledging, recognizing, and giving social consequence to any intertextual link. In terms of these different type of intertextual inquiries and the focus of this study, this research concentrates on the intertextual process and the intertextual rights. One of the
sub-questions that guide this study focuses on the ways in which intertextual connections are me (“What intertextual connections do participants in face-to-face interaction with each other jointly construct?”). Whereas another sub-question focuses on the distribution of the privileges and limitations of this process (“How do these connections privilege some research participants and marginalize others?”).

Feminist Reflexivity

For Hesse-Biber & Yaiser (2004), feminist reflexivity consists of a process through which researchers recognize, examine and understand how their identities, backgrounds, and assumptions affect the research process (See also chapter one). Feminist reflexivity also includes the researcher’s constant examination of the ways in which concepts, relationships, and meaning are shaped by each other. This view of feminist reflexivity is compatible with Bloome et al.’s concern of examining language and literacy from within which includes the researcher’s constant reflection of her own perspectives and voices as well as the ones of her participants. In addition, it supports the researcher in the endeavor to not separate the theoretical and methodological issues of a study.

Many feminist researchers and theorists also support and practice the concept of feminist reflexivity because it is viewed a constant exercise to scrutinize the values and interests of research which include the reduction of the subject and object of research. To reach this goal, Harding (2007) describes the strategies that do not help reduce the gap between the researcher and research participants. One of these strategies is the lack of
recognition that the statuses of the researcher and the researched are different and, in many cases, permanent. She supports that idea that research alone will not change economic, political and social structural inequalities that contribute to position the researcher and the researched differently. One other fruitless strategy is the researcher’s confession to the research audience of her particular locations. According to Harding, many researchers make confessions to their audience as if these confessions reduced the unequal relationship between the researcher and the researched. It is as if the initial reflection presented in chapter one would have been enough to reduce the gap that existed between the group of language learners who participated in the study and me, the researcher and language instructor.

Finally, another pointless strategy is when researchers attempt to record the voices of the researched and do not consider any theoretical and conceptual input. It is a fruitless action because if research is understood as only recording the voices of the researched, there would be an inaccurate translation of their voices. Consequently, it is necessary to consider the researcher’s expertise as well as the resources on behalf of the researched subjects.

The endeavors to reduce the gap between the subject and the object of research, to constantly reflect on the researcher’s voices and perspectives and on the research process make visible the connections that feminist reflexivity have not only with the area of discourse analysis studies but also with feminist standpoint, difference research and issues of race in second language education.
Limitations of the Microethnographic Approach

The usefulness of drawing on the microethnographic approach is the creation of different knowledge. That is, the main advantage of focusing on the particular of any use of language is that the knowledge claims that are produced are the claims produced by the research participants. Similarly, the main limitation lies on the fact that the efficacy of the knowledge claims that come from the conduct of this research is relative to the context of this research, that is, it is relative to a particular Spanish language classroom at Woodbridge College. The knowledge claims produced in this research cannot be entirely reproduced to other contexts. They have meaning in this specific context.

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter explains the design of this study. Generally speaking, it is grounded in the epistemological beliefs that knowledge and power are intrinsically linked which implies the view of language and literacy as constantly struggling for legitimacy and power. The microethnographic approach is located within the areas such as discourse analysis studies, feminist standpoint and difference research. The interdisciplinary nature of this study reinforces some of this study’s main beliefs.

The area of discourse analysis studies contributes with the frameworks of the critical turn, the concepts of language, literacy, events, context and culture; the relationship between local and broader processes of social activity and the relationship
between the constructs of power and discourse. The views of feminist standpoint as an epistemology and a set of theories reinforce the belief that knowledge and power are intrinsically linked as well as the idea that language and literacy are in constant struggle. As a research approach, feminist standpoint reminds researchers to acknowledge the gap that exists between the researcher and the researched and to reduce it.

The views of the categories of race, class, gender and sexuality support the beliefs about the other constructs considered in this study. Scholarship in the field of race, class, gender and sexuality affirm that these categories are: contextual, socially constructed, systems of power relationships, related to micro and macro social processes, simultaneously expressed and interdependent of knowledge and activism. This area also contributes with the term “interconnections” which suggests a more flexible and dynamic relationship between the categories.

In terms of critical issues in the second language education field, some researchers have begun to discuss issues of race. There is awareness that the understanding of cultural difference supports an essentialist and static view of culture. Therefore, critical researchers advocate for the view of cultural difference as a relational category as well as a discursive construct that is inextricably linked and shaped by power. Conversations about terms such as race, racism and racialization have also begun to take place in the second language field and their views are compatible with the nature of this study. The concept of microaggressions and a study on White youth (Bucholtz, 2011) were described as these concepts are crucial to the present study.
Regarding the microethnographic approach, it advocates for the view of language and literacy from within or as in process. The approach’s five theoretical strategies (contextualization cues, boundary making, turn taking, negotiating thematic coherence, and intertextuality) as well as the strategy of feminist reflexivity focus on subjects’ actions and support the idea that what people do enables and limits what they know and what they know and can do depend on their particular location. Therefore, the microethnographic approach focuses on how people construct action, meaning and significance when they interact to each other. It focuses on how classroom participants do language and literacy while it also pays attention to political, social and cultural processes of social activity.

In terms of the main limitations of the microethnographic approach, it was mentioned that the claims produced by this research cannot be fully reproduced to other contexts.
CHAPTER 4

ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXTS AND STRATEGIES OF DATA COLLECTION
AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter centers on the ethnographic contexts in which the study is located. First, it explains the ethnographic strategies of data collection and the stages considered to analyze this type of data. Then, it introduces the first set of contexts which includes the College Consortium Inc., Woodbridge College and the College’s Spanish Department. The description of these contexts emphasizes the most important relationships that were constructed and promoted during one academic year in the late 2000s. After presenting these layers, this chapter focuses on another set of contexts whose primary focus is the fall semester. This second set of contexts includes the explanation as to why the elementary Spanish course section 04 was selected for this study and the description of the first days of classes. It also includes information about the research participants, the characteristics of the classroom setting and the structure and content of the elementary Spanish course section 04. Then, this chapter ends with a summary.

Ethnographic Strategies
Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) define strategies as the specific procedures researchers use to both collect and analyze data. In the next paragraphs, I explain the strategies I used to collect and analyze this study’s ethnographic data.

**Strategies for Collection of Ethnographic Data**

Observational data and archival data require primary and secondary strategies of data collection. Observational data include fieldnotes, audio and video recordings of language lessons. Fieldnotes “are “free-associative flow” writing which includes memories, ideas, feelings, content, or anything about the experiences” (Wengraf, 2004, p. 143). They are crucial because they go through a transformation from observation, talk, and experiences to written texts of qualitative inquiry (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Regarding audio and video recordings of class sessions, they help researchers capture what they are not able to register in the fieldnotes and pay attention to actions that were previously unnoticed.

Secondary strategies of data gathering take into consideration archival data which include a copy of the syllabus of the Spanish class, my lessons plans, the hand-outs I distributed in class as well as a copy of the e-mail correspondence exchanged by research participants. Archival data also include copies of students’ quizzes, exams, and compositions as well as copies of students’ evaluation of the Spanish course at the end of the semester. Finally, they include copies of Woodbridge College’s official documents such as course catalogues, institutional plans, and information presented on its public website.
All these data were collected in two stages. The first stage lasted from September to May. Classroom observations, fieldnotes and audio and video recordings were done and conducted from September to December whereas copies of students’ quizzes and exams, questionnaires, copies of students’ compositions, as well as syllabus, hand-outs and other teaching material were collected from February to May of the following year.

The second stage of data collection took place in the summer of that same year. In these months, data such as electronic mail communication between research participants and college’s official documents were collected.

**Strategies for Analysis of Ethnographic Data**

During the summer months while I was collecting the electronic communication between research participants and Woodbridge College’s official documents, I transcribed the field notes, lesson plans and audio (and video) recordings. Even though field notes and lesson plans do not need to be transcribed mainly because they are used to compare or augment transcribed data analyses with additional contextual information; I transcribed them because the transcription helped me recollect memories, ideas, and feelings.

In the process of collecting and analyzing the ethnographic data, I recognized my role as “moderate” participant observer (Spradley, 1980). However, I struggled to balance my roles as an insider and an outsider. The strategies used to analyze these ethnographic data include feminist reflexivity (Hesse-Biber & Yaiser, 2004), triangulation (Ely et al., 1991; Marshall & Rossman, 1999), induction, recursivity, and interactivity (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Instead of documenting the details of events and actions of research
participants (traditional ethnographic strategies), I used these ethnographic strategies because they were useful to describe, interpret and explain the meanings participants gave to their own practices and experiences.

I drew on feminist reflexivity as it helped me revise my understandings about how concepts, meanings, and relationships are shaped by each other. I used triangulation which helped me confirm a point (Marshall & Rossman, 1999) or the existence of inconsistencies and contradictions (Ely et al., 1991). I also engaged in inductive analysis which means a “close reading” or a “line by line coding” of the fieldnotes. In other words, with this “bottom-up analytic strategy” I was able to identify broad themes and issues (Lucas & Kruger, 2006).

Analysis of the ethnographic data that I had confirmed that I had three issues to pose a challenge to me as the language instructor of this particular elementary Spanish course: the different levels of students’ language proficiency, my struggles to confront a particular language learner and an unpleasant teaching atmosphere. Regarding the different levels of language proficiency, and similar to what occurs in many language classrooms, there were language learners who did not have any previous study of Spanish while other learners had one or two years of high school Spanish. Cathy was the language learner with whom I struggled from the beginning of the semester. She caused some distraction in class and I struggled when the two of us interacted in class. The fact that I constantly struggled when I interacted with Cathy and that learners were distracted made me feel uncomfortable in class (Fieldnotes written on October 19).
The identification of these issues helped me reflect on some connections between these issues and the research questions of this study. For instance, an initial reflection enabled me to understand that I tended to see Cathy in terms of “disrespectful behavior to me and to her classmates.” The scrutiny of this belief made visible the importance of the process of recursivity as it “refers to the continuous interaction between data and hunches or hypothesis until a stable cultural pattern appears” (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 15).

**Ethnographic Contexts (1)**

In order to have a more complete understanding of the contexts of this study, it is useful to view contexts as sets of relationships that exist among people, time, institutions, etc. It is also important to remember that these relationships construct and reflect meaning, relationships of power, social identities, etc. As it has been said previously, this emphasis on relationships enables researchers to understand that the where and when social events take place is a multi-layered task as contexts are unbounded and dynamic (See chapter three).

In this section, the focus is on the following ethnographic contexts: the College Consortium Inc., Woodbridge College, and the Spanish Department at Woodbridge College. The emphasis lies on one academic year in the late 2000s.

**College Consortium Incorporated: A Privileged Environment**
College Consortium Incorporated (CCI) includes five institutions of higher education that are located in small towns of the New England area. The beautiful natural scenery and the small-town lifestyle are viewed as ideal for the production of academic knowledge. Four of these institutions are private liberal arts colleges known as: Washington College, Franklin College, Barnes College, and Woodbridge College. While the first two colleges are coeducational, the last two institutions are only for women.

Washington College (1821), Woodbridge College (1837), and Barnes College (1871) are founded in the nineteen century. Franklin College is conceived as an experimental college by the other colleges in 1965. The fifth institution is a public university founded in 1863.

According to the CCI’s public website, the very close proximity between these five institutions facilitates the creation of the CCI in 1966 in order to formalize the academic and administrative collaboration among the five institutions. CCI includes more than 2,000 faculty members, 5,000 courses, and almost 30,000 students approximately. It offers a joint library system, open cross registration, and inter-campus transportation. It also supports 2 joint departments, a shared major, 13 interdisciplinary programs, joint faculty appointments, and centers such as the Women’s Studies Research Center, the Center for the Study of World Languages, and the Center for East Asian Studies). This description helps understand the high level of academic activity in all the institutions and in the rural towns where these institutions are located. CCI authorities claim that not only is it the oldest consortium but also the most successful higher education consortium in the United States.
In 1999, CCI undergoes its first outside review to evaluate the work it has done and to outline a plan for the years ahead. The members of the review team include presidents of other institutions of higher education, provosts, treasurers, trustees, foundation officers, deans and the directors of the consortium. They emphasize the substance, the importance, and the benefits of the CCI. For instance, the reviewers point out that CCI is a “family consortium” because all institutions are in close proximity. They also claim that the importance of the consortium lies in the academic enrichment and enhancement that come from the “mix of institutions; public and private, women’s and coeducational, graduate and undergraduate, old and rich, and young and poor” (FCI, 1999, p. 4). They affirm that while the old private colleges bring their traditions, the public university brings its relationship with the state, and the experimental college (with the least financial resources) brings the vitality and the innovation of its students. Finally, in terms of the benefits of the consortium, the review team points out the following three advantages:

First, an increased cosmopolitanism including the opportunity it presents for individual members of minority groups to be less isolated. Sharing of services has already been mentioned is another real benefit of the cooperation that takes place here. Finally, and most importantly, the consortium provides the opportunity to innovate in curricular and academic programs that may get stuck in the bureaucracy of the individual institution. (FCI, 1999, p. 7)

Even though the reviewers emphasize the benefits of “cosmopolitanism”, service-sharing, and academic excellence, they neither pay attention to the unequal relationships
among the institutions nor articulate the consortium’s stance on issues of national and international importance.

In a more recent document, CCI begins to recognize the differences among the institutions and articulates a stance to some national and international problems. In terms of the differences among the institutions, it believes that actions such as a single interface to the institutions’ course catalogues and the development of multi-campus events that showcase students’ academic accomplishments help the community experience more evenly the benefits of the college consortium. In terms of national and international problems, the consortium expresses its concern with the environment and thus, it supports the development of what it is known as sustainability studies across multiple disciplines such as environmental studies, green computing, green design, environmental social justice, and peace and world security. In its opinion, through this initiative, the consortium strengthens its ties among the institutions and has a “local impact, regional influence, national importance, and global reach” (FCI, 2010, p. 3).

Thus far, this description shows that the CCI promotes the following beliefs: 1) a family composed of the five institutions 2) curricular and academic innovative activities that enable students to engage with today’s world, 3) liberal arts colleges with old and valuable traditions, 4) a experimental college with innovative and creative students, and 5) a public university that establishes important relationships with the state.

These relationships are compatible with the rationales presented in the first chapter that support traditional language study. These rationales are: multiculturalism, liberal arts education, and pragmatism (Kubota & Austin, 2007). This compatibility also
applies to the belief of cosmopolitanism (Mitchell, 2003). The promotion of these four rationales by the consortium and by each institution does not imply that the differences between the five institutions have been reduced. Rather, they are present.

Since there are four private colleges and one public university, the main differences are in terms of size and cost. According to the latest edition available of America’s Best Colleges, the student community at the public university consists of more than 28,000 students (22,000 undergraduates approximately), whereas each private college has, on average, a student community of 2,000 students. As to the economic cost, the same publication affirms that whereas an undergraduate student at the university (and state resident) pays more than $24,000 dollars for tuition, fees, and room and board per year (non-state resident pays more than $39,000); a student who attends any of the private colleges pays, on average, $46,000 dollars a year. Needless to say, the private colleges promote the belief that they are academic communities where most of their students come from an economically, culturally, and linguistically privileged background. These social privileges are reinforced by the resources that students enjoy such as small-size classes, state-of-the-art facilities, better dorms, and personalized attention from faculty. The private colleges also promote the rank they receive in the list of the best liberal arts colleges in the country. In the 2015 list of the best liberal arts colleges Washington College, Barnes College and Woodbridge College were ranked number 2, 19, and 41 respectively. Having taught at the women’s colleges and at Franklin College

---

7 In the academic year which is the focus of this study, three of the private colleges received a different ranking. Whereas Washington College was ranked as the number 2 liberal arts college in the country, Barnes College, Woodbridge College and Franklin College received a ranking of 19, 25, and 94 respectively.
(which is currently unranked), I witnessed the interest with which students talk about the rankings the colleges receive each year. For instance, even though Woodbridge College usually received a lower ranking than Washington College or Barnes College; Woodbridge College students used to talk enthusiastically about the high rankings the college received in other areas such as the most beautiful campus. The interviews conducted with the students who participated in this study confirmed students’ excitement to study in one of the most beautiful campuses in the country. For example, when Cathy was asked why she chose Woodbridge College to pursue her undergraduate studies, she responded that her mom was an alumna. Thus, since she was little, she knew that she was going to attend Woodbridge College which she described as “a beautiful campus” (Cathy, interview, 12/07/2009).

Even though the five institutions stress the importance of academic excellence, the diversity of its faculty and student community, the academic benefits of the college consortium, and the ability of the institutions to make students function successfully in today’s globalized world, each institution promotes and shapes specific characteristics of its students. This information is worth noting because it shows the relationships that each college constructs with its faculty, students, and staff and vice versa. It also indicates how students from a specific college see themselves and how they construct and establish relationships with their peers and with students from the other institutions of the consortium.

Washington College, a coed college ranked number 2, affirms that its students are “responsible”, “wise”, and “careful” when it comes to making academic decisions.
Franklin College, the coed experimental college, views its students as “passionate about learning” with “curious minds” and with a “willingness to engage vigorously” in the academic environment. This difference between Washington College and Franklin College students is explained by Julie, one of the student participants in this study. In her interview, and based on her opinion of Ethan another student participant who is a Franklin College student, Julie says that Franklin College students “seem more low key” whereas Washington students “are really full of themselves… [Washington College students are] usually from a different background than Franklin students. They know they are good students, they know” (Julie, interview, 12/03/2009).

Regarding the women’s colleges, Barnes College, ranked number 19, claims that students are “women of high ability” who “exceed” their own expectations, “reinvent” themselves and “take a risk on untested” concepts. Woodbridge College, ranked number 41, argues that its students “are smart and motivated women”, “energetic achievers” who “have what it takes to contribute to the world and be successful”. This aspect of being successful and a world contributor is also visible in the interviews conducted to the student participants in this study.

Finally, the state university defines its undergraduate students as explorers of “a broad array of majors and classes” who have the opportunity to “dive into high-level research” and whose “ambition is fueled” by academic support.

Thus, whereas students at the public university are seen as in need of academic support for their desiring success or ambition, students at the liberal arts colleges are seen as being already successful. They are either “responsible”, “passionate”, “risk takers”, or
“world contributors”. In terms of the identity of students at women’s colleges, it is important to notice that while Barnes students are seen as risk takers and as always exceeding their expectations, Woodbridge students are viewed as world contributors and achievers. It is also important to point out that while the authorities of women’s colleges stress the intelligence of their students, authorities of the coed institutions do not. This emphasis on women’s intelligence and their identity as risk takers and world contributors make visible that these aspects have been taken-for-granted in men’s identities.

**Woodbridge College: Where Exceptional Women Study**

“Uncommon women for the common good”

(MH, 2003, p. 3)

The quote above summarizes the Woodbridge College’s mission and the identity of its students as achievers and world contributors. Regarding the identity of Woodbridge College students, it has been said that the college defines its students as energetic achievers and contributors of the world. It has also been said that the college has a student community of more than 2,000 women students⁸ who enjoy of a low student-faculty ratio, small classes, state-of-the-art facilities and that, without any type of financial aid, students’ fees are of more than $40,000 dollars per year (tuition and room and board).

---

⁸ I use the term of women faculty, women students, woman student, woman professor, men faculty, men students, man student, and man professor to highlight the view of gender as socially constructed.
Woodbridge College also defines itself as an institution that enjoys of recognition worldwide “for its rigorous, and innovative academic program, its global community, its legacy of women leaders, and its commitment to connecting the work of the academy to the concerns of the world” (MH, 2007, p. 7). Based on this information, and according to college authorities, its success lies on the following four aspects: 1) its goal to educate women, 2) its diverse community, 3) its engagement with the world, and 4) its liberal arts curriculum.

This particular college articulates its goal to educate women and its legacy of educating women leaders by emphasizing that it provides an environment where women seek more academic challenges, assumes leadership roles, and are encouraged to earn an advanced degree. This belief is aligned with the advocacy of second-wave feminists for more institutional gains for women in the marketplace, the family, the academy, the judicial system, etc. In terms of the diverse community, college authorities affirm that there are students from 70 countries. However, the number of international students is lower than the number of African American, Asian American, Latina, Native American, or multiracial. Additionally, within the group of international students there are more representatives from countries such as China, India, Bulgaria, and Russia than from countries such as Bolivia, Greece, Mexico, and Oman. A similar situation occurs with the cultural and ethnic diversity of the faculty. Even though the college claims that almost a fourth (50 faculty members) is constituted by people of color and that 50% of the faculty (100 faculty members) is women, the number of faculty members who were born in a country different from the United States is lower than the number of faculty members who were born in the country but are from a cultural, linguistic, or ethnic minority group.
In addition, most international faculty is found in the areas of language study and cultural analysis. At the time this study was conducted there were three international faculty members outside the language departments. One woman professor from Pakistan who worked in the politics department, another woman professor from Germany who worked in the economics department and one man professor from Ethiopia who taught in the geography department.

Regarding the college’s engagement with the world, authorities argue that the institution has always been able to “turn challenges into opportunities”. For instance, when dominant trends in higher education call for institutions to be large, public, nonresidential, urban, and coed; Woodbridge College has remained a small, private, residential, non-urban, liberal arts college for women. They also argue that when forces of economic interconnectivity and international cooperation question social identities in terms of gender, ethnicity, religion, and nation, the college’s identity “is stronger than ever” (MH, 2003, p. 1).

The presence of these challenges has taken college authorities to implement a series of actions that construct and reflect the internationalization of its liberal arts curriculum since the early 2000s. As it was mentioned in the first chapter, these actions contributed to have students connected with today’s globalized world. One other aspect to keep in mind is that these actions also contribute to construct a different type of college student. In the word of college authorities,

Connections are important, not only because they pose intellectual and social opportunities and challenges.
Connections are important because ultimately, the subject
of a liberal arts education is humanity. By making connections—to knowledge and ideas, to other people—students learn more about what it means to be human and about how they relate to the greater world. (MH, 2007, p. 9)

This type of student who is learning to be human has the characteristics presented by Mitchell (2003) when she discusses the belief of cosmopolitanism. She argues that the belief of strategic use of diversity is needed in order to succeed in today’s driven market economies. This belief explains the existence of the strategic cosmopolitan subject who is “more individuated, mobile, and highly tracked and skilled-based education” (p. 387). Mitchell also believes that the strategic cosmopolitan subject differs from the multicultural subject that prevailed in the past. The multicultural subject was characterized as tolerant to work through and with diversity and stemmed from the belief that diversity results in the construction and unification of a nation.

Based on these claims, I believe that higher education institutions such as Woodbridge College produce students with characteristics very similar to the ones displayed by the strategic cosmopolitan.

After explaining the first three reasons of the college’s success, the following section focuses on its liberal arts curriculum.

The Liberal Arts Curriculum

A liberal arts curriculum usually promotes the belief that humanity can be learned by studying the most representative civilizations of the Western and Eastern world
particularly their contributions to the arts and social sciences. Based on this idea and similar to other liberal arts institutions, Woodbridge College confers the Bachelor of Arts (A.B.) degree. In order to receive it, students must earn a total of 128 credits which are usually completed in a four-year period. Each course is four credits and the normal schedule is four courses per semester (16 credits per semester and 32 credits per year).

Most students must be registered for a minimum of four semesters and take 18 courses (64 credits) in order to be considered students at Woodbridge College. They must also have a minimum cumulative G.P.A (grade point average) of 2.00 (out of 4.00). Due to its membership to the college consortium, Woodbridge College offers a master’s degree and several dual-degree and certificate options. College authorities emphasize the courses students can take at the other institutions, the programs that grant a consortium certificate, and the off-campus opportunities which include several exchange programs (MH, 2007).

The overall curriculum is divided into two main sections: the distribution (or general education) requirement and the major/minor requirement. To fulfill the distribution requirement, students complete courses from three divisions which are: humanities, science and mathematics, and social sciences. In the humanities division, students are required to take three courses from three different disciplines. They must take, at least, one course from the following two subgroups: 1) arts, language and

---

9 The following academic programs grant a consortium certificate: African Studies, Asian/Pacific/American Studies, Buddhist Studies, Coastal and Marine Science, Cognitive Neuroscience, Culture, Health and Science, International Relations, Latin American Studies, Logic, Middle Eastern Studies, Native American/Indian Studies, and Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies.

10 Woodbridge College established exchange programs with Washington College, Barnes College and other nine Ivy League institutions. Also, it has exchange programs with distinguished women’s colleges on the West Coast, on the South East, with a university in Washington, D.C., and with the Marine Biological Laboratory.
literature (or an interdisciplinary course in arts and literature) and 2) history, philosophy, religion (or an interdisciplinary course in this area. In the science and mathematics division, students must take two courses from two different disciplines. At least, they must take one laboratory course in the natural or physical science. The disciplines in this division are: 1) mathematics, statistics, computer science, or an interdisciplinary course in this area, 2) natural and physical sciences or an interdisciplinary course in the natural and physical sciences with lab and 3) natural and physical sciences or an interdisciplinary course in the natural and physical sciences without lab. In the social science division, students must take two courses from two different disciplines. The disciplines in this division include: anthropology, economics, education, geography, politics, psychology, sociology, or an interdisciplinary course in the social sciences.

Regarding the major/minor requirement, students can choose between a departmental major (32 credits in the major field including 12 credits at the 300 level), an interdisciplinary major (minimum of 40 credits in the approved program and at least 20 credits at the 300 level) and a special major (40 credits in the approved program and at least 20 credits at the 300 level). Whereas students who declare an interdisciplinary major or a special major automatically fulfill the “outside the major” requirement, students who declare a single department major must complete at least 68 credits (17 courses) outside the major department.

In addition to the general education and the major/minor requirements, Woodbridge students must fulfill the multicultural requirement, the physical education requirement, and the language study requirement. The multicultural requirement consists of a course that focus on some aspect of Asia, Africa, Latina America, the Middle East,
or the nonwhite peoples of North America and that incorporates a diversity of perspectives. The physical education requirement consists of six physical education units that students must earn by the end of their third year. Regarding the language study requirement, it is fulfilled according to students' level of proficiency in a language other than English. Woodbridge College offers Spanish, French, German, Italian, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese (up to third year of study). It also offers Arabic (up to second year of study), Ancient Greek (elementary level) and Latin (up to intermediate level)\textsuperscript{11}.

In terms of the language requirement in the Spanish Department, women students with no previous study of Spanish can fulfill it by either taking the two-semester language elementary course (SPAN101 and SPAN102) or a one-semester intensive elementary course (SPAN103). Students with previous study of Spanish are asked to take an online placement test and complete a language questionnaire in order for the Department authorities to locate them in the corresponding level. If students are learners at the intermediate level, they can either take an intermediate language course (SPAN201, SPAN209 and SPAN210) or an upper-intermediate course (SPAN211, SPAN221) to fulfill the language requirement. For those students who have a higher level of language proficiency, they can take a one-semester literature course or can be exempt of the language study requirement by showing a satisfactory performance on an intermediate level examination. Students who are Spanish native speakers, they can be exempt through certification by the corresponding Department or college authority. Finally, students who

\textsuperscript{11} The Center for the Study of World Language of the College Consortium offers instruction in less commonly taught languages such as Turkish, Urdu, and Swahili.
have learned and used Spanish in non-academic settings can fulfill the language requirement by taking the Spanish for Heritage Speakers course (SPAN 202).

In addition to describing the Woodbridge College’s curriculum, it is necessary to mention the general characteristics of the Franklin College’s curriculum mainly because a man student of this college, Ethan, was part of the elementary Spanish course and the particular lesson that was the focus of this study.

Unlike Woodbridge College that has an “off-the-shelf- majors” approach, the Franklin College’s curriculum is alternative as students create their own program of study. This curriculum is organized around 5 interdisciplinary schools (Cognitive Science, Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies, Interdisciplinary Arts, Natural Science and Social Science) and three levels of study. At this institution, the four years of undergraduate study are known as follows. “Division I” refers to the first year of study. “Division II” is also known as “the concentration” and it includes the sophomore and junior years while “Division III” is also known as “Advanced Studies” and refers to the fourth and last year. At the end of each division, there is a portfolio review process in which students and professors discuss students’ academic growth. Instead of receiving letter grades in classes, Franklin College students receive narrative evaluations.

Regarding language study, the college believes that languages are resources and thus, students are required to study one to graduate. The languages offered by the institution are: Spanish, Chinese, Yiddish, and Arabic. With regards to Spanish language classes, Franklin College hires a local language institute which embraces a participatory language teaching and learning philosophy where letter grades are not the result of traditional quizzes and exams but of journal entries and active class participation. This local
language institute hires Spanish native speakers who are usually graduate students from
the public university that is part of the college consortium. Franklin College offers
courses every semester. However, they offer an immersion Spanish course during
January (J-Term) which is popular among many college students.

The above explanation of the Woodbridge College’s curriculum helps end the
description of the four factors that, in the college’s view, are responsible for its success.
A scrutiny of the college’s goal to educate women, its diverse community, its
engagement with the world and its liberal arts curriculum clarifies the meanings of the
beliefs of multiculturalism, liberal arts education, pragmatism and cosmopolitanism. Thus
far, there are the following four meanings: 1) the representation of cultures other than the
majority culture is low in both the student and the faculty body. That is, Woodbridge
College is a predominantly White institution. 2) languages other than English are learned
in terms of their linguistic structures, historical knowledge, and cultural traditions and
studied through levels of language proficiency with which students fulfill the language
requirement needed to graduate. This way of studying a language and culture other than
English particularly in a predominantly White institution such as Woodbridge College
generally reinforces a dichotomized representation of the majority and the minority
languages and cultures. Languages and cultures are seen as homogenous and variations
within a language are not visible. Additionally, non-native cultures are seen as truly not
from the country. 3) language study is believed to advance students’ professional careers.
As it has been said, the Woodbridge College’s curriculum has implemented some actions
toward its internationalization. Nevertheless, the language requirement is still fulfilled
through language courses that last one or two years and where language is studied in
terms of its linguistic structures and cultural traditions. The language courses are not connected with students’ academic majors or minors. 4) The idea that students are engaged with today world’s concerns mainly refers to the construction of functional subjects for today’s world.

The Spanish Department

In the 1990s, the Spanish Department was known as “the Spanish and Italian Department”. When two senior professors (one from each discipline) retired in the early 2000s, the Italian faculty joined the Department of Classics and the Spanish faculty established the Spanish Department. This was the Department’s official name when I collected the data.¹²

The Spanish Department shapes and is shaped by the beliefs of cosmopolitanism, pragmatism, liberal arts education, and multiculturalism promoted by the institution. Regarding the rationale of cosmopolitanism, the Department affirmed that Spanish was the “second most spoken language” in the U.S. and “one of the three most spoken languages in the world” (MH, 2007, p. 454). For its leading position in the world the Spanish language “become [became] an integral part of civic engagement and global citizenship” (Spanish Department’s website). The Department’s endorsement of the rationale of pragmatism was evident upon claiming that “facility with the language” is “an important component of the career success” of many of the college graduates who

¹² The Department’s free-standing position lasted only a few more years. In the 2010-2011 academic year, it changed its name to the Department of Spanish, Latino/a, and Latin American Studies to include the Latin American studies faculty. In the fall semester of 2009, instead of calling it the Spanish major, it called it the major in Hispanophone studies.
work in fields such as “government, law, business, international affairs, education, journalism, medicine, and the performing arts” (Spanish Department’s website).

In terms of the beliefs of multiculturalism and liberal arts education, the idea of multiculturalism was reaffirmed through the Department’s affirmation that Spanish language courses consist on the study of communities of cultures and traditions of the Spanish-speaking world. The liberal arts education rationale was confirmed through the Department’s structure of a two-tier system. This structure reaffirmed the “traditional rift” that made language instructors (language learning curriculum) and professors (cultural analysis curriculum) support the study of the language’s linguistic structures and the goal of achieving native-like proficiency (Byrnes & Kord, 2001).

In the academic year that is the focus of this study, language learning courses were taught by six instructors (graduate students) who were hired on temporary basis and did not hold tenure-track positions. On the other hand, the culture-based courses were taught by six professors who held tenure and tenure track positions. In order to understand the relationships that these two areas constructed and reflected, it is necessary to consider issues such as faculty’s native language ability, ethnicity, class, field of specialization, membership in particular factions and academic distinction because these factors interact in complex ways in Spanish Departments in U.S. colleges and universities (Valdés et al., 2003). Consequently, the remaining part of this section emphasizes these characteristics of Spanish professors and Spanish language instructors.
Cultural Analysis Professors and Curriculum

In the late 1990s, the Spanish faculty consisted of one senior professor, one senior lecturer and three junior faculty hired under two or three-year contracts. When the senior professor and the senior lecturer retired in the early 2000s, the Department hired some professors under a tenure-track basis. These professors defined themselves as a “vibrant group of young, energetic teachers and scholars” (Spanish Department, 2007).

In the academic year which is the focus of this study, this group of scholars included two women and four men professors. One woman professor and one man professor enjoyed tenure and the rank of associate professors. Three of them (a woman and two men) were under-tenure track conditions and had the rank of assistant professors\textsuperscript{13}. The remaining faculty member, a man, had the rank of visiting assistant professor. He left the college at the end of the academic year.

Natividad and Ignacio were the two tenured faculty members. They were also native speakers of Castilian Spanish. Natividad was born in Southern Spain and her field of specialization was Golden Age Spanish Literature. She was in her early forties and used Spanish for almost all her interactions in the Department with colleagues and students. She used English with the Department’s administrative assistant and college authorities. Ignacio was born in Eastern Spain. He was in his early forties too. He specialized in Twentieth Century Iberian and Latin American Literature. Ignacio used English and Spanish in her interactions with colleagues at Department meetings. He rarely used the language used in the place he was born. While Natividad underwent the

\textsuperscript{13} These three tenure-track professors received tenure in the 2012-2013 academic year.
traditional process to obtain tenure (6 year-period), Ignacio received tenure and the rank of associate professor when he joined the college as Department chair in 2006.

Diane, Fred, Christoph were in the group of tenure track professors. Diane was an African American woman and she was in her early forties. Her field of specialization was Afro-Caribbean Literature particularly Afro-Hispanic identity in literature. She was highly proficient in Central American Spanish particularly Costa Rican Spanish. However, she chose to use English in conversations with the rest of faculty. Fred was an English native speaker who was fluent in Castilian Spanish and Basque. He was in his late thirties and his area of specialization was twentieth century Iberian literature and cinema. He used Spanish in his interactions with colleagues in the Spanish Department. He also used Basque in his conversations with Iñaki, the visiting assistant professor. Finally, Christoph was a German native speaker. He held two doctoral degrees. He was in his early forties and his field of specialization included XX Century Latin American Literature, post-dictatorships studies, gender and cinema. In addition to being appointed as an assistant professor in the Spanish Department, he enjoyed the same position in the area of Gender Studies. In addition to German and English, he was fluent in the Argentine Spanish. He used Spanish in his interactions with his colleagues in the Spanish Department and students. He rarely used his native language.

Regarding Iñaki, the visiting assistant professor, he was born in the Basque country. His research focus was Spanish literature and culture of the twentieth century. Since the Spanish Department did not renew his contract, he left Woodbridge College at
the end of the academic year. He used Spanish in all his interactions with his colleagues and students and Basque in most of his conversations with Fred.

These Spanish faculty members revised the curriculum to respond to the changes of the profession and society. They were committed to “do literature, but also study film, gender, politics, and cultural production in a transnational, interdisciplinary context” (Spanish Department, 2007). This claim shows their acceptance of the college’s guidelines to offer interdisciplinary courses that advocate for a global vision.

All cultural analysis professors had a teaching load of four courses a year. Christoph was on leave in the fall semester whereas Natividad, Diane, Iñaki, Fred, and Ignacio taught two courses per semester. Usually, cultural analysis professors taught a bridge course and a cultural or literary analysis course. A bridge course is a 200-level course (211/212 level course) that prepared students for the introductory courses of cultural analysis. Cultural analysis courses could be at the introductory level (235/237; 244/246 level courses) or at the advanced level (320/340; 362 level courses). These advanced courses were also known as seminars.

In the academic year which is the focus of this study, Diane, the African American professor, taught a bridge course and a 300-level seminar in the fall semester and two introductory literary analysis courses in the spring semester. Ignacio, the department chair, taught one bridge course and one introductory literary course in the fall semester. In the spring semester, he taught the same bridge course he taught in the previous term and a 300-level course in the following term (See Table 4.1).
Christoph, Fred, and Natividad taught interdisciplinary courses. Christoph taught a bridge course and an advanced course in the spring semester. This advanced course was cross-listed with film studies and gender studies. Fred taught an introductory course that was cross-listed with film studies. He also taught a seminar and a language learning class. Regarding Natividad, she taught an intensive course for first-year students and an introductory literary course in the fall semester and an upper-intermediate language course and an advanced literary course in the spring term. Natividad’s course for first-year students responded to the college’s initiative to introduce first-year students to “college-level thinking, writing, and discussion” (MH, 2007, p. 87). Her course was about short stories by Spanish, French, and Italian authors. Consequently, it was considered as being the same course as either introductory French, Italian or an introductory level course for the Romance Language and Literature area. This was the only introductory level course that was taught in English.

Finally, Iñaki, the assistant professor who left at the end of the academic year, was the only Spanish professor who taught more language courses than culture-based courses. He taught three language learning courses and one introductory literary analysis course. He taught an intermediate language course and an upper-intermediate language course in the fall semester. In the following term, he taught the same upper-intermediate language course and the second part of the introductory course to Spanish literature.

The above description makes visible, at least, five patterns that are worth noting. First, international faculty members were concentrated in the area of Spanish language study. Four (out of six) professors were born in countries other than the United States.
This fact confirms the belief that Woodbridge College is an institution that celebrates the co-existence of “foreign” languages and cultures and that these languages and cultures are taught by “foreign” professors who are trained to teach them. Second, the number of men faculty doubled the number of women faculty and these four men professors were White. Thus, the cultural analysis area was not only male but also White-dominated. This structure mirrors what is currently occurring at college and university campuses at large. Harris & González (2012) argue that while the student population is becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse, the majority of full-time faculty positions “continue to be filled by white men and women” (p. 39) who, generally speaking, continue to privilege the social perspective of the White man.

Third, in addition to being male and White-dominated, in the area of cultural analysis, Castilian Spanish prevailed over Latin American Spanish as Ignacio, Iñaki, Fred, and Natividad were native speakers of Castilian Spanish (or native-like speakers) and were “peninsulares” (scholars with a concern with Iberian literature and culture). Valdés et al. (2003) argue the positions of Spanish professors in language departments in U.S. colleges and universities are not only influenced by their gender and racial identity but also by the political and economic status of the countries they represent. Since countries with European-descent populations such as Spain and Argentina have a higher status than countries with indigenous populations and/or populations with African origin such as Costa Rica, the four Spanish professors (Ignacio, Iñaki, Fred, and Natividad) were followed by Christoph, and then by Diane. These positions were reinforced by the fact that Christoph was a man and was a more fluent Spanish speaker than Diane. Despite the fact that these four professors did not speak the standard variation of Castilian
Spanish (e.g. from Madrid or madrileño) and did not have the same cultural practices from which they constructed their Spanish identities, all of them contributed to reinforce the value and prestige of native speakership and scholarship in Castilian Spanish over the native speakership and scholarship in Latin American Spanish. The issue of Castilian Spanish and scholarship as having more prestige and being more rewarded than Latin American Spanish and scholarship is found in most Spanish Departments in U.S. colleges and universities (Valdés et al., 2003).

Fourth, cultural analysis professors constructed relations that reproduced the privileged position of White, male, and Castilian Spanish but also the rationale of the cosmopolitan strategic subject as three of them taught interdisciplinary courses. Fred, Christoph, and Natividad taught courses which were cross-listed with areas such as film studies, gender studies and romance languages and cultures. Upon teaching these courses, these professors reinforced the college’s guidelines of the internationalization of its curriculum. In addition, they were able to either strengthen or negotiate their position in the department. For instance, for Fred and Christoph, their cross-listed courses helped them in their process to obtain tenure. Fifth, the hierarchy within the group of cultural analysis professors was as follows: the tenured professors (Ignacio and Natividad) were followed by the tenure-track professors (Fred, Christoph, and Diane) and by, Iñaki, the assistant professor who left at the end of the academic year. Even though these tenure-track professors received tenure years later, this structure in which the number of tenure-track professors is higher than the number of tenured professors is familiar in many colleges and universities. Harris & González (2012) point out that the corporatization of the university has contributed to a shift in the labor market of academia and report that
even though the total numbers of faculty members have grown, most of the new appointments have been in non-tenure track positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member’s name</th>
<th>Age, Gender, and Country of Birth</th>
<th>Spanish Language Proficiency and Variety of Spanish Spoken</th>
<th>Academic Rank and Year Faculty Member joined the College</th>
<th>Field of Specialization/Institution that granted doctoral degree</th>
<th>Courses taught in the Fall (f) and Spring (s) semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natividad</td>
<td>Woman in her early forties. Spain.</td>
<td>Native speaker of Castilian Spanish. Variety: Cordobés, (Southern Spain)</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Tenure) 1999</td>
<td>Spanish Renaissance and Baroque prose literature (Ph.D., University of Oregon)</td>
<td>105f Seminar in Reading, Writing and Reasoning (Romance Languages, French) 244f Foundations of Spanish Literature II 209s Composition and Culture 332s Assault, Rape, Murder: Gendered Violence from Medieval to Contemporary Spain (Gender studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Woman in her early forties. U.S.</td>
<td>Proficient in Latin American Spanish Variety: Central American Spanish (Costa Rican)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (Tenure-Track) 2003</td>
<td>Afro-Hispanic Literature and Culture, Caribbean and African Diaspora Literature (Ph.D., University of Missouri at Columbia)</td>
<td>212f Preparation for Advanced Studies 341f Treading the Ebony Path: Afro-Hispanic Literature 219s U.S. Latino/a Literature 237s Introduction to Latin American Literature II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Male in his late thirties. U.S.</td>
<td>Fluent in Castilian Spanish and Basque Variety: Northern Spain</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (Tenure Track) 2003</td>
<td>History of thought and the arts in modern Spain particularly cinema (Ph.D., Emory University)</td>
<td>221f Introduction to Spanish and Latin American Film (Film studies) 362f Terror and Victimhood: The State of Spain 201s Intermediate Spanish II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Language and Region</td>
<td>Position and Tenure</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>Man in his early forties. Germany</td>
<td>Highly fluent in Latin American Spanish Variety: Argentine (Buenos Aires)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor (Tenure Track) 2003</td>
<td>Twentieth century Latin American, specifically Argentine film and literature. (Ph.D. Rutgers University and Ph.D. Cornell University)</td>
<td>211s Hispanic Cultures and Civilization 320s Queer Theory and Recent Queer film in Latin America (Film studies and Gender studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio</td>
<td>Man in his late thirties. Spain</td>
<td>Native speaker of Castilian Spanish and Valenciano Variety: (Eastern Coast)</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Tenure) 2006</td>
<td>Early modern transatlantic (Spain and Latin America) studies (Ph.D. Penn State University)</td>
<td>212 fs Preparation for Advanced Studies 235f Introduction to Latin American Spanish Literature I 362s Media Monsters: Empire and Resistance in Twentieth-First Century Spain and the Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iñaki</td>
<td>Man in his late thirties. Spain</td>
<td>Native speaker of Castilian Spanish and Basque Variety: Northern Spain</td>
<td>Visiting Associate Professor 2005</td>
<td>Twentieth century Spanish literature and culture (Ph.D., Duke University)</td>
<td>200f Intermediate Spanish I 209 fs Composition and Culture 246s Modern Spanish Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Hierarchies in Faculty in the Spanish Department at Woodbridge College

Language Learning Instructors

As it has been said, Iñaki, Fred, and Natividad taught language courses. In addition to these professors, six women instructors (Molly, Estela, Rosa, María, Lourdes, and me) taught the rest of Spanish language courses in the academic year that is the focus of this study. Similar to the cultural analysis professors, these six language instructors were in their late thirties or early forties and most of them were born in a Spanish-
speaking country. However, they were hired under a nine-month basis and had to sign a new contract every academic year. In addition, they were pursuing a doctoral degree.

Regarding the instructors’ countries of origin, and with the exception of Molly who was born in the U.S., Estela was born in Spain, María in Peru, Lourdes in Argentina, and Rosa and me in Mexico. Also, with the exception of Molly again, the other five instructors were pursuing a doctoral degree either in Spanish literature and linguistics (Estela, Lourdes, Rosa), or in education (María and me). This means that Estela, Rosa, María, Lourdes, and me carried out the workload of being junior faculty and the workload of either designing or completing their dissertation projects.

Estela was from Madrid. She studied Hispanic philology at Complutense University of Madrid (Universidad Complutense de Madrid). She was a graduate student in the Hispanic Linguistics doctoral program at the consortium’s public university. Estela joined Woodbridge College in 2006 as a result of the search for the position of language program coordinator. Before teaching at Woodbridge College, Estela was a part-time language instructor in the Spanish department at the public university. At Woodbridge College, she was hired with the rank of visiting lecturer with a full-time status. She signed a two-year contract with the possibility of renewal. At the end of the academic year, she was going to find out if her contract was being renewed or not.\(^{14}\)

Molly was an English native speaker and was the only instructor who was not pursuing a doctoral degree. She earned a masters of arts in Spanish (Iberian) literature from the public university that was part of the college consortium. Before teaching at

---

\(^{14}\) Estela’s contract was renewed for two more years. Few years later, she received the rank of senior lecturer.
Woodbridge College, she taught Spanish at the high school level. She was highly proficient in Castilian Spanish and was familiar with the Basque language because she was married to Iñaki, the visiting associate professor who left at the end of the academic year. Iñaki and Molly met when they were enrolled in the master’s program at the consortium’s public university. Molly joined Woodbridge in 2005 and was hired as a full-time visiting lecturer under a nine-month period and her contract was renewed every year. Although she had the possibility to teach in the following academic year she left the Department because her husband’s contract was not renewed.

Regarding the instructors who were native speakers of Latin American Spanish, Lourdes was born in Buenos Aires, Argentina. She earned an undergraduate and a master’s degree in Latin American Literature from the University of Buenos Aires (Universidad de Buenos Aires). She was pursuing a doctoral degree in Latin American Literature at a French public university.

Similar to Molly, Lourdes joined the Spanish Department in 2005. At that time, the Spanish Department was going through a restructuring process and was in need of language instructors. Christoph, the Latin American professor, recommended Lourdes for a temporary language teaching position. He mentioned that she lived in Paris, but she was able to teach Spanish in the U.S. for a short period of time. The group of cultural analysis professors accepted Christoph’s recommendation and offered Lourdes a full-time job as a visiting lecturer. The fall semester, focus of this study, was Lourdes’ last term at Woodbridge College. She returned to France in December of that same year. This
description explains why Lourdes was the only language instructor who was not a graduate student at a U.S. university.

Rosa was born in a small town in the state of Jalisco (Mexico). In the late 1980s, when she was a teenager, Rosa emigrated to the U.S. to marry a young man (and English native speaker) she had met in her hometown. Thus, she did not arrive in the U.S. to pursue graduate studies like most of the language instructors and cultural analysis professors in the Spanish Department. Instead, she migrated to the U.S. to start a family. Since she arrived, she lived in a small rural town in New England (an hour away from the college consortium area). At that time, she was the only Spanish native speaker in the town and did not speak English. Consequently, she stopped speaking Spanish in order to learn English and to assimilate into the new culture. Years later, she attended Barnes College (the other women’s college part of the college consortium) and earned her B.A. degree with a major in Latin American Literature and History. During this period, she began to speak Spanish again. In the early 2000s, she received her master’s degree from the public university. Afterwards, she enrolled in the Contemporary Latin American literature program to earn a doctoral degree also from the public university. She completed her doctorate at the end of the academic year. However, the rest of the Spanish native speakers in the Department did not consider Rosa a native speaker. The fact that she re-learned Spanish years after her arrival in the U.S. made her have an accent that many Spanish native speakers viewed as the accent many Latinos have. In addition to her accent, the Spanish native speakers in the Department believed that Rosa’s academic background was not as solid as theirs mainly because they completed their undergraduate studies in universities that enjoyed recognition at the country’s level and within the
Spanish-speaking region. They believed that their academic foundation was stronger and more rounded than the undergraduate education received in U.S. (Molly was in this group too). This group of Spanish native speakers studied four or five years an academic discipline (e.g. Spanish literature, English literature, etc.), wrote a thesis and received the undergraduate degree of “Licenciado” or “Licenciada”. Similar to Molly and Lourdes, Rosa joined the college in 2005 and was hired as a visiting lecturer with a full-time status. Since her contract was not renewed, she left the Department at the end of the academic year.

María was born in Lima, Peru. She graduated in Spanish linguistics and literatures from the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú). She earned a master’s degree in literary studies from the University of Quebec. She was interested in pursuing a doctoral degree in comparative literature, but was accepted in the doctoral program in the School of Education at the public university. She joined Woodbridge College in 2003. Initially, she was hired as a part-time instructor. She was hired as a full-time visiting lecturer for two years. However, in the academic year which is the focus of this study, she was hired as an instructor with a three-fourth workload. In addition, her contract was not renewed and Maria also left the Spanish Department in May.

Finally, as I said in the first chapter, I was born and raised in Mexico City. I completed my undergraduate studies in economics from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México). I earned a master’s degree in education from the public university that is part of the consortium and I was
enrolled in the doctoral program in the School of Education with María, the instructor from Peru. After being an international student and teaching assistant at Woodbridge College’s Spanish Department (1993-1995), I was hired as a language instructor for twelve years. I was the instructor (and member of the Spanish Department) with more seniority. During these years, I gained experience as a Spanish language instructor and curriculum designer. My familiarity with the language learning program and the Spanish Department facilitated my communication and my friendship with cultural analysis professors particularly with Natividad, Ignacio, Christoph, and Iñaki. However, this relationship I had with cultural analysis professors made me face some challenges in terms of my relationship with some of my colleagues in the language learning area.

A couple of instructors such a Rosa and María believed that they were treated unfairly because they did not have all the courses (or times) they requested. Years later, one of the tenured professors told me that these instructors complained about my job as a language coordinator in the meetings they had with the group of cultural analysis professors. Although I had more seniority, I was equally excluded from the decisions tenured and tenure-track professors made about the direction of the Spanish Department and the content of the language learning curriculum. The academic year which is the focus of this study was my last year at the college because I had reached the maximum number of years in the position of visiting lecturer. Similar to Maria, Rosa, and Molly, I left the college in May.

The above description shows one important similarity between the group of language instructors and the group of cultural analysis professors. Most language
instructors were international faculty members. This fact reinforces the idea that language instructors who were also native speakers did not have any limitation to teach their native language. In addition, the predominance of Spanish native speakers exemplifies the belief that the language that the Department taught was formal, correct, and error free. In other words, through the Spanish native speakers, the Department was able to offer to students the ability or the symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2006) to fully participate in a language community other than their own.

On the other hand, the group of language instructors differed from the group of cultural analysis professors in several ways. First, the language learning area was dominated by women. This fact reflected and constructed the reality that the language teaching profession is dominated by women and that there were women of color faculty at Woodbridge College. There were three women of color (María, Rosa, and Thelma) and three White women (Estela, Lourdes, and Molly). This structure in which it is common to find women of color in lower academic ranks is a characteristic of U.S. academia. Ryu (2010) argues that women of color made up 10.4 percent of instructors and lecturers, 9.9 percent of assistant professors, 6.6 percent of associate professors, and 3.4 percent of full professors in 2007 (in Harris & González, 2012, p. 40).

Second, Castilian Spanish speakership and scholarship struggled to prevail over Latin American speakership and scholarship. As it has been said, the statutes of the Spanish-speaking countries influence the position of Spanish speakers in the U.S. and in Spanish language departments (Valdés et al., 2003). In this group, three instructors came from countries where indigenous populations prevail and thus, they offered some
resistance to the domination of Castilian Spanish in the department. However, the social, cultural and linguistic reality of the group of language instructors is quite complex. The instructors’ alliances and identities fluctuated within the group of language instructors and between this group and the group of cultural analysis professors. Lourdes, the Argentinean (White) instructor was likely to have a higher status than María, Rosa, and me who were from Peru and Mexico and were dark-skinned women. In addition, Lourdes’ higher status was reaffirmed because she spoke French and lived in France and she came to Woodbridge College thanks to Christoph’s recommendation. To some extent, these experiences enabled her to align herself with the group of cultural analysis professors. María’s previous experience in Canada helped build her relationship with Lourdes as both of them spoke French. However, the French variety spoken by Lourdes (Parisian French) had more prestige than the variety spoken by Maria (Québécois French). Similarly, my own experiences as language instructor in Spain and in other Spanish-speaking countries helped me reinforce my relationships in the group of language instructors and with cultural analysis professors. More particularly, they helped me strengthen my relationship with Lourdes, Estela and Molly and weaken my relationship with María and Rosa. In addition, Rosa and I struggled in terms of the ways in which we constructed our Mexican identity and our place in the Spanish Department. While I was born in the country’s capital and migrated to the U.S. to further my education, Rosa was born in a small town of the Western state of Jalisco and migrated to the U.S. to start a family. Also, Rosa was seen as sharing more similarities with Spanish heritage speakers than with Spanish native speakers. Overall, and despite the struggles to make Latin American speakership and scholarship prevail, the four language instructors
who were born in Latin American countries reinforced the rationale of multiculturalism as they represented the variety of the “Spanish-speaking world”.

Third, the Spanish language instructors were graduate students and there were aspects that united them but also that divided them. One unifying aspect was that most of the instructors who were born in a Spanish-speaking country completed their undergraduate education in their countries of birth. María, Estela, Lourdes, and I attended recognized universities in our countries of origin. Thus, we reflected and constructed the idea that undergraduate education at institutions outside the U.S. is more rounded than the undergraduate education at U.S. institutions. Another unifying aspect was the fact that María, Estela, Rosa, and I were graduate students at the public university that was part of the consortium. At the same time, this aspect could also divide us mainly because Estela, Rosa and Lourdes were enrolled in doctoral programs that granted a Ph. D. degree (literature) whereas María and I enrolled in a doctoral program that granted an Ed. D. degree (education). Through our graduate student’s identity, we also reflected and constructed the relationships and statutes that existed between the different academic disciplines at the public university as well as the relationships between graduate students and institutions of higher education. Mainly, I am referring to the status and prestige that the area of literature and the Ph.D. degree has over the education field and a Doctor of Education degree. Regarding the relationships between graduate students and higher education institutions, graduate students have been considered “cheap labor” for colleges and universities (Bradley, 2004, p. 2). Additionally, as graduate students and full-time instructors, all the language instructors struggled to complete our doctoral degrees.
Fourth, with the exception of the language program coordinator, the rest of the instructors left at the end of the academic year. This situation enabled cultural analysis professors to renew its language instructors’ base. This meant that cultural analysis professors continued to hire full-time language instructors for a nine-month period every two or three years as it was the case of Molly, Lourdes, María, Rosa, and me.

Fifth, factors such as friendship, seniority, age, alma mater, and field of specialization played an important role as they helped instructors built their relationships with the group of cultural analysis professors. For instance, Molly and Lourdes had Natalia and Natividad’s support to be hired. Natalia was an associate professor in Golden Age Latin American (Argentine) literature. She joined the college in 1993 and before she left the college in 2006, she was part of the committee that hired Natividad in 1999. In 2005, neither Natalia nor Natividad rejected the idea that Iñaki and his wife Molly were hired for a temporary basis. Indeed, Iñaki, Molly, Natalia and Natividad shared some aspects in common. Iñaki and Natividad were born in Spain. Natalia met Iñaki and Molly when they were enrolled in the master’s program at the public university. Natalia also had some aspects in common with Lourdes and Christoph which helps explain why Natalia (and Natividad) supported Christoph’s recommendation to hire Lourdes. Similar to Natalia and Christoph, Lourdes’ research focus was Latin American (Argentine) literature. Additionally, Lourdes and Natalia graduated from the same university (University of Buenos Aires). In addition to Molly and Lourdes, I collaborated with cultural analysis professors closely. My years as language instructor and the fact that I was the same age as some most cultural analysis professors enabled me to develop a friendship with tenured and tenure-track faculty.
The Language Learning Curriculum

According to the department’s website, the language learning courses aimed at “facilitate[ing] language proficiency and contextualize[ing] issues relevant to Spanish speakers abroad and in the U.S”. The Spanish language curriculum consisted of foreign language courses and a language course in which Spanish was taught as a heritage language.

Similar to most colleges and universities in the country, the heritage language program consisted of only one course which was offered every fall semester. The course SPAN202 was the result of the work done by two language instructors (Yamile and me) and a Spanish Department chair. Yamile was also a graduate student pursuing her doctoral studies in education at the public university. She left Woodbridge College in 2006. The Spanish Department chair was an appointed professor in the department of education and psychology. She had taken Spanish courses a few years earlier and thus, she knew some instructors such as María, Natividad, Yamile, and me. In the early 2000s, she accepted the offer to be an interim chair. During this time, she asked Yamile and me to develop the curriculum for the heritage speakers’ course. She also asked us to co-teach the course in the fall semester of 2003. After we taught the course together, I continued teaching it until my last fall semester. In the course, Spanish heritage learners acquired the skills to read and write Spanish in academic ways. They also learned about the history and culture of the Spanish speaking world and reflected on the advantages and disadvantages of being bicultural and bilingual women. The course was popular among the heritage language learners. The highest number of students was Mexican American.
Other students were of Puerto Rican, Colombian, Ecuadorian, and Spanish descent. Students who passed this course fulfilled the college’s language requirement. The heritage language course was offered for the last time in the 2011-2012 academic year.

The foreign language program was divided into the three traditional levels of language proficiency: elementary, intermediate, and upper-intermediate. The elementary level underwent a reform in the early 2000s. The interim chair from the department of education and psychology asked Yamile, María, and me (the graduate students in the School of Education) to review a series of textbooks to replace the teaching material used in the elementary Spanish courses mainly because she was familiar with the teaching material that instructors used in the elementary level. After our revision, we suggested the textbook “Vistas” (Blanco & Donley, 2005). “Vistas” replaced “Destinos” (Van Patten, Marks, Teschner, 1991) which was used since I started teaching at Woodbridge College in 1993. “Vistas” is still used in the college’s elementary Spanish courses.

In the academic year which is the focus of this study, the elementary level consisted of the courses SPAN101, SPAN102 and SPAN103. SPAN101 and SPAN102 were part of a yearlong course. The first half (SPAN101) was only offered in the fall semester while the second half (SPAN102) was only offered in the spring term. SPAN103 was the intensive elementary Spanish course and it was offered every semester. The Spanish Department offered three sections of the yearlong course and two sections of SPAN103 (one per semester).

The SPAN101 and 102 courses were presented as “a dynamic and interactive introduction to Spanish and Spanish American cultures” for students without previous
knowledge of Spanish. These courses covered “the basic grammar structures of the Spanish language through extensive use of video, classroom practice…” (MH, 2007, p. 456). According to the college handbook, students who passed SPAN102 fulfill the college’s language requirement.

The SPAN103 course was presented as being “ideal for students who already know another Romance language”. The intensive course started to be offered in the spring semester of 2006 and Estela, the language program coordinator, has been the only instructor who teaches this course. According to the college catalogue, in the SPAN103 course students practiced Spanish speaking, reading, and writing intensively and they had the opportunity to “short readings, films, and web activities…and creative group projects” (Ibid., p. 456). Once students passed the intensive course, they fulfilled the language requirement.

The intermediate level consisted of the SPAN200 and SPAN201 courses. Estela reviewed the intermediate level curriculum during her first year as language program coordinator. In her opinion, the changes to the intermediate level curriculum aimed at the integration of all the language learning skills so that learners became competent in their use of Spanish (Minutes of Department Meeting, May 31, 2007). She suggested the use of a different textbook. This change took place in the 2007-2008 academic year. The SPAN200 course was described as a “fast-paced review of basic Spanish grammar” (Ibid., p. 456). Regarding the SPAN201 course in the academic year which is the focus of this study, Rosa, Fred, and Estela agreed on not using a predetermined textbook. Instead, they focused on a short novel (“Felices días tío Sergio”) with which students discussed a
series of different topics. They also agreed on having a course packet which would help students review some specific linguistic structures. According to the course catalogue, in the SPAN201 course there were “frequent compositions, selected literary readings, class discussions, and debates on films and current events” (Ibid., p. 456). It was believed that in this course students would practice their writing and reading skills and master complex grammatical structures. Similar to SPAN102, SPAN103, and SPAN202, students fulfilled the language requirement once they passed the SPAN201 course. In terms of the number of sections offered of the intermediate level courses, the department offered four sections of SPAN200 and three sections of SPAN201 in the fall semester. In the spring semester, it offered three sections of SPAN201 and one section of SPAN200.

The upper-intermediate level consisted of two types of courses: the writing intensive course entitled “Composition and Culture” (SPAN209) and the speaking intensive course entitled “Conversation and Culture” (SPAN210). These courses did not satisfy the language requirement and they were not sequential. Most students who took these courses studied Spanish somewhere else and they were interested in improving their writing or speaking skills. In Natividad’s point of view, it was crucial to reform the upper-intermediate level in order to have more potential Spanish majors and minors. In the fall semester, the department offered two sections of SPAN209 and one section of SPAN210 in the fall semester. In the spring semester, it offered two sections of SPAN209 and two sections of SPAN210. As it has been said, Natividad taught one section of SPAN209 in the spring semester and Iñaki taught one section of SPAN209 in each semester.
In terms of who taught the rest of language courses, it is important to mention that whereas tenured and tenure-track professors taught four courses per year, full-time language instructors had a workload of five courses per year. Consequently, Molly, Rosa, and I taught five courses a year. Even though Estela was a full-time lecturer, she taught three courses. Two of them were the intensive elementary course and one seminar. She also coordinated the language Spanish language program. In terms of Maria and Lourdes, they were hired under a $\frac{3}{4}$ workload. This means that they taught two courses per semester (Lourdes’ case) or four courses per year (Maria’s case).

Estela taught one section of the SPAN 103 course and as seminar course in the fall semester. The 300-level course was entitled “Teaching and Learning Spanish as a Second Language”. This was the first seminar course offered by the Spanish Department that focused on language teaching issues. In the spring semester, Estela taught the only section of the intensive elementary course. Molly taught one section of elementary Spanish (SPAN101) and two sections of the intermediate Spanish course (SPAN200) in the fall semester. In the following term, she taught one section of the elementary course (SPAN102) and one section of the intermediate course (SPAN200). In the fall semester, I taught two sections of SPAN101 and the only section of the Spanish heritage course (SPAN202). In the spring semester, I taught the two sections of the elementary level course (SPAN102).

Rosa and María taught sections of both intermediate and upper-intermediate language courses. Rosa taught two intermediate level courses (SPAN201) in the fall semester. In the spring semester, she taught one intermediate Spanish course (SPAN201),
one upper-intermediate Spanish course (SPAN210), and one bridge course (SPAN212). Maria, the instructor from Peru, taught two intermediate Spanish courses (SPAN200 and SPAN201) in the fall semester. In the spring semester, she taught one intermediate Spanish course (SPAN201) and one upper-intermediate Spanish course (SPAN210).

Regarding Lourdes’ courses, she taught upper-intermediate courses in the fall semester: one section of SPAN209 and one section of SPAN210.

Although Estela was the language program coordinator, some instructors supervised the different language levels. I supervised the elementary language level (SPAN101 and SPAN102) whereas Molly supervised the SPAN200 courses. In terms of the SPAN201 courses, Rosa coordinated them in the fall semester and Fred in the spring term. Overall, the coordinators of each level scheduled monthly meetings with the instructors so that they agreed on the content and format of mid-terms and final exams. In the meeting, instructors discussed other topics such as their collaboration with the teaching assistants and the attendance to the language table (See next section). Estela usually attended most of the meetings (See Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member’s name</th>
<th>Age, Gender, and Country of Birth</th>
<th>Spanish Language Proficiency and Variety of Spanish Spoken</th>
<th>Academic Rank and Year Faculty Member joined the College</th>
<th>Field of Specialization and Degree Obtained/Academic Status</th>
<th>Courses Taught in the Fall (f) and Spring (s) Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Woman in her late</td>
<td>Highly proficient in Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>M.A. in Spanish</td>
<td>101f Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initials</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age and Location</td>
<td>Native Language</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Woman in her early forties. Mexico.</td>
<td>thirties. U.S.</td>
<td>Castilian Spanish (Northern Spain)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>literature granted by the consortium’s public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Speaker of Latin American Spanish (Guadalajara, Mexico)</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer 2005</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate in the Hispanic Literatures and Cultures program (area: Spanish Literature and Culture from 1820 to the present) at the consortium’s public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Native Speaker of Latin American Spanish (Location)</td>
<td>Position Type</td>
<td>Position Year</td>
<td>Position Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>Woman in her late thirties. Argentina</td>
<td>Native Speaker of Latin American Spanish (Buenos Aires, Argentina)</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate in the Hispanic American Studies program at the University of Paris VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela</td>
<td>Woman in her mid thirties. Spain</td>
<td>Native Speaker of Castilian Spanish (Central Spain)</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Graduate student in the Hispanic Linguistics program (area: applied linguistics and language acquisition) at the consortium’s public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>Woman in her mid forties. Perú</td>
<td>Native Speaker of Latin American Spanish (Lima, Peru)</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Graduate student in the school of education at the consortium’s public university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courses Taught:**
- Composition and Culture
- Conversation and Culture: Speaking Spanish in the Real World
- Intensive Elementary Spanish
- Teaching and Learning Spanish as a Second Language
- Intermediate Spanish I (1 section)
- Intermediate Spanish II (1 section in the fall semester and 1 section in the spring semester)
- Conversation and Culture: Speaking Spanish in the Real World
Table 4.2 Positioning the Researchers as Laborer: Language Learning Instructors in the Spanish Department at Woodbridge College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thelma</th>
<th>Woman in her late thirties, Mexico</th>
<th>Native Speaker of Latin American Spanish (Mexico City, Mexico)</th>
<th>Visiting Lecturer 1997</th>
<th>Graduate student in the school of education at the consortium’s public university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101f Elementary Spanish (2 sections) 202f Spanish for Heritage Speakers 102s Elementary Spanish (2 sections)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Assistants

Although language instructors were in charge of their courses, there were teaching assistants who collaborated with them. Teaching assistants came to Woodbridge College for a year thanks to the Foreign Fellowship Program. These fellowships were awarded to native speakers of Chinese, French, German, Italian, and Spanish who were about to finish (or finished) their undergraduate studies. These foreign fellows worked as teaching assistants. Basically, they were in charge of the conversation labs of the elementary and intermediate language classes. In addition to teaching in the college’s language departments, foreign fellows received a monthly stipend. They also lived in one of the college’s residential dorms and took courses either at Woodbridge College or at any other institution that was part of the college consortium. Based on the courses they took, foreign fellows received a college certificate at the end of the academic year. As I have said, I was part of the foreign fellowship program in the early 1990s (See chapter one).
The number of foreign fellows depended on the number of language courses offered by each department. One of the foreign fellows was in charge of the language table and for this reason, she was known as the language fellow. The language table was a weekly event where students and faculty had dinner at the “the international dorm”. The main purpose was that students practiced the “foreign language” outside the classroom. Language fellows lived in the international dorm and received a higher stipend than the other foreign fellows. Spanish fellows had a degree in English or Spanish literature or philology. In some years, there were Spanish fellows who studied law, architecture or economics (e.g. my case).

In the academic year which is the focus of this study, there were four teaching assistants: María (Spain), Sofia (Costa Rica), Angélica (Chile), and Carmen (Chile). All of them were in their mid-20s. María and Sofia were about to finish their undergraduate studies in Spanish philology and law respectively. Angélica and Carmen had just graduated in English literature. This group of teaching assistants faced many struggles in their short stay. They faced academic, cultural, social, and emotional struggles. For all of them, it was the first time that they lived in a different country and that lived away from their parents’ home. In addition, they were not used to living in a residential college, in a rural area, and in very cold temperatures. They were also overwhelmed by the amount of work they had to prepare for the courses they were taking and by the speed in which the English-speaking professors spoke in class. In the academic year which is the focus of this study, Iñaki was assigned to be the foreign fellows’ coordinator. As a coordinator, he met with the Spanish language fellows to help them adjust into their new environment so that they fulfilled their responsibilities during the time they were at Woodbridge College.
In addition to their own struggles to adjust to their new social and academic environment, most teaching assistants did not have the experience to teach their native language. Although they received support from Estela and the rest of language instructors, it was likely that Spanish teaching assistants reproduced in the language classroom the ways in which they learned English (or any other language) in their countries of origin. One other factor was that teaching assistants faced a structure that mirrored the hierarchies that existed in the areas of cultural analysis and language learning. This means that issues such as the variety of Spanish they spoke (Castilian Spanish, Central American Spanish, and South American Spanish), their country of birth (Spain, Costa Rica, and Chile), the country of birth of the instructor(s) with whom they worked, the instructor’s beliefs about language teaching and the relationships the instructor(s) constructed in the Department influenced the relationships teaching assistants constructed among themselves, between themselves and the group of language instructors as well as their relationships in the Spanish Department. Additionally, factors such as assistants’ lack teaching experience, instructors’ full-time status, and the fact that most instructors and teaching assistants left Woodbridge College at the end of the academic year contributed to widen the gap between instructors and assistants. Overall, the prestige and higher status that cultural analysis had over language instructors were reproduced and thus, language instructors enjoyed of more prestige and status than teaching assistants.

In terms of the assistants’ responsibilities, María, Sofía, Angélica, and Carmen led the conversation labs of the elementary (101-102), the intermediate (200-201), and the upper intermediate courses (209-210). In the conversation lab, they basically reviewed
vocabulary and discussed certain cultural aspects about Spanish-speaking countries. The conversation labs lasted 50 minutes in non-intensive courses and 75 minutes in the intensive language course. With the exception of the language fellow, the rest of the teaching assistants taught four conversation sessions per week. In the fall semester, Angélica taught the four conversation labs of the elementary level classes (SPAN101 and SPAN103) while María taught the four conversation labs of the intermediate level (SPAN200). Carmen taught two sections of SPAN210 and two sections of SPAN209. Finally, Sofía, the language fellow, taught three sections of the second part of the intermediate level (SPAN201) and organized the Spanish table.

The conversation labs started on the second week of classes and ended a week before the end of the semester. Teaching assistants were asked to send the attendance list to language instructors every week and to write a short individual report about students’ performance before the mid-term and the final exam. Teaching assistants were also asked to attend all the extra-curricular events organized by the Spanish Department such as the weekly Spanish table, the Spanish club, and the event Wednesdays at the movies.

Teaching assistants prepared their classes based on the suggestions given by the instructors. For example, for one class, I explained to Angélica that the class needed to practice two verb tenses (the future and future perfect tenses) and some vocabulary related to the workplace. I gave her a poem and a song as examples with which students could listen and practice the future tense. I told her that this could be an activity in which students worked individually. Regarding the future perfect tense, I suggested that students worked in small groups to create sentences about the probable future of all class
members. I told her that the purpose was that students created sentences such as the one Roberta gave earlier that day. This student, Roberta, said in class: “Para el 2010, Thelma se habrá casado con Roberta” (By 2010, Thelma will have gotten married with Roberta) (Email, April 17, 2008). Usually, teaching assistants followed the suggestions made by the instructors. Thus, in the case of this example, two days later, Angélica wrote and explained to me what she did in class. She said that the students listened to the poem and then, they worked in groups of three to practice the future perfect tense. She also said that the class watched the video clip of the corresponding lesson and that after watching it, students answered some comprehension questions with which they practiced the future tense (Email, April 20).

At the end of the academic year, two of the teaching assistants (María and Angélica) returned to their countries of origin (Spain and Chile) while Sofía and Carmen return to Woodbridge College (Sofía) and to the college consortium (Carmen) for the following academic year. Sofía was the teaching assistant and the Spanish language fellow for a second year while Carmen initiated her graduate studies in Spanish literature at the public university.

It is important to mention that Angélica, the teaching assistant for the elementary Spanish course considered in this study, is not a research participant. The lesson analyzed in the present study is one in which I was as the main instructor.
Spanish Majors and Minors

The Spanish Department conducted an exit interview with Spanish majors and minors in the academic year which is the focus of this study. As far as my knowledge is concerned, this is the first time in which the Department has a written evidence of majors and minors’ opinions. This interview is important mainly because it shows that most students promoted the rationales of liberal arts education, cosmopolitan strategic subject, and pragmatism that have been promoted by the college consortium (CCI), Woodbridge College, and the own Spanish Department. Spanish majors and minors pointed out that even though they were enrolled in cultural analysis courses, they “would rather have someone help us with grammar”. One Spanish double major suggested that she “would like more ongoing language instruction at all levels” so that she could master the language (liberal arts education rationale). Spanish majors also explained that they appreciated the interdisciplinary nature of the Spanish major and minor particularly the consideration of history, politics and film (cosmopolitan strategic subject rationale). Finally, most majors and minors were optimistic about their future endeavors as Spanish major and minors. Most of them were to start their graduate studies in Spanish or Latin American literature (rationale of pragmatism).

Ethnographic Contexts (2)

The emphasis of the following ethnographic contexts lies on the fall semester of the academic year which is the focus of this study because the focal lesson took place on this term. The ethnographic contexts described in this section are: 1) the research
participants, 2) the main characteristics of the classroom setting (room 109), 3) the structure and content of elementary Spanish course section 04 and 4) the college’s academic deadlines and traditions in this specific academic term. However, before describing these contexts, I will explain why this particular language class and section was selected.

**Selection of the Elementary Spanish Class Section 04**

Once I knew that I was leaving Woodbridge College in May, I decided to focus on one of the classes I was teaching. My workload as a full-time instructor did not enable me to observe a class taught by my colleagues. Since I had more experience teaching the elementary levels, I decided to focus on the elementary Spanish courses I taught.

Among the two sections I taught of elementary Spanish, I selected the elementary Spanish class section 04 because there were a series of events that took place during the first days of classes of the fall semester. This decision implied that instead of focusing in the whole academic year, I placed my attention in the fall semester mainly because most students who enrolled in the fall semester would not continue in the following term due to the fact that their schedules varied every semester. In the following, I describe what happened in this particular classroom.

**First days of the Fall Semester**

The first day of classes of the fall semester was on September 6th. It was a Thursday and the class started at 11:00 a.m. and ended 50 minutes later. There were
twenty students in class. Once students sat down on their desks, I greeted the class and introduced myself. I used Spanish to say my name and where I was born. While I was saying each phrase, I pointed to the phrases I had written on the chalkboard before students arrived. I said and pointed to the phrase “Me llamo Thelma” (My name is Thelma), and then to the phrase “Soy de México” (I am from Mexico). Afterwards, I went to where the students were seated and repeated the phrases to the first student who was at my right hand side. While I was saying my name, I shook the students’ hand and pointed to the words “Me llamo” and “Soy de” that were followed by a line that were also written on the white board. This student understood that she had to mention her name and the place she was from. After I interacted briefly with that first student, I continued with the other students. Once I finished, I asked students to introduce themselves with the person who was seated to their left hand side.

Once this ice-breaker activity ended, I explained in Spanish that I was going to distribute an information sheet (hoja de información) and asked students to fill it out. After a few minutes, I collected them and mentioned that I was going to explain the course syllabus in English and Spanish. For the remaining 25 minutes, I mentioned that the elementary course was directed to students with no previous study (or little study of Spanish). I described the course requirements (e.g. attendance, class participation), showed the course materials, (e.g. textbook) and explained the ways in which students were going to be evaluated (e.g. number of compositions, quizzes, and workbook exercises). Before the class ended, I told students that I was going to read the information they provided because I had to make sure that all students were placed in the appropriate
language course. I also told them that I was going to send an email with the material they needed to prepare for the following class.

While some students were leaving the room and others were picking up their backpacks, Cathy came to my desk and told me that although she had taken Spanish before she had to be in the elementary class. At first, I was shocked by Cathy’s voice and determination. Then, I mentioned to her that I was going to read the information she just provided. After hearing my answer, Cathy repeated that she had to be in the elementary class and added that an academic dean advised her to be in it. I asked her for the name of the academic dean and said to her that I would like to talk to the dean. Cathy said that she did not remember the dean’s name. After Cathy’s answer, I asked her if she had taken the online placement test. Cathy said that she had not and I asked her to take it. Finally, I said to her that I was going to read the information she submitted and that I was going to contact her via email.

Hours later, I read students’ information sheets. In hers, Cathy wrote that she had “little [Spanish] in high school” and that she was “not prepared for the 200 [intermediate] class”. In my teaching experience, I have found that even though many of the students say that they are not ready for a higher level course, they are. Some students have taken some Spanish courses in high school and know the basics but insisted on being in an elementary course because they were interested in receiving a good grade and fulfilling the college’s language requirement without being challenged academically. I have found other students who have taken Spanish in high school but wanted to take the elementary Spanish course mainly because they believed that by taking the elementary course at the
college level, they would learn the language correctly. From my interaction with Cathy, I believed that she had probably enrolled in the elementary level class to not be challenged academically. However, I did not have any evidence with which I supported what I thought. For this reason, I asked Cathy to take the online placement test and she received a score that placed her in the elementary level class. Time later, in her interview, Cathy acknowledged that she had two years of high school when she enrolled in the elementary Spanish class.

Returning to what happened on the first day of classes; I wrote an email to Cathy and to the small group of students who had two years of high school Spanish at night. In my email to Cathy, I wrote that according to her information sheet, she had some previous study of Spanish but that I had received the score she received in the online placement test and that according to the test, she was an elementary level learner. One other comment I wrote was that I was interested in contacting the academic dean she had talked. I said to her that I wanted to make sure that she was placed in the appropriate language course. Finally, I mentioned that the chair of the Spanish Department and the language program coordinator were included in the email. I believed that by including Ignacio and Estela, I was putting some pressure on Cathy so that she contacted the academic dean (Email communication, September 6).

On the following day, Cathy and I met for the second class of the semester. Once the class ended, I explained to Cathy that she could benefit greatly if she enrolled in the intermediate level class (SPAN200). Cathy insisted that the academic dean advised her to take the elementary level class and insisted in staying in the class. Other students who
took two years of high school Spanish and whom I contacted via email also insisted in
staying in the class. In the end, Cathy and the small group of students who also had two
years of high school Spanish stayed in the elementary class.

On the third day of classes, Cathy’s mother, Mrs. McDonald, wrote an email to
the language program coordinator. Estela sent it to the chair of the Spanish Department
and to me. Mrs. McDonald introduced herself not only as Cathy’s mother but also as a
Woodbridge College alumna and former language learner. Mrs. McDonald explained that
although her daughter had some previous knowledge of Spanish, Cathy was not ready for
an upper level course because “languages do not come easily to her”. She assured Estela
that the dean of students suggested Cathy to take the elementary level class.
Consequently, Mrs. McDonald believed that the insistence to have the dean’s name was
excessive. In addition to legitimatizing her daughter’s affirmations, Cathy’s mother
expressed her concern about her daughter’s learning experience. She claimed that Cathy
was confused because she did not know whether to buy the class materials and that she
was behind in class. Finally, Mrs. McDonald was concerned because of the antagonistic
relationship that already existed between Cathy and me and suggested Estela to meet with
Cathy (Email communication, September 10).

Estela followed Mrs. McDonald’s suggestion and met with Cathy. However,
Estela called me before the meeting to know more about this situation. I explained to her
that Cathy had some high school Spanish and that I really believed that the intermediate
Spanish course was more beneficial for her. In addition, I mentioned to her that I did not
believe that an academic dean had met with Cathy because I had not received an email
from an academic dean. Finally, I said to Estela that Cathy acted as if she were entitled to be in class.

On the following day (fourth day of classes), the language program coordinator sent her reply to Mrs. McDonald. The chair of the Spanish Department, the dean of second-year students, the language instructor, and Cathy received a copy of the email (Email Communication, September 11). In her email, Estela supported both Cathy and me, as the language instructor. She explained that it was a departmental procedure to ask students with previous knowledge of Spanish to take the online placement test. She also confirmed to Mrs. McDonald that students who had taken Spanish for a year or more usually took the intermediate Spanish course. Thus, she supported the instructor’s insistence to contact the dean Cathy had talked to. In Estela’s words, it is key “to know exactly where they [students] stand to better serve their language learning needs”.

Estela also informed her that when she met with Cathy, Cathy contemplated the possibility of taking the Spanish course at one of the institutions that were part of the consortium. However, she said that Cathy decided to stay in the elementary class section 04. Hours later, the dean of second-year students replied and confirmed that she had not advised Cathy to take the elementary language class nor had she met with her. However, Cathy made the decision to say in the elementary class and she stayed.

Reflecting on this, I believe that Estela and I treated Cathy as a customer. As a customer, Cathy wanted a specific level of language course and she had it. This identity of students as customers is one the cultural changes that have been present since colleges and universities advance in their process of corporatization. Lugo-Lugo (2012) explains it clearly when she writes that
Within this new structuring of the academic institution as a corporate marketplace, students begin to treat their professors and other university workers as clerks or cashiers at a department store, who are there to serve and satisfy their every need. Because of this, professors must accommodate their preferences… As the business cliché goes, the customer is always right. (pp. 188-189)

Unfortunately, Cathy’s staying in the elementary class section 04 helped other students who also took two years of high school Spanish to stay in class. Once they saw that Cathy had a place in class, they also claimed their place in it. This scenario contributed to my decision to select this classroom as the research site for the present study. It also contributed to my decision to focus on moment-to-moment interactions. Mainly, I wanted to understand what was happening when Cathy, the other student participants and me, as the language instructor, interacted.

Since Woodbridge College was a very privileged environment, classes such as elementary Spanish section 04 had to be examined. Schecter & Bayley (2004), Schieffelin & Ochs (1986) point out that the analysis is quite valuable because these classes have an impact on student’s constructions of knowledge and their understandings of themselves and their relations with others. As it has been said, a close reading of the fieldnotes confirmed that I, as the language instructor of this class, struggled with the different levels of students’ language proficiency, an unpleasant teaching atmosphere and in my interaction with Cathy.

Research Participants
19 students were enrolled in section 04 of elementary Spanish in the fall semester. The limit of enrollment was of 18 students but I accepted an additional student because she could not take Spanish at another time. She was a senior and had not fulfilled the college’s language requirement. On September 12th, I asked students to read the consent form which explained the main goals of this research study. I assured them that their decision to be included (or not) would not interfere with their performance in class. After reading it, 10 students gave their permission to participate in this study and only four of them agreed on being interviewed (See Consent and Permission Forms, Appendix C). Nine of these student participants were Woodbridge College students (Anastasia, Elsa, Alexa, Kate, Julie, Cathy, Sonia, Roberta, and Lillian) whereas Ethan was a Franklin College student.

The information sheet that student participants filled out on the first day of classes provided some information about their academic status, their experiences with learning a language other than their native (or first) language, and their reasons for enrolling in the elementary Spanish course (See Information Sheet, Appendix D). The interviews I conducted with Elsa, Julie, Cathy, and Sonia also made visible their beliefs about women’s colleges particularly the advantages and disadvantages of studying at a women’s college, their reasons for choosing Woodbridge College, and their plans after graduation.

In terms of their academic status, five students were first-year students (Anastasia, Elsa, Alexa, Kate, and Julie) two of them were second-year students or sophomores (Cathy and Sonia), one student was a third-year student or junior (Roberta)
and one student was a fourth-year student or a senior (Lillian). Ethan, the student from Franklin College, was a Division II student and thus, he was considered a second or a third-year student. It was somewhat common for Spanish language instructors at Woodbridge College to find that the majority of the students who enrolled in the elementary Spanish courses were first-year students. It was also common to have one or two Franklin College students as well as one or two fourth-year students. One reason why Franklin College students enrolled in Spanish language classes was that these students were looking for a traditional language class where they presented exams and quizzes and received a letter grade.

Regarding the native language and the country of birth of the ten student participants, Sonia was the only ESL (English as a Second Language) student in the classroom. She was born in Nepal and viewed herself as native speaker of Nepali. The remaining nine student participants considered English their first or native language and the United States their country of origin. Among this group of nine students, Anastasia affirmed she was a heritage speaker of a Ghanese language and that she used it to communicate with family members in the U.S. and in Ghana. In terms of the ethnic and racial background of the 10 student participants, Anastasia and Sonia were students of color: Anastasia was a Black student and Sonia was a dark-skinned student. The remaining eight students were White and some of them acknowledged their race such as Julie and Elsa. Regarding the student participants’ social class, Julie, Cathy, and Roberta were the only ones who acknowledged that they come from upper class (Julie and Cathy)

15 Since Anastasia’s parents were born and raised in Ghana, I highlight her African heritage by using the concept of Black instead of African-American.
or working class families (Roberta). In her interview, Julie said that she was a “White upper class woman”. In class, Cathy mentioned several times that she did not have an on-campus job. This means that while most of her classmates had an on-campus job which helped them pay for their personal expenses, Cathy’s family paid the college fees and her personal expenses as well. Finally, Roberta mentioned, in email communication with me and in class, that she had two off-campus jobs. She was a waitress and a bartender in two of the neighboring towns. It is important to point out that Roberta was a non-traditional student, that is, she was in her mid-twenties and not within the usual age range (18 to 21 years old). She lived off-campus.

All student participants reported that they studied a language other than their native or first language in a classroom setting. Sonia, from Nepal, was the only student who communicated successfully in languages other than her native language. In her interview, she mentioned that all her formal schooling had been in the English language and that she attended a boarding school in India (from first to fourth grade) and in Nepal (from fifth grade to high school). Thus, in addition to Nepali, she spoke English and Hindu. She also understood her parents’ native language (Newari), but did not speak it.

Regarding the language study of the remaining 9 students, 8 out of 9 reported that they took language classes during school (Kate was the exception). Six students took Spanish whereas the two other students took Latin and French. In terms of the students who took Spanish, Anastasia, Ethan, Julie, and Cathy studied it for two years and Lillian and Roberta for only one. Then, Elsa took four years of Latin (Julie also took one year) and Alexa took four years of French.
Whereas almost all the students who were born in the U.S. reported that they studied a language in high school; only three of them affirmed that they were in language classes in middle school. Roberta and Elsa affirmed that they took French in middle school while Kate took Spanish classes. Regarding students’ language learning experiences in elementary school, Alexa was the only student who mentioned that she took Spanish in 6th grade (See Table 4.3). The language learning profile of these 9 English native speakers is common mainly because language classes are usually absent from the K-8 curriculum and are viewed as optional courses in high school.

Some student participants reported a learning disability. On the first day of classes, Anastasia reported that she spoke with a stammer. I also noticed that she was dyslexic. She had a Spanish tutor who helped her prepare for exams and to practice some grammatical structures. Lillian mentioned that she became exempt from learning Spanish in high school because of a learning disability. In her interview, Cathy affirmed that she had a listening disability. Throughout the semester, I noticed that Elsa was dyslexic. I suggested that she met with the dean of learning disabilities. She also had a Spanish tutor who helped her practice some grammatical structures and offered support to improve her written assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Native (or first) language and Country of Origin*</th>
<th>Experience with languages before the Spanish language course at Woodbridge College</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>English (USA)</td>
<td>One year of Spanish in High School. She understands what she reads in Hebrew.</td>
<td>She became exempt of language study in high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Studies/ Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Language (Country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>English (MA, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>English (MA, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anastasia</td>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>Economics or International Relations</td>
<td>English (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>English (CA, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>(Transfer student) Unknown</td>
<td>English (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology and Education</td>
<td>English (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Nepali (Nepal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Instructor and researcher</td>
<td>Spanish (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Not all the participants mentioned the state in which they were born or grew up.*
Table 4.3 Personal Histories and General Information about Co-Participants

Regarding students’ informal learning of a language, only four student participants mentioned the role of family, trips, and friends in the process of learning a language different to their native language. As it has been said, Anastasia affirmed that she was able to communicate orally with her African relatives and family. Lillian mentioned that she could read Hebrew for religious purposes. Finally, Julie and Cathy considered that trips had helped them learn and practice a language. Julie mentioned a trip to Italy with her high school peers when she studied Latin and Cathy affirmed that she used and learned Spanish when she traveled to Spanish-speaking countries on vacation.

As to student participants’ reasons for enrolling in the elementary course, students’ opinions revealed how they understood some of the rationales that support language and that were promoted by Woodbridge College and the Spanish Department. For instance, Sonia highlighted the connection between language learning and today’s globalized world. She wrote that even though she spoke three languages (Nepali, English, and Hindi); she knew that Spanish “is widely used all over the world”. Roberta and Kate emphasized the usefulness of learning a language for their professional career in the U.S. Roberta wrote that she planned to teach fifth or sixth grade and thus, she was taking Spanish because she was interested in understanding her students’ cultural background.

Source: Information sheet, interviews, and personal conversations.
and language needs. Similarly, Kate explained that she planned on becoming a doctor. She added that since she would like to work in the emergency area of a hospital, she believed that “Spanish would be mandatory”. Sonia enacted the belief of cosmopolitanism whereas Roberta and Kate mirrored the rationale of pragmatism.

Alexa, Ethan, and Julie also acknowledged the importance of Spanish language and culture in the U.S. Alexa believed that she needed Spanish when she returned to her home state of California. Ethan said that he was learning Spanish because he would be “living and working in a city with a sizable Spanish-speaking population”. Unlike Alexa and Ethan, Julie acknowledged the presence of Spanish speakers, native and non-native, on campus. She wrote that Spanish was an important language to learn in order to talk to “college peers and native speakers”. Finally, Lillian and Cathy viewed the usefulness of Spanish when they visited Spanish-speaking countries. For instance, Cathy affirmed that she would be interested in communicating “with locals in Spain”.

This information points to some traditional beliefs about language learning and the status of the Spanish language in the U.S. It shows the belief that language is a communication tool as some student participants thought that Spanish could be used to communicate either in Spanish-speaking countries or in the U.S. Related to this view of language as a vehicle of communication, there is the idea that the language learning process is lineal and that it mainly consists of linguistic structures, verb tenses, and general cultural information. Lillian expressed that in this elementary Spanish course she wanted to learn “basic conversational skills”. Similarly, Sonia said that she “wanted to be able to understand and speak basic Spanish”. As to the basis of the Spanish language,
Anastasia pointed out that she hoped “to become more confident with verb tenses, especially subjunctives, future tenses and the conditional”. Roberta affirmed that Spanish also consisted in learning “the Spanish culture” whereas Elsa believed that culture consisted of “the history and the evolution of the language”. Regarding the status of the Spanish language in the U.S., some students such as Ethan, Alexa and Roberta acknowledged the presence of Spanish speaking populations. Roberta was aware that in her future classrooms she would have to teach to students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Similarly, Alexa believed that Spanish speakers would be in the Emergency area of the hospital where she will be working in California. Their affirmations reproduce the low social and economic status of most Spanish speakers in the U.S.

Based on these beliefs, as a language instructor, I was interested in students’ reflection on the information discussed in class because I believe that classroom participants need to become aware of the ideas we reproduce, the words we use, and the reasons why we do it. For instance, I was interested in students’ reflection on the meanings of words such as “América” (America), “Estados Unidos” (United States) and Latino/Latina. I wanted them to become aware of their meanings in the U.S. and in Latin American countries. Whereas “America” is used in the U.S. to refer to the country, “América” is used in Spanish-speaking countries to refer to the American continent (“the Americas”). Since students and I read and discussed short excerpts from books written by well-known Latin American authors and watched movie-clips, I was also interested in
contextualizing the material they read and watched as much as possible. I wanted students to view Latin American countries as places where important social, political and economic progress takes place and Spanish as a language in which they could theorize and reflect.

The Classroom Setting: Room 109

Most language classes at Woodbridge College took place in the college’s language learning center. The language center was a three-floor building originally used for dining services. However, it was converted into the college’s language learning center in 1989. The elementary Spanish class section 04 took place in room 109 located on the basement floor.

Among all the classrooms in the language learning center, room 109 was highly desirable by Spanish, German, French, Chinese, and Italian language instructors mainly because it was a fully technologically-mediated classroom. In addition, it was the largest classroom in the building and was located across from the language learning center. This room was usually reserved for elementary language classes because these classes were usually larger than the intermediate level language classes.

Regarding the layout of the room 109, on one of the walls, there were four large-sized sliding chalkboards. Across these chalkboards, there was the computer lectern and next to it, the teacher’s desk. The students’ desks were in front of the teacher’s desk. On another wall, there were two windows through which the students and the instructor
could see other faculty and students entering and leaving the building. When the heat was activated, the room was too hot and thus, these windows were usually half open. The shades were also half down so that classroom participants were not distracted a lot by the noise that came from outside (See Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1 Layout of Room 109

In addition to the window shades, there was a projector screen which was also usually down when the instructor used video clips or the internet. Given the use of both the shades and the screen, room 109 was slightly dark. In addition to the lack of natural light, the personal computers that were close to the walls reduced the space for students’ desks. Students who sat near the projector screen could move their chairs nor saw what was on the screen. Finally, the door was kept closed because the instructor and students could also be distracted from the noise that comes from the hall. On this hall, there was a
restroom, an elevator, a staircase, and the language learning lab. Thus, even though it was convenient to have a computer, a VCR, and a CD player in the room, there were aspects such as the lack of space, lack of light, noise that made room 109 not suitable for learning languages.

**Structure and Content of the Elementary Spanish Course Section 04**

The relationships the student participants and the language instructor of section 04 developed in room 109 were also shaped by the times and days they met for class. All the elementary Spanish classes had a schedule that was known as the 2x2 schedule. This meant that there were two short classes and two long classes. In section 04, the long class sessions were on Tuesday and Wednesday. On those days, student participants and the language instructor met for 75 minutes (11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.). The short sessions were on Monday and Thursday and the class session lasted 50 minutes (11:00 a.m. to 11:50 a.m.). On Monday, student participants met with the language instructor while student participants met with Angélica, the teaching assistant, on Thursday.

Through the language program coordinator and language instructors, the Spanish Department established a series of guidelines regarding the schedule of language learning classes. The first guideline was that language instructors taught the first whole week of the semester to make sure that students were enrolled in the appropriate language level. In terms of the elementary level, this meant that Molly and I taught the first 6 classes. In these first classes, language instructors had their first meeting with teaching assistants.

The second guideline was that the Spanish teaching assistants did not teach the last week of the semester. This meant that language instructors taught from November 30 until December 12, the last day of the classes. Likewise the beginning of the semester, the
last days were seen as helpful for teaching assistants, students, and language instructors. Usually, teaching assistants had time to prepare the final evaluations of students’ performances in class (and to finish the academic work required in the classes they were taking). Language instructors used the last days of the semester to prepare students for the final exam, to finish the program, or to review previously seen material).

The relationships that the student participants and the language instructor constructed in the fall semester were also shaped by the objectives established in the course catalogue and the course syllabus. Similar to the college’s course catalogue, the course syllabus indicated that the Spanish elementary course was for students who had no previous study or little study of Spanish (less than a year of high school Spanish). It also pointed out that students had to answer a brief questionnaire or “hoja de información” (information sheet) that helped instructors confirm whether students were enrolled in the appropriate language class or not. As it has been said, even though students’ information sheets revealed that several students such as Cathy, Ethan, Anastasia, and Julie had two years of high school Spanish, they stayed in the elementary class. The student participants and I knew that this guideline was bent to meet students’ choices and likings.

The syllabus also explained that the Spanish elementary courses offered a dynamic and interactive introduction to the Spanish speaking world. This introduction included the study of the basic grammar structures and the presentation of cultural information through the extensive use of video and weekly conversations with the teaching assistant who was a Spanish native speaker (See Course Syllabus, Appendix A). In terms of the class guidelines established in the syllabus, students were required to participate actively in class, to attend all the activities related to the course, and to do all
the exercises assigned by the instructor and teaching assistant. Rather than getting all the right answers or speaking correct Spanish, the syllabus defined class participation as the effort students made to answer and to speak Spanish. Class participation was also defined by the students’ collaboration in group activities, the preparation to class sessions, the attention paid to others’ participation, and volunteering. The syllabus also mentioned that this view of class participation was valid for the sessions that students had with both the instructor and the teaching assistant. In addition, class participation was measured. The range of always, almost always, usually, sometimes, almost never, and no participation facilitated the distribution of 100 points (10% of the total number of points that students could receive in class).

Regarding the requirement of class attendance, students were allowed to have two unexcused absences with no grade penalties. However, the syllabus does not explain the penalties that students received when students had more than two unexcused absences. As to the students’ attendance to activities related to the course, the syllabus mentioned “la mesa de español” (the Spanish table) and “miércoles de cine” (Wednesday at the Movies). It also indicated that students’ attendance to the Spanish table was noted and that they were required to watch one of the five movies showed by the Spanish Department.

Regarding the exercises students had to submit to the language instructor, they first had to buy the “Vistas package” at the college bookstore whose estimated cost in the academic year that is the focus of this study was of $300 dollars. This package was for both semesters and it consisted of 1 textbook, 5 CDs with textbook activities and vocabulary, 2 interactive CD-ROMs, 1 pocket Spanish-English dictionary and the access
code to the online version of the workbook, video manual, and lab manual. Students learned the material presented in the first ten lessons in the fall semester and they learned the remaining nine lessons in the following term. At the end of each lesson, students handed in the corresponding online exercises of the workbook, the fotonovela, and the lab-manual. All these exercises constituted the 30% of the students’ final grade (15% of the ten online workbook lessons, 10% of the ten online-lab sessions, and 5% of the ten fotonovela lessons). In addition to these exercises, students were also evaluated based on their performance in three pre-scheduled quizzes (15%), one final written exam (15%), one mid-term written test (10%), five compositions (10%), one final oral exam (6%), one mid-term oral exam (4%) and participation in class (10%).

The name “Vistas package” came from the textbook “Vistas” (Blanco & Donley, 2005) that has been a popular textbook among Spanish language learners at high school and university levels in the United States. Drawing on the communicative approach, Blanco & Donley (2005) intended to present Spanish in authentic social and cultural contexts so that students learned the language’s grammatical structures in various social and cultural contexts such as the university, the restaurant, the home, etc. In addition, they showed the main cultural and historical facts of the countries of the Spanish-speaking world (See Overview of the Ten Units, Appendix B).

Regarding the linguistic knowledge that students learned in the fall semester, they were introduced to most important regular and irregular verbs, the present and the past tenses, basic nouns, pronouns and adjectives to create expressions and phrases.

**Summary of the Chapter**
The elementary Spanish class section 04 at Woodbridge College was located within a two sets of ethnographic contexts.

The first set of contexts included College Consortium Incorporated (CCI), Woodbridge College and the Spanish Department. The Spanish Department included the following contexts: the cultural analysis professors (and curriculum), the language learning instructors (and curriculum), the group of teaching assistants, and the group of Spanish majors and minors. The description of this set of contexts highlighted the rationales of traditional language study that were promoted such as: the beliefs of liberal arts education, multiculturalism, pragmatism, and cosmopolitanism. The focus of this set of contexts was on one academic year in the late 2000s.

CCI supervised the administrative and the academic collaboration among Woodbridge College, three other private colleges, and a public university. In addition to promoting the beliefs of multiculturalism, academic excellence and students’ success in today’s globalized world, it emphasized the value of the old traditions promoted by three of the private colleges, the university’s relationship with the State, and the experimental nature of the other private college.

Woodbridge College also promoted these relationships. It emphasized the excellence of its liberal arts curriculum, the cultural diversity of its faculty and student body, its success in educating women so that they became leaders and functioned effectively in the globalized world. However, a close examination of the college’s Spanish Department particularly of its cultural analysis professors and language instructors uncovered that relationships of diversity and equity were not promoted. The
cultural analysis area was dominated by men faculty who were also White: four out of six professors were male and five out of six professors were White. In addition, Castilian Spanish speakership and scholarship prevailed over Latin American Spanish speakership and scholarship. Indeed, four out of the six professors were native speakers of Castilian Spanish and their research focused on different aspects of Iberian literature and culture. In terms of the professors’ academic rank, two professors received tenure and the other four professors were under tenure-track basis. The gendered, racialized, and linguistic identity of the cultural analysis professors helped construct relationships that promoted the dominance of White men and the courses they taught constructed relationships that reinforced the prestige of Castilian Spanish native speakership and the rationales of cosmopolitanism, interdisciplinarity, and pragmatism.

In contrast, the language learning area was a women-dominated area as all the six language instructors were women and four of them were women of color. Spanish native speakership also predominated in this area as five language instructors were born in a Spanish-speaking country and the remaining one used Spanish as a second language. Within the group of instructors who were Spanish native speakers, four of them were born in Latin American countries and one was born in Spain. However, these four instructors struggled among themselves and with the group of cultural analysis professors to challenge and to accept the hierarchical structure that privileges Castilian Spanish speakership and scholarship. Factors such as their undergraduate education in their countries of birth, their age, their status as international faculty, their temporary status at the college, and their status as graduate students at the public university helped instructors form an alliance. At the same time, factors such as their country of birth,
experiences before or during graduate school helped to marginalize or to include some instructors such as Rosa and Molly. Additionally, aspects such as their area of specialization, type of academic degree (Ph. D. vs. Ed. D.), international experience, and their seniority at the Spanish Department helped explain the alliances and struggles instructors had among them and with the group of cultural analysis professors. Factors such as the instructors’ age, their Spanish-native speakership (and thus, their status as international faculty), alma mater, area of specialization, and experiences in European countries helped some instructors such as Lourdes, Molly and me to build some alliances with the group of cultural analysis professors. In terms of the struggles between the language instructors and with the cultural analysis professors, factors such as seniority, type of academic contract (e. g. full time vs. ¾ workload), and lack of friendship mattered. In addition to the six cultural analysis professors, and the six language instructors, there were four teaching assistants. The Spanish teaching assistants reproduced the hierarchical structure that prevailed in the Department. In other words, they contributed to position native speakership and scholarship in Castilian Spanish higher than native speakership and scholarship in Latin American Spanish.

The Spanish as a foreign language curriculum was divided into the elementary, intermediate, and upper-intermediate levels of language proficiency. Elementary Spanish courses were yearlong courses and they were for students who had no previous knowledge or some knowledge of Spanish. However, students with previous study of Spanish enrolled in the elementary language courses. Students who took the elementary level were introduced to the use of specific linguistic structures such as the present and past tenses. They also learned regular and irregular verbs and the use of basic nouns and
adjectives in order to form simple questions and phrases in the language. They were also introduced to the use of the Spanish language in a range of specific contexts such as university life, friends and family, hospitals, restaurants, etc. Research participants used the Vistas textbook (Blanco & Donley, 2005) and the Vistas package which has been used in high schools, colleges and universities in the United States. Since this material draws on communicative approaches to language learning and teaching, it strengthens the idea that if students use the language as it is used in different contexts, they will be able to use it successfully in real language contexts.

The elementary Spanish class section 04 was selected as the research site of the present study due to a series of events that took place during the first days of classes of the fall semester. Cathy, a student participant, insisted on staying in the elementary Spanish course despite the fact that she had studied some Spanish in high school. From the beginning, as the instructor of the class, I believed that Cathy knew more Spanish and for this reason, I insisted on Cathy’s enrollment in the intermediate level course. Factors such as the presence of Cathy’s mother (also a college alumna), Cathy’s treatment as a customer rather than a student by the language program coordinator, and some ambiguities on my part as the instructor (e.g. ask Cathy to take the online placement test on the first day of classes) contributed to the fulfillment of Cathy’s desires. Cathy’s stay helped other students with two years of high school knowledge of Spanish to also stay in class. These classroom events made me (as researcher of this study), select this course I was teaching as the site for this study and focus on the student participants and instructor moment-to-moment interactions.
There were 11 participants in this study: 10 student participants and I as the language instructor. In this group of 10 student participants nine of them were women students at Woodbridge College whereas the remaining student was a young man from Franklin College. Nine of the student participants considered English their first or native language and the United States their country of origin. The tenth student was born in Nepal and was a native speaker of Nepali. Eight of these students were White whereas a Nepali student and a heritage speaker of a Ghanese language were the only two student participants who were women of color. All the participants who were English native speakers took language classes in high school. Similar to the consortium, the college and the Spanish Department, this group of student participants reproduced the rationales that promote traditional language study.
CHAPTER 5

MICRO-ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXTS AND THE STRATEGIES OF DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Similar to the previous chapter which presents the ethnographic contexts; this chapter introduces the micro ethnographic contexts. First, this chapter explains the rationale used to choose the Spanish language lesson that was considered for analysis. This focal lesson took place on October 10th of an academic year in the late 2000s. Second, it presents the several micro ethnographic contexts in which the focal lesson is embedded. These micro-contexts are: the layout of room 109 on the day of the focal lesson, and the content of the focal lesson. After presenting these contexts, this chapter describes the research strategies that were used to analyze the focal lesson. Similar to the previous chapter, these strategies are divided into strategies of data collection and strategies of data analysis. The strategies of data analysis were divided into stages. They are exemplified through an excerpt of the focal lesson. Finally, this chapter discusses some ethical considerations and the main limitations of the study.

Rationale to Choose the Focal Lesson

With the idea that the microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of the language and classroom events presented by Bloome et al., (2005, 2008) emphasizes how the uses of language simultaneously shape both local social interaction and patterns of
social relations in society, I transcribed the audio and video recordings. However, after all
this transcription, I realized that four out five of the video-recordings showed an
incomplete view of the moment-to-moment interactions between classroom participants
because I positioned the video-camera in a fixed place. Even though these video-
recordings presented important data for analysis, I decided that the focal lesson would be
the lesson that was video-recorded by a camera man on October 10th. This specific video-
recording had the following advantages: 1) more complete moment-to-moment
interactions in the classroom, 2) it was a 75-minute session rather than a 50-minute
session, and 3) all the student participants attended that day’s lesson16.

Micro-Ethnographic Contexts

The focal lesson is embedded in the two following micro-contexts: the layout of
room 109 on the day of the focal lesson, and the content of the focal lesson. These
contexts help connect two time frames: the fall semester and the day of the focal lesson.

Layout of Room 109 on the Day of the Focal Lesson

Throughout the 75-minute class, the 10 student participants and I formed a semi-
circle. I was either at the chalkboard or near the computer lectern facing the students.

If it is assumed that I am facing the student participants, then Lillian, Cathy,
Anastasia and Julie were seated to my left hand side. These students had the projector

---

16 After I conducted the analysis, I believed that in addition to the camera man it would have been beneficial
to have a fixed video camera in the classroom. It could have helped me confirm or see other aspects of the segments of
language activity.
screen behind them. Thus, it was difficult for them to see what was projected onto the screen when it was on.

Alexa, Sonia, and Elsa were seated in front of me. Ethan, the student from Franklin College, Kate and Roberta were on my right hand side. Álvaro (the video camera man) usually stood near the door and behind Ethan. There were also five more students in the room. These students enrolled in the elementary Spanish class but decided not to participate in this study (See Figure 5.1.).

Figure 5.1 Layout of Room 109 on the Day of the Focal Lesson
On October 10th, student participants and I started the fifth lesson unit of the Vistas’ textbook (Blanco & Donley, 2005). The topic of this lesson was “las vacaciones” (on vacation). In previous weeks, student participants learned and talked about introductions (lesson unit 1), university life (lesson unit 2), the family (lesson unit 3), and pastimes (lesson unit 4).

Regarding the grammatical content and knowledge in the first four units, students learned some nouns and definite articles, how to tell the time, and how to count from zero to thirty in the first lesson. They also discussed about the Spanish-speaking population in the U.S. and Canada (cultural video). In lesson unit 2, student participants learned the present tense of “ar verbs”, how to ask questions, the present tense of the verb “estar” (to be), and how to count from thirty one to one hundred. In addition, they talked about some historical and cultural information of Spain (cultural video). In lesson unit 3, they learned some adjectives, and the present tense of “er” and “ir” verbs. They also read and discussed about some historical and cultural information of Ecuador. While reviewing this lesson unit, student participants had their first class with the teaching assistant. They also had a review session for their first quiz and turned in the draft of their first written composition. In lesson unit 4, I introduced the present tense of the verb “ir” (to go), and the topic of stem-changing verbs and some irregular verbs in the present tense. In this unit, student participants discussed cultural information about Mexico.

The fifth lesson unit was covered in four sessions. On the day of the focal lesson, we discussed vocabulary related to the theme of going on vacation such as weather, seasons and months of a year. We also focused on the use of the verb “to be”
with conditions (e.g. the door is closed) and emotions (e.g. she is angry). On October 11th, participant students met with the teaching assistant. In this 50-minute session, they reviewed the words related to planning a vacation. They also discussed what they did during the October break. On Monday October 15th, we reviewed the use of the verb “to be” with conditions and emotions. We also focused on the second grammatical structure which was present progressive tense (e.g. we are studying Spanish). Finally, on Tuesday October 16th, we reviewed the last two grammatical structures of the lesson: the difference between “ser” and “estar” (verb “to be”) and the theme of direct object nouns and pronouns. In addition, we watched the fotonovela or video clip that corresponded to this lesson unit (See Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Vistas’ Lesson Unit 5 “On Vacation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1</strong> (Wed. October 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-minute class with me, the language instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical structure: verb “to be” with conditions and emotions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 The Overt-Reign of the Textbook-Driven Curriculum
Strategies for Collection of Micro-Ethnographic Data

Similar to the previous chapter which considered the ethnographic contexts, the micro-ethnographic contexts that are the foci of this chapter require the use of primary and secondary strategies of data collection.

Primary strategies of data collection included observational and interview data. Observational data consisted of the video recording of the focal lesson and the fieldnotes I had about the focal lesson. In terms of the interview data, they were the four interviews I conducted with the participants who gave their consent (Sonia, Elsa, Julie, and Cathy).

Secondary strategies of data collection consisted of archival data. These data referred to the handouts used and the textbook activities done on the day of the focal lesson. They also included the lesson plan of that day as well as other material such as power point presentations, overhead transparencies, and video clips watched during the lesson.

Strategies and Stages of Analysis of Micro-Ethnographic Data

In this section, the five theoretical tools described in the third chapter are exemplified through the first 20 seconds of the focal lesson. These strategies are situated within a stage of data analysis. Thus, all the stages of data analysis are also described here. Emphasis is put on the explanation of these stages mainly because critical researchers who conduct classroom-based studies have faced two main challenges: the theory-practice dichotomy in which theory receives more importance than practice, and the complexity of classroom data. They also face the lack of literature that explains how to conduct classroom-based research (See also chapter one).
The explanation of the stages of data analysis considers the work done by Pane & Rocco (2009). They affirm that a description of the stages to conduct a critical microethnography does not contradict or diminish its importance. They also argue that the description is needed because critical researchers require a heuristic which is helpful for two reasons: First, it helps researchers walk through the new journey of critical research or help them visualize the journey if they desire. Second, it helps researchers initiate a dialogue about and with the critical microethnographic approach. These words show their belief in discussing the ethical issues that arise in research in order to have a better understanding of it.

Pane & Rocco’s critical microethnography considers the approach presented by Bloome et al., (2005) as well as the work by Carspecken (1996). As it has been mentioned, the microethnographic approach is compatible with most of the beliefs embodied in chronotope IV. On the other hand, Carspecken’s work is compatible with some of the beliefs embodied in chronotope III mainly the idea that truth is a result of a dialogic and unrestricted process of communication which is present in the first two stages of data analysis. One other idea comes from the claim that Carspecken does not address how critical researchers can minimize the biases and the dominance of the researcher (Vandenberg & Hall, 2011). As it has been mentioned, this study is located within the sets of beliefs embodied in chronotopes III and IV. In case of the power of the researcher, the strategy of feminist reflexivity has helped me become aware of my own biases and the control I have as a researcher.
Stage One: Identification of Language Activity and Meaningful Units

The objective of this stage was to identify the language activity and the message units. Consequently, I viewed the video-recording several times in order to identify them. In these viewings, I played the role of “moderate observer” and reflected continuously of my roles as an outsider and an insider (Spradley, 1980).

Language activity refers to how the all research participants used verbal and nonverbal language during our moment-to-moment interactions with each other. This means that while I was viewing the video-recording, I wrote detailed accounts that included all speech acts in verbatim form and all body movements and postures. I kept in mind that verbatim transcriptions are based on message units. As it has been said, message units can be identified by contextualization cues and are mostly defined from a perlocutionary perspective (the impact the linguistic behavior has on listeners). I wrote notes that included the classroom contextual information and draws diagrams of how the classroom is set-up on that day. Additionally, I wrote “theoretical memos” which are “notes about the experience based on ideas and memories provoked to produce initial interpretations” (Pane & Rocco, 2009, para. 31). These memos augmented the fieldnotes I had of the focal lesson. Finally, I wrote down comments in order to speculate the meaning of interactions.

Table 5.2 exemplifies these steps as it shows the verbatim transcript of message units as well as the language activity of the first 10 seconds of the focal lesson. As I have mentioned throughout this study, I was the instructor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Quiero que lo veamos I want us to see it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[She is typing and speaking at the same time. The main webpage of the college’s electronic learning arena (ELLA) is on the projector screen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Buen buenos días Good good morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[She raises her voice tone when she looks at the door and sees Sonia. The instructor smiles and laughs. Then, she frowns.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student 1:</td>
<td>What happened in there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[A female student whispers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Un momento One moment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[She changes her voice tone. She turns to where Lillian and Cathy are. Lillian is looking through the pages of a notebook and Cathy is looking at the floor. The instructor also uses her left hand to signal that she is making a pause. She walks to the door to talk to Sonia]

5  Student 2: What

[Another female student whispers. Ethan turns his head to the door]

6  Instructor: Qué pasó

What happened

[She whispers]

7  Sonia: Buenos días

Good morning

[Her voice tone is different]

8  Instructor: Buenos días

Good Morning
[The instructor greets Sonia. Her voice is different and speaks faster. She returns to the computer lectern]

Table 5.2 Transparency in Transcription (Sample Transcription with Language Activity Observed, Lines 1-8)

Lines 1 through 8 show how the lesson started. They show that I was typing and speaking. These actions indicated that I wanted to log onto the college’s electronic area. I was interested in opening a file that was about a talk that was going to take place on campus on the following day. Then, I greeted the class and I turned to look at the door and saw Sonia, the student from Nepal. I was glad to see her. At that moment, I stopped typing because I thought Sonia wanted to ask me something. A couple of students wondered why I stopped what I was doing and walked to the door where Sonia was. When I was close to Sonia, I asked her what happened. Sonia greeted me and I greeted her back. At that moment, I realized that Sonia did not want to ask for help or ask something from me. She wanted to greet me.

**Stage Two: Initial Meaning Reconstruction**

Reconstructive data analysis is the inductive process of interpreting implicit meanings into explicit discourse. Mainly, this process consists of: initial meaning reconstruction (stage 2) and the microethnographic analysis (stage 3). In this stage, I
conducted the initial meaning reconstruction to gain a holistic picture of what was happening in the language classroom based on observations I articulated. The holistic picture of room 109 was obtained by three actions: a conduction of low-level coding, the selection of portions of representative language activity and the inferring of participants’ possible intentions.

Low-level coding procedures refer to language activity that was open to multiple access. It refers to language activity that the language participants who were listening or looking would probably agree that it happened. Table 5.3 exemplifies the low-level coding from lines 2-6. It shows the general code category and the level of objectivity. The three code categories are slightly objective because I used slight interpretation in their construction. The three codes have a level of medium objectivity which means that some objectivity was involved in its construction. Codes with slight and medium levels of objectivity were mainly supported through microethnographic analysis (stage 3). Consequently, this table suggests the importance of analyzing three aspects of the first 10 seconds of the focal lesson: the reason why I was glad to see Sonia and interrupted the class (line 4), Cathy and Lillian’s activity (line 4), and Sonia’s response (line 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>General Code Category</th>
<th>Level of Objectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ways of getting attention by Sonia</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 7</td>
<td>Buenos días</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good morning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways of getting attention by instructor Slight
Line 4 Un momento
One moment Medium

Ways of getting attention by Cathy and Lillian Slight
Line 4 By not looking at her Medium

Table 5.3 Emerging Codes and Noticings (Sample of Low-Level Coding, Noting Objectivity Levels from Table 5.2, Lines 1-8)

Based on the low-level coding, I selected 13 portions of language activity that represented patterns and irregularities for initial meaning reconstruction. I placed special attention on irregularities because they made visible patterns that I had not noticed or that I wanted to confirm. However, I also focused on the segments where Sonia, Elsa, Julie and Cathy participated because these were the students I interviewed. Consequently, out of these 13 segments I selected five of them. Table 5.4 shows the 13 segments that I selected and the names of the students who participated in each of the segments. As to the five selected segments, they are the segments number 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Segments of Language Activity</th>
<th>Participants’ Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“¿Qué razas?”</td>
<td>Instructor-students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Which races?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“You watch it you sing it</td>
<td>Julie-Cathy-Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right yeah”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Thank you ‘cause now it’s</td>
<td>Roberta-Julie-Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>going to be all right”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“¿Viajan ustedes?”</td>
<td>Instructor-students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“A cultural note”</td>
<td>Instructor-students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“How do you say to</td>
<td>Ethan-Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>check-in?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“How do you say drizzling?”</td>
<td>Julie-Instructor-Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I am confused as to when</td>
<td>Roberta-Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to use hace or estar’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Sorry sorry”</td>
<td>Julie-Instructor-Cathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4 Expectations and Surprises: Microaggressions Perceived and Unnoticed Patterns and Irregularities of Language Activity Identified in Focal Lesson

Once these particular portions of language activity were selected, the possible underlying meanings of the interactions were inferred. According to Carspecken (1996), this inferencing was gained by “noting possible intentions of actions, how actions are monitored by the actor, and how others understand the act. It requires the ability to take positions (i.e. intersubjectivity) and to recognize, reflect on, and explicitly examine and differentiate between personality and cultural typifications (i.e. intricacies in settings) of participants and others” (in Pane & Rocco, 2009, para. 46).

Table 5.5 shows a sample transcription with inferences of possible underlying meanings of lines 1-8. It shows that a possible underlying meaning as to why I was glad to see Sonia. I was probably glad to see her because she was a participative language learner and I felt that she supported what I did in class. Regarding why Sonia greeted me in line 7, she greeted me because she probably wanted to use Spanish correctly (e.g. how
to greet) or she probably wanted to greet in the way she is used to in Nepal or she wanted to greet me because it was the first day after the October break. Finally, in terms of why I greeted Sonia back in line 8, there are different possible explanations. I greeted Sonia back because I probably realized it was time to start the class. I greeted her because I probably recognized that Sonia wanted to greet me formally as it was the first day after the October break or because I probably recognized that Sonia used formal and correct Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Quiero que lo veamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I want us to see it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[She is typing and speaking at the same time. The main webpage of the college’s electronic learning arena (ELLA) is on the projector screen] Language Activity Observed

It is the first day of classes after the October Break. It is also a Wednesday (long session). Just like in other sessions, the instructor decides to spend the first five or ten minutes of class to make announcements. Underlying Meanings

203
2 Instructor: Buen buenos días
Good good morning

[She raises her voice tone Language Activity Observed when she looks at the door and sees Sonia. The instructor smiles and laughs. Then, she frowns]

The instructor may be glad Underlying Meanings to see Sonia because Sonia is a participative Spanish language learner. Thus, the instructor feels supported by her.

3 Student 1: What happened in there

[A female student whispers] Language Activity Observed

The student wonders because she may not see a reason why the class must be stopped. Underlying Meanings

4 Instructor: Un momento
One moment

[She changes her voice tone. She turns to where Cathy and Lillian are. Lillian is looking through the pages of a notebook and Cathy is looking at the floor.] Language Activity Observed
The instructor also uses her left hand to signal that she is making a pause. She walks to the door to talk to Sonia.

The instructor is aware of the challenges that many international students face. She probably thinks that Sonia has a family problem or she has a problem in the dorm. The instructor was a former head resident at Woodbridge College. She has had other students who have asked her for help/advice. By making an interruption, the instructor may also want to attract Lillian and Cathy’s attention.

5 Student 2 What

[Another female student whispers. Ethan turns his head to the door]

They may not see a reason why the instructor stopped the class. Ethan does not know what happened to Sonia.
6  Instructor: Qué pasó
   What happened

   [She whispers]  Language Activity Observed

7  Sonia:  Buenos días
   Good morning

   [Her voice tone is different]  Language Activity Observed

   Sonia may not want to support the instructor when she interacts with inattentive students such as Lillian and Cathy. She may want to show her classmates how to greet correctly in Spanish. And/or she may want to greet in the way she does in Nepal. She may want to greet the instructor after the October break.

8  Instructor: Buenos días
   Good Morning

   [The instructor greets Sonia. Her voice is different and speaks faster. She returns to the computer lectern]  Language Activity Observed
The instructor greets Sonia because she knows that she needs to start the class. And/or she greets Sonia back because she recognizes that Sonia is using Spanish correctly. She greets Sonia back because she recognizes that Sonia wants to greet her formally on the first day after the October break.

Table 5.5 Possible Meanings (Sample Transcription of Possible Underlying Meanings, Lines 1-8)

Since this initial meaning reconstruction was based on my observations, microethnographic analysis (stage 3) was needed to analyze subjective (personal) and normative-evaluative claims (agreement on what is appropriate or right). These claims are not of multiple access but of privileged access.

Stage Three: Microethnographic Analysis

A pragmatic horizon analysis entails the articulation of language activity within the classroom context of lessons over time and space (Carspecken, 1996 in Pane & Rocco, 2009). In this type of analysis, actions, instead of perceptions, are the key to understand experience. It is equivalent to seeing a particular object in clear focus with the
background objects visible but out of focus. Thus, pragmatic horizon analysis contrasts
the idea in focus (foreground object) with where the idea originated (background
experience or understanding). For example, I was glad to see Sonia (foreground
experience) because I knew that Sonia was a participative student in class. Since I
struggled with inattentive students such as Cathy and Lillian, I was glad to see Sonia in
class (background understanding or experience). My action of being glad to see a student
becomes understandable as a meaningful action when explicit and shared language
activities are analyzed in reference to the language activity over time and space.

The five theoretical tools presented by Bloome et al. (2005, 2008) and feminist
reflexivity (Harding, 2007; Hesse-Biber & Yaiser, 2004) were used to conduct a
pragmatic horizon analysis mainly because these tools focus on people’s actions. The
analysis was conducted on the utterances in the original language spoken. When
participants used Spanish, I scribed them as Spanish and then translated into English.
When participants spoke English, I scribed them as English and in italics. When
participants used English words with Spanish pronunciation, I considered them as
Spanish words.

**Contextualization Cues**

Contextualization cues are the visible ways in which people communicate their
intentions when they interact with each other. Thus, while viewing the video-recording
and reading the language activity of the selected segments, I inserted the transcription
symbols into the transcript in order to make the contextualization cues visible.
Table 5.6 shows the contextualization cues for lines 1 to 8 showed previously. For example, the greater and less-than signs in line 1 show that I talked faster (>I want us to see it, goo<). The comma signals that I continued with the same voice tone. This tone included the last word which is the first but incomplete greeting (goo). The asterisk transcription symbols surrounding *buenos días* (good morning) in line 2 show the boundaries of a change in voice, pitch, or style. These symbols are also present in lines 3 through 8. The period in line 4 and line 7 indicates a stopping fall in voice tone. The words qué (what) and buenos días (good morning) are underlined in lines 6 and 8 respectively to indicate the emphasis I put in these words. The words in italics in line 3 and 5 show that these words were spoken in English (Student 1 and Student 2). Finally, the upwards arrow of lines 3, 5, and 6 show that there was a raising intonation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Meaningful Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>&gt;Quiero (.) que lo veamos, buen&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;I want (.) us to see it, goo&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Ahh <em>buenos días</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahh <em>good morning</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student 1:</td>
<td><em>What happened in there↑</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td><em>Un momento.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>One moment.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6 Analytical Tool 1 (Sample of a Contextualization Cues Transcript, Lines 1-8)

After all the representative segments were analyzed for contextualization cues, I conducted boundary-making analyses.

Boundary-making

Since people use cues to communicate their intentions and meanings, people give meaning to boundaries when they propose, maintain and/or resist them. These socially constructed boundaries exist at the different levels of interaction. There are message units, interactional units, phases of lessons, and events. Message unit “is the smallest unit of conversational meaning” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 19). As it has been said, message
units can be identified by contextualization cues and determined by what is in the unit itself. Message units are not determined by words alone (sentences), nor are only defined by pauses and other prosodic features from an illocutionary perspective or the perspective of what the speaker wants to accomplish (utterances). Also, message units are not defined by changes in who is speaking (turns of talk). Instead, message units are defined from a perlocutionary perspective or the impact that language behavior has on listeners. Since the verbatim transcripts are based on message units, I identified and interpreted the boundaries of message units. Table 5.7 shows the interpretation of the boundaries of message units in lines 1-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>&gt;Quiero (.) que lo veamos, buen&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;I want (. ) us to see it, goo&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She is typing fast and looking at the computer screen. Her talk is fast, too. These actions signal the beginning of the message unit. An unnoticed pause after the first word (quiero) and the same voice intonation helps her continue. The last incomplete word (goo) indicates the end of the message unit. It also helps her claim her right for the next turn-at-talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Ahh <em>buenos días</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahh <em>good morning</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the door indicates the beginning of a different message unit. She sees Sonia. These actions help understand the interjection (ahh), her change in voice tone, the words (buenos días), and her laughter. At the end, she frowns because she believes that Sonia wants to tell her something. Her frowning maintains her claim for the next turn-at talk.

3 Student 1 *What happened in there*

She whispers

4 Instructor: *Un momento.*

*One moment.*

The change in her voice tone indicates the beginning of the message unit, the movement with the left hand and her turn to her left hand side indicate that she will make a pause. She turns to where Lillian and Cathy are seated. She looks at them. Her fall in tone at the end signals the end of the message unit. She walks to the door.

5 Student 2: *What*

She is whispering when she asks this question. At the same time, the instructor is walking to the door and Ethan turns his head to the door. The instructor’s walking to the door helps her maintain the conversation floor.

6 Instructor: *Qué pasó*

*What happened*

The change of voice and the stress on the first word (qué) signal the beginning of the message unit. The instructor asks a question and thus, she is waiting for an answer.
7 Sonia:  *Buenos días.*  

*Good morning.*

The change of voice and pitch signals the beginning of the message unit. The fall in tone indicates the end of the message unit.

8 Instructor:  *Buenos días*  

*Good morning*

Stress on both words (buenos) and the change of voice and pitch signal the beginning of the message unit. The fact that she returns to the computer lectern signals the end of the message unit. The instructor’s talk is faster and similar to the one registered in line 2.

Table 5.7 Message Unit Boundaries of Analytical Tool 2 (Sample of a Transcript, Lines 1-8)

Line 1 begins with my fast talk at the same time that I was typing and looking at the computer screen. The last incomplete word (goo) helped me claim my right for the next turn-at-talk. In line 2, I turned and looked at the door. I saw Sonia. These actions help understand my interjection (ahh), a change in my voice tone, a repeated but completed word (good), and my laughter. The frowning at the end of the unit helped me continue in the next turn. Line 3 begins when Student 1 asked the question “What happened in there” This student’s whispering signaled a change in voice and pitch. The
student’s actions were a response to my frowning. Line 4 begins with a change in my voice and pitch. These actions as well as the words “un momento” (one moment) indicated that I was going to interrupt what I was doing. Then, I turned to my left hand side and walked towards the door. These actions helped me maintain the conversational floor. In the following line, student 2 whispered the question “what”. In addition, Ethan, the Franklin College student, turned his head toward the door. These actions were a response to my decision to interrupt the class and to go to the door to talk to Sonia. Line 6 begins with the change in my voice, the stress on the first word “qué” (what) and the fact that I was at the door where Sonia was. The raising intonation at the end signaled that I was asking Sonia a question and thus, I was waiting for an answer. Line 7 starts with Sonia’s answer. The fall in the tone of her voice at the end of “buenos días” (good morning) signaled the end of this message unit. Finally, line 8 starts with the stress on the words “buenos días” (good morning) and a change in the style of my voice. This message unit ended as soon as I returned to the computer lectern. My voice’s style and speed was similar to the one registered in line 2.

Interactional units are several message units. They are the “smallest units of joint social activity” (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 26). Similarly to message units, the beginning and closure of interactional units depend on contextualization cues and intonations. Table 5.8 shows the interactional units in lines 1 to 8.

The line above message unit 1 represents the beginning of the first interactional unit. The line below message unit 2 denotes the closure of interactional unit 1 and the initiation of the following interactional unit in line 3. Similarly, the line below message
unit 6 denotes the closure of second interactional unit and the initiation of the interactional unit 3 in line 7 when Sonia greeted me with a different voice tone and by saying buenos días (good morning).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1

1 Instructor: >Quiero(.) que lo veamos, buen<
> I want(.) us to see it, goo<

She is typing fast and looking at the computer screen. Her talk is fast, too. These actions signal the beginning of the message unit. An unnoticed pause after the first word (quiero) and the same voice intonation helps her continue. The last incomplete word (goo) indicates the end of the message unit. It also helps her claim her right for the next turn-at-talk.

2 Instructor: Ahh *buenos días* <laugh>
Ahh *good morning* <laugh>

Looking at the door indicates the beginning of a different message unit. She sees Sonia. These actions help understand the interjection (ahh), her change in voice tone, the words (buenos días), and her laughter. At the end, she frowns because she believes that Sonia wants to tell her something. Her frowning maintains her claim for the next turn-at-talk.

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2

3 Student 1 *What happened in there*↑
She whispers

4  Instructor:  *Un momento.*
   *One moment.*

The change in her voice tone indicates the beginning of the message unit, the movement with the left hand and her turn to her left hand side indicate that she will make a pause. She turns to where Lillian and Cathy are seated. She looks at them. Her fall in tone at the end signals the end of the message unit. She walks to the door.

5  Student 2:  *What*↑

She is whispering when she asks this question. At the same time, the instructor is walking to the door and Ethan turns his head to the door. The instructor’s walking to the door helps her maintain the conversation floor.

6  Instructor:  *Qué pasó*↑
   *What happened*↑

The change of voice and the stress on the first word (qué) signal the beginning of the message unit. The instructor asks a question and thus, she is waiting for an answer.

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3

7  Sonia:  *Buenos días.*
   *Good morning.*
The change of voice and pitch signals the beginning of the message unit. The fall in tone indicates the end of the message unit.

8 Instructor: *Buenos días*

*Good morning*

Table 5.8 Message Unit Boundaries and Identification of Interactional Units of Analytical Tool 2 (Sample of a Transcript, Lines 1-8)

Several interactional units contain phases of lessons, and several phases of lesson constitute the entire class event. Phases were recorded numerically and by name (e.g., Phase 1, The beginning/El comienzo). I usually introduced them. The focal lesson was constituted by four phases: Phase 1—The beginning (El comienzo), Phase 2—I ask myself (Me pregunto), Phase 3—On vacation (De vacaciones), and Phase 4—To be with emotions and conditions (Estar con emociones y condiciones). The first phase was constituted by six interactional units whereas the second and third phases were constituted by seven IUs. The last phase was constituted by two interactional units.

Regarding where the four segments of language activity were within the phases and the interactional units of the focal lesson, Table 5.9 shows that the first two segments (S1 and S2) were within the second phase (“Me pregunto”) particularly in the sixth (S1) and seventh (S2) interactional units. The third and fourth segments (S3 and S4) were within the first interactional unit (“I have three questions”) of the third phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Sets of Interactional Units (Literacy Events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) The beginning/El comienzo | a) Introduction/Introducción  
b) One moment/Un momento  
c) What day is it/?Qué día es?  
d) Holidays/Días festivos  
e) Columbus Day’s Event/Charla del Día de la Raza  
f) Other announcements/Otros anuncios |
| 2) I ask myself/Me pregunto | a) Review of stem-changing verbs/Repaso de verbos con cambio de raíz  
b) Song’s lyrics/Letra de la canción  
c) First listening/Primera vez  
d) Second listening/Segunda vez  
e) Review of song’s lyrics/Revisión de la letra de la canción  
f) Remix versión/Versión disco de la canción (S1)  
g) Singing/Cantar (S2) |
| 3) On vacation/De vacaciones | a) I have three questions/Tengo tres preguntas (S3, S4)  
b) Four places/Cuatro lugares  
c) Seasons and months of the year/Estaciones y meses del año  
d) The Weather/El clima  
e) What is the weather like in/?Qué tiempo hace en?  
f) Activity in pairs/Actividad en parejas  
g) Review of exercise’s answers/Revisión de las respuestas del ejercicio |
| 4) To be with emotions and conditions/Estar con emociones y condiciones | a) Explanation/Explicación  
b) Exercise/Ejercicio |

Table 5.9 Phases and Interactional Units of Focal Lesson

The table below shows lines 1-21 which represent the first 40 seconds of the focal lesson and include the first three interactional units of phase 1 (introduction, one moment,
and what day is it?). In these 40 seconds, and after I greeted Sonia back (line 8), I asked questions to student participants such as “what day is today" (line 9), “Yesterday ↑(.) what day was it ↑” (line 12), and “and the day before yesterday ↑what day was it↑” (line 14). These questions helped student participants review vocabulary words such as days of the week and numbers because they learned these topics in the first and second lesson units. In addition, these questions helped me introduce both the topic of holidays (días festivos) and a campus talk about “Día de la Raza” (Columbus Day) scheduled for the following day. Some students answered these questions. However, I wanted Cathy and Lillian to participate. These two students were inattentive in class since the moment they entered into the language classroom (See Table 5.10).

SPANISH LANGUAGE FOCAL LESSON

PHASE 1, THE BEGINNING/EL COMIENZO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1

1   Instructor:   >Quiero (). que lo veamos, buen<

> I want (). us to see it, goo<

She is typing fast and looking at the computer screen. Her talk is fast, too. These actions signal the beginning of the message unit. An unnoticed pause after the first word (quiero)
and the same voice intonation helps her continue. The last incomplete word (goo) indicates the end of the message unit. It also helps her claim her right for the next turn-at-talk.

2 Instructor: Ahh *buenos días* <laugh>

Ahh *good morning* <laugh>

Looking at the door indicates the beginning of a different message unit. She sees Sonia. These actions help understand the interjection (ahh), her change in voice tone, the words (buenos días), and her laughter. At the end, she frowns because she believes that Sonia wants to tell her something. Her frowning maintains her claim for the next turn-at-talk.

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2

3 Student 1 *What happened in there*↑

She whispers

4 Instructor: *Un momento.*

*One moment.*

The change in her voice tone indicates the beginning of the message unit, the movement with the left hand and her turn to her left hand side indicate that she will make a pause. She turns to where Lillian and Cathy are seated. She looks at them. Her fall in tone at the end signals the end of the message unit. She walks to the door.

5 Student 2: *What*↑
She is whispering when she asks this question. At the same time, the instructor is walking to the door and Ethan turns his head to the door. The instructor’s walking to the door helps her maintain the conversation floor.

6     Instructor: *Qué pasó*↑
   *What happened*↑

The change of voice and the stress on the first word (qué) signal the beginning of the message unit. The instructor asks a question and thus, she is waiting for an answer.

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3

7     Sonia: *Buenos días.*
   *Good morning.*

The change of voice and pitch signals the beginning of the message unit. The fall in tone indicates the end of the message unit.

8     Instructor: *Buenos días*
   *Good morning*

Stress on both words (buenos) and the change of voice and pitch signal the beginning of the message unit. The fact that she returns to the computer lectern signals the end of the message unit. The instructor’s talk is faster and similar to the one registered in line 2.

9     Instructor: *Qué día es hoy*↑
   *What day is it*↑
Shift in voice tone, the stress on the first word (qué), and the fact that instructor is in front of the class signal a new message unit. Rising intonation pattern at the end and an unnoticed pause indicate that she is asking a question and thus, she is waiting for an answer. She turns to her left hand side where Lillian and Cathy are seated. Indeed, she moves her head slowly. These actions indicate that she expects Lillian and Cathy to answer the question. Lillian is yawning and when she finishes yawning, she tries to answer the question. Cathy is wiping her right eye with her hand.

10 Students: (.)<Miércoles>

   (.)<Wednesday>

A brief pause signals the beginning of a new message unit. The instructor is waiting for an answer. Three students say the answer. One of voices is low and slow. The other voice is a bit louder while the last one is louder and faster. These students are seated on the instructor’s right hand side.

11 Instructor: Miércoles (.)>Muy Bien<

       Wednesday (.) >Very Good<

After hearing the students’ answers, she moves her hands up and down while repeating the word and stressing it. After a barely noticed pause, she also emphasizes very good (muy bien) and says it faster.

12 Instructor: Ayer↑ (.) qué día fue↑

       Yesterday ↑ (.) what day was it↑

A movement with her arms while saying the first word (ayer) and a rising intonation at the end signal the beginning of a new message unit. A barely noticed pause helps her continue holding the conversation floor. Stress on the second word (qué) and a rising
intonation on the last word (fue) indicate that she is asking another question and thus, she expects students to answer it. Once she finished asking the question, the instructor looks at her left hand side. Lillian is writing. Cathy is not looking at the instructor; she is turning to her left hand side. Lillian’s desk is empty. The instructor looks at the students who are in front of her.

13 Student 3: Martes

Tuesday

One student answers the question. Her voice is clear.

14 Instructor: Y antier↑ qué dia fue↑

And the day before yesterday↑ what day was it↑

Immediately after the instructor hears the answer, she acknowledges it by nodding. This action signals the beginning of this message unit. The moment she is saying the word “antier” (they day before yesterday), she exaggerates an arm movement and gives a step back to indicate that she is referring to a point further in past. While she is asking the question, Anastasia walks fast to sit down. Julie and Cathy are next to her. Julie is on Anastasia’s left hand side and Cathy is on her right hand side. Immediately after the instructor asks the question, she turns to her left hand side where Lillian Cathy are seated. Cathy is not looking at her. She is looking at the students in front of her.

15 Student 3: >Jueves<

>Thursday<

This voice is similar to the voice heard in line 11. This time, the voice is faster.

16 Instructor: Miércoles(.) ñ Martes(.) Lunes
Immediately after hearing the wrong answer, the instructor says the first word (miércoles). While the instructor is saying the first word (miércoles), she uses her left hand to signal that Wednesday correspond to one point in time. Then, she makes a brief pause. While she is making the pause, Sonia interrupts her and says the right answer (lunes). The instructor continues saying the second word (martes) and uses her hand to refer to a different point in time. She makes another brief pause. Finally, the instructor says the third and last word (lunes) and emphasizes it. Simultaneously, the instructor takes a step back and moves both hands to indicate that she is referring to further point in the past.

17 Sonia  *Lunes*  
  *Monday*

Sonia interrupts the instructor and gives the right answer. There is a change of voice and style.

18 Student 3:  *Lunes*  
  &  *Monday*

Student 4

A couple of students repeat Sonia’s answer. One of them is the student who provides the answer in lines 11 and 13. Their voice is different. The voice of student 1 is slower and lower than before.

19 Instructor:  Lunes (.) Muy bien  
  Monday (.) Very Good
After the instructor hears the right answer, she repeats it, looks at the student or students in front of her and points to her with the index finger of her right hand. Then, she makes a brief pause and says very good (muy bien). She quickly turns to the blackboard and starts walking towards the second blackboard. This movement signals the end of this message unit and helps the instructor maintain her claim for the next turn-at talk.

20  Instructor: Entonces lunes I no (.)

Then Monday I no (.)

When she says the first word (entonces), the instructor is already at the blackboard. Thus, while she is saying the second word (lunes), she is writing it down on the second blackboard. During the 5-second pause she makes, she draws a downwards arrow below the word Monday. At the moment she says no, she writes the word martes (Tuesday) on the third blackboard. She makes a barely noticed pause which signals the end of this message unit.

21  Instructor: Y hoy (.) miércoles

And today (.) Wednesday

After saying the first two words, and making a barely noticed pause, the instructor writes on the third blackboard the word miércoles (Wednesday). In addition to emphasizing the word, she underlines it on the blackboard. The underlining of this word signals the end of this message unit.

Table 5.10 Analytical Tool 2 (Sample of a Transcript Interpreting Message Unit Boundaries, Identifying Interactional Units and Indicating Phases of the Focal Lesson, Lines 1-21)
**Turn-taking**

Bloome at al., (2005) affirm that turn-taking is defined within the institution in which the classroom event takes place and it is analyzed within the participation structure constructed by classroom participants. Participants use participation structures to decide whether and how to interpret and participate (or not) in an event. Consequently, while viewing the segment of the video-recording and reading the selected language activity to augment interpretations, I identified I-R-E/F turn-taking patterns and/or anomalies by noting whether the language activity is an initiation, response, evaluation, or feedback. Table 5.11 shows the I-R-E/F sequences indicated in lines 1-21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRE/F Sequence</th>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I/Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;Quiero (.) que lo veamos, buen&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;I want (.) us to see it, goo&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I/Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ahh <em>buenos dias</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahh <em>good morning</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1 I/Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>What happened in there</em>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I/Q</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Un momento.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>One moment.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2 I/Q</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*What</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

226
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor I/Q</th>
<th>6</th>
<th><em>Qué pasó</em>↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>What happened</em>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia I/Q</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Buenos días.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Good morning.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Buenos días</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Good morning</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I/Q</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Qué día es hoy↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>What day is it↑</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(.)&lt;Miércoles&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.)&lt;Wednesday&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor E/F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Miércoles (.)&gt;Muy Bien&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday (.)&gt;Very Good&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor I/Q</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ayer↑ (.) qué día fue↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yesterday ↑ (.) <em>what day was it↑</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3 R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Martes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor I/Q 14  Y antier↑ qué día fue↑
And the day before yesterday↑what day was it↑

Student 3R 15  >Jueves<
>Thursday<

Instructor I/Q 16  Miércoles (.) ¶ Martes (.) Lunes
Wednesday(.) ¶ Tuesday (.) Monday

Sonia R 17  *Lunes*
*Monday*

Student 3& R 18  *Lunes*
Student 4  *Monday*

Instructor E/F 19  Lunes (.) Muy bien
Monday (.) Very good

Instructor I/Q 20  Entonces lunes. I no (.)
Then Monday I no (.)

Instructor I/Q 21  Y hoy (.) miércoles
And today (.) Wednesday
Table 5.11 Analytical Tool 3 (Sample of a Transcript with I-R-E/F Sequences Indicated, Lines 1-21)

The above table shows that there are typical I-R-E/F sequences such as lines 9 to 11 which illustrate that student participants and I knew how to participate in the language classroom in the traditional way. However, there are other sequences such as lines 1 and 2 and lines 20 and 21 which indicate that it took me several turns to initiate the interaction with the class (I-IR-E/F). Other sequences show that I did not always give a verbal feedback or evaluation to student participants. For instance, lines 12-13, 14-15 exemplify I-R sequences. Finally, there are sequences which indicate that students responded several times (I-R-R-E/F) such as lines 16-19 and that they also initiated the interaction such as in lines 3 (Student 1), line 5 (Student 2), and line 7 (Sonia).

**Thematic coherence**

This theoretical tool focuses on the ways that meanings are organized and/or negotiated during an event through ideas, interactions, and/or texts (Bloome et al., 2005). Some events have multiple overlapping themes at multiple levels whereas other events have little thematic coherence. This means that participants question, accept or reject what is happening either through verbal or non-verbal interactions. Themes can be declared by any participant and agreed upon or not by the other participants involved. Themes are analyzed by determining what is assumed to be forefronted and what and how themes are shifted and negotiated. Consequently, while viewing the selected video-
recording and reading the corresponding language activity to augment interpretations, I analyzed thematic coherence (See Table 5.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>SAC SLC CIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructor</td>
<td>Quiero (. ) que lo veamos, buen&lt;</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want (. ) us to see it, goo&lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Instructor</td>
<td>Ahh <em>buenos días</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahh <em>good morning</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Student 1</td>
<td><em>What happened in there</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Instructor</td>
<td><em>Un momento.</em></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>One moment.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student 2:</td>
<td><em>What</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Instructor</td>
<td><em>Qué pasó</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What happened</em>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sonia</td>
<td><em>Buenos días.</em></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Instructor *Buenos días*

*Good morning*

9 Instructor Qué día es hoy↑

What day is it↑

10 Students (.)<Miércoles>

(.)<Wednesday>

11 Instructor Miércoles (.)Muy Bien

Wednesday (.)Very Good

12 Instructor Ayer↑ (.) qué día fue↑

Yesterday ↑ (.) what day was it↑

13 Student 3 Martes

Tuesday

14 Instructor Y antier↑ qué día fue↑

And the day before yesterday↑

what day was it↑

15 Student 3 >Jueves<

>Thursday<
16 Instructor  Miércoles (.) ¶ Martes (.) Lunes x
    Wednesday (.) ¶ Tuesday(.) Monday

17 Sonia  *Lunes*
    *Monday*

18 Student 3  *Lunes*
    
    &
    *Monday*

    Student 4

19 Instructor  Lunes (.) Muy bien x
    Monday (.) Very good

20 Instructor  Entonces lunes  I no (.) x
    Then Monday  I  no (.)

21 Instructor  Y hoy (.) miércoles x
    And today (.) Wednesday

Table 5.12 Analytic Tool 4 (Sample Transcription with Thematic Coherence Indicated, Lines 1-21)

SAC= Spanish Activities on Campus, SLC= Spanish Literacy and Culture, and CIS= Care for International Students
Table 5.12 shows that there are three themes in this segment of language activity: Spanish Activities on Campus (SAC), Spanish Literacy and Culture (SLC), and Care for International Students (CIS). I introduced these themes. In line 1, I introduced the theme of Spanish activities on campus as soon as I referred to a piece of information that I posted on the college’s electronic learning arena (ELLA). It was a college talk about “Día de la raza” (Columbus Day). At the end of this line, I also introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture as soon as I greeted the class. In line 2, I abandoned the topic of Spanish activities on campus and continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture as I greeted Sonia. However, at the end of this line, I frowned and this action signaled my belief that Sonia needed help. Consequently, I introduced the theme of care for international students which continued until line 6. In line 3, student 1 wondered what Sonia wanted. This interest continued until line 6 when I asked Sonia what had happened.

In line 7, Sonia greeted me and, by doing this, she made clear that she was not going to ask for help, or wanted something from me. Thus, her response signaled her intention to return to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture initiated by me. In the following line, I accepted Sonia’s actions by greeting her back. Indeed, the theme of Spanish literacy and culture is present from line 8 until line 21. In terms of the specific topics within the theme of Spanish literacy and culture, I introduced vocabulary such as the days of the week, questions with the interrogative word what (qué), and the verb to be

---

17 Día de la Raza (Day of the Race) is a holiday that is celebrated in Mexico on October 12th. It is similar to Columbus Day in the United States and to Spain’s Día de la Hispanidad (Day of Spanishness/ Spain’s National Holiday).
(ser) in lines 9, 12, 14, 16, 20, and 21. Conversely, most student participants were responsible for continuing these themes in lines 10, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

Intertextuality

Intertextuality occurs when two or more written, verbal, nonverbal, or other type of texts share a feature, refer to one another, or lead to another text (Bloome et al., 2005). Intertextualities are socially constructed and proposed, acknowledged, recognized, agreed upon, or contested among those involved. Thus, while viewing the segment of the video-recording and reading the corresponding language activity, I identified the intertextual links. Table 5.13 shows the intertextualities identified in line 1-21.

In line 1, I proposed an intertextuality link when I said that I wanted all participants to read the piece of information I uploaded into ELLA (the college’s electronic learning arena) about a campus talk. At the end of the line, I also greeted Sonia and thus, I initiated the themes of Spanish activities on campus and Spanish literacy and culture. In line 2, I proposed two intertextual links. Upon greeting Sonia, I continued proposing a link to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture. Upon frowning, I proposed a link related to the theme of care for international students. In line 3, Student 1 acknowledged my link related to the theme of care for international students by asking what happened. In line 4, I recognized this theme by walking to the door where Sonia was. I was aware of the social consequence of interrupting the class. I knew that the rest of student participants had to wait and that they would not know whether Sonia needed help or not.
In line 5, the question asked by Student 2 and Ethan’s body movement represented the acknowledgment and recognition of the intertextual link I made previously. In line 6, by asking what happened to Sonia, I made a request. However, Sonia did not acknowledge nor recognize my request in line 7. Rather, the student proposed an intertextuality link related to the topic of Spanish literacy and culture which was introduced previously by me in line 1. In line 8, I acknowledged, recognized, and confirmed the link proposed by Sonia by greeting her back and walking back to the computer lectern.

In the following line, I proposed another intertextual link related to the topic of Spanish literacy and culture by asking the day of the week of that day (“qué día es hoy”). In line 10, some student participants acknowledged and recognized that I required an answer. Similarly, these students were aware of the social consequence of answering my question. They knew that I would give a positive feedback or evaluation if the answer was correct and that I might give a negative evaluation if they provided an incorrect answer. In the case of line 10, the participant students provided the correct answer “miércoles” (Wednesday). In line 11, I confirmed students’ acknowledgment and recognition of the link I made by repeating the correct answer and saying “muy bien” (very good).

In line 12, I continued proposing another intertextuality link of the topic of Spanish literacy and culture by asking students the day of the week that was the day before. Student 3 knew the social consequence of acknowledging and recognizing this intertextual link, and provided the correct answer “martes” (Tuesday). In this case, I did
not give verbal feedback, but I nodded. In the following line, I proposed another intertextual link of the same topic by asking students for the day of the week of two days earlier. In line 15, Student 3 acknowledged and recognized that I asked a question and that I required an answer. Student 3 also knew the social consequence of this action. In this case, she gave an incorrect answer “jueves” (Thursday). The way in which I signaled that the answer was incorrect was by proposing another intertextual link.

In line 16, I repeated previous correct answers such as “miércoles” (Wednesday) and “martes” (Tuesday) as a way to remind Student 3 that instead of asking for the name of the following day, I was asking them to say “lunes” (Monday). While I was doing this, Sonia interrupted me to give the right answer “lunes” (Monday) in line 17. This means that Sonia acknowledged, recognized, and knew the social consequences of interrupting me. In the following line, Student 3 and Student 4 repeated Sonia’s correct answer. They acknowledged, recognized and knew the social consequence of giving the correct answer to me and repeating the answer previously mentioned by someone else. In line 19, I acknowledged and recognized the students’ answer. I confirmed these students’ intertextual link by repeating their answer and saying very good (“lunes muy bien”). In line 20, I confirmed the answer again by saying “entonces lunes” (it is Monday, then). Finally, in the last line, I said “hoy miércoles” (today Wednesday) which was a confirmation of the answer students gave in line 9. These words in lines 20 and 21 helped me introduce the theme of Holidays, since the focal lesson was on October 10, and Columbus Day had been two days earlier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>&gt;Quiero (.) que lo veamos, buen&lt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Ahh <em>buenos días</em> &lt;laugh&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td><em>What happened in there</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td><em>Un momento.</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td><em>What</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td><em>Qué pasó</em>↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td><em>Buenos días.</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td><em>Buenos días</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Qué día es hoy↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>(&lt;Miércoles&gt;)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Miércoles (&lt;) Muy Bien&lt;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Ayer↑ (.) qué día fue↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>Martes Tuesday</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Y antier↑ qué día fue↑</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>&gt;Jueves&lt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Miércoles (&lt;) Martes (&lt;) Lunes Wednesday (&lt;) Tuesday(.) Monday</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td><em>Lunes</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Monday</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Student 3 &amp;</td>
<td><em>Lunes</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td><em>Monday</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Lunes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.) Muy bien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.) Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Entonces</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lunes I no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday I no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Y hoy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>miércoles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And today</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13 Analytic Tool 5 (Sample Transcription with Intertextualities Indicated, Lines 1-21)

IP= Intertextuality Proposed, IA= Intertextuality Acknowledged, IR= Intertextuality Recognized, SC= Social Consequence, NT= New Topic, R= request, C=Confirmation

Once the intertextualities were identified, the microethnographic analysis was completed as well as the process of reconstructive data analysis. In the next stage, I generated dialogical data to prioritize subjective and normative-evaluative claims. In other words, I considered the perspectives of student participants.

**Stage Four: Dialogical Data**

This stage I considered the interviews I had with Cathy, Sonia, Elsa, and Julie who were the four participants who gave their consent to be interviewed. I met with each of them in the café located across from the college campus in the late 2000s.
In these interviews I gained student participants’ general information. Consequently, I conducted lightly-structured depth interviews because they provided space for student participants’ voices and they stimulated the exploration of a topic (Schensul & LeCompte, 1999). The interviews included open questions which pertained to their background, their beliefs about language learning, and their opinion about the Spanish elementary class section 04 that has taken place in the fall semester (See Interview Questions, Appendix E).

At the beginning of each interview, I explained that they would answer general questions about themselves, the Spanish language and the class. Then, I placed the digital recorder on the table between the interviewee and me. In addition to the interview questions, I placed a copy of the syllabus of the course, and the textbook VISTAS. I tried to not take notes while I was conducting the interview because I did not want the interviewee to be distracted or feel anxious. After the interview, I set aside 15 or 20 minutes to self-debrief about the experience. I reviewed these notes I took at a later time. Overall, the interviews helped me learn about the student participants’ perspectives about language learning in general and what happened and why in the elementary Spanish course in the fall semester.

Regarding the first 40 seconds of the focal lesson which shows how I started the class and how I interacted with Sonia, Sonia’s interview helped me validate some of the foregrounded claims. Sonia explained that she enrolled in a Spanish language class for “personal satisfaction”. That is, she did not need to fulfill the language requirement as it “had already been waived”. In terms of the grammatical structures she learned in the fall
semester, Sonia said that she particularly enjoyed using “usted” (a formal and singular
form of you) and “tú” (an informal and singular form of you) mainly because this
difference also exists in her native language Nepali. She also said that she understood the
difference between being formal and informal which is different from the English
language. The theoretical notes I wrote about Sonia’s interview helped me validate some
of foregrounded claims as well. These claims related to my belief that I wanted to have a
vocabulary review of the days of the week within the first section of the class in addition
to making the announcement of the campus talk about “Día de la Raza”.

**Stage Five: High-Level Coding**

High-level coding is supported by matches between interview statements and the
horizon analyses. According to Carspecken (1996), high-level codes “should be backed
up with an exemplary horizon analysis … [and] ideally… match statements made by
participants during the interviews…” (p. 148). They are “dependent on greater amounts
of abstraction than low-level codes which are used in initial meaning reconstruction and
to select portions” of language activity for microethnographic analysis. Table 5.14 shows
an example of two high-level codes and their level of abstraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Code Category</th>
<th>Level of Abstraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Category: Reproduction of college ideology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Traditional language study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Table 5.11: class runs by traditional turn-taking</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage Six: Final Reconstructive Data Analysis

After matching statements made by co-participants in the interview with the horizon analysis, I grouped together the code categories into larger themes which helped me understand what was happening in the segments of language activity and in the lesson. This grouping also helped me structure my narrative or testimonio. In this study, I view testimonio as an “authentic narrative, told by a witness who is moved to narrate by the urgency of a situation” (Yúdice, 1991, p. 17). After more than ten years of experience at Woodbridge College as a woman instructor of color, I believed that it was time to narrate my views of a college language classroom and my understanding of face-to-face interactions. I have firmly believed that these views are important. I also see testimonio as being jointly constructed with dynamic power relations. That is, I view testimonio as a
process as well as the result of the interactions I have had with my own understandings of the epistemologies, theories, data, analyses and my critical reflections throughout a long period of time. The view of testimonio as a result, by no means implies that it is complete or general. Instead, it is partial, particular and part of a process.

In terms of the 40-second segment that has been considered to exemplify the stages of data analysis, it shows that Sonia and I shaped our identities. On one hand, I attempted to construct my identity as a Spanish language instructor and a woman of color who was sensitive to the out-of-the-classroom-needs of international students such as Sonia (lines 2, 4, and 6). In other words, I tried to enact/animate the discourse of care for international students that Woodbridge College also promoted. However, Sonia, the only international student in the room, shaped her identity as a woman language learner and attempted to greet me correctly. She recognized me as a woman instructor of color, but she did not recognize me as a faculty member who cared for international students (line 7). Consequently, in the following line, I confirmed Sonia’s identity as a woman learner of color (line 8). This means that I did not recognize Sonia as a member of the international student community. In line 17, Sonia shaped her identity as a woman language learner who used Spanish correctly again. This identity was confirmed by Student 3 and Student 4 in line 18.

I shaped my identity as a language instructor and a woman of color who taught Spanish literacy and culture (lines 9, 11, 12, 14, 16). In these lines, I specifically focused on vocabulary related to days of the week and numbers and on grammatical structures. Some students confirmed it in line 10 whereas Student 3 confirmed it in lines 13 and 15.
In turn, I confirmed Student 3’s identity as a White woman learner of Spanish in lines 14 and 16. However, the discourse of Spanish literacy and culture enacted by, Sonia, Students 3 and 4 and me carried two aspects: the racialized native speaker/non-native speaker dichotomy and the norm of learning and speaking Spanish which is not only error-free and but also a standard variation first of Castilian Spanish and then of a variety of Latin American Spanish. The first time that Sonia and I interacted (lines 6-8), I confirmed Sonia’s identity as a woman language learner who knew how to use it correctly (“buenos días”). However, in line 17, when Sonia provided the correct answer (“lunes”) and shaped her identity as a woman language learner who knew the correct Spanish, I did not acknowledge nor recognize this action. I was interacting with Student 3 and I wanted Student 3 to provide the correct answer in line 16 (“miércoles, martes, lunes”). Although I did not acknowledge Sonia’s identity, Student 3 and Student 4 (White women learners) did by repeating her answer in line 18 (“lunes”). Indeed, even though I struggled when I faced the discourses enacted by Sonia, Student 3, and Student 4; I did not acknowledge and recognized Sonia’s enacted discourses of a woman of color learner of Spanish language and culture who was a non-native- speaker of English and who used and spoke correct Spanish. I acknowledged and recognized these two students’ answer and viewed it as correct in line 19 (“lunes muy bien”). In other words, the discourse of Spanish language and culture promoted by White and native-English speakers predominated over the Spanish language and culture promoted by ESL and non-White students. I suggest that this face-to-face interaction needs to be further analyzed mainly because it might be perceived as a very subtle attack or microaggression that I directed towards Sonia.
Ethical Considerations

As I have said in previous chapter, during the analysis and writing stages of this study I struggled with my roles as observer, participant and analyst. I constantly tried to have these role separated from one another. For instance, even though I knew that my voice is composed by my different experiences, reflections and actions as an instructor, research participant, and researcher, in preliminary versions of this study; I did not write the pronoun “I” to refer to my actions as an instructor. I mainly used it to describe my role as the observer and analyst of this study. My decision to not use this pronoun showed my struggles to voice my opinion(s) and value it/them.

I also struggled to keep the identity of the liberal arts college anonymous. I provided a lot of specific information about Woodbridge College and I also used some documents that are available online. One way in which I secured the anonymity is by omitting the academic year in which the classroom-based study took place.

Limitations of the Study

It is important to mention that I did not ask specific questions about the focal lesson or about the segments I selected from the focal lesson when I interviewed student participants. The reason for this omission was that when I conducted the interviews, I was still transcribing the audio-recordings and the video-recordings and I did not know exactly what video-recording I was going to select and what themes were going to emerge. Consequently, this fact contributed to my decision to focus on my testimonio and
on my own understandings of how the social categories of language, race, class and gender can be interrelated in face-to-face classroom interaction.

One aspect that can be seen as a limitation of this study is the fact that I have not reported the findings of this research to the student participants. As of today, I have been unable to communicate with them. They graduated from Woodbridge College years ago.
CHAPTER 6

EXAMINATION OF MOMENT-TO-MOMENT INTERACTIONS AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PARTICULAR CLASSROOM LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EVENTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the examination of the four segments of language activity that were taken from the focal lesson. Before the analysis of the segments is presented, this chapter explains what happened in the focal lesson before the first segment started.

The analysis of each of these four segments is divided into two parts. The first part focuses on the micro level. Therefore, the analysis draws on the theoretical tools presented by Bloome et al. (2005, 2008), Harding (2007) and Hesse-Biber & Yaiser (2004). The second part of the analysis focuses on the practices at the larger level of activity (discourse practices).

Before the First Segment of Language Activity

The first segment of language activity occurred 26 minutes and 30 seconds after the focal lesson started. It started in the sixth interactional unit of the second phase of the focal lesson. Thus, in the following paragraphs, I describe what occurred from the beginning of the class up to that point.
The first 40 seconds examined in the previous chapter included the first three Interactional Units (IUs) of the first phase “El comienzo” (The beginning’’). During this time, I greeted the class and Sonia (IU 1), I stopped what I was doing to talk to Sonia and asked her what had happened (IU 2) and I asked three questions to the class as a way for student participants to review vocabulary about the days of the week and numbers (IU 3).

In IU 4, I introduced the theme of national holidays (“días festivos”). I mentioned that holidays in the Spanish-speaking world were observed on a specific day. I said that while Columbus Day was observed on the second Monday in October; “Día de la Raza” was observed on Monday, October 12th (two days after the focal lesson)18. In IU 5, I made the announcement that a talk was going to take place on the college campus on the following day. The title of the talk was “Día de la Raza” and was sponsored by the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA). As the name suggests, MEChA was the organization of Chicano students on campus. Then, I read part of the poster which was on the projector screen and asked some questions to class participants related to the talk’s topic. I asked what race was celebrated in Mexico (“what race en Mexico” “qué raza”) and whether Mexicans were Spanish (from Spain) (“los mexicanos teóricamente son españoles†”) or indigenous (“son indígenas†”). In the last interactional unit (IU 6), I made other announcements that reminded students about activities that were due on the following day such as: 1) the class with Angélica, the teaching assistant, 2) the submission of the first draft of the second composition, and 3) the attendance to the Spanish Table.

18 At that time, I did not know that some Mexican holidays are observed on either Monday or Friday similar to the way it takes place in the United States.
While the emphasis of the first phase was on the announcements I made to the class, the second phase of the focal lesson focused on the listening and singing of the song “Me pregunto”. In its IU 1, student participants reviewed some verbs in the present tense particularly the stem-changing verbs. Mainly, I asked student participants: “los verbos zapatos cuáles son?” (what are the stem-changing verbs?). In the following IU, I distributed a handout and explained that there were some stem-changing verbs that were part of a song’s lyrics. I reminded student participants that this was the song that we could not listen to the previous week, before the break started. With this information, student participants became aware that they were going to start doing some grammar activities. I explained to them that in the upper part of the handout there were 7 verbs in a chart and that they were stem-changing verbs. I asked for the meaning in English of each Spanish verb and asked students to fill out the chart with the corresponding verb ending. For instance, if they read “caminar (yo)”, they had to conjugate the verb “to walk” in the first person singular “yo” (I). In other cases, students read the conjugated form of a verb in a specific ending and had to write the verb in its infinitive form. This means that if they read “camino” (I walk), they had to write down the verb “caminar” (to walk).

In IU3, I said that the song’s title could be translated in English as “I ask myself” (Me pregunto). I encouraged students to listen to the song by saying “vamos a escuchar la canción” (let’s listen to the song). I added that the song was a little fast, but told student participants that they were going to hear the verbs that were in the upper part of the handout. Then, I asked them to write down the words in the lyrics’ blank spaces. After saying this, we listened to the song for the first time. In IU 4, I asked student participants if they would like to listen to the song again (“otra vez†”). One student responded
affirmatively and I played the song for the second time. In IU 5, I asked student participants to review the words they wrote down. That is, I asked them “por qué no vemos que palabras son” (Why don’t we see/review which words are [in the song]?). A second later, I started to read the lyrics and stopped when there was a blank space. Students knew that when I stopped it was time for them to say the missing verb. Once students provided the answer, I wrote it down on the blackboard. Thus far, twenty three minutes have passed. According to my lesson plan, I was on track as I had planned to spend ten minutes for announcements, and less than 20 minutes for the listening to the song. In the remaining 10 minutes I wanted students to sing the song. However, before asking them to sing it, I told participants about the song. I told them that the song was popular in Mexico in 2003 and that people sang it and danced it (“la gente la cantaba y la gente la bailaba”). I also mentioned that in Mexico there were many songs that had a remix version (“en México hay mucha versión disco”). Then, I said that I had uploaded two videos: the original and the remix version of the song they had just heard in ELLA (the college’s learning arena).

After saying that, I started to play the song’s video in its original version as a way to signal that I wanted them to sing the song. Julie, a student asked me to “play it more” twice. Having heard this, I told students that they could sing the song (“la pueden cantar”). At the beginning, I was the only person who was singing. Seconds later, I said to the class that the camera man was going to sing (“Álvaro va a cantar”). He giggled. Then, Elsa, Sonia, Julie, Alexa, and Ethan started to sing the song. I sang a part of each line as a way to encourage students to keep singing. Other students such as Lillian, Cathy, and Anastasia were watching the video. Before the following verse started, I mentioned
that the images they were seeing corresponded to Mexico City downtown (“Ciudad de México Mexico City downtown”). Then, I interrupted the video to speak about the song in its remix version. This moment marks the beginning of the last interactional unit (IU 6) as well as the start of the first segment of language activity.

First Segment: “You watch it you sing it right” (Julie)

26’31” to 28’00” (lines 373-395)

The first segment of language activity shows the introduction I made of the song in its remix version. Similar to the introduction I made of the song in its original version, I mentioned that young people danced this song. I told student participants that if they watched the song’s video in its remix version, they had to sing it. First, I used Spanish but then I switched to English (“Están si la vemos if we watch it you have to sing it”). This comment triggered the participation of students who—in English—expressed their resistance. I consider that the interaction between four of these students and I provides an example of how a subtle attack or a microaggression is jointly constructed. It also shows my struggles to continue with my intention to play the song for some seconds for class participants to listen to it and sing it. For instance, I apologized for two false starts of the song. At the end of this segment, participant students listened to some seconds of the song and when the lyrics started some of them sang it.
Es el video

[This] is the video

Y también para que vean un poquito la diferencia

And also so you see the difference a little

Entre la versión original y la versión remix (.) no ↑

Between the original versión and the remix versión (.) no ↑

Que es la versión disco ↑porque esta canción fue

That it is the remix version ↑because this song was

La gente joven en las discotecas (.) ↓bailaba esta canción

Young people in discotheques (.) ↓danced this song

Están si la vemos *if we watch it you have to sing it*

Are you if we watch it* if we watch it we have to sing it*

Si

Yes

She said what ↑
381 Julie: *You watch it you sing it right*

382 Student 2: *Yeah*

383 Instructor: *Sí +*  
            *yes +*

384 Student 3: *Yeah*

385 Student 4: *You do*

386 Student 5: *Go on*

387: Student 6: *Your turn*

388 Instructor: *A ver (.) es la misma canción es la misma canción III*  
                Okay (.) it is the same song it is the same song III

389 Instructor: *What ↑*III no toda porque es muy larga 10 minutos *no ↓ pero es el video*  
                *What ↑*III not the whole song because it is too long [it is]10 minutes [long] *no ↓ but it is the video*

390 Instructor: *A ver chicas (.) ah no (.) perdón*  
                Okay chicas (.) ah no (.) sorry

391 Instructor: *Es que eso se oía en las discotecas en México ↑* (.) bailaban  
                *That [music] was what was heard in discotheques in Mexico↑*  
                (.) danced
392 Instructor:  Listas↑
                Are you ready↑

393 Instructor:  Okay okay perdón perdón ¶
                Okay okay sorry sorry ¶

394 Julie:  Start singing

395 Instructor:  Ahora sí chicos
                Now yes guys

Analysis of Theoretical Tools

Regarding the theoretical tools of contextualization cues and boundary-making, in line 374, I wanted student participants to see/hear the difference between the song in its original version and its remix version (“y para que vean un poquito la diferencia”). I expressed this idea by emphasizing the verb “to see” (“vean”) and the last part of the word difference (“diferencia”). Additionally, my voice was very clear. In the following line, while I was saying the words “versión remix” (remix version); I also placed the cursor on the web link of the song’s remix version. Since the projector screen was on, all participants saw the cursor on the web link. I also uttered a tag question (“no”) with a slight rising intonation in the end (line 375). Through these actions I showed my interest in playing the song’s video in the remix version.
Two students giggled after I said “versión remix” (remix version”) in line 375 and “versión disco” in line 376. This suggests that these student participants probably found the words “remix” and “disco” (discotheques) old-fashioned and/or that they referred to the topics of dancing and night life. In fact, I had not realized that these words were not commonly used in Mexico City. The students’ giggling made my voice difficult to hear. For this reason, I raised the tone of my voice in the middle of line 376 until the last part of line 377. In line 378, I emphatically said the verb “están” (are you) as if I were to going to ask ¿están listos/listas? (are you ready?). However, I did not ask them the question. Instead, I said with an emphatic voice “si la vemos” (if we watch it). With these words, I expressed my intention to set a condition. Additionally, my choice to use the direct pronoun “la” indicated that I was referring to the song as the noun “canción” is feminine. However, after saying “si la vemos” I switched to English. My lower voice tone when I said “if we watch it you have to sing it” shaped some insecurity which contrasted with my conviction I spoke Spanish in class. At the moment I spoke English I had my left arm extended and I was holding some handouts with my left hand. My index finger was pointing to the projector screen and my right hand was on the computer mouse. These body actions helped me reinforce my intention to play the song and that it was more convincing so that student participants sang part of the song.

My intention that student participants listened to the song and sang it triggered only one positive answer. The other responses are not (lines 384-387). The positive answer came from Julie who said “si” (yes) in line 379. In line 380, Student 1 used English to ask what I had said (“she said what”). Then, Julie answered the question but used English in her response in line 381 (“you watch it you sing it right”). After this
answer, Student 2 responded “yeah” in line 382 with an ironic tone. This irony made me said “si” in line 383 but with an elongated vowel “i” so that the word sounded more like the “yeah” uttered previously. While the Student 2’s voice was low, my voice could be heard clearly. Additionally, my left hand was still pointing to the projector screen and I was also still holding some handouts while I had my right hand on the mouse. One other action on my part was that I quickly looked at the students who were at my left hand side mainly Lillian and Cathy. After a quick look, I looked at the computer screen. Through these actions, I showed that I kept interested in playing the song. Additionally, I checked what Lillian and Cathy were doing. They were not participating in the interaction. Then, other four student participants, who were in front of me and at my left hand side, used English to express their disagreement. Their answers overlapped (lines 384 387). Their responses were: “yeah” (Student 3), “you do” (Student 4), “go on” (Student 5), “your turn” (Student 6). Their voices were clear. At this point, I clicked on the web link of the song’s video in its remix version so the music and the video started to be heard and seen on the projector screen. Consequently, despite the students’ opposition, I played the song and hoped that some of them sang part of it.

In line 388, I took some steps to be closer to the students who were at her left hand side such as Lillian, Cathy, Anastasia and Julie. I also nodded while she was walking. In my opinion, I was showing to them that I was following the music’s rhythm. Then, I extended my arms and said “a ver” (okay). My tone of voice suggests that I tried to attract students’ attention. After a barely noticed pause, I said emphatically that the song they were going to sing was the same they listened to a few minutes ago. I said this twice (“es la misma canción es la misma canción”). While I was saying this, I looked
quickly at the students who were at my right hand side and at the students who were in front of me. In other words, I looked at the students who usually paid attention in class. Although I was closer to the students who were at her left hand side, I did not look at them because I was looking for the support of the students who are usually attentive in class.

After saying that it was the same song, there was a 5-second pause. During this time, and while the music continued playing, I saw that some student participants were not paying attention and that some others were getting ready to sing. For instance, Cathy was talking to Lillian and a couple of students were talking in English. Their talk was undecipherable mainly because the music was loud. Cathy finished talking to Lillian and Lillian turned to look at the video images. Unlike Cathy and Lillian, Julie and Anastasia were looking at their handout as if they were getting ready to sing. Then, in line 389, I asked in English and in a higher tone of voice “what” with a raising intonation at the end which indicates that I wanted some students to stop talking and giggling. After another long pause, I emphatically said “no toda porque es muy larga 10 minutos” which meant that I was not going to play the whole song because it was 10 minute long. My use of the adjective long in its feminine form (“larga”) confirmed that I was referring to the song. Then, I said in a low voice “*no↓ pero es el video*” (no but it is the video). With these words, I meant that the song was long because it was a remix version and not the song’s original version. While I was saying this, Cathy was talking to Lillian and Ethan was talking to another student (line 389).
In line 390, I said emphatically “a ver chicas” (okay girls). Similarly to line 388, I used “a ver” to signal my intention to make students pay attention to the class activity particularly Lillian and Cathy. After a barely noticed pause, I apologized because the lyrics did not start. First, I said “ah no” and after a pause I uttered “perdón” (sorry).

In line 391, I repeated what I said in line 377, that is, I mentioned again that Mexican people danced this song. This time I used the passive voice (impersonal voice). More specifically, I said “es que eso se oía en las discotecas en México bailaban” (this is what was heard and danced in discotheques in Mexico). While I was saying this, I was looking at some of the students who were in front to me. In addition, I was watching the video and moving slowly as if I were dancing. Thus, through repetition, watching the video, dancing, and looking quickly at some students, I tried to keep the conversation floor because the song had not started and I was waiting for the lyrics to start.

In line 392, I asked with some emphasis if student participants were ready to sing (listas↑). I used the word with the feminine ending to mainly refer to Cathy and Lillian because while I was saying this, I turned to look at Lillian. I was asking these students to pay attention again. Similar to seconds earlier, Lillian was watching the video and was turning her back to me and I used my left finger as if I were going to direct the students who were in front of me mainly because I believed that the lyrics were about to start. These actions signaled my struggles as Cathy and Lillian were not participating in class and I was relying on the students who were attentive in class. After this moment, I turned my head to the projector screen and looked at the students who were in front of me. I also looked at the camera man and I finally laughed in line 393. I continued laughing and I
also apologized by saying “okay okay perdón perdón”. I apologized because the song had not started. However, Julie interrupted me and in low voice and in English she said “start singing” (line 394). However, I continued laughing and I extended my arms. I moved them up and down as if I were asking students to calm down. Then, some participants also laughed. After this, I leaned on my left side and used the index finger of my left hand to point to the projector screen. Similar to previous lines, these actions indicated that I wanted students to get ready to sing the song. At that moment, I said “ahora sí chicos” (now yes guys) to signal that the song’s lyrics were about to start and that they had to get ready to sing. This time, I emphasized the second word (“sí”) and used the noun in its masculine form (“chicos”). After a couple of seconds, the lyrics started and participant students started to sing the song (line 395).

Regarding the turn-taking structure of the first segment of language activity, it is visible that I had the conversational floor at the beginning and at the end of the segment. That is, I had it from lines 373 to 378 and from lines 398 to 393. The turn-taking structure also shows that I struggled to keep the conversational floor when I interacted with student participants. In lines 378 and 379, there was an I-R structure initiated by me (“están sí la vemos if we watch it you have to sing it”) and followed by Julie (“sí”). Student 1 initiated a traditional I-R-E/F structure in line 380 when she asked “she said what”. Julie responded “you watch it you sing it right” and Student 2 gave an evaluation or feedback by saying “yeah” in an ironic tone. After hearing Student 2 negative evaluation, I initiated another conversational structure in line 383 (“sí”) which had several responses (lines 384-387). This interaction had an I-R-R-R-R conversational structure. Upon clicking on the web link in line 388, I initiated another interaction. However, the first part of line 388
represents an initiation of an interaction (“a ver”) whereas the second part signals an evaluation or feedback (“a ver es la misma canción es la misma canción”). This pattern in which there is an initiation and an evaluation or feedback in the same line occurs in lines 389 and 390. In line 389, there is an initiation (*“what↑”) and an evaluation (“no toda porque es muy larga 10 minutos * no↓ pero es el video*”). In line 390, the initiation is “a ver chicas” whereas the evaluation is the word “perdón”. Then, line 391 and line 392 represented two initiations made by me which were followed by an evaluation also made by me (“okay okay perdón perdón”). Finally, this segment ends with an initiation made by Julie in line 394 (“start singing”) and another one by me (“ahora sí chicos”) in line 395.

In terms of the tool of thematic coherence, the themes that student participants and I co-constructed through our moment-to-moment interactions of the first segment of language activity in room 109 were five: 1) Music and images of Mexico City, 2) Youth and Dancing, 3) Spanish literacy and culture, 4) Resistance, and 5) Apology. I introduced the theme of music and images of Mexico City in line 373 by referring to the video of the song in its remix version (“es el video”). This theme continued until line 376 mainly through the following words: “la versión original y la versión remix” (line 375) and “versión disco” and “canción” (line 376). In line 377, I continued with the theme of music and images of Mexico City and introduced the theme of youth and dancing when I said that young people used to dance this song in Mexican discotheques (“la gente joven en las discotecas bailaba esta canción”). In line 378, while the theme of music and images of Mexico City continued, I referred to the song and in this way; I introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture. These two themes prevailed in line 379 as Julie agreed
with me on singing the song. However, in line 380, Student 1 introduced the theme of Resistance (e.g. resistance to music and images of Mexico City and to Spanish literacy and culture) upon asking her classmates what I had said. Upon answering “you watch it you sing it right” in line 381, Julie continued with the theme of resistance. This interaction between Student 1 and Julie triggered the participation of Student 2 (line 382), Student 3 (line 384), Student 4 (line 385), Student 5 (line 386), and Student 6 (line 387) who continued with the theme of resistance. In the middle of students’ responses, I re-introduced the themes of music and Images of Mexico City and Spanish literacy and culture (line 383).

In line 388, I re-introduced the themes of youth and dancing when I nodded as if I were following the song’s rhythm. I also re-introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture when I said that it was the same song they had listened to and that had sung previously. I also continued with the theme of resistance as I tried to make students pay attention to the class activity particularly through “a ver” (okay). In the following line, I continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture by saying that student participants would not sing the whole song because it was too long. I also continued with the theme of resistance by asking “what” which was a way for me to refer to some student participants were giggling and talking and to asked them to stop. In line 390, I continued with the theme of resistance as I struggled to make Cathy and Lillian pay attention (“a ver chicas”). I also continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and Culture when I said “ah no” as I believed that the song’s lyrics were about to start. In addition, I introduced the theme of apology by saying (“perdón”). In the following line, I re-introduced the theme of music and Images of Mexico City and Youth and Dancing as I
said that Mexican people used to hear and dance that song. In line 392, I wanted students to pay attention and to be ready “listas” and thus, I continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture and with the theme of resistance as I turned to look at Lillian while I was saying it. Since the song’s lyrics did not start, I apologized again for the false start in line 393. Indeed, I said each word twice (okay okay perdón perdón”) and thus, I continued with the theme of apology. In the last two lines, Julie introduced the theme of music and images of Mexico when she told me to “start singing” and the theme of Spanish literacy and culture. Finally, I introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture and, to a lesser extent, the theme of youth and dancing by asking them to be ready to sing the song (“ahora sí chicos”).

In terms of the intertextual links co-constructed in this first segment of language activity, I proposed intertextual links related to the theme of music and images of Mexico from line 373 to line 376. In lines 377, I proposed an intertextual link related to the themes of music and images of Mexico City and youth and dancing (“la gente joven en las discotecas bailaba esta canción”). In the following line, I proposed another link related to the themes of music and images of Mexico City and Spanish literacy and culture (“están si la vemos if we watch it you have to sing it”).

In line 379, Julie acknowledged, recognized and was aware of the social consequences of agreeing with me after I conditioned the watching of the video to singing the song. In line 380, Student 1 proposed another intertextual link related to the theme of resistance to these two themes. In line 381, Julie acknowledged, recognized and was aware of the social consequence of answering to Student 1 in English. Her answer
contributed to the participation of Student 2, Student 3, Student 4, Student 5 and Student 6 (line 382, line 384-387). These students acknowledged, recognized, and were aware of the social consequence of disagreeing with me and continued with the theme of resistance. In line 383, I proposed an intertextual link but it was not acknowledged nor recognized. I proposed it once again in line 388. This link was related to the themes of resistance, youth and dancing, and Spanish literacy. In line 389 I proposed a link related to two themes: Spanish literacy and culture and resistance while in line 390 I proposed a link that was related to the themes of resistance, Spanish literacy and culture and apology. I continued proposing links in the following two lines. In line 391, I proposed a link that was related to the themes of music and images of Mexico City and youth and dancing (“es que eso se oía en las discotecas en México bailaban”). In the following line, the link I proposed was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and resistance (“listas”). In line 393, I proposed an intertextual link that was related to the theme of apology (“okay okay perdón perdón”) whereas in line 394 Julie proposed an intertextual link related to the themes of music and images of Mexico and Spanish literacy and culture (“start singing”). Finally, I proposed an intertextual link related to the themes of youth and dancing and Spanish literacy and culture (“ahora si chicos”).

Discourse Practice

From lines 373 to 376 I drew on the discourse of music and images of Mexico City which helped me shape my identity as a Mexican and woman of color who knows about the music and images of Mexico City. In line 377, I drew on this discourse as well.
as on the discourse of youth and dancing. In the following line, I drew on the discourses of music and images of Mexico City, Spanish literacy and culture and English speakership. In line 379, Julie confirmed my identity as a woman of color who knew about music and images of Mexico City, who also spoke English and who was the instructor of Spanish literacy and culture. At the same time, Julie shaped her identity as a White woman and a learner of Spanish literacy and culture. However, upon responding to Student 1 in line 381 (“you watch it you sing it right”), Julie confirmed the identity of Student 1 as a White woman, a native speaker of English who resisted learning about Spanish literacy and culture and about the music and images of Mexico City. Additionally, Julie shaped her identity as a White woman and a native speaker of English who also resisted learning about Spanish literacy and culture particularly the music and images of Mexico City. These identities of Student 1 and Julie were confirmed by Student 2, Students 3, Student 4, Student 5, and Student 6. At the same time these students enacted the discourses of White women and native speakers of English who resisted learning about Spanish literacy and culture as well as music and images of Mexico City.

In line 383, I attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color, a Spanish native speaker and instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, but I struggled with the discourses the group of student participants enacted. I tried again to maintain my identity again as a woman of color, a Spanish native speaker who liked dancing and instructor of Spanish literacy and culture by clicking on the web link of the song’s video and saying “a ver es la misma canción es la misma canción” in line 388. In line 389, I said “what no toda porque es muy larga 10 minutos no pero es el video” and I enacted the identity of a
Spanish native speaker, a woman of color who was an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture and a speaker of English as a second language. In line 390 ("a ver chicas ah no perdón"), I took the identity of a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a Spanish native speaker who was responding to the resistance I found in some students. At the same time, I enacted the identity of an apologetic woman. In line 391, I shaped my identity as a young woman of color who knew about music and images of Mexico City and who also liked dancing ("es que eso se oía en las discotecas en México bailaban").

In line 392, I returned to the discourses of Spanish literacy and culture, Spanish native speakership, resistance to learning Spanish literacy and culture. These discourses helped me shape my identity as Spanish native speaker, a woman of color and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who responded to resistance to learning Spanish literacy and culture ("listas"). In line 393, I enacted the discourses of a Spanish native speaker and a woman of color instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who was apologetic ("okay okay perdón perdón"). Similar to seconds earlier, none of these positioning were confirmed or acknowledged by student participants. In line 394, Julie attempted to shape her identity as a woman native speaker of English who resisted learning Spanish literacy and language ("start singing"). In the last line, I attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who was interested in music and images of Mexico City. With the words "ahora sí chicos" (now yes guys), I confirmed part of Julie’s identity as she also wanted me to sing. The fact that student participants started singing also confirmed my attempted identity.
Second Segment: “Thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right” (Roberta)

29’52” to 31’21” (lines 400–435)

Once the song’s lyrics started, some student participants began to sing the song. The singing signaled the beginning of IU 7 which was the last interactional unit of the second phase of the focal lesson. In this IU, Anastasia, Alexa, Elsa, Julie, Ethan, and Sonia were singing the song. I was following the song’s rhythm with some body movements. While these participants were singing, Cathy was not. First, she was looking at the video images and then, she started looking at her handout. I sang a part of some lines as a way to encourage students to sing. When the first verse ended, I said “okay bien” (okay good) emphatically to motivate them. Sonia, Elsa, and other student participants were giggling in a low voice. While students were singing the chorus, I said “no escucho” (I do not hear) and touched my ear lobe. These actions signaled that I wanted students to sing louder. They did. After singing for almost 70 seconds, I walked to the computer lectern. Once at the lectern, I smiled and look at the video camera and said “10 minutos” (10 minutes) and moved my head to say no. With these actions, I signaled that the song was too long and that I was going to stop the video in the following seconds. After my words, Julie said “cinco cinco minutos” (five five minutes) with an amusing tone of voice. I looked and smiled at Julie. It was very likely that Julie knew that I was going to the music. I repeated what Julie said and moved my head again to signal that I was going to stop the video. However, I said “okay” in a low voice and let the video play for a few seconds more. Then, I moved my hand to indicate that I wanted
students to continue singing. The students’ voices were low and I sang the first part of each line. Cathy and Lillian were not singing. Lillian was giving her back to the class and to me while Cathy turned her head to look at the images projected on the screen. When the chorus ended, I clapped and looked at the students who were in front of me. I also turned my head to my right side and looked at Roberta and Kate. Immediately after this moment, the second segment starts.

In this segment, I encouraged student participants to go to ELLA (the college’s electronic learning arena) to continue practicing their Spanish (“okay práctica ELLA”). Then, I signaled the start of a new class activity by saying “okay” with an emphatic tone of voice. However, Julie said to the instructor: “you’re a groover”. I did not understand Julie’s comment. Mainly, I did not know the meaning of the adjective “groover”. For this reason, I did not respond to Julie or to Student 1 who repeated it in a lower voice. I continued with the idea that singing and/or listening to music was a good way to practice Spanish (“es buena práctica”). After Cathy said that she would laugh (“I would laugh”), Julie used English to asked me if she could sing the song “me voy”.

Student participants were familiar with this song because they sang it the week before the academic break. I seemed to not understand Julie’s question and thus, I asked her to repeat it. Julie asked again if she could sing the song (“Can I sing me voy”). Then, she explained that she had the song in her mind and that it was one of the ring tones of her cellular phone. Her comments triggered the participation of Students 3 and Cathy who did not believe her. Since I did not respond, Cathy and Student 2 encouraged Julie to play the song.
Similar to the first segment, I used “a ver” (okay) to call for students’ attention. Then, I said “la cantan” (all of you sing it) with which I showed my agreement but, like in the first segment, I conditioned the fact that Julie played the song with students’ singing it. After these words, Julie was unable to play the song from her cellular phone (“Why is it not playing?”). While Julie was trying to fix the problem, Student 4 asked when student participants decided that Julie played the song (“when do we say this?”). At that moment, I started to talk about the singer of “me voy” and seconds later Julie played the song. When it ended, Roberta ironically thanked Julie by saying “thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right”. Student 5 said “okay never the last” and I repeated my belief that music was a good way to learn Spanish.

Overall, this segment shows that at the beginning of the segment, Julie and I co-constructed a subtle attack that was directed towards me (“you are a groover”). Additionally, it shows that I supported Julie throughout the segment and did not support Roberta when she ironically told her that everything was going to be all right. Indeed, the analysis of the interaction between Roberta and Julie suggests that they co-constructed a microaggression that was directed to Julie (“thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Okay (. ) práctica ELLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okay (. ) practice ELLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students & Ethan: *Sure*

Instructor: Okay

Julie: *You’re a groover*

Students: *(laugh)*

Student 1: *(You are a groover)*

Instructor: Práctica ELLA (. ) muy bien chicos (. ) ↑*es buena práctica *↑
Practice ELLA (. ) very good guys (. ) ↑*it is a good practice *↑

Cathy: *I would laugh*

Julie: *Can I sing me voy*↑

Instructor: mmm↑

Julie: *Can I sing me voy*↑

Student 2: *(It is always stuck in my head all the time)*

Students: *(Yeah)*
Julie:  

*It is my ring tone on my ring tones*

Student 3:  

*No (.) it is not*

Cathy:  

*No (.) it is not*

Student 2:  

*Oh yes*

Instructor:  

*Julieta Venegas*

Julie:  

*I couldn’t get it out of my head*

Instructor:  

*Lo que lo que (.) ¦*

*What is what is(.) ¦*

Julie:  

*Can I just play it↑ It’s really short*

Student 2:  

*Yeah (.) do it!*  

Cathy:  

*Just do it!*  

Instructor:  

*A ver (.) la cantan↑*

*Okay (.) but all of you sing it↑*

Julie:  

*(II) Why is it not playing↑*

Student 4:  

*When do we say this↑*

Julie:  

*I am not kidding I cannot get it out of my head*
Instructor: <Julietas Venegas es una cantante mexicana muy famosa>
<Julieta Venegas is a very famous Mexican singer>

Instructor: <En España también Julieta Venegas>
<In Spain too Julieta Venegas>

Instructor: <Está su página web oficial esta me voy>
<Her official web site is it is the song “I am going way”>

Roberta: Thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right

Student 5: Okay never the last

Instructor: *Muy bien*
*Very good*

Instructor: Ah ↑ la música es bueno (.) es una forma de aprender
Ah ↑ music is good (.) it is a way to learn

Instructor: Julieta Venegas (.) no sé (.) Belanova
Julieta Venegas (.) I do not know (.) Belanova

Instructor: Es una forma de aprender (.) el idioma (.) muy bien (.)
It is a way to learn (.) the language (.) very good (.)
Analysis of Theoretical Tools

After student participants and I finished singing the song’s verse, I walked to the computer lectern. At the same time, I clapped to congratulate the class for having sung the song. Once I stood at the computer lectern, in line 400, I emphatically said “okay” with which I signaled that the activity was over and another one was about to start. After a barely noticed pause, I said “práctica ELLA”. All these words were said emphatically because the music was still playing. While saying “práctica ELLA”, I also looked quickly at the students who were in front of me and at my right hand side. Then, I looked at the computer screen. My left arm was pointing to the projector screen. These actions signaled that I believed that the students who particularly the ones who were in front of me and at my right hand side could practice their Spanish by singing the songs I uploaded in ELLA.

In line 401, Ethan and other student participants responded “sure”. Even though it was a word that showed agreement with the instructor, their voice tone signaled irony. After these students’ response, some students giggled. These giggles signaled that they were aware of the ironic tone and that it was likely that they would not practice Spanish with the songs that I had uploaded in ELLA. In the following line, I said “okay” and at the same time, I stopped the video clip. I also moved my hands. These actions indicated that I was going to start a different activity.

In line 403 Julie said “you’re a groover”. She said the last part of the word not only using a different tone but also in a slower speed mainly because at that moment, I was turning my head to look at Julie. Julie’s comment triggered laughs on the part of
some students (line 404) and a repetition by Student 1 who said it in a slower and lower voice. Once Student 1 finished saying “you are a groover”, she giggled. The laughs and the repetition by Student 1 overlapped. Since the light was still off, it was unclear to see who Student 1 was. At that moment I was smiling and was walking toward the computer lectern. I looked at my left hand side where Julie was seated. It is important to say that I did not understand what Julie had said basically because it was the first time I heard the adjective “groover”. However, I thought that “groover” meant funny (line 405). As the video recording shows, I encouraged students again to sing the songs I had uploaded in ELLA by saying “práctica ELLA muy bien chicos es buena práctica.” After this, I extended my arms and moved them up and down as if I wanted students to calm down (line 406).

Line 406 is divided into three parts. In the first part, I repeated what I said in line 400 (“práctica ELLA”). After a brief pause, I said emphatically “muy bien chicos” (very good guys). Finally, I made another barely noticed pause I said emphatically “es buena práctica” (it is a good practice). There was a rising intonation at the beginning and at the end of this short sentence. While I was saying it, I looked at the students who were in front of me. Even though these actions helped me hold the conversation floor, the lack of a different action on my part made Cathy said in English “I would laugh”. Cathy’s words and voice tone made me turn to look at her. At that moment, Cathy covered her head with her left arm. She also turned her head to look at Lillian (line 407).

In line 408, Julie asked in English “Can I sing Me voy” with a rising intonation at the end. “Me voy” (I am going away) was the first song that student participants listened
to in the elementary Spanish class section 04. They heard and sang part of this song a week earlier when they were introduced to the irregular verb “ir” (to go). After Julie’s question, I leaned forward and said “mmm” with a rising intonation at the end (line 409). These actions signaled that I wanted Julie to repeat the question because I did not listen or did not understand it. In line 410, Julie repeated “Can I sing me voy”. This action was followed by laughs and reactions by some of her classmates which overlapped in lines 411 and 412. In line 411, Student 2 said in English “[the song] it is always stuck in my head all the time” and giggled afterwards. At the same time, some students said “yeah” while Anastasia, Sonia, Alexa and Elsa were smiling (line 412). After hearing these reactions to her question, Julie explained why she wanted to sing the song in line 413. First she said that the song was her ring tone. Indeed, she repeated this idea (“it is my ring tone on my ring tones”). At that moment, the camera man turned on the light. Julie’s affirmation that she had the song as one of her ring tones triggered comments by two of her classmates which overlapped in lines 414 and 415. Student 3 and Cathy said “no it is not”. However, Cathy said it louder and in a tone that signaled disbelief. Then, Cathy turned to look at Julie. This action signaled that Cathy wanted Julie to confirm that the song was her ring tone. In line 416, Student 2 said emphatically “oh yes” and clapped slowly three times. These actions could signal irony as this topic attracted the attention of some students. While this was happening, Julie was looking in her backpack for her cellular phone and Sonia and Elsa were talking with other students in a low voice.

In line 417, I said “Julieta Venegas”. By mentioning the singer’s name, I signaled my support to Julie so that she played the song. The tone of my voice signaled knowledge about what Julie was talking about. While I was saying this, Julie found her cellular
phone. Once Julie had her cellular phone in her hand, she started looking for the ring tone. She also explained again why she wanted to play the song. In line 418, she said “I couldn’t get it out of my head”. This claim overlapped with my words in line 419 “lo que lo que” (what what). My choice of these words signaled that I was going to say something about the Mexican singer. At this moment, my voice was low and there were other student participants who were also talking in a low voice.

In line 420, Julie asked me again if she could play the song “Can I just play it it is really short”. While she was saying this, she was also looking at her cellular phone. Her words highlighted three aspects: First, she really wanted to play the song instead of singing it as she had mentioned in lines 408 and 410. Second, she used the adjective “just” and the adverb “really” which showed that she was aware that she was taking time from class. Third, she expected a direct answer from me. After hearing Julie’s question, Student 2 and Cathy participated again and encouraged Julie to play the song. Their responses overlapped again in lines 421 and 422. Student 2 said “yeah do it” while Cathy, in a firmer voice, said “Just do it”. Since Julie had the support of some of her classmates, I signaled my agreement in a way that was similar to what I did in the first segment. That is, I said “a ver” (okay) and after a barely noticed pause, I added “la cantan” (all of you sing it) with a rising intonation at the end. With the phrase “a ver”, I tried to attract students’ attention. With the words “la cantan” and I conditioned my agreement to Julie’s song playing to students’ singing.

In line 424, and after a noticeable pause, Julie did not succeed in playing the song. She suggested that there was something wrong with her cellular phone. She asked “why is
“it not playing” with emphasis on the first and last word and a rising intonation at the end.

In line 425, Student 4 asked when students agreed on Julie playing a song with a rising intonation at the end (“when do we say this”). While Student 4 asked the question, the song could be heard from Julie’s cellular phone which she put on her desk so that the whole class could hear it. At that moment, there was silence in the classroom.

In line 426, and similar to line 418, Julie said that she could not get the song out of her hand (“I am not kidding I cannot get it out of my head”). By saying “I am not kidding”, Julie signaled that she really liked the song. While Julie was saying that, Alexa and Anastasia were smiling. Then, in line 427, I mentioned that the song’s singer was a very famous Mexican singer (“Julieta Venegas es una cantante mexicana muy famosa”). While I was saying this, I was leaning on my left hand side and looking at Julie. These actions signaled my support to Julie’s actions. In line 428, I added that the Mexican singer was also very famous in Spain (“en España también Julieta Venegas”). While I was referring to Spain, I emphasized the adverb too (“también”) and looked at the camera man. At that moment, Cathy and Lillian were talking and Lillian was looking at the screen.

In line 429, I took the opportunity to remind student participants that there was a link to the singer’s official website in ELLA. This means that students could go to the singer’s website and looked for the song “me voy” (“está su página web oficial esta me voy”) and that the link to this website was also in ELLA. I used my index finger, I nodded and then, I started to walk to the computer lectern. Cathy and Lillian continued talking in low voices. After these actions, Roberta, who was at the other side of the semi-
circle, thanked Julie for having played the song. With a clear voice and an ironic tone, she said “thank you ’cause now it’s going to be all right”. The emphasis on “all” probably highlighted how important the song was for Julie, but not for Roberta. After hearing this, some students laughed and Roberta and I smiled. In line 431, Student 5 said “okay never the last” that could show some support (or not) to Roberta’s words.

In line 432, I took the conversational floor and said “muy bien” (very good). These words signaled that I disregarded Roberta and Student 5’s comment and that I was going to start another class activity. In line 433, I used an interjection (“ah”) with emphasis and a rising intonation at the end to attract students’ attention. Then, I said that music was a good way to learn (“la música es buena es una forma de aprender”). While I was saying this, I elongated the vowel “e” of the word “buena” (good) and the vowel “o” of the word “forma” (way) to emphasize my belief about music and language learning. I also looked at Roberta and at the students who were seated in front of her mainly Alexa, Sonia and Elsa. With these actions, I let Roberta know that I supported Julie. At that moment, Lillian and Cathy stopped talking.

In line 434, I captured the students’ attention by repeating the singer’s name (“Julieta Venegas”). Then, I made a barely noticed pause and said “no sé” (I don’t know) with which I signaled that there were other singers with whom they could practice Spanish. At that moment, I turned to look at Julie and Cathy and moved her hands to attract Cathy and Lillian’s attention because Cathy was untangling her bracelet and yawning while Lillian had put her notebook on the instructor’s desk. Finally, in the last part of line 434, I said “Belenova” which was the name of the Mexican trio whose song
we sang a few minutes earlier. In the last line, I repeated that music was a good way to learn ("es una forma de aprender"). Then, I made a brief pause and said “el idioma” (the language) with which I referred to the Spanish language. At the end, I made another brief pause and said “muy bien” (very good). While I was speaking, I also moved my hands and looked at the students who were in front of me. My voice tone and the fact that I turn to the teacher’s desk and took my steno pad signaled that I was going to initiate another class activity.

In this segment there are many initiations and two conversational structures that were specific of this classroom setting. In line 400, I initiated an I-R structure (“okay práctica ELLA”) which was responded by some students and Ethan in line 401 (“Sure”). Then, Julie and I initiated two structures. In line 402, I said “okay” whereas in line 403 Julie said “you’re a groover”. Unlike my initiation, Julie’s initiation was followed with laughs by some students (line 404). At the same time, Student 1 gave a positive evaluation of Julie’s words by repeating what Julie said in line 405. Line 406 shows an I-E-E conversational structure. That is, even though the line started with an initiation, it continued with two evaluations (“práctica ELLA(.) muy bien chicos (. ) ↑*es buena práctica*↑”). In line 407, Cathy responded with “*I would laugh*”.

In line 408, Julie initiated the interaction when she asked me if she could sing the song “Me voy”. I responded “mmm” in line 409 and Julie asked again if she could sing the song in line 410. With her question, Julie initiated another interaction. Lines 411 and 412 exemplified responses given by Student 2 and other students with which they supported Julie’s request to sing the song. These responses overlapped. Once Julie heard
these students’ comments, she gave some feedback as to why she wanted to sing it (“it is my ring tone on my ring tones”) in line 413. This information made Student 3, Cathy and Student 2 respond. Their responses overlapped (lines 414-416).

Then, I initiated an interaction in line 417 (“Julieta Venegas”). However, in line 418, Julie initiated another interaction by mentioning again why she was interested in playing the song (“I couldn’t get it out of my head”). Julie’s words overlapped with my words “lo que lo que” in line 419 which signaled my attempt to initiate an interaction about the singer and the song. After my initiation, Julie started another interaction related to question to me about whether she could play the song or not in line 420 (“Can I just play it? it is really short”). This question made Student 2 and Cathy participate again. Similarly to their responses in lines 415 and 416, the responses overlapped in lines 421 (“Yeah do it”) and 422 (“Just do it”). In line 423, I responded Julie’s question by saying “a ver” and then by asking students to sing it (“la cantan*”). After this response, Julie initiated another interaction in line 424 when she announced that she was having problems with her cellular phone (“why is it not playing”). After this, Student 4 initiated another interaction in line 425 by asking when classroom participants decided that Julie was going to play the song (“when do we say this†”). This initiation made Julie initiate another interaction by saying “I am not kidding I cannot get it out of my head” in line 426. From lines 427 to 429, I gave a positive evaluation of Julie’s words mainly because they supported my idea that music was an important resource for learning Spanish.

From lines 430 to 432, there is an I-R-E structure. Roberta initiated an interaction in line 430 (“thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right). In line 431, Student 5
responded with an “okay never the last” whereas I participated with an evaluation in line 432 (“muy bien”). There is an initiation and a response in lines 433 and 434. Finally, line 435 shows an I-R-E. That is, there is an initiation (“es una forma de aprender”), a response (“el idioma”) and an evaluation (“muy bien”).

In terms of the themes constructed by the participants in this segment of language activity, six themes were identified: 1) Spanish literacy and culture, 2) Instructor’s identity, 3) Resistance to Spanish literacy and culture, 4) Music of Mexico, 5) Resistance to music of Mexico, and 6) Julie’s identity. I introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture in the first line as I referred to the practice of Spanish by going to ELLA. Then, upon responding ironically, Ethan and some students introduced the theme of Resistance to Spanish literacy and culture in line 401 (“sure”). I re-introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture in line 402 by saying “okay”. In line 403, Julie introduced the theme that was related to my identity as a woman instructor when she said “you’re a groover”. Some students (line 404) and Student 1(line 405) continued this theme.

In line 406, I re-introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture when I encouraged students to practice Spanish (“práctica ELLA muy bien chicos es buena práctica”). This theme did not continue because Cathy re-introduced the theme of resistance to Spanish literacy and culture in line 405 (“I would laugh”). In line 408 Julie asked if she could sing “Me voy” and thus, she re-introduced the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico. These themes prevailed from line 409 to 413 with the participation of Julie (line 410, line 413), Student 2 (line 411), some students (line 412) and I (line 409). In the following three lines, Students 3, Cathy and Student 2
re-introduced the themes of resistance to Spanish literacy and culture and resistance to music of Mexico. In line 417, I said “Julieta Venegas” and thus, I re-introduced the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico. These themes continued from line 417 to 420. In lines 421 and 422 Student 2 and Cathy re-introduced the themes of resistance to Spanish literacy and culture and resistance to music of Mexico when they told Julie to play the song. In line 423, I re-introduced the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico when I said “A ver la cantan”. These themes continued in the following line as Julie wanted to know why the song was not playing (“Why is it not playing”). In line 425, Student 4 questioned Julie’s actions by asking “when do we say this”. Thus, this student re-introduced the themes of Resistance to Spanish literacy and culture and Resistance to music of Mexico. After this, Julie re-introduced the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico in line 426. These themes continued until line 429 through the interaction between Julie and me.

In line 430, Roberta ironically thanked Julie for playing the song and told her that everything was going to be all right. With these words, Roberta introduced the theme of Julie’s identity mainly her possible view of Julie as a White language learner and an English native woman who focused on things such as the ring tones of her cellular phone in a language class. In the following line, Student 5 said “okay never the last” with which she could have supported Roberta’s comment. After this participation, I re-introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture as I said “muy bien” (very good) in line 432. In the following line, I continued with this theme when I insisted on my idea that music was a good way to learn (“ah la música es buena es una forma de aprender”). In line 434, I provided two examples of music which are Mexican and with which students were
somewhat familiar (“Julieta Venegas no sé Belanova”). Consequently, not only did I continue with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture but I re-introduced the theme of music of Mexico. Finally, in line 435, I ended this segment with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture when I repeated her idea that music was a good way to learn a language (“es una forma de aprender el idioma muy bien”).

Regarding the intertextual links co-constructed in this segment, I proposed an intertextual link in line 400 and introduced a new theme (Spanish literacy and culture). Ethan and some students acknowledged my comment. Their ironic tone helped them introduce the theme of Resistance to Spanish literacy and culture. In line 402, I proposed another link related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture by saying “okay”. However, Julie proposed another link in the following line by saying to the instructor “you’re a groover”. Julie’s link was acknowledged and recognized by some students who laughed in line 404 and by Student 1 who, in line 405, repeated what Julie had said.

In line 406, I proposed another intertextual link (“práctica ELLA muy bien chicos es buena práctica”) and Cathy acknowledged this when saying “I would laugh”. With these words, Cathy re-introduced the theme of Resistance to Spanish literacy and culture. In line 408, Julie proposed an intertextual link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico when she asked if she could sing the song “Me voy”. I recognized and acknowledged this link when I asked Julie to repeat her question in line 409. In the following line, Julie repeated the question she asked and thus, she proposed the link again. Julie’s link was acknowledged and recognized by some students and by Student 2 in line 411 and line 412. They were also aware of the social consequences of
supporting Julie’s request. The fact that their responses overlapped helped strengthen the position of these two students as well as diminish the possibility of a negative response by me. Julie proposed another intertextual link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico in line 413 when she explained that the song was the ring tone of the cellular. In lines 414, 415 and 416, Student 3, Cathy and Student 2 acknowledged the link proposed by Julie. Thus, they continued with the themes of proposed another link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico. as they did not believe that the song was one of her ring tones. In line 417, I proposed another link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico. In line 418, Julie proposed another link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico when she said “I couldn’t get it out of my head”. After this link, I proposed a link related to the themes of Spanish language literacy and culture and music of Mexico in line 419. Julie proposed another link in the following line. Her link was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico because she asked if she could only play the song which was really short (“Can I just play it it’s really short”).

This link was acknowledged and recognized by some of her classmates such as Student 2 (line 421) and Cathy (line 422) who encouraged Julie to play the song. These student participants were aware of the consequences of speaking in English and telling Julie to play the song. They were also aware that their overlapped responses strengthen their position. Indeed, I acknowledged and recognized Julie’s question when I said “a ver la cantan” in line 423. After this recognition, Julie proposed another link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music in Mexico in line 424 when she asked
“why is it not playing”. This question was not acknowledged nor recognized. Instead, Student 4 proposed a link related to the resistance to Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico in line 425 when she asked “when do we say this”. After these words, Julie played the song. With these actions, she proposed another link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico. From lines 427 to 429, I acknowledged and recognized Julie’s actions and thus, I continued with the theses of Spanish literacy and language and culture and music of Mexico.

In line 430, Roberta proposed a link related to Julie’s student identity when she said “thank you ‘cause now it’s going to be all right”. This link was acknowledged and recognized by Student 5 who said “okay never the last”. From line 432 to line 435, I proposed several intertextual links related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico.

Discourse Practice

I tried to shape my identity as a woman of color, a native speaker of Spanish and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture several times at the beginning of the segment such as in lines 400, 402 and 406. However, Ethan and some students in line 401 (“sure”), Julie in line 403 (“you’re a groover”) and Cathy in line 407 (“I would laugh”) acknowledged these aspects of my identity. At the same time, these students shaped their identities as White native speakers of English. In addition, Ethan and Cathy shaped their identities as students who resisted learning Spanish literacy and culture. When Julie said “you’re a groover” her tone of voice and the change at the end of the last word signaled
that she was referring to the idea that I was a goofy instructor. Julie’s intention to shape my identity as a cool person in a mocking manner was successful as some students (line 404) and Student 1 (line 405) supported Julie’s claim. Julie’s attempts to shape her identity in lines 408 and 410 as a White woman and a native speaker of English who was learning Spanish literacy and culture and who was interested in music of Mexico (e.g. singing a Mexican song) were successful mainly because of my action in line 409 (“mmm”), Student 2 in line 411 (“it is always stuck in my head all the time”) and some students in line 412 (“yeah”) supported these aspects of Julie’s identity.

Julie attempted to shape her identity in a similar way in line 413. However, Student 3, Cathy and Student 2 in lines 414, 415 and 416 did not confirm it. Instead, they shaped their identities as White women who were native speakers of English and who resisted learning Spanish literacy and culture and music of Mexico.

Julie and I interacted from line 417 to line 420. In lines 417 and 419 I tried to shape my identity as a Spanish native speaker, a woman of color, and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who knew about music of Mexico. In line 418 and 420, Julie attempted to shape her identity as an English native speaker, a White woman learner of Spanish literacy and culture who was interested in music of Mexico. In this struggle, Julie’s identity was confirmed by Student 2 (line 421), Cathy (line 422), and me (line 423).

In line 424 Julie attempted to position herself again as a native speaker of English, a White woman learner of Spanish literacy and culture who was interested in playing (rather than singing) a Spanish song. However, she was unsuccessful as Student 4 in line
425 positioned herself as a native speaker of English, a White woman who resisted learning Spanish literacy and culture and Music of Mexico. After this, Julie (line 426) and I (lines 427, 428 and 429) struggled to shape our identities. Similar to our previous interaction, Julie was interested in seeing herself as a native speaker of English, a White woman learner of Spanish literacy and culture who was also interested in playing a Spanish song. Regarding my identity, I insisted on be seen as a native speaker of Spanish, a woman of color and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who knew about music of Mexico.

In line 430, Roberta attempted to shape her identity as a White woman native speaker of English and a Spanish language learner who challenged Julie’s identity as a White woman learner interested in playing a Spanish song from her cellular phone. This identity was confirmed by Student 5 in line 431. However, this confirmation was momentary because I attempted to shape my identity as a native speaker of Spanish, a woman of color and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who knew about music of Mexico and promoted the link between language learning and music (line 433-435).

Third Segment: “Viajan ustedes” (Do all of you travel?) (The Instructor)

31’22” to 34’11” (lines 436-486)
Whereas the two previous segments took place in the second phase of the focal lesson, this segment occurred in the third phase entitled “On Vacation” (De vacaciones) particularly in the first IU entitled “Tengo tres preguntas” (I have three questions).

In this literacy event, I introduced the theme of the fifth lesson unit which was “On Vacation” (De Vacaciones). I asked participants three questions. In these three questions, I used the verb to travel (viajar). These questions were: “quiénes viajan” (who travels in here?), 2) “A dónde viajan” (where do all of you travel to?), and 3) “Cómo viajan” (How do all of you travel?). After asking the first question “quiénes viajan” (who travels in here?), none of the student participants answered it. Student 1 and Julie answered and through their answers I realized that I needed to change the question. Consequently, I asked “viajan ustedes” (do all of you travel?). After hearing answers from student participants, I started to ask “viajas” (do you travel?) which was a yes/no question to each of the 10 student participants.

I started by asking Lillian and Cathy who were on my left hand side. Both of them said no. After I heard Cathy, I realized that both of them decided to answer negatively. Then, I asked Anastasia, the Ghanese student, who also said “no”. After hearing her answer, I asked her if she took short trips (“viajecitos no”) and she answered negatively. Then, I asked Julie who had been raising her hand since I started asking questions. Not only did she respond affirmatively but promptly. Since it was the first affirmative question I received, I asked Julie the second question (“adónde viajas”) and she responded that she had traveled to Vermont. After asking Julie, I decided to ask the question to the student participants who were at my right hand side. Thus, I turned to my
right hand side and I asked Roberta if she traveled (“viajas”). Roberta made a mistake when she answered. Instead of saying “no viajo” (I do not travel), Roberta said “no viejo” which means not old or not an old man. After hearing a different word from the one I expected, I corrected Roberta in a low voice. After Roberta, I asked Kate and Ethan who also responded negatively. Once I asked the question to the student participants who were at my right hand side, I asked the students who were seated in front of me. Elsa answered affirmatively and for this reason, I asked her where she had traveled to. She answered that she traveled to her home town which was two hours from Woodbridge College. After Elsa, I asked Sonia, the student from Nepal, who answered negatively (“no viajo”). Once I heard Sonia’s answer, I repeated it and imitated her voice tone and speed which were low and slow. Finally, I asked Alexa who answered “no viajo” (I do not travel) in a very low voice.

In what follows attention focuses on the interactions I had with Anastasia, Sonia, and Roberta. I suggest that the interaction that Anastasia and I shaped together exemplifies a microaggression I directed towards Anastasia (lines 461-464). Similar suggestion I make about the interaction that Sonia and me co-constructed. I perceive that I directed a microaggression towards Sonia (lines 480-483). In terms of the interaction Roberta and I co-constructed, I suggest that I directed a subtle attack towards Roberta (lines 469-472).
Line  Speaker  Message Unit
#
436  Instructor:  ↑Pero bueno ↑Por qué no volvemos un poco (.)<aVistas>(.)
            *uhh*↑(.) *uhh*↑
            ↑But well ↑Why don’t we return a little (.)<toVistas>(.) *uhh*↑(.)
            *uhh*↑
437  Instructor:  Volvemos a *Vistas y volvemos a la lección 5*
            We return to *Vistas and we return to lesson 5*
438  Instructor:  >Entonces hoy< vamos a empezar la lección 5 chicos y es ↑(.)
            >So today< we are starting lesson 5 and it is ↑(.)
439  Instructor:  Vamos a hablar un poquito de las va-ca-cio-nes
            We are going to talk a little about [the topic of] taking a va-ca-tion
440  Instructor:  La lección 5 es va-ca-cio-nes (.). ehh entonces ehh I okay
            Lesson five is about taking a va-ca-tion (.). ehh so ehhh I okay
441  Instructor:  *Mientras está el CD ↑(.) la pregunta es ↑
            *While the CD is ready ↑(.) the question is ↑
442  Instructor:  Yo tengo tres preguntas (.). una pregunta es ↑ III
            I have three questions (.). one question is ↑ III
443  Instructor:  Y otra pregunta es ↑*I también.
            And another question is ↑*I also.
And another question is *I also.*

444 Instructor: Saben el verbo viajar ↑ Qué es viajar ↑
You know (the meaning of) the verb viajar ↑ What is viajar ↑

445 Student 1: Travel
446 Instructor: To travel (.)

447 Instructor: La pregunta es (.quiénes viajan (.)) aquí↑ quiénes viajan I
The question is (. who travels (.)) here↑ who travels I

448 Instructor: I quiénes viajan
I who travels
449 Student 1: Who travels

450 Instructor: Quiénes
Who
451 Student 1: Who

452 Instructor: Who quiénes viajan aquí
Who who travels in here

453 Julie: Los estudiantes
Students (travel)
Yes (.) do all of you travel↑

No sí
No yes

>Do you travel Lillian↑<

No

>Do you travel Cathy↑<

Sss no
Yyy no

You don’t travel (.) Anastasia

No

[Do you take] short trips (.) ∥ no.

No

Si
Yes

466 Instructor: >Dónde a dónde viajas<
>Where Where do you travel to<

467 Julie: A Vermont
To Vermont

468 Instructor: A Vermont () no ↑
To Vermont () no ↑

469 Instructor: Roberta viajas ↑ (.)
η no ↑
Roberta do you travel ↑ ()
η no ↑

470 Roberta: No () r <no viejo”>
No () r<no old man”>

471 Instructor: L no viajo
L I don’t travel

472 Instructor: Viajo() *viajo*
I travel (.) *I travel*

473 Instructor: Kate viajas↑
Kate:  do you travel↑

Instructor:  *No*

Ethan:  *No viajo (.)
I do not travel (.)

Instructor:  *No* Elsa viajas↑
*No* Elsa do you travel↑

Elsa:  Si en Northborough (.)  Northborough Mass
Yes in Northborough (.)  Northborough Mass

Instructor:  Northborough Massachusetts okay (.) Sonia↑
Northborough Massachusetts okay (.) Sonia↑

Sonia:  *No viajo*(.)
*I do not travel *(.)

Instructor:  *Muy bien  <laughs>
*Very good  <laughs>
Analysis of the Theoretical Tools

In line 436, I leaned on the computer lectern. I had her steno pad on my left hand. I raised my voice pitch to say “pero bueno” (but well) with an emphasis on the second word which helped me get students’ attention. I continued with this pitch and asked student participants “por qué no volvemos un poco” (Why don’t we return a little to) with which I signaled that the next class activity was not related to the previous ones. There are two important aspects about this question. First, I included myself in the activity by using the first person plural (“volvemos”) and I used the adverb “un poco” (a little) which constructed the idea that we were going to do the activity for a short period of time. While I was asking this question, I was looking at the students who were at my right hand side such as Roberta and Kate. Up to this point, my talk was slow. After a barely noticed
pause, I said “Vistas” which was the name of the textbook. While I was saying this word, I looked at the students who were at my left hand side mainly Lillian and Cathy. These actions signaled that I wanted these students to pay attention mainly because the next class activity was going to be about the textbook and thus, it was going to be important. Lillian was looking at me, but Cathy continued untangling her bracelet. After a barely noticed pause, I raised my hands and said “uhh” for the first time with a rising intonation at the end. Then, I made another brief pause and said “uhh” again but in a lower tone. At the same time, I bent my legs as if she were a cheerleader. These actions helped me shape the idea that I believed that the content in the textbook was boring and thus, I had to cheer students up. Then, I turned to my desk, put her steno pad on it and a couple of students giggled and laughed.

In line 437, I said to classroom participants that we were going to review the fifth lesson unit of the textbook (“volvemos a Vistas y volvemos a la lección 5”). While I was saying this, I looked at students who were in front of me and then at the students who were at the right hand side. When she said “Vistas” I changed my voice style. I also emphasized the number of the lesson unit and turned to my left hand side to look at Cathy and Lillian. With these actions, I signaled my intention to make Cathy and Lillian pay attention. However, Lillian was taking out her textbook from her backpack and Cathy continued untangling her bracelet.

In line 438, I repeated to all class participants that we were going to start the fifth lesson unit of the textbook. However, this time, I said faster the first part (“entonces hoy”) and then, in a slower speed I said (“vamos a empezar la lección 5 chicos y es”).
When I was saying this, I emphasized the number 5 and leaned on the computer lectern to move from it seconds later. I also talked to the students who were at her left hand side and in front of me. In line 439, I turned to the desk to take a CD and mentioned the theme of the fifth lesson unit which was taking a vacation (“vamos a hablar un poquito de las va-ca-cio-nes”). While I was saying these words, I held the CD with my left hand and looked at the students who were at my right hand side. Similar to previous lines, I used the first person plural (“vamos”) to highlight my participation in the activity and used the adverb a little (“un poquito”) to signal that we were not going to spend a lot of time in this activity. I also divided the word “vacaciones” into syllables to stress the important of the topic. After I said this word, one student said “yeah” in a very low voice as if she were excited to talk and learn about this topic in Spanish. One other student said “mmm” as if she were less excited about it.

In line 440, I repeated that the topic of lesson five was about taking a vacation. I also emphasized it and divided into syllabus again (“la lección 5 es va-ca-cio-nes”). While I was saying this, I looked at the students who were in front of me and the students who were at my right hand side. Then, I said “ehh entonces ehh I okay” (ehh so ehh I okay) which signaled that I was getting prepared to start the lesson. During these seconds, I walked to the computer lectern and inserted the CD into the computer drive as it had the transparencies (or PDF files) with which I presented the images related to the theme unit. Students knew that the images that they were going see on the screen were also in their textbook. While I was saying this, some students were also getting ready. Some of them were opening their textbooks while other students were talking in a low voice. Lillian and
Cathy also started to talk in low voices and giggled afterwards. Since Lillian was using a wheeled chair, she turned quickly to her left hand side to listen to Cathy.

In line 441, I said that while the CD was ready I was going to ask a question ("mientras está el CD la pregunta es"). I emphasized the words "mientras" (while) and CD. I also said the word CD with a rising intonation at the end. After a barely noticed pause, I emphasized the words "la" (the) and "es" (is) and raised the intonation at the end. While I was saying this, Lillian and Cathy continued talking and giggling in a low voice. Thus, the rising intonation at the end the emphasis on certain words aimed at attracting the students’ attention mainly Lillian and Cathy.

In line 442, I said that I was going to ask them three questions ("yo tengo tres preguntas"). I emphasized the words "yo" (I) and "tres" (three) which helped students understand what I was saying. After a barely noticed pause, I indicated that I was going to ask one of the questions ("una pregunta es"). I emphasized the word "una" (one) and raised the intonation at the end. With these actions, I called students’ attention. Then, I made a long pause and walked to the second blackboard. When I arrived there, I erased the blackboard with my right hand and wrote the first two questions with the other hand. Once I finished erasing, I wrote “quiénes viajan” (who travels?) and below this question I wrote “adónde viajan” (where do you travel to?). After writing the second question, I wrote the preposition “a” (to) and drew a line with which I indicated the way in which the question had to be answered. While I was writing, a student yawned.

In line 443, I referred to the third question and said “y la otra pregunta es” (and another question is también). Similarly to previous message units, I emphasized the first
word “y” (and), the verb “es” (is) and raised the intonation at the end. The voice tone I used in line 441 ended after saying “es” (is). Then, I started to write the question “cómo viajan” (how do you travel?) on the chalkboard. I also indicated the way in which this question had to be answered because I wrote the preposition “en” (by), underlined it, and wrote its English meaning below. I gave the English meaning of this word because I thought that not all the students knew that the preposition “en” which usually means “in” and “on” was also used with means of transport.

In line 444, and once I wrote the three questions on the blackboard, I asked student participants whether they knew the meaning of the verb to travel (“saben el verbo viajar”). This time, I emphasized the verb to know (saben) and raised the intonation at the end of the last word. This intonation shaped the meaning that I was asking them a question. Then, I asked them “qué es viajar” (what is [the meaning of the verb] viajar) with an emphasis on the interrogative word (“qué”) and a rising intonation at the end. While I was asking this, I turned and looked at the class mainly at the students at my right hand side and the ones who were in front of me. In line 445, Student 1 provided the answer “travel” in a low voice. Once I heard the answer, I said the verb in its infinitive form (“to travel”) in line 446 and emphasized the preposition “to” as a way to signal the correct English translation of “viajar” to Student 1.

Line 447 is divided into three parts. First, I said “la pregunta es” (the question is). Then, after a very brief pause, I asked “quiénes viajan” (who travels?). In this part, I emphasized the interrogative word and, at the same time, I pointed to the written form of the question on the blackboard. Finally, and after a second brief pause, I said “aqui
quienes viajan” (who travels here) and made a pause. When I was saying “aqui” (here), I made a movement with my right hand to indicate that I was referring to the group of student participants. I also raised the intonation at the end to signal that I was not making a claim but asking a question and that I expected them to answer it.

In line 448, I made a two-second pause and repeated the question “quiénes viajan” (who travels). In line 449, Student 1, who had answered the same question in line 445, translated my question into English. Thus, Student 1 said “who travels” in a very low voice. Since my question had not been answered, I asked it again in line 450. I only said “quiénes”. Similarly, Student 1 provided the English translation in a very low voice in line 451 (“who”). After hearing that Student 1 gave the English translation to my question for the second time, I acknowledged her answer by repeating it (“who”) at the beginning of line 452. Then, I asked the question for the fourth time (“quiénes viajan aquí”) in the same way I did previously.

In line 453, Julie answered “los estudiantes” (students) in a low voice. After hearing the answer, in line 454, I confirmed it by saying “si” (yes). After a barely noticed pause, I changed the question by asking student participants if they traveled (“viajan ustedes”) with an emphasis on the verb “viajan” and a rising intonation at the end. Unlike my initial question, this question triggered several answers by several student participants and Cathy in line 455. Whereas Cathy said “no”, other student participants responded affirmatively. Two other student participants nodded.

Once I received affirmative answers, I started to ask each student participant whether s/he travel or not (“viajas”). Thus, I turned to her left hand side and asked Lillian
whether she traveled or not (“Lillian viajas”) in line 456. I emphasized the student’s name and finished with a rising intonation at the end. My talk was faster. While I was asking the question, Anastasia was looking at me and Julie was raising her hand to signal her willingness to answer the question. In line 457, Lillian said “no” in a low voice. She covered her mouth with her hand after she answered the question. While Lillian was answering, Julie continued to have her hand up. In line 458, I was surprised by Lillian’s answer because I remembered that Lillian had traveled to other countries. For this reason, I said “no” with a rising intonation at the end to signal surprise.

In line 459, I asked Cathy whether she traveled or not (“Cathy viajas”). Similar to Lillian’s question, my talk was faster. I also emphasized the student’s name and ended her words with a rising intonation at the end. In line 460, Cathy hesitated to respond. She was going to say yes (sí) but she ended saying “no”. While she was giving an answer, Cathy was looking at me. At the same time, Lillian was smiling. Once Cathy responded, she continued untangling her bracelet.

Line 461 is divided into two parts. In the first part, I said “no viajas” without any rising intonation which referred to my realization that Cathy also decided to respond negatively despite the fact that she had mentioned that she traveled to other countries. Then, in the second part of this line, I made a barely noticed pause to ask a question to the next student who was Anastasia, the Black student. In this case, I said Anastasia’s name without any rising intonation at the end or emphasis. Although my voice tone did not signal a question, at the moment I said the student’s name, both of us were looking at each other. Thus, this action helped construct the idea it was Anastasia’s turn to answer a
question. At that moment, Lillian turned her head and looked at Cathy. In line 462, Anastasia said “no” in a very low voice and moved her head to say no at the same time. After hearing another negative answer, I asked her a second question. In line 463, I asked Anastasia whether she took short trips (“víajecitos”). My choice of the word “víajecitos” ([do you take] short trips) confirmed the idea that before this question, I had in mind the idea of long trips (e.g. international trips). After saying “víajecitos”, I made a barely noticed pause to wait for Anastasia’s answer. My talk was faster than Anastasia’s talk. After the pause, I said “no” in an extremely low tone and a stopping fall in her voice tone as if I knew that Anastasia did not take short trips. Then, Anastasia answered “no” in a very low voice. She also moved her head with which she also expressed that she did not take short trips.

After this interaction between Anastasia and me, Julie was certain that she was the next student to be asked a question because she was next to Anastasia. Thus, she emphatically said “sí” (yes) in a clear voice in line 465. Once I heard the first affirmative answer, I asked Julie where she traveled in line 466. That is, I asked where (“dónde”) and then, I emphasized the question where… to (“a dónde viajas”). This question was the second question I wrote on the blackboard. When I asked this question, I emphasized the interrogative word and my talk was faster than in the previous line. In line 467, Julie answered “A Vermont” (To Vermont) in a clear voice. At the moment Julie was responding she had her left hand under her chin.

In line 468, I repeated Julie’s answer (“A Vermont”) and wrote it on the blackboard on the space I had left for students’ answers. Then, I added “no” with a slight
rising intonation at the end which meant that it was a tag question and that I confirmed Julie’s answer. Alexa was next to Julie and after I said “no”, Alexa left her pencil on her desk as if she were getting ready to answer my next question. However, I did not ask Alexa. I asked Roberta who was the first student seated on her right hand side. I usually engaged in this kind of practice because I believe that this helped the class to be ready. Thus, in line 469, I asked Roberta whether she traveled or not (“Roberta viajas”). I said Roberta’s name emphatically with a rising intonation at the end. While I was asking her, I was also looking at her. I made a very short pause to wait for Roberta’s answer. However, after the pause, I said “no” in a low voice. The word “no” can be a signal that shows that, similar to what I did with Anastasia; I assumed that Roberta had not traveled. Since Roberta’s talk was slower than my talk, my “no” was heard before than Roberta’s negative answer (“no”). After this, Roberta made a short pause and took her time to give a complete answer in line 470. While Roberta was giving the complete answer “no viajo” (I do not travel), I was also saying the same words in a very low voice in line 471. In other words, our responses overlapped. However, instead of saying “no viajo”, Roberta said “no viejo” which meant that something was not old or that someone was not an old man. After hearing the answer, I said emphatically the correct answer “viajo” and made a pause afterwards. Then, I repeated “viajo” in a lower tone of voice in line 472.

After asking Roberta, I asked Kate (“Kate viajas”) in line 473. Similar to the previous questions, I said the student’s name with emphasis and said the verb with a rising intonation at the end. After hearing my question, Kate took a couple of seconds to answer and said “no” in line 474. While she was giving the answer, she was also looking at me. In line 475, I repeated the word “no” with a high pitch and a different tone. These
actions signaled that Kate hesitated to say no and that I was surprised by her negative response. Ethan was seated next to Kate. Thus, in line 476, I asked him the same question. However, this time, I just said his name with a rising intonation at the end (“Ethan”). While I was saying his name, Cathy said quickly in a low voice “don’t you” and, in line 477, Ethan gave a negative complete answer (“no viajo”) in a low voice. Consequently, Cathy encouraged Ethan to provide a negative answer and this confirmed that Cathy decided to answer my question negatively.

In line 478, I said “no” in a lower and slow voice which may indicate that I was becoming aware of Cathy’s encouragement. After saying no, I asked Elsa whether she traveled or not (“Elsa viajas”). This question signals my return to my practice of emphasizing the student’s name and finishing with a rising intonation at the end. In line 479, Elsa responded affirmatively (“Sí en Northborough Northborough Mass”). First, Elsa said the adverb yes, and then, similar to Julie, she mentioned her hometown. Since I gestured that she repeated the name, Elsa repeated the name emphatically and added the State’s name.

In line 480, I repeated the town’s name, I said the complete name of the state, and gave Elsa a positive feedback (“Northborough Massachusetts okay”). Afterwards, I made a very short pause to ask Sonia. Similar to what I did with Ethan, I only said her name. However, this time I said it more emphatically (“Sonia”). In line 481, Sonia clearly responded “no viajo” (I don’t travel). Her voice tone was lower and faster than the tone of the rest of student participants. These characteristics made me said “muy bien” (very good) in line 482 which was a very positive feedback. However, my voice tone was
similar to Sonia’s and my talk was faster than hers. After this, I laughed briefly and then, other students laughed too. In line 483, I imitated Sonia’s voice tone and I also repeated our interaction. That is, I said “Sonia viajas no viajo muy bien” (Sonia do you travel I do not travel very good). Once I said the first two words (“Sonia viajas”), I made a pause which helped me introduce Sonia’s answer (“no viajo”). After this, I made another pause which helped me repeat the positive and enthusiastic evaluation I gave Sonia (“muy bien”).

In the last three lines, I asked Alexa who was the last student participant. In line 484, I said her name without any rising intonation at the end (“Alexa”). In line 485, the student answered in a low voice that she did not travel (“no viajo”). In line 486, I repeated the student’s answer “no viajas”. While she was repeating it, I nodded as a way to signal my approval. However, my voice tone signaled that I did not completely believe in the student’s answer mainly because I remembered that she was from the West Coast and thus, she had traveled. Then, I said “muy bien” (very good) in a lower voice with a stopping fall in her voice tone which indicated the end of the first two questions I wanted to ask student participants.

Regarding the turn-taking structure of this segment of language activity, it took me 9 message units to initiate a verbal interaction with student participants. That is, I asked students whether they knew the meaning of the verb “viajar” in line 444. From line 444 to line 446, there was a traditional I-R-E structure between Student 1 and me. In lines 447 and 448, I initiated an interaction and Student 1 answered again in line 449. That is, this interaction had an I-I-R structure. In line 450, I initiated a third interaction with
Student 1. First, I asked “quién” and Student 1 translated my question into English in line 451 (“who”). In line 452, I repeated the answer given by Student 1 which represented an evaluation (“who”) and, at the same time, I initiated another interaction with a question (“quién viajan aquí”). In line 453, Julie answered (“los estudiantes”). Then, in line 454 I evaluated Julie’s answer (“sí”) and initiated another interaction (“viajan ustedes”). The interaction that I initiated in line 454 was followed by a negative and an affirmative answer by some students in line 455 (“no sí”). After this I-R structure, I asked each participant student a question related to whether they traveled or not (“viajas”).

Lines 456 to 458 represented a traditional I-R-E interaction that took place between Lillian and me. Then, I initiated the interaction with Cathy in line 459 and Cathy responded in 460. In line 461, I evaluated Cathy’s answer (“no viajas”) and, at the same time, I initiated my interaction with Anastasia (“Anastasia”). The interaction between Anastasia lasted until line 464 because I asked her a second question which I answered first (“viajecitos no”) and she answered seconds later.

The interaction between Julie and I showed an R-I-R-E structure. This means that Julie initiated the interaction with a response (“sí”) in line 465. This response was followed by my question (“dónde a dónde viajas”) and then a response by Julie (“A Vermont”). Finally, this interaction ended with my evaluation (“A Vermont no”) in line 468. Lines 469 to 472 showed the interaction between Roberta and me. In this case, even though I initiated the interaction in line 469, I responded before Roberta did. Then, in line 470, Roberta responded and while she was giving an answer, I evaluated her answer in line 471 and also in line 472.
After interacting with Roberta, I asked Kate. Our interaction followed a traditional I-R-E structure (lines 473 to 475). I initiated the interaction, Kate answered and I evaluated her answer. The next interaction was between Ethan and me. In this case, I also initiated the interaction by saying Ethan’s name (“Ethan”) and Ethan responded negatively (“no viajo”). However, and similar to my interaction with Cathy, I not only evaluated Ethan’s answer but I also initiated another interaction with Elsa in line 478. After this initiation Elsa, Elsa responded in line 479 and I evaluated her answer in the following line (“Northborough Massachusetts okay”). Similarly, at the end of this line, I initiated an interaction with Sonia by saying her name emphatically (“Sonia”). After this initiation, Sonia responded in line 481 (“no viajo”) and I evaluated her response by saying “muy bien” in line 482. However, after this I-R-E structure, I repeated our interaction in line 483 (“Sonia viajas no viajo muy bien”). Consequently, this line had an I-R-E structure. Finally, the interaction between Alexa and I followed a traditional I-R-E structure from lines 484 to 486.

In terms of the thematic coherence of this segment of language activity, six themes were identified: 1) Spanish literacy and culture, 2) Vacation/Traveling, 3) Resistance, 4) Age, and 5) Race/Class and 6) Gender. I introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture in the first line (“pero bueno por qué no volvemos un poco a Vistas uhh uhh”) and it was present throughout the segment. I also introduced the theme of vacation. It started in line 439 when I said “vamos a hablar un poquito de las va-ca-cio-nes” and it continued in line 440 when I mentioned that it was the theme of lesson 5. The theme of vacation takes the particular shape of traveling or taking trips from line 442 to
Consequently, the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling prevailed in this segment.

The theme of resistance to be a traveler and thus, to do Spanish literacy and culture was introduced by Cathy in line 455 (“no sí”) and it continued in line 457 (“no”), line 460 (“sss no”) and in line 477 (“no viajo”) thanks to the participation of Lillian, Cathy and Ethan respectively. Roberta introduced the theme of age in line 470 when she mistakenly said that she was old or that she was an old man (“no no viejo”). In addition to constructing the themes related Spanish literacy and culture and age, this line shapes an idea related to gender. Lines 482 (“muy bien”) and 483 (“Sonia viajas no viajo muy bien”) uttered by me in my interaction with Sonia are also related to the theme of gender. Indeed, these lines show certain complexity because they continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture but they also shaped beliefs about women’s voices (high/low tone). Finally, line 463 (“viajecitos no”) showed my belief that Anastasia did not take long trips and that she probably did not take short trips either. In line 469 (“Roberta viajas no”) showed my assumption that Roberta, the non-traditional student, did not take any trip either.

In terms of the intertextual links proposed, acknowledged and recognized in this third segment, I proposed a series of intertextual links at the beginning of the segment. From lines 436 to 438, I proposed an intertextual link related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture. In lines 439 and 440, I proposed two intertextual links related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture and the theme of vacation. In lines 442, 443 and 444, I proposed a link related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture and the theme
of traveling. In line 444, I made a verbal request which was acknowledged and recognized by Student 1 in line 445. This woman student was aware of the social consequence of responding to my answer. She was aware that I might have said yes, very good or I might have corrected her. Since I corrected her answer, I only acknowledged it.

In line 447 and 448, I continued making requests related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Again, Student 1 acknowledged and recognized these themes in line 449. Student 1 was aware of the social consequences for translating again my request into English. Since I did not hear the answer I was expecting, I made another request in line 450. In line 451, Student 1 acknowledged, recognized and was aware of my request by translating it into English. In line 452, I acknowledged Student1’s answer, but since it was not the answer I expected I made another request. Julie acknowledged, recognized and was aware of giving me the correct answer in line 453. With her answer, Julie continued with the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. In line 454, I acknowledged and recognized Julie’s answer. I was also aware of the social consequences of giving a positive evaluation. That is, I was aware that Julie could have continued talking or not. In line 455, some participant students acknowledged, recognized and were aware of the social consequence of answering my question both affirmatively and negatively.

I made a request to Lillian in line 456 related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. In line 457, Lillian acknowledged, recognized and was aware of answering my question negatively. Thus, Lillian re-introduced the theme of resistance to traveling and to Spanish literacy and culture. In line 458, I made another intertextual
link to Lillian and in line 459 I made a request to Cathy. Similar to Lillian, Cathy acknowledged, recognized and was aware of the consequences of answering negatively in line 460. Thus, Cathy continued with the themes of resistance to traveling and to Spanish literacy and culture.

In line 461, not only did I realize that Cathy and Lillian had decided to answer negatively but I also proposed an intertextual link to Anastasia. Similar to the links proposed to Cathy and Lillian this link was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. In line 462, Anastasia recognized, acknowledged and was aware of answering my question negatively. Since the answers I had received had been negative, I made another intertextual link to Anastasia in line 463 (“viajecitos no”) in which I probably introduced the theme of race and class. In the following line, Anastasia recognized, acknowledged and was aware of providing a negative answer to my question.

In line 465, Julie provided an affirmative answer. That is, she recognized and acknowledged my question. Julie was also aware of giving an answer without being asked a question. In line 466, I made a request to Julie (“Dónde a dónde viajas”). In the following line, Julie acknowledged and recognized my request and was aware of its social consequence. In line 468, I acknowledged and recognized her answer. After asking Lillian, Cathy, Anastasia, and Julie, I made a request to Roberta in line 469. In this line I assumed that Roberta’s answer was negative and thus, I probably introduced the theme of class. Roberta took her time to acknowledge, recognize my question. She was also aware of the social consequences of giving a correct and complete answer. Thus, in line 470, her goal was to give me a complete and correct answer. However, she said a different word
and thus, she introduced the theme of gender. In line 471, I acknowledged Roberta’s answer by giving her the correct answer with which I re-introduced the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Indeed, I reinforced this link by repeating the correct answer in line 472.

In line 473, I made a request to Kate. In the following line, Kate acknowledged, recognized and was aware of giving me a negative answer. Similar to my second request to Lillian, I made another request to Kate that went unanswered in line 475. Then, I made a request to Ethan in line 476. Ethan acknowledged, recognized and was aware of giving me a negative answer. In this line, he re-introduced the theme of resistance to Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Once I finished asking Ethan and realized that Cathy was insisting that her classmates responded negatively my question, I made a request to Elsa in line 478. This request was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. In line 479, Elsa acknowledged, recognized and was aware of answering my question affirmatively. In line 480, I repeated Elsa’s answer with which I acknowledged and recognized her answer. At the end of this line, I made an intertextual link to Sonia related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. In line 481, Sonia acknowledged, recognized and aware of giving me an affirmative and correct answer. In line 482 I gave Sonia a positive evaluation but immediately afterwards I proposed another intertextual link related to the theme of gender which was triggered by Sonia’s low voice. This link was also acknowledged and recognized by some participant students. Then, in line 483, I proposed another link related to the theme of gender but it was not acknowledged or recognized. In line 484, I made the last request to Alexa which was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Alexa
acknowledged, recognized and was aware of giving me a negative answer. In the last line, I also acknowledged and recognized her answer.

**Discourse Practice**

From line 436 to line 443, I attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color, instructor of Spanish literacy and culture and a native speaker of Spanish. In lines 439 and 440, I also attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color and an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who followed the content of the textbook through the theme of being on vacation. In line 442, I shaped my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a native speaker of Spanish, and a traveler (“yo tengo tres preguntas una pregunta es”). In line 445, Student 1 confirmed these aspects of my identity. In line 446, I confirmed Student 1’s identity as a White learner of Spanish literacy and culture, an English native speaker and a woman traveler (“to travel”). In lines 447 and 448, I shaped my identity as a woman of color, a traveler as well as a Spanish literacy and culture instructor and a Spanish native speaker. In line 449, Student 1 confirmed these aspects of my identity again. In line 450, I tried to be seen again as a Spanish literacy and culture instructor, a woman of color, a Spanish native speaker and a traveler (“quién viajan aquí”) and, for the third time, Student 1 confirmed these identities. In line 452, I confirmed the identities of Student 1 as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and an English native speaker (“who”). I also tried to shape my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a native Spanish speaker and a traveler (“quién viajan aquí”). However, in line 453, Julie
confirmed these aspects of my identity. In line 454, I confirmed Julie’s identity as a Spanish language learner, an English native speaker and a White woman traveler.

Through my question in line 454 and the answer by some student participants in line 455 I confirmed their identities as Spanish language learners, English native speakers and White women travelers and they confirmed my identities as the Spanish native speaker, and language instructor a woman of color and to a lesser extent of a woman traveler.

In line 457 and 460, Lillian and Cathy did not confirm my identity as an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture and a woman of color who was also a traveler. Indeed, they shaped their identities as White women who were non-travelers and who resisted learning Spanish literacy and culture. Kate and Ethan did not confirm these aspects of my identity as well. Kate shaped her identity as a White woman who was a non-traveler and who resisted learning Spanish literacy and culture in line 474 whereas Ethan shaped his in similar ways in line 476. It is important to mention that in line 475 where I uttered “no” that showed my surprise when I heard Kate’s negative response, it was evident my taken-for-granted idea that learners such as Kate were going to respond affirmatively. Indeed, I showed the same surprise in line 457 when I was surprised to hear Lillian’s negative answer.

Three other student participants who answered my question negatively were Alexa, Anastasia, and Roberta. Alexa was the last student to answer my question and from what I observed in the video recording, Cathy did not encourage her to answer negatively. Even though my voice suggested that she did not belief Alexa’s answer
because she was from the West Coast, I confirmed Alexa’s identity as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and a non-traveler. In line 461, I said Anastasia’s name and in the following line Anastasia responded “no”. With this answer, Anastasia shaped her identity as a Black woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a non-traveler. Then, in line 464, Anastasia confirmed the identity that I shaped of her: the identity of a Black woman who did not take short or long trips. One possible reason why I assumed that Anastasia did not travel was the unfounded association I made between the Black race and a low economic status.

Regarding Roberta, I asked her whether she took trips or not in line 469. As it has been said, after a barely brief pause, I said “no” in a very low voice. This action reflects my assumption that Roberta does not take trips either. One possible reason why I assumed that Roberta did not travel was the association I made between her off-campus status, her non-traditional student identity and the fact that she had two part-time jobs. In addition, when our responses overlapped while I said the right answer “no viajo” Roberta said “no viejo”. Thus, Roberta’s wrong answer contributed to shape her identities as a White learner of Spanish literacy and culture who needed to improve her knowledge of Spanish and a White woman who did not travel.

In terms of affirmative answers, Julie and Elsa responded “sí”. In line 478, I asked Elsa “Elsa viajas”. This question suggested that I shaped Elsa’s identity as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a traveler. In the following line, Elsa responded affirmatively and mentioned the place she traveled to. Consequently, her
words confirmed her identity as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a traveler.

After evaluating Elsa’s affirmative answer, I said Sonia’s name. She responded “no viajo” (I don’t travel) in line 481 with a low tone of voice. With this answer, Sonia confirmed her identity as a woman of color, an ESL learner, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a non-traveler. Sonia’s answer was correct, well-pronounced and fast. This explained why I gave Sonia a very positive evaluation. However, Sonia’s low voice tone triggered some laughs on my part mainly because the low tone of voice probably reminded me a male voice. Consequently, despite the fact that Sonia answer correctly and it was pronounced correctly, I imitated our interaction and I shaped Sonia’s identity as a learner of Spanish literacy and culture, a non-traveler and a woman of color with a low pitch voice. In this case, the low-pitch voice was placed in an inferior place in relation to a higher pitch voice which I represented.

**Fourth Segment: “Chicos nota Cultural”/Guys A Cultural Note (The Instructor)**

34’12” to 35’01” (lines 487-502)

After I asked each student participant whether s/he traveled or not and where s/he traveled to, I made a parenthesis which I called “a cultural note”. “Cultural notes” was a common practice and student participants were used to them. Mainly, it was considered a break between class activities. In this case, the cultural note was related to Roberta’s
mistake. That is, it was about the difference between “viejo” (old, an old man) and “viajo” (I travel). However, before I made the distinction between these two words, Julie interrupted me and explained it in English (“no viejo means I’m not old not old”). After Julie’s explanation, I talked about the meaning of these two words in Spanish and English. However, through my explanation I reaffirmed by identities as a non-old traveler woman and positioned Roberta as an old non-traveler woman. After my explanation, I asked students the third question that I wrote on the board “cómo viajan” (how do all of you travel?). Consequently, in this fourth segment of language activity, it is important to focus on the ways in which I attempted to shape my identity in relation to Roberta’s identity. I suggest that this interaction can exemplify an example of a subtle attack I directed towards Roberta (lines 489-490).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Chicos nota cultural (.) &lt;cuidado&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guys a cultural note (.) &lt;be careful&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Julie:</td>
<td>No viejo means I’m not old (.) not old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Via+jo means I travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor: Viejo [means old]

Cathy: Jesús

Student 1: Oh no

Instructor: No es lo mismo
It is not the same

Instructor: Yo viajo (.). yo soy viejo (.). no.
I travel (.). I am an old man (.). no.

Instructor: *Yo viajo* (.). >otherwise I would be saying I am old<
*I travel* (.). >otherwise I would be saying I am old<

Instructor: O vieja y no (.). no es el caso no.
Or I am an old lady and no (.). it is not the case no.

Instructor: Viajo
I travel

Instructor: >*Entonces muy bien* (.). >*So very good* <(.).

Instructor: La pregunta es (.). cómo viajan
The question is (.) how do you all travel

500 Instructor: Por ejemplo a Vermont a Connecticut a Nueva York a Cape Cod
For example to Vermont to Connecticut to New York to Cape Cod

501 Instructor: Cómo viajan* en qué
How do you travel* By what (means of transportation)

502 Student 2: En coche
By car

Analysis of the Theoretical Tools

In the first line, I made a pause from the questions I was asking student participants by saying “chicos nota cultural” (guys a cultural note). After a barely noticed pause, I emphasized the word “cuidado” (be careful) and rose my left index finger. These actions indicated that the information I was going to share was important. Then, I looked at student participants and turned to the first board. These actions reinforced the idea that I wanted students to pay attention to what I was going to write on the board. While Lillian and Anastasia were looking at the instructor, Cathy was looking at her nails.

In line 488, I started to write on the board. I wrote and pronounced the personal pronoun I (yo). Then, I wrote the letter “v”. These actions signaled that I was going to write the sentence “yo viajo” (I travel). However, Julie interrupted me. First, Julie said
“no viejo” which were Roberta’s words. Then, Julie explained in English “*means I’m not old not old*”. When I heard Julie’s explanation, I turned to look at her, then I nodded and gestured an exaggerated laugh. This exaggerated laugh signaled that I did not welcome the interruption. At that moment, Lillian and Cathy were talking. Lillian put her left hand on her mouth so it was difficult to know what she was telling Cathy. In addition, some student participants were giggling. In line 489, I finished writing the sentence “yo viajo” and underlined the vowel “a”. While I was underlining the vowel, I also said the word “via+jo” with an elongated vowel “a”. At that moment, I turned and looked at Roberta and then, I turned to the students who were in front of me and said “*means I travel*” with an emphasis on the pronoun. While I was saying “I” I pointed to myself with my left index finger and leaned forward. That is, instead of pointing to the pronoun I had written on the board, I chose to point to myself. Through these actions, I clearly informed student participants that I was a traveler.

In line 490, I turned to the board to write the word “viejo” (old/an old man) below the word “viajo” which I had written seconds earlier. Similar to what I did previously, I underlined the vowel “e” and said the word “viejo” with an elongated vowel “e” and looked at Roberta. Then, I said “*means old*” and turned to look at the students who were in front of her. In line 491, while I was saying “viejo”, Cathy whispered the word “*Je+sus*” with an elongated vowel “e” which imitated what I did previously. At that moment, I turned to my left hand side where Cathy was seated. In line 492, Student 1 said “oh no”. Student 1’s comment was the answer I expected to hear because it provided an opportunity to repeat the distinction between the two words. Thus, in line 493, I said that “viajo” and “viejo” were not the same words (“*no es lo mismo*”) with an emphatic voice.
While I was saying it, I started to walk to the computer lectern. At that moment, some students sighed. In line 494, I explained that I traveled but that I was not old. First, I said “yo viajo” (I travel). I pointed to myself with my left hand and looked at the participant students who were in front of me. After a barely noticed pause, I said that I was old (“yo soy viejo”). While I was saying this, I looked at my right hand side where Roberta was seated. Then, after a second barely noticed pause; I smiled and said “no” with a clear and emphatic voice. With these actions I stressed my idea that I was not an old woman.

In line 495, I repeated the sentence “Yo via-jo” (I travel). This time I divided the word into syllables that enabled me to elongate the vowel “a”. In addition, I used a calm tone of voice. After a brief pause, I switched to English and changed the pace of my voice. Then, in fast speed, I explained “otherwise I would be saying I am old”. While I was saying this, I was walking backwards towards the blackboard. I was also looking at her left hand side where Lillian and Cathy were seated.

In line 496, I switched to Spanish and said “o vieja” (or an old woman). While I was saying “vieja” emphatically, I changed the last vowel of the word I had written on the board. That is, I changed “viejo” to “vieja”. In addition, I underlined the vowel “a” and said emphatically “y no” (and no). After a barely noticed pause, I said that it was not the case (“no es el caso”) with an emphasis on the word “no”. With this, I continued emphasizing the difference between the two words and my identity as a not old woman. After a second brief pause, I said “no” emphatically to attract students’ attention. In addition, my voice tone signaled some sense of humor or irony because I was the oldest person in the room. In the following line, I repeated the word “via+jo”. Similar to what I
did earlier, I divided the word into syllables which enabled me to elongate the vowel “a”. While I was saying this, I erased the word “vieja” on the board and looked at Roberta which helped me shape her an identity as an old woman.

In line 498, I said “entonces muy bien” (so very good). These words as well as my fast talk, high voice pitch and a very short pause signaled that my “nota cultural” had ended. In line 499, I returned to the questions with which I introduced the theme of lesson unit 5. Similar to the way I introduced the first two questions, I said “la pregunta es” (the question is) and after a brief pause I asked the third and last question “cómo viajan” (how do all of you travel). I kept the high pitch and emphasized the interrogative word “cómo” (how). While I was asking the question, I used the piece of chalk I had and used it to point to the written question on the board.

In line 500, I repeated the places student participants had mentioned. While I was saying this, I looked at the students who gave these answers. Every time I mentioned a place, I moved the eraser I had in my hand up and down. These actions contributed to keep students’ attention. In line 501, I asked again “cómo viajan” with an emphasis on the interrogative word. My voice was still in the same high pitch but my talk was slower and clearer. Then, I asked “en qué” (by what) as if I were helping students give a correct answer. In the last line, Student 2 answered “en coche” (by car”).

In terms of the turn-taking structure in this segment, I initiated an interaction in line 487 (“chicos note cultural cuidado”). In line 488, Julie initiated another interaction as she explained what I had in mind. In the two following lines, I initiated another interaction as I explained the difference between “via+jo” y “vie-jo”. These initiations
triggered responses by Cathy (line 491) and Student 1 (line 492). Thus, this was an I-R-R structure. Indeed, Student 1’s answer (“oh no”) was the answer that I expected. Thus, from line 493 to line 497, I kept the conversational floor. In line 498, the change in my pitch and the words “entonces muy bien” (so very good) signaled that I was evaluating the interaction and that I was about to start another one that was related to another theme.

In line 499, I asked the last question with which I introduced the theme of the fifth lesson unit (“la pregunta es cómo viajan”). The initiation included lines 500 and 501. In line 500, I mentioned the places to where students had traveled whereas in line 501 I asked the question in two different ways (“cómo viajan en qué”). In the last line, Student 2 provided the response “en coche” (by car). This last interaction showed an I-I-R structure. This summary highlights the fact that I dominated this segment of language activity mainly by initiating interactions.

Regarding the thematic coherence, in this segment of language activity four themes were identified: 1) Spanish literacy and culture, 2) Traveling, 3) Age, and 4) Gender. I introduced the theme of Spanish literacy and culture in line 487 (“Chicos nota cultural cuidado”). In the following line, Julie continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture and introduced the themes of age and gender (“no viejo means I am not old not old”). In line 489, I continued with the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling (“via+jo means I travel”). In line 490, I continued with the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and age (“vie+jo means old”). From lines 491 to 493, Cathy (“Je+sus”), Student 1 (“Oh no”) and I (“no es lo mismo”) continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture.
In line 494, I continued with the themes of Spanish literacy and culture, traveling, age, and gender (“yo viajo yo soy viejo no”). In line 495 I continued with these themes when I said (“yo viajo otherwise I would be saying I am old”). In line 496, I continued the themes of Spanish literacy and culture, age and gender when I said “o vieja y no no es el caso no” (or an old woman and no it is not the case no). After these explanations, I continued the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling (“via+jo”) in line 497. Once I ended discussing the distinction between “viajo” and “viejo”, I continued with the theme of Spanish literacy and culture in line 498 when I said “entonces muy bien”. In the last lines, Student 2 (line 501) and I (lines 499 to 501) continued with the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling.

In terms of the intertextuality links co-constructed in this segment, I proposed an intertextual link in line 487 related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture (“chicos nota cultural cuidado”). In line 488 Julie proposed another intertextual link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture, age and gender (“no viejo means I’m not old not old”). In lines 489, I proposed an intertextual link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling (“via+jo means travel”). In line 490, I proposed another intertextual link related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and age (“vie+jo means old”). In line 492, Student 1 recognized and acknowledged the links that I proposed by saying “oh no”. She was aware that her comments had a social consequence mainly they would help me continue with the explanation. Thus, Student 1 reaffirmed my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a Spanish native speaker and a young traveler.
I continued proposing intertextual links from lines 493 to 498. The first of these links was related to the theme of Spanish literacy and culture. The two following links were related to the four themes identified in this segment which were: Spanish literacy and culture, traveling, age and gender. The link proposed in line 496 was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture, age and gender while the proposed link of line 497 was related to the themes of Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Finally, the last link of line 498 was related to the permanent theme of Spanish literacy and culture.

Regarding the four last lines in this segment, the first three lines referred to three intertextual links proposed by me whereas the line 502 was related to the acknowledgment, recognition and awareness of the consequences of these actions by Student 2. The themes of these lines were: Spanish literacy and culture and traveling. Student 2 confirmed my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a Spanish native speaker, and a traveler.

**Discourse Practice**

In line 487, I attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, and a native speaker of Spanish. Then, in line 488, Julie attempted to shape her identity as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a native speaker of English. In lines 489 and 490, I attempted again to be seen as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and language, a native speaker of Spanish, an English language learner and a not-old traveler.
In line 491, Cathy attempted to shape her identity as a native speaker of English who resisted being a learner of Spanish literacy and culture. In line 492, Student 1 confirmed my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a native speaker of Spanish, an English language learner and a young traveler. At the same time, Student 1 attempted to shape her identity as a White woman, a learner of Spanish literacy and culture and a native speaker of English.

From line 493 to line 501, I attempted to be seen as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture who was also a not-old traveler and an English language learner. At the same time, in lines 494 to 497 I shaped and confirmed Roberta’s identity as a White woman and a learner of Spanish literacy and culture who made mistakes. In addition, Roberta was ridiculed as I confirmed her identities as old man and an old woman. It is important to point out that while I said (“viejo” or “yo soy viejo”), Julie mentioned “no viejo” which were the exact words used by Roberta. Consequently, Julie also contributed to confirm Roberta’s identity as a learner of Spanish literacy and culture who needed to study more to produce the correct answers that I expected. From line 499 to line 501, I attempted to shape my identity as a woman of color, an instructor of Spanish literacy and culture, a Spanish native speaker and a traveler. These aspects of my identity were confirmed by Student 2 in line 502.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND REFLECTIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the findings of this study. I also share my reflections about the contributions of this study. Mainly, I reflect on what it means to understand microaggressions from critical frameworks of language and literacy as a language instructor, researcher and a woman of color.

Discussion

Many world language instructors believe that the main cause of classroom problems is students’ behaviors. For example, on the third day of the fall semester, I believed that Cathy had a behavior problem. In my fieldnotes I wrote “Cathy is one of the first students that arrive on time to class, I see her and I treat her with respect. Then, she asks me about the homework or about an exercise but, in class she had a different attitude” (Fieldnotes, September 13). In addition to believing that many classroom problems stem from students’ behavior, most world language instructors are frustrated because they are unable to do what they believe is the solution to their classroom problems. On the third week of classes, I wrote in my fieldnotes that if I had talked with the academic dean or with any other college authority about Cathy’s insistence to stay in
the elementary level class, I would have been labeled as an unprofessional or incompetent instructor. What is more, I believed that Cathy and her mother would accuse me of discrimination against them. In my fieldnotes I wrote: “After talking with Lourdes [the Argentinean instructor] I confirmed the idea that if I decided to talk with the dean or with another college authority, Cathy would accuse me of discrimination and ignorance” (Fieldnotes, September 25). In other words, I feared that if I questioned Cathy and Estela’s decision to have Cathy in the elementary class; I would be labeled as an incompetent instructor. In addition, I feared jeopardizing the final months I had at the college. I did not want to ruin the relationships that I had built with the administration and with my colleagues.

This study demonstrates that classroom tensions cannot be reduced to students’ behaviors or to instructors’ incompetence because classroom life is quite complex. Students and language instructors bring in their own knowledge, their values, their stories, their assumptions, their beliefs, etc. when they interact with each other in the classroom setting. In addition, not only do all these aspects bring power relations but these power relations change and intertwine with the knowledge, values, stories, assumptions that exist in the contexts where the classroom is located. It also shows that one entry point to reflect on the complexity of classroom life is face-to-face interactions. Through the microethnographic approach to the discourse analysis of four segments of language activity, I illustrate how microaggressions are jointly constructed by classroom participants. In addition, I perceive that there are different types of microaggressions based on the participants who co-constructed them.
The first segment of language identity exemplifies the co-construction of a subtle attack by several White language learners and me, a woman instructor of color. In this case, the microaggression was directed towards me ("Yeah", "You do" "Go on" "Your turn"). The categories of race (White/non-White) and language (English/Spanish) were the more visible interconnected categories.

The second segment shows the co-construction of a microaggression by one White woman learner and me, a woman instructor of color. The analysis of this microaggression that Julie and I co-constructed suggests that it was directed towards me ("you are a groover"). Similar to the first segment, in this microaggression the categories of race and language were the ones that were more visibly interconnected. This segment also suggests that two White women learners, Julie and Roberta, co-constructed a microaggression. This subtle attack was directed towards Julie ("thank you ‘cause now is going to be all right"). It suggests variations within the category of race particularly the category of Whiteness and its connections with the category of class where Julie exemplified the wealthy student (e.g. preppy student) and Roberta embodied the identity of a non-traditional student from a middle class background.

The third segment shows three microaggressions co-constructed by two women learners of color, a White woman learner and me, as a woman instructor of color. The face-to-face interaction that Anastasia and I co-constructed shows that I directed a subtle attack towards Anastasia ("viajecitos no"). The analysis of this microaggression suggests the interconnectedness between the categories of race (Black/mestizo), class (working class/middle class) and language (Spanish learner/Spanish native speaker). The face-to-
face interaction that Sonia and I co-constructed shows that I directed a microaggression towards her ("Sonia do you travel I do not travel very good") In this case, I perceived that the attack was mainly based on the category of gender particularly variations of constructions of women’s identity in terms of low pitch voice (Sonia) and high pitch voice (me). Finally, in the microaggression co-constructed between Roberta and me, I perceive that I directed the microaggression towards Roberta (“Roberta viajas no”). In this case, I suggest that the category of class was the most visible in the analysis. This category was exemplified through the identities of a non-traveler woman (Roberta) and a traveler-woman (me).

Finally, in the fourth segment, the face-to-face interaction that Roberta and I co-constructed suggests that I directed a microaggression towards Roberta (“viajo means travel”, “viejo means old”). I suggest that the categories that were more visibly interconnected were age (old/not-old) and class (traveler/non-traveler). These two categories were interconnected to the category of gender. That is, age and class were interconnected with variations within the categories of women’s identity.

Reflections

I am aware that the findings of this study cannot be reproduced to other contexts. That is, the insights presented by this classroom-based study have meaning in the specific context of room 109 at Woodbridge College. However, they enable me to reflect in terms of what these findings mean to me as a woman of color, a researcher and a language instructor and educator.
As a woman of color, the topic of microaggressions makes me aware of the complexity of face-to-face communications as well as the instability of the social categories of language, race, gender and class mainly at the micro level of social activity. As a woman of color it also makes me aware of the work that I have to do to not reproduce (or reproduce less) dominant power hierarchies.

As a researcher, the findings of this study have encouraged me to continue conducting studies regarding the topic of microaggressions. I continue to be interested in the theorization and examination of classroom life as well as in the interconnection of social categories.

As a language instructor and educator, this research on microaggressions has made me understand the challenges that exist to develop and implement language programs and classroom practices that benefit the language learners who come from linguistically, racially and cultural diverse backgrounds. I also value the practices of being video recorded to become aware of the ways in which I can exert my power as instructor in the classroom setting. Thank you to this study, it became evident to me the negative effect that traditional teaching practices (e.g. close-ended questions) have on students’ language learning process.

I hope this study encourages language instructors and educators to be interested in the topic of microaggressions, the social categories such as gender, race, class and language and the theorization and examination of classroom life.
Course description

This course will be conducted in Spanish and will introduce you to 1) the basic grammar structures of the Spanish language and 2) the most important socio-cultural aspects of the Spanish-speaking world. In order to achieve these goals, you will need to actively participate in class daily. In addition, you will be expected to commit adequate time when preparing for each class, in order to do this successfully you must do all exercises that have been assigned in class as well as make every effort possible to attend campus activities related to this course.

Placement

The first day of class you will answer a brief questionnaire that will help your instructor decide whether or not you are matriculated in the appropriate level. After having evaluated the questionnaire your instructor will inform you whether a change of level should be made. No grade will be assigned to this questionnaire.
Course material

- (1) VISTAS (Web-SAM + MP3 with an access code to the online version of workbook, video, and lab manuals)
- (2) CDs (textbook activities)
- (3) CDs (vocabulary)
- (2) Interactive CD-ROMs
- (1) Pocket Dictionary

Course requirements

Attendance

You are expected to attend class four times per week. The class meets with the instructor three times (two days for seventy five minutes and one day for 50 minutes). The fourth class meeting is with a native speaker language assistant. Attendance to all sessions is required as well as active participation in Spanish in all class activities. You will be allowed a maximum of 2 unexcused absences before incurring any grade penalties. After two unexcused absences, you will be expected to provide a medical excuse from health services or – depending on the circumstances – a note from your academic dean. If you miss a class for any unexcused reason, it is your responsibility to inform yourself about the work done in class and to submit any work due on that day. Be advised that if you are absent for an exam or quiz (and it is unexcused), you will not be able to take it. Please see me if you would like further information on what constitutes as an acceptable excuse for missing class.

Class participation

Since participation is crucial in learning to speak any foreign language, you are expected to participate actively in class. Participating in class does not mean getting all the answers right or speaking proper Spanish, but rather TRYING to do so. A student who participates often and, say, gets “all answers wrong” will get exactly the same credit as a student who participates and gets all answers right (i.e. full participation credit). The most important aspect about class participation is that it is relevant, showing that you have studied and reflected upon material. Relevant participation also includes listening and learning from others’ participation. For example, a relevant wrong answer is a great opportunity for others to learn. Your participation will also be determined by active, on-task participation in-group activities, by coming prepared to class, and by volunteering.
• Always participates actively in group activities, prepared 100-81 points
• Almost always 80 - 61
• Usually 60 – 41
• Sometimes 40 - 21
• Almost never 20 - 1
• Never 0

Spanish Table and Movie

We strongly recommend that you attend the Spanish Language Table because it will help strengthen your ability to speak Spanish in an informal environment. Your attendance will be noted. In case you have a schedule conflict, please let the instructor know during the beginning of the course (time, day and location of the Spanish Language Table to be announced). There are also 5 movies in Spanish (with English subtitles) that will be shown throughout the semester. You are required to watch one movie and are encouraged to watch all movies due to the fact that they will show and discuss current aspects of several Spanish-speaking countries.

Course evaluation

There will be (3) pre-scheduled quizzes, (1) mid-term written test, and (1) final written exam composed of a listening, grammar and reading section. There are also a mid-term and a final oral exam that may consist of a short role-play by two students or an interview. There will be no make-up tests except in cases of emergency, and no make-ups will be given after the tests have been handed back to the class. There will also be (5) short written compositions as well as (10) QUIA-workbook, (10) QUIA-fotonovela and (10) QUIA-lab manual lessons that you are required to hand in on the day indicated by your instructor. If you are absent on that day, you may leave them in the instructor's office or hand them in the day before they are due. Late workbook lessons will receive a lower grade, if turned in within 3 days only. All worksheets turned in later than 3 days of the due date will not receive any credit, though they may be handed in for correction.

3 quizzes or parciales (50 points each) 150 points
1 mid-term written test (examen escrito de medio semestre) 100 points
1 final written exam (examen final escrito) 150 points
1 mid-term oral exam (examen oral de medio semestre) 40 points
1 final oral exam (examen final oral) 60 points
5 written compositions:
  Preliminary version (10 points each) 50 points
  Final version (10 points each) 50 points
10 Workbook QUIA lessons (15 points each) 150 points
10 Fotonovela QUIA lessons (5 points each) 50 points
10 Lab QUIA lessons (10 points each) 100 points
Class participation (TA’s class included) 100 points

Total 1000 points

Compositions

You will be expected to write 5 compositions during the semester. Each composition will have two drafts. The due dates for these compositions have not yet been noted but will be announced in class individually by each instructor. We will review in depth the rules for writing and passing in compositions. Please be aware that these dates will be added as the course progresses.

Grading scale

A 930-1000 points  
A- 900-929  
B+ 860-899  
B 830-859  
B- 800-829  
C 730-759  
C- 700-729  
D+ 660-699  
D 630-659  
D- 600-629
VISTAS

Your VISTAS package includes (1) VISTAS textbook, (2) textbook activities CDs, (3) vocabulary CDs, (2) Interactive CD-ROMs, Workbook/Video Manual online and (1) pocket dictionary. This is the material you will need for two semesters. During this semester you will learn the grammatical and the socio-cultural information of the first 10 lessons.

TEXTBOOK (T)

The VISTAS textbook lessons are organized in the same way. The major sections of each lesson are color-coded: red for Contextos, purple for Fotonovela, blue for Estructura, green for Adelante, orange for Panorama, and gold for Vocabulario. The Adelante section includes: Lectura, Escritura, and Escuchar. You are expected to prepare in advance the sections of the textbook that are indicated in the column of the syllabus that is entitled Preparación. The Fotonovela and the Panorama sections in the textbook correspond with the Fotonovela and Panorama Cultural that you will also find in QUIA-Web-SAM (online version). Upon discretion of the instructor, the lesson of the Fotonovela will be shown in class. However, you are also expected to watch it on your own in order to turn in the exercises that appear in the QUIA-Web-SAM.

QUIA-Web-SAM (online)


Workbook

Each lesson consists of Contextos, Estructura, Sintesis and Panorama. After every three workbook lessons you will find a Repaso Section that provides cumulative practice of what you learned in previous lessons. In this semester, you are expected to hand in the
first 10 lessons and the 3 Repaso exercises of the workbook section on the assigned dates designated by your instructor.

**Video Manual**

It is divided in two sections: **Fotonovela** and **Panorama Cultural**. Each **Fotonovela video** lesson consists of **Antes de ver el video (pre-viewing)**, **ver el video (while viewing)**, and **Después de ver el video (post-viewing)**. This semester you are expected to hand in the 10 lessons of the **Video Manual: Fotonovela** section on the assigned dates by your instructor. As for the second section, the **Panorama cultural video section**, it is integrated with the Panorama section in each lesson of the VISTAS textbook. Each video segment is 2-3 minutes long and consists of documentary footage from the countries of focus. During this semester you will have the opportunity to learn and expand your socio-cultural and political knowledge of the following countries: Estados Unidos, Canadá, España, Ecuador, México, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Perú, Guatemala, Chile, and Costa Rica. You will be watching most of these 10 panorama cultural videos in the discussion session with the teaching assistant. In these sessions with the teaching assistant, you will also be expected to do some of the exercises as well.

**Lab Manual**

The lab manual is divided into three sections: **Contextos, Pronunciación**, and **Estructura**. During this semester you are expected to hand in the first 10 lessons of the lab manual section on the assigned dates designated by your instructor.
Programa del curso

(It may be subject to change upon the discretion of the instructor)

Dates for midterm oral exams will also be designated as semester progresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lección</th>
<th>Preparación</th>
<th>¿Entregar!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Sept.</td>
<td>Presentación.</td>
<td>(páginas del libro de texto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contextos ¡Hola, ¿qué tal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fotonovela ¡Todos a bordo!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 1.1 Sustantivos y artículos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Estructura 1.2 Números 0-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 1.4 Como decir la hora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Estructura 1.3 Presente del verbo “ser”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panorama cultural: Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Contextos En la universidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fotonovela ¿Qué clases tomas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 2.1 Presente de los verbos “ar”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Estructura 2.2 Hacer preguntas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Estructura 2.3 Presente del verbo estar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 2.4 Números 31-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar&lt;br&gt;Contextos La familia&lt;br&gt;Fotonovela ¿Es grande tu familia?&lt;br&gt;<strong>Estructura 3.1. Adjetivos descriptivos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Estructura 3.2 Adjetivos posesivos</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estructura 3.3. Presente de los verbos “er” e “ir”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hora de conversación: Presentación&lt;br&gt;Panorama cultural: España</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Estructura 3.4 Presente de los verbos “tener” y “venir”</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repaso para parcial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARCIAL 1 (lecciones 1 a 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hora de conversación:&lt;br&gt;Panorama cultural: Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contextos Los pasatiempos&lt;br&gt;Fotonovela ¡Vamos al parque!&lt;br&gt;<strong>Estructura 4.1 Presente del verbo “ir”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 4.2 Verbos con cambio de raíz e-ie, o-ue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estructura 4.3. Verbos con cambio de raíz e-i</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estructura 4.4. Verbos irregulares en la forma “yo”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hora de conversación:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panorama cultural: México</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECESO DE MEDIO SEMESTRE (NO HAY CLASES EL LUNES 8 Y EL MARTES 9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>10</strong></th>
<th><strong>5</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contextos: Las vacaciones</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fotonovela Tenemos una reservación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 5.1 Verbo “estar” con condiciones y emociones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 5.2 Presente progresivo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>11</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hora de conversación:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repaso de vocabulario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>15</strong></th>
<th><strong>Estructura 5.3 “Ser y estar”</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Estructura 5.4 Pronombres de objeto directo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>16</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Repaso para parcial 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **17** | **PARCIAL 2 (lecciones 4 y 5)** |   |
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| 18 | **Hora de conversación**  
Panorama cultural: Puerto Rico | Versión final composición 2 |
| 22 | 6 | **Contextos: ¡De compras!**  
Fotonovela ¡Qué ropa más bonita!  
Estructura 6.1 Números 101 y más |
| 23 |  | **Estructura 6.2 Pronombres de objeto indirecto**  
**Estructura 6.3 Pretérito**  
**Estructura 6.4 Adjetivos y pronombres demostrativos** |
| 24 |  | **Lectura, Escritura, Escuchar**  
**Repaso para el examen de medio semestre**  
(lecciones 1 a 6) |
| 25 |  | **Hora de conversación**  
**Repaso de vocabulario** |
| 29 |  | **EXAMEN DE MEDIO SEMESTRE** |
| 30 |  | **EXAMEN DE MEDIO SEMESTRE** |
| 31 | 7 | **Contextos: La rutina diaria**  
Fotonovela ¡Jamás me levanto temprano!  
Estructura 7.1. Verbos reflexivos |
| 1 Nov. |  | **Hora de conversación** |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Estructura 7.2. Palabras negativas e indefinidas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Estructura 7.3. Pretérito del verbo “ser” e “ir”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 7.4 Verbs gustar y similares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contextos La comida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fotonovela ¿Qué tal la comida?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hora de conversación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versión final composición 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panorama cultural: Perú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Estructura 8.1 Pretérito de los verbos con cambio de raíz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estructura 8.3 Saber y conocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Estructura 8.2 Pronombres dobles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Estructura 8.4. Comparativos y superlativos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Repaso para parcial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hora de conversación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panorama cultural: Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PARCIAL 3 (lecciones 7 y 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Contextos Las fiestas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borrador composición 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fotonovela ¡Feliz cumpleaños, Maite!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECESO DE ACCION DE GRACIAS (NO HAY CLASES EL MIERCOLES 21 Y EL JUEVES 22)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Estructura 9.1 Verbos irregulares en el pretérito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Estructura 9.2 Verbos que cambian de significado en el pretérito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Estructura 9.4 Pronombres seguidos de preposiciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Hora de conversación:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final written (and listening) exam will be pre-scheduled. Please, be advised that the final exam will take place during the final exam period (15 AL 19 DE DICIEMBRE).

I, _________________________________, have read and understand the attendance and the participation guidelines. I also understand that the course program may be subject to change upon discretion of the instructor. Please sign and keep the syllabus.

X
# APPENDIX B

## OVERVIEW OF THE TEN UNITS SEEN IN THE SPANISH ELEMENTARY COURSE SECTION 04 (THE FALL SEMESTER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Social Contexts</th>
<th>Grammatical Structures</th>
<th>Video Clip (Fotonovela)</th>
<th>Cultural Overview (Video)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hi, how are you?</td>
<td>Greetings and leave-takings</td>
<td>Articles, Nouns, Numbers (0-30)</td>
<td>Everyone on board! Greetings and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressions of courtesy</td>
<td>Present tense of verb to be</td>
<td>The United States (Latinos) and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying yourself and others</td>
<td>Telling time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 / 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At the university</td>
<td>University life</td>
<td>Present tense of –ar verbs</td>
<td>What classes are you taking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The classroom and the academic life</td>
<td>Forming questions</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic subjects</td>
<td>Present tense of estar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Days of the week</td>
<td>Numbers (31-100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The family</td>
<td>The family</td>
<td>Descriptive adjectives</td>
<td>How large is your family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying people</td>
<td>Possessive adjectives</td>
<td>Families in the Spanish-speaking world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professions and occupations</td>
<td>Present tense of –er and –ir verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Present tense of tener and venir</td>
<td>Let’s go to the park!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pastimes, Sports, Places in the city</td>
<td>We have a reservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vacation, Travel and vacation, Months of the year, Seasons and weather, Ordinal numbers</td>
<td>A holiday accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 / 9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clothing and shopping, Negotiating a price and buying, Colors, More adjectives</td>
<td>What nice clothing!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily routine, Personal hygiene, Time expressions</td>
<td>I never get up early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 / 11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily routines</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>like gustar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food descriptions</td>
<td>Preterite of stem-changing verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>Double object pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saber and conocer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparisons and superlatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How is the food?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food in the Spanish-speaking world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
<td>Happy birthday!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parties and celebrations</td>
<td>Irregular preterits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>Verbs that change meaning in the preterite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stages of life</td>
<td>¿Qué? and ¿cuál?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronouns after prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrations in the Spanish-speaking world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>At the doctor’s office</td>
<td>Medicare System in the Spanish-speaking world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and medical terms</td>
<td>The imperfect tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parts of the body</td>
<td>The preterite and the imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symptoms and medical conditions</td>
<td>Constructions with se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health professions</td>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review for final written exam and students final oral presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

CONSENT AND PERMISSION FORMS

The Consent Form

Dear Students:

I would like to conduct observations in this class during the fall semester. The Observations will be part of a study with the intent to better understand language and literacy development in Spanish as well as my own teaching practices as foreign language instructor. The Results from this study would increase our knowledge regarding the learning processes that students of Spanish go through, and would inform us as to how to improve the current teaching practices of Spanish as a foreign language in college settings in the U.S.

I would like to request your participation in the study. I will be taking notes during many of the class meetings, and audio-recordings of the proceedings in the class. I will video-tape some of the class sessions. Such audio-and video-recorded materials are only used for the purpose of data analysis. I would also like permission to consider your writing texts (that is, compositions, workbook exercises and tests) and would like to ask some of you to participate in interviews (which will be conducted in English) and audio-recorded. Occasionally, assisting me in the analysis of my own teaching practices will be another graduate student.

The findings of this study will be used in my doctoral dissertation. It is possible that data collection from this study will be used in presentations made at professional conferences, and published articles and books.

The identity of the college and all participants in the study will be changed in any written reports or articles to protect the anonymity and insure your privacy. It is important that you know that there are no risks associated with this study and that your language learning process will not be disrupted. After you agree to participate in the study, you still have the right to withdraw your permission at any time during the data-collection stage.

You are welcome to contact me at any time and ask questions about the study. If you would like more information about any aspect of this project, I can be reached at 413.210.3706 or you can also reach the Chairperson of my dissertation committee, Dr. Theresa Austin, at 413.545-0138. When the study is completed, a report of the study will be available at your request, and you are welcome to read it.

Please fill out the attached permission form and return it to me. I certainly hope you will give me permission, but be assured that you are free to participate or not; this has no influence on the evaluation of your performance in the Spanish course (SPAN101).

I thank you in advance for your cooperation and understanding in helping me become a more effective foreign language instructor.

Sincerely,
Thelma Belmonte-Alcántara

The Permission Form

Date: ______________________________________________
Name: _____________________________________________

Please check:

_______ I give permission to be included in the study of Spanish language and literacy.

  • I also give permission to photocopy my written assignments Yes/No
  • I am also willing to participate in an interview Yes/No

_______ I do NOT give permission to be included in the study of Spanish language and literacy.

Signature: _________________________________
APPENDIX D
INFORMATION SHEET

HOJA DE INFORMACIÓN

Nombre/Name:
Año académico: Academic year (1º, 2º, 3º, 4º)
Especialización/Major:
Correo electrónico/Email:

1. Escribe cualquier experiencia previa que tengas con el español (Describe any previous experiences with Spanish)

2. Escribe cualquier experiencia previas que tengas con otros idiomas (experiencia académica, idiomas hablados en casa, viajes, etc.) (Describe any previous experience with any other language (academic experience, language(s) spoken at home, travel, etc.).)

3. ¿Por qué estudias español? ¿Qué aspectos de la lengua y/o de la cultura te interesan? ¿Consideras que podrías usar el español después de graduarte? (Why do you study Spanish this semester? What aspects of the language and/or culture interest you? Do you think you could use Spanish after you graduate?)

4. ¿Qué esperas aprender/lograr en esta clase? (What do you want to accomplish/achieve in this class?)

5. ¿Existe algo que te pone nerviosa en las clases de español o en las clases de lengua? (Is there anything that makes you nervous in a Spanish class or in a language class in general?)

6. ¿Qué actividades te han gustado en tus otras clases de español? (Do you like a specific kind of activities (role plays, oral presentations, etc.)
7. ¿Recuerdas el puntaje que obtuviste en el examen de colocación? (Please tell us the score you received in the placement exam)

8. Comentarios adicionales (algo que tú crees que yo deba saber) (Please write any additional comments. Something you think I need to know).

¡Muchas gracias!
APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

1. What is your first language/home language/native language?

2. If you are multilingual/multiliterate, what language do you use, for what purposes and with whom?

3. How do you define yourself in terms of ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, etc?

4. Why do you attend Woodbridge College? What factors were influential in your decision?

5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of attending a women’s college?

6. What is your academic year?

7. What is your major?

8. What are your future goals/plans?

SPANISH LANGUAGE QUESTIONS

1. Did you have any knowledge of Spanish (or any other language) before you took the course?

2. Why did you take Spanish?

3. What were your goals for the elementary level class?
4. What do you think is the most important element (are the most important elements) in learning Spanish as a foreign language?

5. How important was it for you to become competent in Spanish?

SPANISH 101 QUESTIONS

1. What are your general impressions/feelings about the class?

2. What did you like the most/the least?
   - Long classes with instructor
   - Short classes with instructor
   - Online exercises/QUIA
   - Fotonovela
   - Classes with the TA

3. What is the importance of grammar sessions?

4. What is the importance of speaking/oral presentations?

5. What is the importance of listening comprehension activities?

6. What is the importance of compositions?

7. What is the importance of reading?

8. What functions do you think learning grammar has in terms of your learning of Spanish and in terms of achieving your own goals?
9. Which grammar lessons from those we had in class (1-10) do you like the most and the least? Why?

10. Which part of the lesson from those I conducted in class do you like the most and the least? Why?

11. Do you remember a grammatical structure in particular? Which one? Why?

12. Do you remember a lesson/class in particular? Which one? Why?

AFTER SPANISH

1. Do you use Spanish?

2. Are you studying Spanish now? Another language?

3. Any additional comments/questions
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